



United Nations

Department of Political Affairs

**Repertoire of the Practice
of the Security Council**

Supplement 2000-2003

Volume I

Department of Political Affairs

**Repertoire of the Practice
of the Security Council**

Supplement 2000-2003

Volume I



United Nations • New York, 2012

Note

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

ST/PSCA/1/Add.14

United Nations publication

Sales No. E.12.VII.3

ISBN 978-92-1-137039-3

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Volume I	
Introduction	xv
Members of the Security Council, 2000-2003.	xvi
Items considered by the Security Council at formal meetings, 2000-2003.	xviii
Chapter I. Provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council and related procedural developments	
Introductory note	3
Part I. Meetings (rules 1-5).	5
Note	5
A. Special cases concerning the application of rules 1-5	5
B. Procedural developments relating to meetings.	7
Part II. Representation and credentials (rules 13-17)	12
Part III. Presidency (rules 18-20)	12
Note	12
Part IV. Secretariat (rules 21-26)	15
Part V. Conduct of business (rules 27-36)	15
Note	15
Special cases concerning the application of rules 27-36	16
Part VI. Languages (rules 41-47)	22
Note	22
Special cases concerning the application of rules 41-47	22
Part VII. Publicity of meetings, records (rules 48-57)	23
Chapter II. Agenda	
Introductory note	X
Part I. The provisional agenda (rules 6-8 and 12)	27
Note	27
A. Circulation of communications by the Secretary-General (rule 6)	27
B. Preparation of the provisional agenda (rule 7)	27
C. Communication of the provisional agenda (rule 8)	27
Part II. Adoption of the agenda (rule 9)	28

Note	28
Discussions on the adoption of the agenda	28
A. Scope of items on the agenda in relation to the scope of discussion	28
B. Phrasing of agenda items	29
C. Postponement of consideration of items	29
Part III. The agenda and matters of which the Security Council is seized (rules 10 and 11) ..	30
Note	30
Practice of the Security Council regarding the retention and deletion of items from the list of matters of which the Council is seized (rule 11)	31
Addition, retention and deletion of items during the period under review	31
A. Items added to the list of matters of which the Security Council was seized during the period 2000-2003	32
B. Items that appeared in previous volumes of the <i>Repertoire</i> on which new action by the Security Council was reported in summary statements issued during the period 2000-2003	40
C. Items that were deleted from the list of matters of which the Security Council was seized during the period 2000-2003	48
Chapter III. Participation in the proceedings of the Security Council	
Introductory note	57
Part I. Basis of invitations to participate	58
Note	58
A. Invitations under rule 37 (States Members of the United Nations)	58
B. Invitations under rule 39 (members of the Secretariat or other persons)	59
C. Invitations not expressly extended under rule 37 or rule 39	60
D. Requests for invitations denied or not acted upon	63
Part II. Procedures relating to participation of invited representatives or individuals	65
Note	65
A. The stage at which those invited to participate are heard	65
B. Limitations on participation	66
Annexes	
I. Invitations extended under rule 37	67
II. Invitations extended under rule 39	89
Chapter IV. Voting	
Introductory note	135
Part I. Procedures relating to decision-making and voting	135

Part II. Procedural and non-procedural matters	136
Note	136
Cases in which the vote indicated the non-procedural character of the matter	137
Part III. Proceedings of the Security Council regarding voting upon the question whether the matter was procedural within the meaning of Article 27, paragraph 2, of the Charter	138
Part IV. Abstention, non-participation or absence in relation to Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter	138
Note	138
A. Obligatory abstention	138
B. Voluntary abstention, non-participation or absence in relation to Article 27, paragraph 3	139
1. Cases in which permanent and/or elected members abstained otherwise than in accordance with the proviso to Article 27, paragraph 3	139
2. Cases in which elected members did not participate or were absent during the voting	142
Part V. Adoption of resolutions and decisions without a vote	143
Note	143
A. Cases in which the Security Council adopted resolutions without a vote	144
B. Cases in which Security Council decisions were announced in presidential statements issued after being agreed upon by the members of the Council at consultations	144
C. Cases in which Security Council decisions were recorded in notes by the President of the Security Council.	151
D. Cases in which Security Council decisions were recorded in letters from the President of the Security Council	154
Chapter V. Subsidiary organs of the Security Council	
Introductory note	165
Part I. Subsidiary organs of the Security Council established or continuing during the period 2000-2003.	166
A. Standing committees and ad hoc committees	166
B. Security Council committees	166
C. Informal and ad hoc working groups	182
D. Investigative bodies	183
E. Peacekeeping operations and political missions.	184
F. Ad hoc commissions and ad hoc international tribunals	206
Part II. Subsidiary organs of the Security Council whose mandate was completed or terminated during the period 2000-2003	210

Part III. Subsidiary organs of the Security Council proposed but not established	212
Chapter VI. Relations with other United Nations organs	
Introductory note	216
Part I. Relations with the General Assembly	216
Note	216
A. Election by the General Assembly of non-permanent members of the Security Council	216
B. Recommendations by the General Assembly to the Security Council in the form of resolutions under Articles 10 and 11 of the Charter	218
Note	218
1. Recommendations on matters relating to the Council's powers and functions or with regard to the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security	219
2. Recommendations with regard to questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security, or requesting action on such questions by the Council	221
C. Practice in relation to Article 12 of the Charter	221
Note	221
D. Practice in relation to provisions of the Charter involving recommendations by the Security Council to the General Assembly	223
Note	223
1. Membership in the United Nations	223
2. Appointment of the Secretary-General	224
E. Reports of the Security Council to the General Assembly	224
F. Relations with subsidiary organs established by the General Assembly	226
Note	226
Communications from subsidiary organs established by the General Assembly	229
Part II. Relations with the Economic and Social Council: practice in relation to Article 65 of the Charter	231
Note	231
A. Requests or references to the Economic and Social Council in decisions of the Security Council	231
Note	231
1. Resolutions containing references to the Economic and Social Council	232
2. Presidential statements containing references to the Economic and Social Council	232

B. Constitutional discussion arising in connection with the Economic and Social Council	233
Note	233
Part III. Relations with the Trusteeship Council	241
Part IV. Relations with the International Court of Justice	242
Note	242
A. Practice in relation to the election of members of the International Court of Justice	242
Note	242
B. Consideration of the relationship between the Security Council and the Court	243
Note	243
Part V. Relations with the Secretariat	245
Note	245
A. Functions other than those of an administrative nature entrusted to the Secretary-General by the Security Council	245
Note	245
B. Matters brought to the attention of the Security Council by the Secretary-General	249
Part VI. Relations with the Military Staff Committee	250
Note	250
Chapter VII. Practice relative to recommendations to the General Assembly regarding membership in the United Nations	
Introductory note	255
Part I. Applications for admission to membership in the United Nations and action taken thereon by the Security Council and the General Assembly, 2000-2003	256
Note	256
A. Applications recommended by the Security Council	256
B. Discussion of the question in the Security Council	256
C. Applications pending on 1 January 2000	257
D. Applications submitted and action taken thereon by the Security Council and the General Assembly from 1 January 2000 to 31 December 2003	258
Part II. Presentation of applications	260
Part III. Referral of applications to the Committee on the Admission of New Members	260
Part IV. Procedures in the consideration of applications within the Security Council	260
Part V. Practices relating to the applicability of Article 4 of the Charter	261
Note	261

Chapter VIII. Consideration of questions under the responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security

Introductory note	268
Africa	
1. The situation concerning Western Sahara	270
2. The situation in Liberia	275
3. The situation in Somalia	285
4. The situation in Angola	296
5. The situation concerning Rwanda	319
6. The situation in Burundi	322
7. Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America	332
8. The situation in Sierra Leone	335
9. The situation in the Great Lakes region	356
10. The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	361
11. The situation in the Central African Republic	412
12. The situation in Africa	418
13. The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	428
14. The situation in Guinea-Bissau	437
15. The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone	443
16. Security Council resolution 1054 (1996) of 26 April 1996	448
17. Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council	449
18. Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security	451
19. Letter dated 29 November 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	453
20. The situation in Côte d'Ivoire	454
21. Letter dated 2 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	462
22. Central African region	463
Americas	
23. The question concerning Haiti	466
Asia	
24. The situation in Timor-Leste	467

25. The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border	509
26. The situation in Afghanistan	511
27. Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.	534
28. Letter dated 10 November 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Solomon Islands to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	539
Index	I
Volume II	
Introduction	xv
Members of the Security Council, 2000-2003.	xvi
Chapter VIII (continued). Consideration of questions under the responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security	
Introductory note	
Europe	
29. The situation in Cyprus.	540
30. Items relating to the situation in the former Yugoslavia	543
A. The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	543
B. The situation in Croatia	560
C. Items relating to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.	562
D. Items relating to Kosovo	565
E. Briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans	588
31. The situation in Georgia	591
Middle East	
32. The situation in the Middle East	600
A. United Nations Disengagement Observer Force	600
B. United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and developments in the Israel-Lebanon sector	601
33. The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	605
34. Items relating to Iraq.	635
A. The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	635
B. Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq	688
35. Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	

Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	690
---	-----

Thematic issues

36. Items relating to the International Tribunals	692
A. International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	
International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994	692
B. International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	701
C. International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994	704
37. Items relating to the maintenance of international peace and security	707
A. The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security.	707
B. Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peacebuilding	708
C. Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council	711
D. The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations.	714
E. Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa	720
38. Children and armed conflict.	725
39. Items relating to terrorism	735
A. Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts.	735
B. High-level meeting of the Security Council on the anniversary of 11 September 2001: acts of international terrorism.	763
C. High-level meeting of the Security Council: combating terrorism.	763
40. Promoting peace and security: humanitarian assistance to refugees in Africa.	765
41. Protection of civilians in armed conflict.	767
42. Items relating to small arms	782

A. Small arms	782
B. Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa	787
43. Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts	790
44. Protection of United Nations personnel, associated personnel and humanitarian personnel in conflict zones	793
45. General issues relating to sanctions	795
46. Women and peace and security	800
47. Items relating to peacekeeping	806
A. No exit without strategy	806
B. Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries	808
C. Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations	811
D. United Nations peacekeeping	812
E. The importance of mine action for peacekeeping operations	815
48. Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach	817
49. Nobel Peace Prize	820
50. Items relating to food and security	821
A. Food aid in the context of conflict settlement: Afghanistan and other crisis areas	821
B. Africa's food crisis as a threat to peace and security	822
51. Kimberley Process Certification Scheme	825
52. The Security Council and regional organizations: facing the new challenges to international peace and security	825
53. The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes	827
54. Security Council mission	829
55. Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role	835
56. Briefings	838
Chapter IX. Decisions taken by the Security Council in the exercise of its other functions and powers	
Note	840
Chapter X. Consideration of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter	
Introductory note	843
Part I. Referral of disputes and situations to the Security Council	846
Note	846
Part II. Investigation of disputes and fact-finding	854
Note	854

Part III. Decisions of the Security Council concerning the pacific settlement of disputes	858
Note	858
A. Decisions of the Security Council on general and thematic issues relating to the pacific settlement of disputes.	860
B. Recommendations relating to methods, procedures or terms of the pacific settlement of disputes	862
C. Decisions involving the Secretary-General in the Council's efforts at the pacific settlement of disputes	878
D. Decisions involving regional arrangements or agencies	891
Part IV. Constitutional discussion bearing on the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter	891
Note	891
Chapter XI. Consideration of the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter	
Introductory note	916
Part I. Determination of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression in accordance with Article 39 of the Charter	917
Note	917
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 39	917
B. Discussion relating to Article 39	922
Part II. Provisional measures to prevent the aggravation of a situation in accordance with Article 40 of the Charter	934
Note	934
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 40	934
B. Discussion relating to Article 40	939
Part III. Measures not involving the use of armed force in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter	940
Note	940
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 41	940
B. Discussion relating to Article 41	949
Part IV. Measures to maintain or restore international peace and security in accordance with Article 42 of the Charter	967
Note	967
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 42	967
B. Discussion relating to Article 42	969
Part V. Decisions and deliberations having relevance to Articles 43 to 47 of the Charter	980
Note	981

A.	Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 43	982
B.	Discussion relating to Article 43	986
C.	Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 44	988
D.	Discussion relating to Article 44	989
E.	Decisions of the Security Council relating to Articles 46 and 47	991
F.	Discussion relating to Articles 46 and 47	991
Part VI.	Obligations of Member States under Article 48 of the Charter	992
Note	992
A.	Obligations arising pursuant to Security Council decisions adopted under Article 41	993
B.	Obligations arising pursuant to the Security Council decisions adopted under Article 42	995
Part VII.	Obligations of Member States under Article 49 of the Charter	996
Note	996
A.	Calls for mutual assistance in the implementation of decisions adopted under Article 41	996
B.	Calls for mutual assistance in the implementation of decisions adopted under Article 42	997
Part VIII.	Special economic problems of the nature described in Article 50 of the Charter	998
Note	998
A.	Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 50	999
B.	Discussion relating to Article 50	1000
C.	Instances arising in Security Council subsidiary bodies	1003
Part IX.	Right of self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter	1004
Note	1004
A.	Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 51	1004
B.	Discussion relating to Article 51	1005
C.	Invocation of the right of self-defence in other instances	1014
Chapter XII. Consideration of the provisions of other Articles of the Charter		
Introductory note	1021
Part I.	Consideration of the purposes and principles of the United Nations (Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter)	1022
A.	Article 1, paragraph 2	1022
B.	Article 2, paragraph 4	1026
C.	Article 2, paragraph 5	1038

D. Article 2, paragraph 6	1041
E. Article 2, paragraph 7	1041
Part II. Consideration of the functions and powers of the Security Council (Articles 24 and 25 of the Charter)	1044
A. Article 24	1044
B. Article 25	1054
Part III. Consideration of the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter	1057
Note	1057
A. General consideration of the provisions of Chapter VIII	1059
B. Encouragement or calls by the Security Council for action by regional arrangements in the pacific settlement of disputes	1066
C. Calls by the Security Council for involvement of regional arrangements in the implementation of Chapter VII measures	1073
D. Consideration or authorization by the Security Council of enforcement action by regional arrangements	1075
E. Consultation, briefing and reporting by regional arrangements	1077
Part IV. Consideration of the miscellaneous provisions of the Charter	1078
Note	1078
Index	I

Introduction

The present publication, in two volumes, constitutes the fourteenth supplement to the *Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council, 1946-1951*, which was issued in 1954. It covers the proceedings of the Security Council from the 4087th meeting, on 10 January 2000, to the 4891st meeting, on 22 December 2003.

The *Repertoire* was mandated by the General Assembly in its resolution 686 (VII) of 5 December 1952, entitled “Ways and means for making the evidence of customary international law more readily available”. It is a guide to the proceedings of the Council and sets forth in a readily accessible form the practices and procedures to which the Council has had recourse. The *Repertoire* is not intended as a substitute for the records of the Council, which constitute the only comprehensive and authoritative account of its deliberations.

The categories employed to arrange the material are not intended to suggest the existence of procedures or practices that have not been clearly or demonstrably established by the Council itself. The Council is at all times, within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations, its own provisional rules of procedure, and practice established through notes by the President of the Security Council, master of its own procedure.

In recording the Council’s practice, the headings under which the practices and procedures of the Council were presented in the original publication have been largely retained. Where necessary, however, adjustments have been made to better reflect the Council’s practice. For ease of reference, the studies contained in chapter VIII are organized according to region or thematic issues. This introduction contains a table indicating the membership of the Security Council during the period under review.

The agenda items considered by the Council during 2000-2003, and the meetings at which they were considered, are presented in a table hereunder in the order in which the items were initially taken up during the period.

* * *

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of letters combined with figures. Security Council documents are indicated by a symbol such as S/2000/537. References to the verbatim records of meetings of the Council are given in the form S/PV.4886, meetings being numbered consecutively, starting with the first meeting in 1946. As in previous recent supplements, reference is made in this Supplement only to the provisional verbatim records of Security Council meetings, as the practice of publishing the meeting records in the *Official Records* has been discontinued.

The resolutions adopted by the Security Council and most of the statements by the President are published in the yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. Resolutions are identified by a number followed by the year of adoption in parentheses, for example, resolution 1324 (2000). Statements by the President not included in the yearly volumes are recorded in the relevant verbatim records.

Readers who wish to consult the full record of a meeting or the text of a Security Council document referred to in the *Repertoire* may do so on the official United Nations Documentation Centre website, www.un.org/en/documents/. Security Council documents can be accessed on the website by selecting “Official Document System (ODS)” or one of the direct links to specific categories of documents. The volumes of resolutions and decisions may be accessed by symbol (S/INF/56, for 2000; S/INF/57, for 2001/02; S/INF/58, for 2002/03; and S/INF/59, for 2003/04). The original *Repertoire* and the other supplements may be consulted at www.un.org/en/sc/repertoire.

Members of the Security Council, 2000-2003

<i>Member</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>2003</i>
Angola				•
Argentina	•			
Bangladesh	•	•		
Bulgaria			•	•
Cameroon			•	•
Canada	•			
Chile				•
China (permanent member)	•	•	•	•
Colombia		•	•	
France (permanent member)	•	•	•	•
Germany				•
Guinea			•	•
Ireland		•	•	
Jamaica	•	•		
Malaysia	•			
Mali	•	•		
Mauritius		•	•	
Mexico			•	•
Namibia	•			
Netherlands	•			
Norway		•	•	
Pakistan				•
Russian Federation (permanent member)	•	•	•	•
Singapore		•	•	
Spain				•
Syrian Arab Republic			•	•

<i>Member</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>2003</i>
Tunisia	•	•		
Ukraine	•	•		
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (permanent member)	•	•	•	•
United States of America (permanent member)	•	•	•	•

**Items considered by the Security Council at formal meetings,
2000-2003**

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in Africa	6
The situation in Africa	4087
The impact of AIDS on peace and security in Africa	
The situation in Africa	4096, 4577
The situation in Africa	4460, 4465
Letter dated 10 January 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/46)	
The situation in Africa	4538
Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa	
<hr/>	
Items relating to the situation in the former Yugoslavia	
The situation in Croatia	8
The situation in Croatia	4088
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (UNMOP) (S/1999/1302)	
The situation in Croatia	4170
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMOP (S/2000/647)	
The situation in Croatia	4256
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMOP (S/2000/1251)	
The situation in Croatia	4346
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMOP (S/2001/661)	
The situation in Croatia	4448
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMOP (S/2002/1)	
The situation in Croatia	4574
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMOP (S/2002/713)	
The situation in Croatia	4622
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMOP (S/2002/1101)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in Croatia	4662
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMOP (S/2002/1341)	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	27
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4117
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH) (S/2000/215)	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4136, 4303
Briefing by Mr. Wolfgang Petritsch, High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4154, 4162
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIBH (S/2000/529)	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4169, 4188, 4222, 4304, 4566, 4573, 4786
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4209
Letter dated 18 October 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/999)	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4245
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIBH (S/2000/1137)	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4330
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIBH (S/2001/571 and Corr.1)	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4333
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIBH (S/2001/571 and Corr.1)	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4379
Letter dated 14 September 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/868)	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4433
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIBH (S/2001/1132 and Corr.1)	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4484
Letter dated 26 February 2002 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/209)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4555, 4558, 4563, 4564
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIBH (S/2002/618)	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4568
Letter dated 3 July 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Canada to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/723)	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4631
Letter dated 18 October 2002 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1176)	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4661
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIBH (S/2002/1314)	
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4837
Letter dated 25 September 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/918)	
International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia	7
International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	4161, 4581, 4582
International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	4260
Letter dated 11 January 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/61)	
International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	4274
Establishment of the list of candidates for permanent judges	
International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	4316
Establishment of the list of candidates for ad litem judges	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	4759
Letter dated 7 May 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/530)	
Items relating to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	5
Letter dated 4 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/191)	4289, 4290, 4301
The situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	4356, 4381
Items relating to Kosovo	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	49
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4102, 4108, 4171, 4190, 4200, 4225, 4232, 4258, 4277, 4286, 4309, 4350, 4359, 4409, 4430, 4454, 4473, 4475, 4498, 4533, 4543, 4559, 4605, 4633, 4770, 4823, 4880, 4886
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4138
Report of the Security Council mission on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) (S/2000/363)	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4153
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) (S/2000/538)	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4249, 4250
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK (S/2000/1196)	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4296, 4298
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK (S/2001/218)	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4331
Presentation of the report of the Security Council mission to Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4335
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK (S/2001/565)	
Report of the Security Council mission on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) (S/2001/600)	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4387, 4388
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK (S/2001/926 and Add.1)	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4518, 4519
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK (S/2002/436)	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4592
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK (S/2002/779)	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4643
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK (S/2002/1126)	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4676
Report of the Security Council mission to Kosovo and Belgrade, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (S/2002/1376)	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4702, 4703
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK (S/2003/113)	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4742
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK (S/2003/421)	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4782
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK (S/2003/675)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4809
Letter dated 14 August 2003 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Serbia and Montenegro to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/815)	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4853
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK (S/2003/996)	
Security Council resolution 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998	
Security Council resolution 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998	4366
Briefing by His Excellency Mr. Nebojša Čović, Deputy Prime Minister of Serbia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia	
Briefing by His Excellency Mr. Nebojša Čović, Prime Minister of Serbia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia	4373
Briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans	
Briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans	4105, 4164
Promoting peace and security: humanitarian assistance to refugees in Africa	4089
The situation in Angola	26
The situation in Angola	4090, 4377, 4418, 4419, 4444, 4472, 4499, 4514, 4517, 4536, 4575, 4603, 4628, 4657
The situation in Angola	4113, 4129
Letter dated 10 March 2000 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/203)	
The situation in Angola	4126
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Office in Angola (S/2000/304 and Corr.1)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in Angola	4178
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Office in Angola (S/2000/678)	
The situation in Angola	4263, 4283
Note by the President of the Security Council (S/2000/1225 and Corr.1 and 2)	
The situation in Angola	4311
Note by the President of the Security Council (S/2001/363)	
The situation in Angola	4376
Briefing by His Excellency Mr. Fernando da Piedade Dias dos Santos, Minister of the Interior of Angola	
The situation in Angola	4393
Letter dated 12 October 2001 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/966)	
The situation in Angola	4595, 4604
Report of the Secretary-General on Angola (S/2002/834)	
The situation in Angola	4671
Interim report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Angola (S/2002/1353)	
The situation in Burundi	25
The situation in Burundi	4091, 4201, 4202, 4285, 4338, 4341, 4378, 4383, 4399, 4406, 4407, 4408, 4416, 4417, 4467, 4468, 4471, 4609, 4655, 4749, 4876
The situation in Burundi	4297
Letter dated 14 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Burundi to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/221)	
The situation in Burundi	4675
Report of the Secretary-General (S/2002/1259)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in Burundi	4832
Letter dated 17 September 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Burundi to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/900)	
The situation in Burundi	4891
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Burundi (S/2003/1146)	
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	63
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4092, 4135, 4151, 4156, 4157, 4158, 4159, 4183, 4237, 4349, 4361, 4365, 4410, 4411, 4412, 4459, 4544, 4548, 4583, 4596, 4597, 4602, 4608, 4626, 4705, 4723, 4756, 4764, 4790
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4104
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) (S/2000/30)	
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4132
Second report of the Secretary-General on MONUC (S/2000/330 and Corr.1)	
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4143
Report of the Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, 4-8 May 2000 (S/2000/416)	
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4189
Letter dated 14 August 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/799)	
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4207
Fourth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC (S/2000/888)	
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4247
Fifth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC (S/2000/1156)	
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4271
Briefing by His Excellency Major General Joseph Kabila, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Sixth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC (S/2001/128)	4279, 4280, 4282
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Briefing by Sir Ketumile Masire, facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue	4281, 4364
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Letter dated 12 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/357)	4317, 4318
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Eighth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC (S/2001/572)	4327, 4329
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Briefing by Mr. Kamel Morjane, Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Head of MONUC	4348
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Ninth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC (S/2001/970)	4395, 4396
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Letter dated 10 November 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/1072)	4437, 4441
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Tenth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC (S/2002/169)	4476
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Letter dated 18 March 2002 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/286)	4495
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Eleventh report of the Secretary-General on MONUC (S/2002/621)	4554
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Letter dated 15 October 2002 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1146)	4634, 4642, 4691

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Special report of the Secretary-General on MONUC (S/2002/1005)	4653
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Second special report of the Secretary-General on MONUC (S/2003/566 and Corr.1)	4780, 4797
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Letter dated 25 June 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/674)	4784
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Letter dated 15 October 2002 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1146 and Add.1)	4807
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Letter dated 14 August 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/821)	4813
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Letter dated 23 October 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/1027)	4863
Admission of new Members	8
Admission of new Members Note by the Secretary-General (S/2000/5)	4093
Admission of new Members Report of the Committee on the Admission of New Members concerning the application of Tuvalu for admission to membership in the United Nations (S/2000/70)	4103
Admission of new Members Note by the Secretary-General (S/2000/1043)	4214
Admission of new Members Report of the Committee on the Admission of New Members concerning the application of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for admission to membership in the United Nations (S/2000/1051)	4215
Admission of new Members Note by the Secretary-General (S/2002/558)	4540

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
Admission of new Members	4542
Report of the Committee on the Admission of New Members concerning the application of the Democratic Republic of East Timor for admission to membership in the United Nations (S/2002/566)	
Admission of new Members	4584
Note by the Secretary-General (S/2002/801)	
Admission of new Members	4585
Report of the Committee on the Admission of New Members concerning the application of the Swiss Confederation for admission to membership in the United Nations (S/2002/825)	
The situation in Georgia	17
The situation in Georgia	4094
Report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia (S/2000/39)	
The situation in Georgia	4137
Report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia (S/2000/345)	
The situation in Georgia	4179
Report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia (S/2000/697)	
The situation in Georgia	4221
Report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia (S/2000/1023)	
The situation in Georgia	4269
Report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia (S/2001/59)	
The situation in Georgia	4299, 4300
Letter dated 17 March 2001 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/242)	
The situation in Georgia	4313, 4314, 4799

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in Georgia	4353
Report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia (S/2001/713)	
The situation in Georgia	4400
Report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia (S/2001/1008)	
The situation in Georgia	4464
Report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia (S/2002/88)	
The situation in Georgia	4590, 4591
Report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia (S/2002/742)	
The situation in Georgia	4697
Report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia (S/2003/39)	
The situation in Georgia	4800
Report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia (S/2003/751)	
<hr/>	
Middle East	
The situation in the Middle East	19
The situation in the Middle East	4095
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) (S/2000/28)	
The situation in the Middle East	4131
Letters dated 6 and 17 April 2000 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/294 and S/2000/322)	
The situation in the Middle East	4146
Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) (S/2000/460)	
The situation in the Middle East	4148
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) (S/2000/459)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in the Middle East	4160
Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) (S/2000/590)	
The situation in the Middle East	4177
Report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL (S/2000/718)	
Letter dated 24 July 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/731)	
The situation in the Middle East	4235
Report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF (S/2000/1103)	
The situation in the Middle East	4267
Report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL (S/2001/66)	
The situation in the Middle East	4322
Report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF (S/2001/499)	
The situation in the Middle East	4354
Report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL (S/2001/714)	
The situation in the Middle East	4428
Report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF (S/2001/1079)	
The situation in the Middle East	4458
Report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL (S/2002/55)	
The situation in the Middle East	4546
Report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF (S/2002/542)	
The situation in the Middle East	4593
Report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL (S/2002/746)	
The situation in the Middle East	4670
Report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF (S/2002/1328)	
The situation in the Middle East	4696
Report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL (S/2003/38)	
The situation in the Middle East	4779
Report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF (S/2003/655)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in the Middle East	4802
Report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL (S/2003/728)	
The situation in the Middle East	4889
Report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF (S/2003/1148)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	54
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4204, 4205
Letter dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/928)	
Letter dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/929)	
Identical letters dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (S/2000/930)	
Letter dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of South Africa to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/934)	
Letter dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/935)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4217, 4218, 4233, 4234, 4248, 4292, 4293, 4305, 4488, 4489, 4504, 4505, 4508, 4509, 4511, 4556, 4578, 4613, 4645, 4668, 4681, 4685, 4704, 4722, 4741, 4757, 4773, 4788, 4810, 4846, 4861, 4862, 4879
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4231
Letter dated 21 November 2000 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/1109)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4295
Letter dated 13 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Emirates to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/216)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4357
Letter dated 15 August 2001 from the representatives of Mali and Qatar to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/797)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4438
Letter dated 13 December 2001 from the representative of Egypt to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/1191)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4474, 4478
Identical letters dated 20 February 2002 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Observer Mission of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/182)	
Letter dated 20 February 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Yemen to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/184)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4503
Letter dated 29 March 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/329)	
Letter dated 29 March 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Qatar to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/331)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4506
Letter dated 1 April 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/336)	
Letter dated 2 April 2002 from the Permanent Representative of South Africa to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/342)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4510
Letter dated 6 April 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/359)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4515, 4516
Letter dated 17 April 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/431)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4525
Letter dated 2 May 2002 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/510)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4552
Letter dated 11 June 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Bahrain to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/655)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4588
Letter dated 23 July 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Saudi Arabia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/828)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4614
Letter dated 20 September 2002 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1055)	
Note verbale dated 20 September 2002 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1056)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4824, 4828
Letter dated 12 September 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/880)	
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4841, 4842
Letter dated 9 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/973)	
The situation in Timor-Leste¹	37
The situation in East Timor	4097
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) (S/2000/53)	
The situation in East Timor	4114, 4133, 4147, 4165, 4191, 4195, 4198, 4203, 4206, 4236, 4308, 4358, 4367, 4368, 4598

¹ As from 4646th meeting, held on 14 November 2002, the item "The situation in East Timor" was revised to read "The situation in Timor-Leste".

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in East Timor	4180, 4182
Report of the Secretary-General on UNTAET (S/2000/738)	
The situation in East Timor	4228, 4244
Report of the Security Council mission to East Timor and Indonesia (S/2000/1105)	
The situation in East Timor	4265, 4268
Report of the Secretary-General on UNTAET (S/2001/42)	
The situation in East Timor	4321
Interim report of the Secretary-General on UNTAET (S/2001/436)	
The situation in East Timor	4351
Progress report of the Secretary-General on UNTAET (S/2001/719)	
The situation in East Timor	4403, 4404
Report of the Secretary-General on UNTAET (S/2001/983 and Corr.1)	
The situation in East Timor	4462, 4463
Report of the Secretary-General on UNTAET (S/2002/80 and Corr.1)	
The situation in East Timor	4522, 4534, 4537
Report of the Secretary-General on UNTAET (S/2002/432 and Add.1)	
The situation in Timor-Leste	4646
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISSET) (S/2002/1223)	
The situation in Timor-Leste	4715, 4735
Special report of the Secretary-General on UNMISSET (S/2003/243)	
The situation in Timor-Leste	4744, 4758
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMISSET (S/2003/449)	
The situation in Timor-Leste	4843
Report of the Secretary-General on UNMISSET (S/2003/944)	

The situation in Sierra Leone**29**

The situation in Sierra Leone

4098, 4099

Letter dated 23 December 1999 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1999/1285)

Second report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) (S/2000/13 and Add.1)

The situation in Sierra Leone

4111

Third report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2000/186)

The situation in Sierra Leone

4134, 4163, 4173, 4442, 4539, 4654

The situation in Sierra Leone

4139

Letter dated 10 May 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Eritrea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/408)

Letter dated 11 May 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Mali to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/409)

Letter dated 11 May 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Namibia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/410)

The situation in Sierra Leone

4145

Letter dated 17 May 2000 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/446)

The situation in Sierra Leone

4168

Fourth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2000/455)

The situation in Sierra Leone

4184

Fourth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2000/455)

Fifth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2000/751)

The situation in Sierra Leone

4186

Fifth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2000/751)

The situation in Sierra Leone

4193

Sixth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2000/832)

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in Sierra Leone	4199
Sixth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2000/832 and Add.1)	
The situation in Sierra Leone	4216
Report of the Security Council mission to Sierra Leone (S/2000/992)	
Seventh report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2000/1055)	
The situation in Sierra Leone	4253
Eighth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2000/1199)	
The situation in Sierra Leone	4264
Note by the President of the Security Council (S/2000/1195)	
The situation in Sierra Leone	4306
Ninth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2001/228)	
The situation in Sierra Leone	4340
Tenth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2001/627)	
The situation in Sierra Leone	4374
Eleventh report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2001/857 and Add.1)	
The situation in Sierra Leone	4451
Twelfth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2001/1195 and Add.1)	
The situation in Sierra Leone	4500
Thirteenth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2002/267)	
The situation in Sierra Leone	4570
Fourteenth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2002/679)	
The situation in Sierra Leone	4615
Fifteenth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2002/987)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in Sierra Leone	4729
Seventeenth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2003/321 and Corr.1)	
The situation in Sierra Leone	4789
Eighteenth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2003/663)	
The situation in Sierra Leone	4829
Nineteenth report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL (S/2003/863)	
Protection of United Nations personnel, associated personnel and humanitarian personnel in conflict zones	4100, 4814
The situation in the Central African Republic	9
The situation in the Central African Republic	4101
Ninth report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic (S/2000/24)	
The situation in the Central African Republic	4261, 4262
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in the Central African Republic and on the activities of the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic (S/2001/35)	
The situation in the Central African Republic	4347
Third report of the Secretary-General on the situation in the Central African Republic and on the activities of the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic (S/2001/660)	
The situation in the Central African Republic	4380, 4382
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in the Central African Republic pursuant to the statement by the President (S/2001/886)	
The situation in the Central African Republic	4571
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in the Central African Republic (S/2002/671)	
The situation in the Central African Republic	4627, 4658

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation concerning Western Sahara	17
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4106
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2000/131)	
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4149
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2000/461)	
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4175
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2000/683)	
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4210
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4211
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2000/1029)	
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4284
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2001/148)	
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4315
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2001/398)	
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4342
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2001/613)	
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4427
Letter dated 12 November 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/1067)	
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4480, 4594
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2002/178)	
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4523
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2002/467)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4698
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2003/59)	
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4725
Letter dated 19 March 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/341)	
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4765
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2003/565)	
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4801
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2003/565 and Corr.1)	
The situation concerning Western Sahara	4850
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2003/1016)	
Elections to the International Court of Justice	4
Election of a member of the International Court of Justice (S/2000/105, S/2000/106 and Add.1 and 2 and S/2000/107)	4107
Date of election to fill a vacancy in the International Court of Justice (S/2001/615)	4345
Election of a member of the International Court of Justice (S/2001/881, S/2001/882 and Add.1 and S/2001/883 and Corr.2)	4389
Election of five members of the International Court of Justice (S/2002/925, S/2002/926 and S/2002/927)	4629
Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council	4109, 4110
The question concerning Haiti	4112
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (S/2000/150)	
The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border	4
The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border	4115, 4116
Interim report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Tajikistan (S/2000/214)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border	4140, 4141
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Tajikistan (S/2000/387)	
Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peacebuilding	4118, 4119
Report of the Secretary-General on the role of the United Nations peacekeeping in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (S/2000/101)	
Items relating to Iraq	40
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4120, 4123
Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraphs 28 and 30 of resolution 1284 (1999) and paragraph 5 of resolution 1281 (1999) (S/2000/208)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4152
Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 1281 (1999) (S/2000/520)	
Letter dated 5 June 2000 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) (S/2000/536)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4241
Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 1302 (2000) (S/2000/1132)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4324, 4344
Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 1330 (2000) (S/2001/505)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4336
Letter dated 15 June 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/597)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4431
Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 1360 (2001) (S/2001/1089)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4531, 4644, 4683, 4692, 4701, 4707, 4708, 4721, 4732, 4743, 4761, 4812, 4844, 4851, 4868, 4869, 4872, 4884
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4625
Letter dated 10 October 2002 from the Permanent Representative of South Africa to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1132)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4650, 4656
Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraphs 7 and 8 of resolution 1409 (2002) (S/2002/1239)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4709
Letter dated 6 February 2003 from the Permanent Representative of South Africa to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/153)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4714
Note by the Secretary-General (S/2003/232)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4717
Letter dated 7 March 2003 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Malaysia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/283)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4726
Letter dated 24 March 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/362)	
Letter dated 24 March 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/363)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4768
Note by the Secretary-General (S/2003/580)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4783
Report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (S/2003/656)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4791, 4808
Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraph 24 of resolution 1483 (2003) (S/2003/715)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4883
Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraph 24 of resolution 1483 (2003) and paragraph 12 of resolution 1511 (2003) (S/2003/1149)	
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4887
Fourteenth report of the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraph 14 of resolution 1284 (1999) (S/2003/1161)	
Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq	
Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq	4762
The situation in Guinea-Bissau	8
The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4121, 4122
Report of the Secretary-General on developments in Guinea-Bissau (S/2000/250)	
The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4238, 4239, 4834, 4860
The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4567
Report of the Secretary-General on developments in Guinea-Bissau and on the activities of the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in that country (S/2002/662)	
The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4776
Report of the Secretary-General on developments in Guinea-Bissau and on the activities of the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in that country (S/2003/621)	
The situation in Afghanistan	36
The situation in Afghanistan	4124, 4125
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security (S/2000/205)	
The situation in Afghanistan	4251, 4414, 4415, 4443, 4449, 4452, 4461, 4469, 4479, 4490, 4497, 4521, 4541, 4557, 4560, 4611, 4638, 4651, 4664, 4682, 4699, 4711, 4712, 4750, 4774, 4848

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in Afghanistan	4325, 4352
Letter dated 21 May 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/511)	
The situation in Afghanistan	4434
Letter dated 5 December 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/1154)	
The situation in Afghanistan	4501
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security (S/2002/278)	
The situation in Afghanistan	4579
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security (S/2002/737)	
The situation in Afghanistan	4727, 4730
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security (S/2003/333)	
The situation in Afghanistan	4840
Letter dated 7 October 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/970)	
Items relating to Rwanda	9
The situation concerning Rwanda	
The situation concerning Rwanda	4127
Letter dated 15 December 1999 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council (S/1999/1257)	
International Tribunal for Rwanda	
International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994	4307, 4666
Establishment of the list of candidates for Judges on the International Tribunal for Rwanda	

International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons
Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International
Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan
Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed
in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and
31 December 1994 4601

International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons
Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International
Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan
Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed
in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and
31 December 1994 4621

Letter dated 26 September 2002 from the Secretary-General
addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1106)

International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons
Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International
Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan
Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed
in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and
31 December 1994 4731

Letter dated 6 March 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to
the President of the Security Council (S/2003/290)

International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons
Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International
Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan
Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed
in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and
31 December 1994 4745

Letter dated 21 April 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to
the President of the Security Council (S/2003/467)

International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons
Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International
Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan
Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed
in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and
31 December 1994 4760

Letter dated 16 April 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to
the President of the Security Council (S/2003/431)

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994	4849
Letter dated 12 September 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/879)	
Letter dated 3 October 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/946)	
General issues relating to sanctions	4128, 4394, 4713
Protection of civilians in armed conflict	10
Protection of civilians in armed conflict	4130
Report of the Secretary-General on the protection of civilians in armed conflict (S/1999/957)	
Protection of civilians in armed conflict	4312
Report of the Secretary-General on the protection of civilians in armed conflict (S/2001/331)	
Protection of civilians in armed conflict	4424, 4492, 4493, 4777, 4877, 4882
Protection of civilians in armed conflict	4660, 4679
Report of the Secretary-General on the protection of civilians in armed conflict (S/2002/1300)	
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	24
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4142
Report of the Security Council mission to Eritrea and Ethiopia, 9 and 10 May 2000 (S/2000/413)	
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4144, 4227, 4230, 4310, 4320, 4420, 4421, 4529, 4530
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4181
Report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2000/643)	
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4187, 4197
Report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2000/785)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4275
Progress report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2001/45)	
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4294
Report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2001/202)	
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4372
Report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2001/843)	
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4450
Progress report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2001/1194)	
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4485
Report of the Security Council mission to Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2002/205)	
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4494
Progress report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2002/245)	
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4600
Report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2002/744)	
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4606
Progress report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2002/977)	
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4719
Progress report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2003/257)	
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4787
Progress report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2003/665)	
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4822
Progress report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2003/858)	

International tribunals**11**

International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 4150, 4229, 4429, 4535, 4637, 4674, 4806, 4817, 4819, 4838

International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994

International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 4240

International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994

Letter dated 7 September 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/865)

The situation in Cyprus**10**

The situation in Cyprus 4155

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus (S/2000/496 and Corr.1)

The situation in Cyprus 4246

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus (S/2000/1138)

The situation in Cyprus 4328

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus (S/2001/534)

The situation in Cyprus 4436

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus (S/2001/1122)

The situation in Cyprus 4551

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus (S/2002/590)

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in Cyprus	4649
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus (S/2002/1243)	
The situation in Cyprus	4738, 4740
Report of the Secretary-General on his mission of good offices in Cyprus (S/2003/398)	
The situation in Cyprus	4771
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus (S/2003/572)	
The situation in Cyprus	4870
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus (S/2003/1078)	
The situation in Somalia	19
The situation in Somalia	4166, 4167, 4332, 4486, 4524, 4737
The situation in Somalia	4196
Briefing by His Excellency Mr. Ismail Omar Guelleh, President of the Republic of Djibouti	
The situation in Somalia	4254
Briefing by His Excellency Mr. Ali Khalif Galaydh, Prime Minister of the Transitional National Government of Somalia	
The situation in Somalia	4255
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia (S/2000/1211)	
The situation in Somalia	4392, 4401
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia (S/2001/963)	
The situation in Somalia	4487, 4502
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia (S/2002/189)	
The situation in Somalia	4565, 4580
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia (S/2002/709)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in Somalia	4663
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia (S/2002/1201)	
The situation in Somalia	4718
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia (S/2003/231)	
The situation in Somalia	4856
Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia (S/2003/987)	
The situation in Somalia	4885
Letter dated 4 November 2003 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 751 (1992) concerning Somalia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/1035)	
The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations	4172, 4259, 4339, 4859
Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts	3
Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts	4174
Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts	4334, 4360
Report of the Secretary-General on the prevention of armed conflicts (S/2001/574 and Corr.1)	
Children and armed conflict	7
Children and armed conflict	4176, 4185
Report of the Secretary-General on children and armed conflict (S/2000/712)	
Children and armed conflict	4422, 4423
Report of the Secretary-General on children and armed conflict (S/2001/852)	
Children and armed conflict	4528
Children and armed conflict	4684, 4695
Report of the Secretary-General (S/2002/1299)	
Consideration of the draft report of the Security Council to the General Assembly	4192, 4375, 4616, 4831

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa	4
Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa	4194
Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa	4220
Letter dated 10 November 2000 from the Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on the Brahimi Report addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/1084)	
Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa	4288, 4302
Letter dated 28 February 2001 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/185)	
Women and peace and security	7
Women and peace and security	4208, 4213, 4402, 4589, 4852
Women and peace and security	4635, 4641
Report of the Secretary-General (S/2002/1154)	
Briefings	9
Briefing by Judge Gilbert Guillaume, President of the International Court of Justice	4212, 4398, 4636
Briefing by Mrs. Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	4219
Briefing by the Secretary-General	4226
Briefing by His Excellency Mr. Mircea Geoana, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Romania, Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe	4266
Briefing by Mr. Ruud Lubbers, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	4470
Briefings by the Chairmen of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia, the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa, and of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations	4673

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
Briefings by the Chairmen of the Security Council committees and working groups	4888
Items relating to peacekeeping	63
No exit without strategy	
No exit without strategy	4223
Letter dated 6 November 2000 from the Permanent Representative of the Netherlands to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2000/1072)	
Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries	
Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries	4257, 4270
Letter dated 8 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/21)	
Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries	4326
Letter dated 31 May 2001 from the Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/546)	
Meetings with troop-contributing countries	
United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea	
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4369, 4491, 4599
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4716, 4821
United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone	
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4371, 4496, 4610
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4724, 4827
United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission	
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4386, 4617

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4733, 4781
United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo	
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4391, 4483, 4550, 4612
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4767
United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor	
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4397, 4456, 4527
United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor	
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4755
United Nations Disengagement Observer Force	
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4425, 4545
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4669, 4778, 4878
United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara	
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4426, 4477, 4520, 4587
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4690, 4763, 4847

United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus

Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A 4435, 4549, 4648

Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B 4769, 4866

United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka

Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A 4446, 4569, 4620

United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon

Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A 4455, 4576

Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B 4689, 4795

United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia

Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A 4457, 4586

Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B 4687, 4796

United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A 4553

United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire

Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B 4854

Proposed United Nations peacekeeping operation in Liberia

Meeting of the Security Council with the potential troop and civilian police-contributing countries to the proposed United Nations peacekeeping operation in Liberia pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B 4825

Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations

Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations 4447

Letter dated 31 December 2001 from the Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/1335)

United Nations peacekeeping

United Nations peacekeeping 4572

United Nations peacekeeping 4772

Letter dated 6 June 2003 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada, Jordan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand and Switzerland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/620)

The importance of mine action for peacekeeping operations

The importance of mine action for peacekeeping operations 4858, 4864

Letter dated 10 November 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Solomon Islands to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/1088) 4224

The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security 4242, 4243

The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone 4

The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone 4252

The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone 4276

The situation in Liberia

The situation in Sierra Leone

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation along the borders of Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone	4291
Briefing by Mr. Ruud Lubbers, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	
The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone	4319
The situation in Sierra Leone	
Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/434)	
Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach	4272, 4278
Letter dated 25 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/82)	
The situation in the Great Lakes region	4
The situation in the Great Lakes region	4273
The situation in the Great Lakes region	4323
Report of the Security Council mission to the Great Lakes region, 15-26 May 2001 (S/2001/521)	
The situation in the Great Lakes region	4532
Report of the Security Council mission to the Great Lakes region, 27 April-7 May 2002 (S/2002/537 and Add.1)	
The situation in the Great Lakes region	4865
Report of the Secretary-General on preparations for an international conference on the Great Lakes region (S/2003/1099)	
The situation in Liberia	13
The situation in Liberia	4287, 4481, 4665, 4693, 4815, 4816
The situation in Liberia	4405
Letter dated 26 October 2001 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/1015)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The situation in Liberia	4526
Letter dated 19 April 2002 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/470)	
Third report of the Secretary-General pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) (S/2002/494)	
The situation in Liberia	4751
Letter dated 24 April 2003 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/498)	
The situation in Liberia	4803
Letter dated 29 July 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/769)	
The situation in Liberia	4826, 4830
Report of the Secretary-General on Liberia (S/2003/875)	
The situation in Liberia	4890
Letter dated 28 October 2003 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/937 and Add.1)	
Recommendation for the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations	4337
Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the month of June 2001	4343
Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month	4363
Letter dated 27 August 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/822)	
Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month	4332
Letter dated 7 November 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Jamaica to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/1055)	

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month	4445, 4466, 4482, 4547, 4562, 4748, 4818
Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month	4677
Letter dated 19 December 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1387)	
Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month	4766
Conflicts in Africa: Security Council missions and United Nations mechanisms to promote peace and security	
Items relating to small arms	5
Small arms	
Small arms	4355, 4362
Letter dated 25 July 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/732)	
Small arms	4623, 4639
Report of the Secretary-General on small arms (S/2002/1053)	
Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities	
Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa	4720
Items relating to terrorism	26
Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts	4370, 4385, 4413, 4453, 4512, 4513, 4561, 4618, 4619, 4624, 4632, 4667, 4672, 4678, 4686, 4706, 4710, 4734, 4752, 4792, 4798, 4811, 4845, 4867
High-level meeting of the Security Council on the anniversary of 11 September 2001: acts of international terrorism	4607
High-level meeting of the Security Council: combating terrorism	4688
Security Council resolution 1054 (1996) of 26 April 1996	4384
Nobel Peace Prize	4390
Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the	4439, 4440

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
President of the Security Council (S/2001/434)	
Items relating to food and security	3
Food aid in the context of conflict settlement: Afghanistan and other crisis areas	4507
Briefing by Ms. Catherine Bertini, Executive Director of the World Food Programme	
Africa's food crisis as a threat to peace and security	4652, 4736
Briefing by Mr. James Morris, Executive Director of the World Food Programme	
Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security	4630, 4640
Letter dated 21 October 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Cameroon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1179)	
Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1998/287)	4647, 4728, 4805, 4881
Letter dated 29 November 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1317)	4659
The situation in Côte d'Ivoire	11
The situation in Côte d'Ivoire	4680, 4746, 4747, 4793, 4873, 4874, 4875
The situation in Côte d'Ivoire	4700
Letter dated 27 January 2003 from the Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/99)	
The situation in Côte d'Ivoire	4754, 4804
Report of the Secretary-General on Côte d'Ivoire (S/2003/374 and Corr.1 and Add.1)	
The situation in Côte d'Ivoire	4857
Second report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (S/2003/1069)	
Kimberly Process Certification Scheme	4694

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
The Security Council and regional organizations: facing the new challenges to international peace and security	4739
The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes	4753
Security Council mission	4
Security Council mission	4775
Report of the Security Council mission to Central Africa, 7-16 June 2003 (S/2003/653)	
Security Council mission	4785
Report of the Security Council mission to West Africa, 26 June-5 July 2003 (S/2003/688)	
Security Council mission	4794
Report of the Security Council mission to Central Africa, 7-16 June 2003 (S/2003/653)	
Report of the Security Council mission to West Africa, 26 June-5 July 2003 (S/2003/688)	
Security Council mission	4855
Report of the Security Council mission to Afghanistan 31 October-7 November 2003 (S/2003/1074)	
Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America (S/23306, S/23307, S/23308, S/23309 and S/23317)	4820
Letter dated 15 August 2003 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/818)	
Letter dated 15 August 2003 from the Permanent Representatives of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/819)	
Voting on draft resolution S/2003/824	
Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role	4833, 4835

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/939)	4836
Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/943)	
Letter dated 2 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/934)	4839
Central African region	4871
Letter dated 10 November 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/1077)	

Chapter I

Provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council and related procedural developments

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introductory note	3
Part I. Meetings (rules 1-5).....	5
Note	5
A. Special cases concerning the application of rules 1-5	5
B. Procedural developments relating to meetings.....	7
Part II. Representation and credentials (rules 13-17)	12
Part III. Presidency (rules 18-20).....	12
Note	12
Part IV. Secretariat (rules 21-26)	15
Part V. Conduct of business (rules 27-39)	15
Note	15
Special cases concerning the application of rules 27-36	16
Part VI. Languages (rules 41-47)	22
Note	22
Special cases concerning the application of rules 41-47	22
Part VII. Publicity of meetings, records (rules 48-57)	23

Introductory note

Article 30 of the Charter of the United Nations provides that the Security Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President. The Preparatory Commission of the United Nations, established 26 June 1945 to make provisional arrangements for the first sessions of the organs of the United Nations, including the Security Council, discussed at some length whether it should recommend provisional rules of procedure to the Security Council or whether the rules should be formulated from inception by the Council. The text of the rules as recommended was a compromise between those who desired more comprehensive rules and those who considered that the whole subject should be left to the Security Council.

The Security Council adopted provisional rules of procedure at its first meeting held on 17 January 1946, and has amended them eleven times.¹ During the period under review, the Council did not consider the adoption or amendment of its provisional rules of procedure. Some members of the Council did however, in their interventions, note the need for the review or updating of the provisional rules of procedure. For instance, at the 4616th meeting, held on 26 September 2002 to consider the draft report of the Security Council to the General Assembly, the representative of Singapore noted “it is remarkable that the Council’s rules of procedure remain provisional after 57 years”.² He further cited the recommendation of the Secretary-General, contained in his report entitled “Strengthening the United Nations: an agenda for further change”³ that the Security Council “might consider codifying the recent changes in its own practice”.⁴ The representative of France, however, questioned whether further codification was necessary and favoured developing the Council’s working methods without “getting bogged down too much in codification”.⁵ Similarly, the representative of the United Kingdom was of the opinion that it was not necessary to institutionalize, but to “achieve results in practice”.⁶

From 2000 to 2003, the Council took a number of steps to improve its working methods and procedure,⁷ which included the following: attendance by newly elected members during the month preceding their term;⁸ inclusion and circulation of printed fact sheets for briefings by the Secretariat to Council members;⁹

¹ The provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council were amended five times during its first year, at its 31st, 41st, 42nd, 44th and 48th meetings on 9 April, 16 and 17 May, 6 and 24 June 1946; twice in its second year at the 138th and 222nd meetings, on 4 June and 9 December 1947; at its 468th meeting on 28 February 1950; at its 1463rd meeting, on 24 January 1969; at its 1761st meeting, on 17 January 1974; and at its 2410th meeting, on 21 December 1982. The provisional rules of procedure have been issued under the symbols S/96 and S/96/Rev.1-7.

² S/PV.4616, p. 3.

³ A/57/387 and Corr.1, para. 21.

⁴ S/PV.4616, p. 4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁷ By a letter dated 6 September 2002, the President of the Security Council drew the attention of the Secretary-General to a descriptive index of notes and statements by the President of the Security Council relating to documentation and procedure (S/2002/1000, annex). The descriptive index was updated in the note by the President of the Security Council of 7 February 2006 (S/2006/78).

⁸ S/2000/155 and S/2002/1276.

⁹ S/2002/316.

communication and dissemination by the President and Secretariat of Council decisions and statements to the press as well as issuance of statements to the press made by the President as United Nations press releases.¹⁰ New arrangements were also introduced for consultation and exchange of information with troop-contributing countries.¹¹

The material in the present chapter follows the order of the relevant chapters of the provisional rules of procedure: part I, Meetings (rules 1-5); part II, Representation and credentials (rules 13-17); part III, Presidency (rules 18-20); part IV, Secretariat (rules 21-26); part V, Conduct of business (rules 27-36); part VI, Languages (rules 41-47); part VII, Publicity of meetings, records (rules 48-57).

The practice of the Council in relation to some of the provisional rules of procedure is more appropriately dealt with in other chapters of this *Supplement*, as follows: rules 6 to 12, in chapter II (Agenda); rule 28, in chapter V (Subsidiary organs of the Security Council); rules 37 and 39, in chapter III (Participation in the proceedings of the Security Council); rule 40, in chapter IV (Voting); rules 58 to 60, in chapter VII (Practice relative to recommendations to the General Assembly regarding membership in the United Nations); and rule 61, in chapter VI (Relations with other United Nations organs).

The material in chapter I relates to questions that arose regarding the application of a certain rule, especially when there was a discussion regarding variations from the Council's usual practice. The case histories presented here do not constitute cumulative evidence of the practice of the Council, but are indicative of special problems or issues that have arisen in the proceedings of the Council under its provisional rules of procedure.

¹⁰ S/2001/640.

¹¹ S/2002/964.

Part I Meetings (rules 1-5)

Note

The material in section A reflects the practice of the Council in relation to provisions of Article 28 of the Charter, and indicates special instances of the interpretation or application of rules 1 to 5 on the convening and place of Security Council meetings. During the period under review, there were two instances falling under rule 1, one case under rule 2 (case 1) and two cases under rule 4 (cases 2 and 3). There were no special instances of the application of rule 5. Section B includes a number of procedural developments relating to meetings that occurred during the period under review.

During the period under review, in two instances, dealt with under rule 1, meetings were not convened within the interval of 14 days.

In one case, dealt with under rule 2, a request for convening an urgent meeting of the Security Council was made and generated a number of complaints on the timing (case 1).

The meeting of the Security Council held on 7 September 2000 at the level of Heads of State or Government has been included under rule 4, although it was not convened explicitly under that rule or Article 28 (2) of the Charter (case 2).¹² Four ministerial-level meetings, convened between 2000 and 2003, have also been included (case 3).¹³ In addition, reference is provided to a number of meetings that enjoyed the high-level participation of representatives of both members and non-members of the Council. In fact, during the review period it became a common practice

¹² At the 1544th meeting, on 12 June 1970, the President announced the Council's decision to hold a periodic meeting, in accordance with Article 28 (2), and outlined broadly the nature and purposes of periodic meetings.

¹³ In one instance, the Secretary-General encouraged the Council to utilize high-level meetings on thematic issues more often. At the 4174th meeting, held on 20 July 2000 in connection with the prevention of armed conflicts, the Secretary-General suggested that, as some of the Charter's provisions related to prevention had been underutilized, the Council could hold "periodic meetings at the foreign minister level, as provided for in Article 28" to discuss thematic or actual prevention issues. See S/PV.4174, p. 3.

of Ministers for Foreign Affairs or other high-ranking officials of the Presidency to preside over some of the meetings during their term.¹⁴ Non-members participating in the same deliberations were correspondingly represented at a high level.

During the period under review, the members of the Council continued to meet frequently in the format of informal consultations of the whole. Aside from official meetings and informal consultations of the whole, Council members maintained the practice of informal activities¹⁵ as opportunities for a further and candid exchange of views and for strategic reassessment of their work.

A. Special cases concerning the application of rules 1-5

Rule 1

Meetings of the Security Council shall, with the exception of the periodic meetings referred to in rule 4, be held at the call of the President at any time he deems necessary, but the interval between meetings shall not exceed fourteen days.

From 2000 to 2003, two cases fell under rule 1 when Council meetings were not convened within the

¹⁴ For instance, during the United States presidency, the Vice-President of the United States presided over the 4087th meeting, held on 10 January 2000 on the issue of Africa and AIDS (see S/PV.4087). In addition, apart from meetings designated as summit and ministerial levels, a number of Council members held one or more meetings during their Presidencies that were presided over by their Ministers for Foreign Affairs, and not by their permanent representatives to the United Nations. See, for example, S/PV.4485, S/PV.4701, S/PV.4739, S/PV.4753 and S/PV.4414.

¹⁵ Such informal activities included the Arria-formula meetings, monthly luncheons and annual retreats with the Secretary-General, annual workshops for newly elected members of the Council (see document S/2004/135 containing the report of the first such workshop held in December 2003) as well as seminars and workshops conducted in collaboration with the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and such entities as the International Peace Academy and Columbia University.

interval of 14 days: 19 days between the 4253rd meeting on 22 December 2000 and the 4254th (closed) meeting on 11 January 2001; and 19 days between the 4445th meeting on 21 December 2001 and the 4446th (closed) meeting on 10 January 2002.¹⁶ However, no questions arose in the proceedings of the Council on this matter.

Rule 2

The President shall call a meeting of the Security Council at the request of any member of the Security Council.

Case 1

By a note verbale dated 20 September 2002,¹⁷ addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic informed the President of his delegation's support for the convening of an immediate meeting of the Security Council to consider the latest developments in the occupied Palestinian territories, as previously requested by the Chairman of the Arab Group.¹⁸

At the Council's 4614th meeting, held on 23 September 2002 in connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question,¹⁹ the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, while thanking the President of the Security Council for convening the meeting, noted that "it was somewhat delayed".²⁰ He added that he did not understand the delay, in view of the fact that the situation in the region was "boiling".²¹ The representative of Palestine also regretted the "unwarranted" delay in convening the meeting.²²

¹⁶ An interval of 20 days also occurred between the 4891st meeting on 22 December 2003 and the 4892nd meeting on 12 January 2004. For details, see the fifteenth Supplement to the *Repertoire*.

¹⁷ S/2002/1056.

¹⁸ S/2002/1055.

¹⁹ S/PV.4614.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*, p. 5.

Rule 3

The President shall call a meeting of the Security Council if a dispute or situation is brought to the attention of the Security Council under Article 35 or under Article 11 (3) of the Charter, or if the General Assembly makes recommendations or refers any question to the Security Council under Article 11 (2), or if the Secretary-General brings to the attention of the Security Council any matter under Article 99.

During the period under review, there were no special instances of the application of rule 3.

Rule 4

Periodic meetings of the Security Council called for in Article 28 (2) of the Charter shall be held twice a year, at such times as the Security Council may decide.

Case 2

On the occasion of the Millennium Summit of the General Assembly, at its 4194th meeting on 7 September 2000, the Council also held a summit meeting²³ at the level of Heads of State or Government,²⁴ in order to discuss the need to ensure an effective role for the Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa. This constituted the second such instance in the Council's history after the summit meeting held on 31 January 1992.²⁵ In his introductory comments, the President (Mali) stated that "this extraordinary meeting" was an opportunity for "providing the human, financial and material resources necessary" for the United Nations "more effectively to deal with conflict situation and to shoulder its incomparable responsibility to ensure and guarantee world peace".²⁶ During the course of the meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation stated that "in the new century it might be well to make more frequent use of high-level summit meetings — and not only at United Nations Headquarters in New York, but also at

²³ S/PV.4194. The decision to hold a summit meeting was announced by the President on 4 August 2000 in a statement to the media (see S/2000/772).

²⁴ Fourteen members of the Council were represented at the level of the Heads of State or Government. One member was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

²⁵ S/PV.3046. For details, see chapter I, case 5, of the eleventh Supplement.

²⁶ S/PV.4194, p. 3.

locations closer to the events” the Council was dealing with.²⁷

Case 3

The Council on four occasions designated its meetings to be at the ministerial level.²⁸ At numerous other meetings held during the period under review, the members of the Council were represented by Heads of State or Government or by representatives of ministerial rank.²⁹

At the 4432nd meeting, held on 30 November 2001 in connection with the wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the month of November, a number of members stressed the importance and usefulness of the high-level meetings, stating that the Council should maintain the practice of meeting at ministerial level on occasion.³⁰ Others cautioned against regularizing ministerial-level meetings.³¹ The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland remarked, in particular, that the value of ministerial-level discussion was often that it was rare and gave a particular impetus to a particular subject at a particular time.³² Ireland saw great value in the practice but noted the risk of

setting up a hierarchy of importance of Council meetings.³³ The representative of the United States of America stated that since Security Council meetings at the ministerial level represented an important instrument, their impact should not be diluted.³⁴

B. Procedural developments relating to meetings

From 2000 to 2003, the Council witnessed, inter alia, a number of significant procedural developments relating to the format of meetings which will be briefly introduced below: (a) the introduction of private meetings open to all non-members; (b) the holding of “wrap-up sessions”; (c) the formalization of the consultative mechanism with countries contributing troops to peacekeeping operations; and (d) the revitalization of Security Council missions.

Private meetings open to all non-members

During the period under review, the Security Council held private meetings open to the entire membership of the Organization.³⁵ These meetings, closed to the media and the public, were announced in the *Journal of the United Nations* as being open to non-members of the Security Council who wished to attend. Consequently, non-members attended the private meetings without having to submit a letter of request for participation.

Wrap-up meetings

In June 2001, the Council met in public for the first time to evaluate procedural and substantive aspects of its work during the month in a “wrap-up session”.³⁶ During the period under review, the Council periodically held wrap-up sessions, which at first involved only the participation of Council members and subsequently included the participation of non-members.³⁷

²⁷ Ibid., p. 11.

²⁸ See 4413th meeting of 12 November 2001 on “Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts” (attended by 15 ministerial-level representatives); 4607th meeting of 11 September 2002 on “High-level meeting of the Security Council on the anniversary of 11 September 2001: acts of international terrorism” (attended by 1 Head of State and Government and 13 ministerial-level representatives); 4688th meeting of 20 January 2003 on “High-level meeting of the Security Council: combating terrorism” (attended by 13 ministerial level representatives); and 4833rd meeting of 24 September 2003 on “Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role” (attended by 11 ministerial-level representatives).

²⁹ See for instance the 4414th meeting, held on 13 November 2001, on the situation in Afghanistan in which 12 Council members were represented by their Foreign Ministers; the 4460th meeting, held on 29 and 30 January 2002 on the situation in Africa; and four meetings on the situation between Iraq and Kuwait in February and March 2003 (4701st, 4707th, 4714th and 4721st meetings).

³⁰ S/PV.4432, p. 3 (Mauritius); p. 4 (Russian Federation); p. 9 (Tunisia); and p. 16 (Ukraine).

³¹ Ibid., p. 6 (United Kingdom); p. 8 (Ireland); p. 11 (France); p. 12 (China); and p. 17 (United States).

³² Ibid., p. 6.

³³ Ibid., p. 8.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 17.

³⁵ See S/2002/603, p. 5.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ See S/PV.4343 and S/PV.4363 (in this connection, see also two papers outlining the framework for exchange of views at the respective meetings (S/2001/822, annex and S/2001/1140, annex)); S/PV.4432; S/PV.4445; S/PV.4466; S/PV.4482; S/PV.4547 (in this connection,

Meetings with troop-contributing countries

One of the major developments relating to meetings during the 2000-2003 period was the establishment of a formal mechanism for consultation and exchange of information with troop-contributing countries in the format of public or private meetings, following the adoption of resolution 1353 (2001).

At its 4220th meeting held on 13 November 2000 in connection with the item entitled "Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: letter dated 10 November 2000 from the Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on the Brahimi report addressed to the President of the Security Council",³⁸ the Council adopted resolution 1327 (2000), by which it endorsed the recommendations of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations on strengthening the existing consultations between troop-contributing countries, the Council and the Secretariat.³⁹ At that meeting, several Council members supported the recommendations in their explanations of vote.⁴⁰ The representative of Jamaica underscored that the use of private meetings between potential and current contributors before and after the establishment of a peacekeeping mission was a step which Jamaica believed should be pursued in earnest."⁴¹

Formalization of the consultative mechanism with the troop-contributing countries was further enhanced when the Council considered the item entitled "Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries" at its 4257th meeting on 16 January 2001.⁴² In his introductory remarks, the President (Singapore) stated that the Council did not have any preconceived notions of the outcome of the open debate, and that the goal of the debate must be to enhance the relationship between the troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat and bring about a new spirit of cooperation among the three partners.⁴³ Several delegations particularly cited the consultations between Council members and countries contributing troop to the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) on 4 October 2000 as a good example of collaboration between the partners.⁴⁴

On 31 January 2001, by a presidential statement,⁴⁵ the Council established a Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations to address both generic peacekeeping issues and technical aspects of individual operations.⁴⁶ By the same statement, the Council recognized the need for a transparent three-way relationship between the Council, the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries that would foster a new spirit of partnership, cooperation and confidence, and reiterated its agreement to hold consultations with those countries in a timely manner at different stages of a United Nations peacekeeping operation. On 13 June 2001, the Council adopted resolution 1353 (2001) on cooperation with troop-contributing countries which stipulated, *inter alia*, that the Council would hold public or private meetings with the participation of troop-contributing countries to ensure a full and high-level consideration of issues of critical importance to specific peacekeeping operations.⁴⁷ In addition, it provided that consultation meetings with troop-contributing countries chaired by the President of the Council would continue as the principal means of

see also the summary paper of the meeting (S/2002/622)); S/PV.4562 (in this connection, see also the summary paper of the meeting (S/2002/759) and the note verbale for the preparation of the wrap-up session (S/2002/701)); S/PV.4677 (in this connection, see also the background document on the wrap-up of the work of the Security Council during the year 2002 (S/2002/1387)); S/PV.4748; S/PV.4766; and S/PV.4818.

³⁸ See S/2000/1084.

³⁹ The Panel on United Nations Peace Operations was convened by the Secretary-General in March 2000 to undertake a thorough review of United Nations peace and security activities and present a clear set of concrete and practical recommendations for such activities in the future. The Panel's report was transmitted to the Council by a letter dated 21 August 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council (S/2000/809).

⁴⁰ S/PV. 4220, p. 3 (Jamaica); p. 7 (Bangladesh); p. 8 (France); p. 9 (Canada); p. 10 (Argentina); p. 11 (United Kingdom); p. 13 (Tunisia); p. 14 (Malaysia); p. 15 (Ukraine); pp. 15-16 (Namibia); and pp. 16-17 (Netherlands).

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁴² S/PV.4257 and resumption 1. Prior to the 4257th meeting, the Presidency (Singapore) prepared and circulated a background paper for the debate (S/2001/21).

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 26 (New Zealand); S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1), p. 11 (Ukraine); and p. 31 (Singapore).

⁴⁵ S/PRST/2001/3.

⁴⁶ See S/2002/603, p. 16.

⁴⁷ Resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sect. A.

consultation.⁴⁸ The 4369th meeting, held on 10 September 2001 in accordance with resolution 1353 (2001), at which the Council met with the countries contributing troop to the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) was the first private meeting with the troop-contributing countries.⁴⁹

Security Council missions

During the period under review, the Council conducted 13 missions away from headquarters (see table 1 below), while during the period covered by the previous Supplement (1996-1999) it conducted only one mission.⁵⁰ In particular, the Council dispatched its missions to areas of conflict five times in 2000, the highest number of missions dispatched per year in the Council's history. Upon return of its missions, the Council in general held meetings to consider the reports of the missions.⁵¹ Following consideration of

the reports, the Council, in some cases, adopted resolutions and presidential statements. In one case the resolution, while welcoming the efforts of the Council mission and its report, condemned the renewed fighting in the region.⁵² In another case, the mission's report was endorsed in the preambular part of a resolution.⁵³ Three presidential statements⁵⁴ were adopted with regard to four missions during the reporting period, in which the Council endorsed the recommendations contained in its reports of the missions.⁵⁵ In the presidential statement⁵⁶ regarding the two missions to Central and West Africa which took place in June and July 2003, the Council also expressed its intention to review progress in implementing the recommendations by the end of 2003.⁵⁷ Among the 13 missions, the mission dispatched to Kosovo in June 2001 was noteworthy for two reasons: it was the first Council mission led by the President of the Council and comprised all 15 members of the Council. Henceforth, Council missions have included all 15 members.

⁴⁸ Resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sect. B. Further to resolution 1353 (2001), the President issued a note regarding participation on 27 August 2002 (S/2002/964).

⁴⁹ At the close of the meeting, a communiqué (S/PV.4369) was issued in accordance with rule 55 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

⁵⁰ East Timor (8-12 September 1999).

⁵¹ In respect of the Council mission to East Timor and Indonesia in November 2000, the Council held first a private meeting (4228th) on 20 November 2000, followed by a public meeting (4236th) on 28 November 2000.

⁵² Resolution 1297 (2000).

⁵³ Resolution 1355 (2001).

⁵⁴ S/PRST/2000/31, S/PRST/2000/39 and S/PRST/2003/12.

⁵⁵ S/2000/992, S/2000/1105, S/2003/653 and S/2003/688.

⁵⁶ S/PRST/2003/12.

⁵⁷ The reviews took place at the 4899th meeting, on 23 January 2004, on the Council mission to West Africa; and at the 4911th meeting, on 17 February 2004, on the Council mission to Central Africa. See the fifteenth Supplement to the *Repertoire*.

Table 1
Security Council missions from 2000 to 2003

<i>Duration of mission</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Composition</i>	<i>Terms of reference</i>	<i>Report</i>	<i>Council reaction</i>
27-29 April 2000	Kosovo	Bangladesh (Head of mission), Argentina, Canada, China, Jamaica, Malaysia, Russian Federation, Ukraine	S/2000/320	S/2000/363	4138th meeting 11 May 2000
4-8 May 2000	Democratic Republic of the Congo	United States (Head of mission), France, Mali, Namibia, Netherlands, Tunisia, United Kingdom	S/2000/344	S/2000/416 [and Corr.1 (Chinese only)]	4143rd meeting 17 May 2000
9-10 May 2000	Eritrea and Ethiopia	United States (Head of mission), France, Mali, Namibia, Netherlands, Tunisia, United Kingdom	S/2000/392 ^a	S/2000/413	4142nd meeting 12 May 2000 Adopted resolution 1297 (2000)
7-14 October 2000	Sierra Leone	United Kingdom (Head of mission), Bangladesh, Canada, China, France, Jamaica, Mali, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Ukraine, United States	S/2000/886	S/2000/992 [and Corr.1 (Chinese only)]	4216th meeting 3 November 2000 President made a statement (S/PRST/2000/31)
9-17 November 2000	East Timor and Indonesia	Namibia (Head of mission), Argentina, Malaysia, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States	S/2000/103	S/2000/1105	4228th meeting 20 November 2000 (private) 4236th meeting 28 November 2000 4244th meeting 6 December 2000 President made a statement (S/PRST/2000/39)
15-26 May 2001	Great Lakes region	France (Head of mission), China, Colombia, Ireland, Jamaica, Mali, Mauritius, Singapore, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States	S/2001/408	S/2001/521 and Add.1	4323rd meeting (and resumption 1) 30 May 2001 Endorsed the report in preambular paragraph 14 of resolution 1355 (2001) on the Democratic Republic of the Congo
16-18 June 2001	Kosovo	Bangladesh (Head of mission), China, Colombia, France, Ireland, Jamaica, Mali, Mauritius, Norway, Russian Federation, Singapore, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States	S/2001/482	S/2001/600	4331st meeting 19 June 2001 4335th meeting 22 June 2001

<i>Duration of mission</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Composition</i>	<i>Terms of reference</i>	<i>Report</i>	<i>Council reaction</i>
21-25 February 2002	Eritrea and Ethiopia	Norway (Head of mission), Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Colombia, France, Guinea, Ireland, Mauritius, Mexico, Russian Federation, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United States	S/2002/129	S/2002/205	4485th meeting 6 March 2002
27 April-7 May 2002	Great Lakes region	France (Head of mission), Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Guinea, Ireland, Mauritius, Mexico, Norway, Russian Federation, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United States	S/2002/430	S/2002/537 and Add.1	4532nd meeting 14 May 2002
13-17 December 2002	Kosovo and Belgrade, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia	Norway (Head of mission), Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Colombia, France, Guinea, Ireland, Mauritius, Mexico, Russian Federation, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United States	S/2002/1271	S/2002/1376	4676th meeting 19 December 2002
7-16 June 2003	Central Africa	France (Head of mission), Angola, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, China, Germany, Guinea, Mexico, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United States	S/2003/558	S/2003/653	4775th meeting 18 June 2003 4794th meeting 25 July 2003 President made a statement (S/PRST/2003/12)
26 June-5 July 2003	West Africa	United Kingdom (Head of mission), Angola, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, China, France, Germany, Guinea, Mexico, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, United States	S/2003/525	S/2003/688	4785th meeting 9 July 2003 4794th meeting 25 July 2003 President made a statement (S/PRST/2003/12)
31 October-7 November 2003	Afghanistan	Germany (Head of mission), Angola, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, China, France, Guinea, Mexico, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United States	S/2003/930	S/2003/1074	4855th meeting 11 November 2003

^a The Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo was authorized to visit Ethiopia and Eritrea following its visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and neighbouring States.

Part II Representation and credentials (rules 13-17)

Rule 13 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council requires each member of the Council to communicate the credentials of its accredited representative to the Secretary-General not less than twenty-four hours before that representative takes his seat on the Council. In addition, any Member of the United Nations not a member of the Council and any State not a Member of the United Nations, if invited to participate in a meeting or meetings of the Council, must also communicate the credentials of its representative in a like manner to the Secretary-General, in accordance with rule 14. The Secretary-General is required by rule 15 to examine the credentials of the above categories of representatives and to submit a report thereon, certifying that the credentials are in order, to the Security Council for approval. The practice of the Council regarding those rules has been that the credentials of representatives have been communicated to the Secretary-General who submits his report to the Council pursuant to rule 15 when changes in the representation of members of the Council have been made and when, at the beginning of each year, the representatives of the newly elected non-permanent members of the Council are designated. This practice was followed during the period under review.

No special cases concerning the application of rules 13-17 occurred during the period under review.⁵⁸

⁵⁸ See chapter III for information related to invitations to and participation in the meetings of the Security Council.

Part III Presidency (rules 18-20)

Note

Part III of the present chapter deals with the proceedings of the Security Council directly related to the Office of the President of the Council. Material relevant to the exercise by the President of his functions in connection with the agenda is dealt with in chapter II. Material pertaining to the exercise by the President of his functions in the conduct of meetings is included in part V of this chapter.

During the period under review there were no special instances of the application of rule 18, which provides for the monthly rotation of the presidency in the English alphabetical order of the names of the members of the Council; rule 19, which deals with the conduct of the presidency; or rule 20, which deals with the temporary cession of the chair by the President.

The members of the Council continued to use informal consultations of the whole as a procedure for reaching decisions. On many occasions, the President presented the results of such consultations to the Council in the form of a presidential statement made on behalf of its members, or as a draft resolution, which the Council then adopted in a formal meeting without further debate. On other occasions, the President announced the agreement or consensus in a press statement, note or letter circulated as a Council document.⁵⁹

During the period from 2000 to 2003, the President continued to conduct activities other than in meetings of the Council and informal consultations of the whole. He regularly briefed non-members, made statements and remarks to the press and held bilateral

⁵⁹ For all resolutions and decisions taken by the Council during the period under review, see chapter IV.

meetings with concerned parties. In accordance with the note by the President dated 29 June 2001,⁶⁰ regarding communication and dissemination by the President and the Secretariat of Council decisions and statements to the press, the President was encouraged to continue to draw the attention of the representative(s) of the Member State(s) as well as regional organizations and arrangements to relevant statements to the press made by the President on behalf of Council members, or to decisions of the Council.⁶¹

Furthermore, the President continued to represent the Council in various capacities in accordance with rule 19.⁶²

During the period under review, the Council witnessed, *inter alia*, a number of procedural developments relating to the Office of the President.⁶³ In November 2001, at the request of the President, a new presidential website was launched by the Secretariat.⁶⁴ It supplemented the websites maintained by individual presidencies and was designed to provide easy access to up-to-date information on the Council's work and decisions.

With a view to promoting transparency and efficiency, the Presidency, in some instances, outlined

its objectives for the month in papers that were distributed to all Member States.⁶⁵ In November 2001 and May 2002 the President's statements of objectives were first published as Security Council documents.⁶⁶ Similarly, in November 2000, a background paper prepared by the Presidency was circulated as a document of the Security Council for the first time.⁶⁷ The paper dealt with the theme "No exit without strategy", which the Council debated that month.⁶⁸ In addition, during the period under review, the Presidency issued several summary papers following Council meetings,⁶⁹ and in December 2002 the Presidency issued a non-paper containing guidelines for the forthcoming public wrap-up meeting.⁷⁰ There were also several occasions when the President made introductory and/or concluding remarks that were not made in his national capacity, or explicitly on behalf of the Council.⁷¹

Finally, from January 2001 onwards,⁷² outgoing Council Presidents started addressing to the current President of the Security Council brief assessments of the work of the Council for the month during which they presided, pursuant to the note by the President of the Council dated 12 June 1997.⁷³ The above-mentioned assessments (see table 2), also attached as an addendum to the annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly, were prepared by representatives who had completed their functions as President of the Security Council, under their own responsibility and following consultations with members of the Council.

⁶⁰ S/2001/640.

⁶¹ During the period under review, following the issuance of the note, the President of the Security Council made 250 statements to the press on behalf of the Council that were subsequently issued as United Nations press releases.

⁶² For instance, on a number of occasions, the President represented the Security Council before the General Assembly and its subsidiary bodies, the Economic and Social Council and regional organizations.

⁶³ S/2002/603, chap. III.

⁶⁴ See <http://www.un.org/docs/sc/presidency.asp>. At the 4432nd meeting, the representatives of Singapore and Mauritius spoke favourably about the newly launched website (S/PV.4432, p. 13 and p. 4). At the 4616th meeting, the representative of Singapore stated that the website would allow non-Council Members to have quicker access to information related to the Security Council's work (S/PV.4616 and Corr.1, p. 3).

⁶⁵ See S/2002/603, chap. III.

⁶⁶ S/2001/1055 and S/2002/519, respectively.

⁶⁷ S/2000/1072.

⁶⁸ S/PV.4223.

⁶⁹ See, for example, S/2002/607, S/2002/622, S/2003/705 and S/2003/1055.

⁷⁰ S/2002/1387.

⁷¹ See, for example, S/PV.4257, S/PV.4272, S/PV.4308, S/PV.4309, S/PV.4439, S/PV.4474 and S/PV.4630 (Resumption 1).

⁷² S/2002/685.

⁷³ S/1997/451.

Table 2
Assessments of the work of the Security Council

<i>Month</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Presidency</i>
December 2003	S/2004/609	Bulgaria
November 2003	S/2004/56	Angola
October 2003	S/2003/1221	United States
September 2003	S/2003/1046	United Kingdom
August 2003	S/2003/1120	Syrian Arab Republic
July 2003	S/2003/805	Spain
June 2003	S/2003/798	Russian Federation
May 2003	S/2003/826	Pakistan
April 2003	S/2003/763	Mexico
March 2003	S/2003/693	Guinea
February 2003	S/2003/432	Germany
January 2003	S/2003/212	France
December 2002	S/2003/77	Colombia
November 2002	S/2003/609	China
October 2002	S/2003/820	Cameroon
September 2002	S/2003/825	Bulgaria
August 2002	S/2002/1322	United States
July 2002	S/2002/937	United Kingdom
June 2002	S/2002/843	Syrian Arab Republic
May 2002	S/2002/685	Singapore
April 2002	S/2002/704	Russian Federation
March 2002	S/2002/663	Norway
February 2002	S/2002/753	Mexico
January 2002	S/2002/187	Mauritius
December 2001	S/2002/158	Mali
November 2001	S/2002/160	Jamaica
October 2001	S/2001/1298	Ireland
September 2001	S/2001/976	France
August 2001	S/2002/166	Colombia
July 2001	S/2002/493	China
June 2001	S/2001/757	Bangladesh
May 2001	A/56/2	United States
April 2001	S/2001/596	United Kingdom
March 2001	S/2001/730	Ukraine
February 2001	S/2001/753	Tunisia
January 2001	S/2001/365	Singapore

Part IV Secretariat (rules 21-26)

Part IV relates to rules 21 to 26 of the provisional rules of procedure, which set out the specific functions and powers of the Secretary-General in connection with the meetings of the Security Council.⁷⁴ These rules reflect the provisions of Article 98 of the Charter insofar as they concern the requirements of the Security Council. Instances in which the Secretary-General was requested or authorized to carry out other functions are dealt with in chapter VI (Relations with other United Nations organs).

During the period under review, there were no special instances of the application of rules 21 to 26.

⁷⁴ Under rule 24 the Secretary-General not only provides the staff required to service meetings of the Council, but also makes available staff for subsidiary organs of the Council both at Headquarters and in the field.

Part V Conduct of business (rules 27-36)

Note

Part V sets out the cases bearing on rules 27 and 29 to 36. Material relating to rule 28 can be found in chapter V (Subsidiary organs of the Security Council), while material relating to rules 37 and 39 is included in chapter III (Participation in the proceedings of the Security Council).

As in previous volumes of the *Repertoire*, the cases assembled here are indicative of the special problems or issues that arose in the application of the rules on the conduct of business, rather than the routine practice of the Council. They relate to such matters as the following:

(a) Rule 27, on the order of intervention in the debate (cases 4-15);

(b) Rule 33, on the suspension and adjournment of meetings (case 16).

During the period under review, there were no special instances of the application of rules 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35 or 36.

In relation to rule 27 of the provisional rules of procedure, the Security Council used a variety of means to facilitate determination of the order of speakers. These included preparation of lists of speakers prior to formal meetings as well as

proceeding with an interactive dialogue with no predetermined list. For the first time, the list of speakers prepared prior to meetings was sometimes determined by lots (case 4).

In two instances, Council members agreed to allow the departing members of the Council to make their statements first (case 5). In a number of instances, Council members proceeded to the discussion of the item on the agenda without a pre-established list of speakers. In one case, a member of the Council voiced his complaint over this practice (case 6).

In cases where a list of speakers is prepared prior to a meeting, members would theoretically have priority over non-members who, while able to indicate their desire to participate, must first be invited to the meeting. Therefore, in most cases, members of the Council did speak before non-members. However, flexibility has been shown by the Council in this regard. In one instance, a non-member voiced his regret over the practice of Security Council members taking the floor before non-members (case 7). In another instance, one Council member expressed his regrets for the lack of transparency in the preparation of the list of speakers (case 8). In some cases, which are included here for illustrative purposes, non-members spoke first or interactively with members (cases 9, 10, 11 and 12). Finally, in one instance, one

Council member made a joint statement with another Council member (case 13).

On various occasions, the President of the Council requested speakers to limit their statements to 5 to 10 minutes at public briefings and open debates in order “to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously” and “within its timetable”. The announcements in the *Journal* concerning the 4709th meeting on the situation between Iraq and Kuwait⁷⁵ and the 4710th meeting on threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts,⁷⁶ for the first time, included text requesting speakers inscribed on the list to “limit their statements to no more than seven minutes”.⁷⁷

In a number of meetings, the Presidency requested delegations with lengthy statements to circulate them in writing and to deliver condensed versions in the Chamber. In one instance, a number of speakers agreed to circulate their statements in writing in place of making an oral presentation (case 14). In another, the President of the Council called for focused and operational interventions (case 15).

With regard to the application of rule 33, one case related to the adjournment of a meeting is included for illustrative purposes (case 16).

The provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council do not contain a rule permitting the President to call speakers to order if their remarks are not relevant to the item under discussion, nor do they contain a provision for the “right of reply”.⁷⁸ However, in one instance, during the period under review, one representative made reference to the “right of reply”. At the resumption of the 4336th meeting, held on 28 June 2001 in connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the representative of Iraq reserved his right “to respond to any right of reply”.⁷⁹ In another instance, a representative complained about the “right of reply” granted to another member. At the second resumption of the 4295th meeting, held on 19 March 2001 in connection with the situation in the Middle

East,⁸⁰ the representative of Palestine, referring to the second time the representative of Israel took the floor, inquired whether it was “an attempt to exercise the right of reply” or it was “the second statement by Israel during the same meeting of the Security Council”.⁸¹

During the period under review, the Council witnessed a number of procedural developments relating to the conduct of business. In a note by the President dated 29 May 2002,⁸² the Council addressed the issue of seating arrangements for non-members of the Council invited to speak at its meetings, clarifying that when non-members were invited to speak, they would be seated at the Council table on the alternate sides of the President, with the first speaker seated on the President’s right. In a note by the President dated 26 May 2002,⁸³ with a view to improving clarity and transparency, the Council referred to a number of elements agreed, including, inter alia, that the President would address speakers by name and title in public meetings.⁸⁴

Special cases concerning the application of rules 27-36

Rule 27

The President shall call upon representatives in the order in which they signify their desire to speak.

Case 4

In November 2001, the President of the Security Council instituted a lottery system for determining the order of speakers for certain meetings. At the 4432nd meeting, held on 30 November 2001 in connection with the wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month, several delegations commented on this innovation introduced by the Presidency (Jamaica). The representative of Singapore stated that the system created “regularity and predictability” and made everyone feel that they

⁷⁵ S/PV.4709.

⁷⁶ S/PV.4710.

⁷⁷ See *Journal of the United Nations*, No. 2003/32 of 15 February 2003 and No. 2003/34 of 20 February 2003, respectively.

⁷⁸ According to the practice of the Council, the terminology used is “to make a further statement”.

⁷⁹ S/PV.4336 (Resumption 1), p. 31.

⁸⁰ S/PV.4295 (Resumption 2).

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁸² S/2002/591.

⁸³ S/2002/316.

⁸⁴ For a discussion in the Council concerning its practice, procedure and working methods, including time management, see the report of the workshop for newly elected members of the Security Council which was held on 13 and 14 November 2003 (S/2004/135).

had a level playing field when it came to the selection of the speakers. He added that it had also helped to improve the chemistry among the members by making them feel equally treated and not as just belonging to “class A or class B” within the Council.⁸⁵

The representative of Mali, concurring with the representative of Singapore, remarked to the President that she had succeeded in enhancing transparency in the work of the Council, particularly by organizing a drawing of lots for the list of speakers.⁸⁶ The representative of Mauritius expressed gratitude to the President for having tackled the very delicate issue of the speakers’ list and noted that the new system was working well and without complaint from members of the Council. He therefore hoped that this practice would be continued under future presidencies.⁸⁷ The representative of Ukraine expressed similar views, by commending the initiative and strongly encouraging future Presidents to continue it.⁸⁸

Case 5

At the 4445th meeting, held on 21 December 2001 in connection with the wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month,⁸⁹ the representative of Singapore made a procedural suggestion at the beginning of the meeting, which was agreed upon by the other Council members. As a gesture of courtesy, he proposed to “allow the departing members of the Council to speak first, in alphabetical order”, followed by the other members in accordance with their desire to take the floor.⁹⁰ The Council agreed to the suggestion and the debate continued accordingly.

Similarly, at the 4677th meeting, held on 20 December 2002 in connection with the wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month,⁹¹ the session began with statements by the representatives of the outgoing non-permanent members of the Security Council followed by statements of the representatives of other members of the Council. The order of both groups was determined by drawing lots, as explained in the letter dated

⁸⁵ S/PV.4432, p. 13.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁸⁹ S/PV.4445.

⁹⁰ S/PV.4445, p. 2.

⁹¹ S/PV.4677.

19 December 2002 from the representative of Colombia addressed to the President of the Security Council.⁹²

Case 6

In a number of instances, no speakers’ list was drawn up and the President invited participants who wished to speak to raise their hands.⁹³

At the 4387th meeting held on 5 October 2001 in connection with Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999), the representative of Ukraine recommended that the Council get back to its system of drawing up lists of speakers, because, at that meeting, he was one of the first to raise his hand to be on the list but was the twelfth speaker. He added that Ukraine reserved its right “to return to this issue during consultations on the working methods of the Council”.⁹⁴ In response, the President (Ireland) stated that he was “proceeding punctiliously on the basis of the speakers’ list provided by the Council secretariat”.⁹⁵

Case 7

At the 4522nd meeting held on 26 April 2002 in connection with the situation in East Timor, the Council extended a number of invitations under rules 37 and 39, including invitations under rule 39 to the President-elect of East Timor, Mr. Xanana Gusmão and to the Chief Minister of East Timor, Mr. Mari Bin Amude Alkatiri. The Council first heard a briefing from the Secretary-General and the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, followed by statements from Mr. Gusmão and Mr. Alkatiri.⁹⁶ After all 15 members of the Council had spoken, the President (Russian Federation) noted that

⁹² S/2002/1387, p. 3.

⁹³ See, for example, S/PV.4308, S/PV.4309, S/PV.4310, S/PV.4350 and S/PV.4351 (for Council members); and S/PV.4361, S/PV.4367, S/PV.4379, S/PV.4380, S/PV.4387, S/PV.4392, S/PV.4394, S/PV.4395, S/PV.4403, S/PV.4424, S/PV.4429, S/PV.4432, S/PV.4466, S/PV.4568, S/PV.4598, S/PV.4616, S/PV.4631, S/PV.4736, S/PV.4762, S/PV.4812, S/PV.4834, S/PV.4838, S/PV.4851, S/PV.4865, S/PV.4869 and S/PV.4876.

⁹⁴ S/PV.4387, p. 18.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁹⁶ S/PV.4522, pp. 2-10.

Mr. Gusmão would soon have to leave. Two non-members were then called upon to make their statements. Thereafter, the President called upon the representative of Australia, who regretted the arrangements made for non-members to speak, particularly given the contribution of his country in respect of East Timor. He expressed his concern for what he considered as “a less-than-appropriate opportunity” to participate in the Security Council debate concerning East Timor.⁹⁷

Case 8

At the 4323rd meeting, held on 30 May 2001 in connection with the situation in the Great Lakes region, the representative of Singapore raised a procedural question, subsequently endorsed by Ireland and Mauritius,⁹⁸ concerning the list of speakers that the President referred to in his opening remarks.⁹⁹ He complained that the list of speakers had been established without his knowledge and contrary to the understanding reached by the Council in prior consultations to dispense with such a list. The representative expressed concern at the lack of transparency in the preparation of the list of speakers, stating that there was “no level playing field for all members of the Council when it comes to speaking before the Council”. He further expressed his hope that this would be a “useful signal to all members of the Council” to ensure that, henceforth, when it came to preparation of the speakers’ list, it would be done in “an open, transparent fashion, with a level playing field for all”.¹⁰⁰ The President (United States) stated that the understanding reached by the Council at its prior consultations concerned the proposed nature of the meeting and the order of speakers; it did not include the question of whether or not there would be a list of speakers. The President, therefore, decided to follow the list of speakers he had before him and proceeded accordingly.¹⁰¹

Case 9

At the 4257th meeting, held on 16 January 2001 in connection with strengthening cooperation with

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

⁹⁸ S/PV.4323, p. 3.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

troop-contributing countries,¹⁰² Council members departed from their customary practice of speaking before non-members. During the debate, which was held over two sessions, the representatives of most troop-contributing countries spoke during the morning session. In the afternoon session, Council members spoke first, followed by the remaining representatives of troop-contributing countries. At the 4288th meeting, held on 7 March 2001, on ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa, non-members spoke first. In his introductory remarks, the President stated that he would like “to draw particular attention to the decision taken by the Security Council to invite non-members of the Council to speak first”.¹⁰³ In a number of other instances, non-members were invited to speak first.¹⁰⁴

Case 10

At the 4532nd meeting, held on 14 May 2002 in connection with the situation in the Great Lakes region, the President first called on the Head of the Security Council mission to the Great Lakes region to brief the Council.¹⁰⁵ The President then called upon the representative of Spain,¹⁰⁶ who was not a member of the Security Council. Following the statement by the representative of Spain, the President noted that there “was some puzzlement among observers” when he gave the floor to a non-member of the Council to speak first. He explained that in prior consultation it was agreed that, after the briefing by the representative of France, he “would invite non-members of the Council to speak and then throw open the floor to Council members to respond or make additional comments”.¹⁰⁷ As a consequence, the President called upon four additional non-members before giving the floor to members of the Council.

¹⁰² S/PV.4257 and resumption 1.

¹⁰³ S/PV.4288, p. 2.

¹⁰⁴ See, for example, S/PV.4257, S/PV.4288, S/PV.4317, S/PV.4323, S/PV.4506, S/PV.4515, S/PV.4525, S/PV.4532, S/PV.4537, S/PV.4625 and resumptions 1-3, S/PV.4630 and S/PV.4642.

¹⁰⁵ S/PV.4532, pp. 2-6.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8. The representative of Spain spoke on behalf of the European Union and the associated and aligned countries.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

Case 11

At the 4312th meeting, held on 23 April 2001 in connection with the protection of civilians in armed conflicts, the President dispensed with a pre-established list of speakers and called upon the briefers to respond to questions and comments as they arose, rather than at the end of the meeting. In particular he stated that if questions were raised during the course of the debate, either to the Secretariat, the High Commissioner or each other, he would make arrangements for those questions to be taken up within a fairly short period of their being raised, so that the Council could get some interaction on points that were raised during the debate.¹⁰⁸ During the 4424th meeting, held on 21 November 2001 on the same item,¹⁰⁹ there was no fixed list of speakers. At that meeting, the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs was invited to respond to questions both during and at the conclusion of the meeting.

In a number of other instances, an interactive style of debate was occasionally utilized, with members and non-members being encouraged to ask and respond to questions during the course of the meeting.¹¹⁰ For instance, at the 4453rd meeting, held on 18 January 2002 in connection to threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts,¹¹¹ Council members and non-members spoke in alternate order. Following briefings by the Secretary-General and the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) to combat terrorism, the President gave the floor alternately to three members and three non-members and invited the Chairman of the Committee to reply to questions or make comments after every six speakers.¹¹²

¹⁰⁸ S/PV.4312, p. 7.

¹⁰⁹ S/PV.4424.

¹¹⁰ See, for example, S/PV.4308, S/PV.4424, S/PV.4429, S/PV.4358, S/PV.4470, S/PV.4538, S/PV.4552, S/PV.4568, S/PV.4577 and S/PV.4589. In some cases, questions raised were answered, by those who had provided the briefings on the issue, before the speakers' list was exhausted. See, for instance, S/PV.4308, S/PV.4309, S/PV.4310, S/PV.4312 and S/PV.4720.

¹¹¹ S/PV.4453.

¹¹² Similarly, at the 4429th meeting on 27 November 2001 in connection with the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda, the Council first heard briefings by three representatives from the Tribunals, then statements from

Case 12

At the 4087th meeting, held on 10 January 2000 in connection with the impact of AIDS on peace and security in Africa, following briefings by the Secretary-General, the President of the World Bank, the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, the Executive Director of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS and the representative of the United States,¹¹³ the President of the Council opened the floor for discussion by the members of the Council. In that connection, he stated that members of the Security Council would speak first, and that subsequently, because of the special nature of the meeting, any other Member of the United Nations that wished to speak was so invited to do so.¹¹⁴ Following the statements made by the representatives of Namibia, Bangladesh and France, the President briefly consulted the Council on a procedural matter. He pointed out that under the rules of the Security Council, Ministers of Security Council members took precedence, and that is why the Council began with the Vice-President of the United States and the Minister of Namibia. He added that, although Security Council members had the right to speak before Ministers of other countries that were not members, he had received several notes from the representatives of African countries, requesting him "to break into the procedural order" and allow the Ministers of Health of Uganda and Zimbabwe to speak prior to the next scheduled speakers. The Council therefore agreed to invite the Ministers from Uganda and Zimbabwe to take a seat at the Council's table and speak out of order.¹¹⁵

Case 13

At the 4355th meeting, held on 2 August 2001 in connection with small arms, the representative of Norway informed the Council that Mali and Norway,

three non-members of the Council, followed by questions and comments from 12 Council members which were answered by the briefers. After the statements by non-members, the President stated that it had been agreed in prior consultations that the format for the remainder of the meeting would take the form of an interactive dialogue. As a result, no list of speakers for members of the Council had been drawn up (see S/PV.4429, p. 18).

¹¹³ At the 4087th meeting, the United States was represented by its Vice-President.

¹¹⁴ S/PV.4087, p. 12.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

both members of the Security Council, had a joint statement to make on the issue of small arms.¹¹⁶ Subsequently, the representative of Mali delivered the statement, stating that Norway and Mali attached high priority to the question of small arms on their foreign policy agendas and also shared the same positions on critical issues linked to it. He further emphasized that it was the first time, to his knowledge, that such a procedure was being applied in the Security Council, and that it was his honour to speak also on behalf of Norway.¹¹⁷

Case 14

At the 4092nd meeting, held on 26 January 2000 to discuss the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the President (United States) requested speakers to limit their statements, owing to the large number of speakers inscribed and the time constraint. Hence, upon the President's request, several speakers, including one Council member,¹¹⁸ decided to circulate their statements in writing, in lieu of making an oral statement. Of those speakers, 10 had received invitations to participate, 1 was a Council member and held the Presidency, and 2 (Cape Verde and the International Organization of la Francophonie) had not received an invitation to participate.¹¹⁹

Case 15

During the month of April 2001, the President (United Kingdom) circulated a note to all permanent and observer missions in which he elaborated certain guidelines,¹²⁰ on both form and substance, which might be followed in the forthcoming debate on the protection of civilians in armed conflict. In particular, he requested delegations to consider preparing focused and operational statements of no more than five minutes that were clearly relevant to the issues arising

from the Secretary-General's report on the subject.¹²¹ At the 4312th meeting held on 23 April 2001 to discuss the protection of civilians in armed conflict, following briefings by the Deputy Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the President suggested that any speaker could make arrangements with the Secretariat "to get their written speech into the record" if they wished to shorten it in their oral remarks.¹⁰⁸ Subsequently, two non-members¹²² read out abridged versions of their respective statements, the texts of which were circulated and recorded in full.¹²³ Several other members and non-members announced their intention to make interventions that were in conformity with the President's guidelines.¹²⁴

¹²¹ Similarly, in a non-paper (S/2002/1387), the President stated that statements of Council members were expected to be brief (no more than 10 minutes), frank, focused and pointed, preferably on the issues outlined in the paper. Guidelines issued for the 28 June 2002 private wrap-up meeting suggested a five-minute time limit on interventions (S/2002/701).

¹²² S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Sweden, on behalf of the European Union); and p. 20 (Malaysia).

¹²³ Similarly, at the 4370th meeting held on 12 September 2001 to discuss "Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts", the President announced that statements by 10 non-members would subsequently be circulated as annexes to a note by the President (S/2001/864).

¹²⁴ To enable the Council to carry on its work more expeditiously, on various occasions the Presidency asked speakers to limit their statements. See, for example, S/PV.4087 (Resumption 1), S/PV.4091, S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), S/PV.4117, S/PV.4308, S/PV.4312, S/PV.4453, S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), S/PV.4478, S/PV.4525, S/PV.4575, S/PV.4577, S/PV.4589, S/PV.4677, S/PV.4688, S/PV.4701, S/PV.4707, S/PV.4709 and resumption 1, S/PV.4710, S/PV.4714, S/PV.4717 and resumption 1, S/PV.4720 and resumption 1, S/PV.4721, S/PV.4726 and resumption 1, S/PV.4734, S/PV.4739, S/PV.4744, S/PV.4748, S/PV.4792, S/PV.4823, S/PV.4824 (Resumption 1), S/PV.4833, S/PV.4835 and S/PV.4852. At the 4739th meeting, a complex formula of time limits was proposed. The Secretary-General and representatives of regional organizations were requested to limit their statements to between 7 and 10 minutes; members of the Council to between 3 and 5 minutes; followed by a response from representatives of regional organizations of from 3 to 5 minutes (S/PV.4739, p. 3). At the 4726th meeting, the President, noting that a large number of speakers were inscribed on the list, asked representatives to "refrain from congratulating the President" on his assumption of

¹¹⁶ S/PV.4355, p. 19.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁸ S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), pp. 2, 6 and 8.

¹¹⁹ Brazil, Cape Verde, Colombia, Eritrea, India, Israel, Japan, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Norway, United Republic of Tanzania, United States and International Organization of la Francophonie.

¹²⁰ A revised version of the guidelines is contained in the letter dated 15 June 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (see S/2001/596, annex).

Rule 33

The following motions shall have precedence in the order named over all principal motions and draft resolutions relative to the subject before the meeting:

1. *To suspend the meeting;*
2. *To adjourn the meeting;*
3. *To adjourn the meeting to a certain day or hour;*
4. *To refer any matter to a committee, to the Secretary-General or to a rapporteur;*
5. *To postpone discussion of the question to a certain day or indefinitely; or*
6. *To introduce an amendment.*

the Presidency (S/PV.4726, p. 12). At the 4709th meeting, the President introduced a time-saving seating arrangement by which he did not invite individual speakers to take seats at the Council table nor to resume their seats at the side of the Council Chamber. When a speaker was taking the floor, a conference officer seated the next speaker on the list at the table and the President refrained from thanking the speakers for their statements at the conclusion of statements (S/PV.4709, p. 3). This “time-saving” seating arrangement was also applied at the 4710th, 4717th (Resumption 1), 4726th, 4792nd, 4836th, 4841st, 4877th (Resumption 1) and 4881st meetings.

Any motion for the suspension or for the simple adjournment of the meeting shall be decided without debate.

Case 16

At the 4820th meeting, held on 9 September 2003 in connection with letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom and the United States (bombing of Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie), the President noted the presence of families and friends of those who had lost their lives on flight 103. After remarking that the Security Council was “moving towards a resolution of this terrible affair”, he stated that the Security Council, in considering the agenda before it, was also conscious of two factors: first, that the Council, in a matter of this gravity, needed to act unanimously; and secondly, that there were other very legitimate concerns pertaining to Libya which still needed resolution. Therefore, on the basis of the understanding reached in prior consultations, the President invoked article 33 of the Council’s provisional rules of procedure and proposed the adjournment of the meeting until 10:30 a.m. Friday, 12 September 2003, in the expectation that the agenda adopted during the present meeting would be the agenda before the Council on Friday.¹²⁵ The procedural motion was put to the vote and carried unanimously. The meeting, which had been called to order at 2:35 p.m., was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

¹²⁵ S/PV.4820 (Part I), p. 2.

Part VI Languages (rules 41-47)

Note

During the period under review, there were no special cases concerning the application of rules 41 to 43 and 45 to 47. There were two instances in which rule 44 was applied, and they are included for illustrative purposes.

Special cases concerning the application of rules 41-47

Rule 44

Any representative may make a speech in a language other than the languages of the Security Council. In this case, he shall himself provide for interpretation into one of those languages. Interpretation into the other languages of the Security Council by the interpreters of the Secretariat may be based on the interpretation given in the first such language.

Case 17

At its 4661st meeting, held on 12 December 2002 in connection with the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Council heard briefings from the three members of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina who spoke in, respectively, Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian.¹²⁶ Interpretation from each language into English was provided by the delegation of the State.

Case 18

At its 4194th meeting, held on 7 September 2000 in connection with the issue “Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa”, the representative of Bangladesh made a statement in Bengali.¹²⁷ The English text was provided by the delegation of the State.

¹²⁶ S/PV.4661, pp. 7-10.

¹²⁷ S/PV.4194, pp. 14-15.

Part VII Publicity of meetings, records (rules 48-57)

During the period under review, there were no special instances of the application of rules 48 to 57.

In addition to official records and documents, as established by chapter IX of the provisional rules of procedure, the Council has availed itself of other means to publicize its meetings and work. For instance, during the period under review, the President regularly briefed non-members and the media, and made statements and remarks to the press.¹²⁸

In a note by the President dated 29 June 2001,¹²⁹ recognizing the importance of timely, full and effective dissemination of its decisions and presidential statements, the members of the Council indicated their agreement on the following: (a) that the President of the Security Council should, when requested by the Council members, draw the attention of the concerned parties to relevant Council decisions and press statements; (b) that the Secretariat should continue to bring to the knowledge of those concerned relevant Council decisions and press statements and ensure their promptest communication and widest possible dissemination; and (c) that the Secretariat should issue, as United Nations press releases, all press statements made by the President on behalf of the Council, upon clearance by the President.

With a view to increasing the transparency and clarity of its work, during the period under review the Council also addressed the issue of the distribution of documents. By a note by the President dated 31 March 2000, the members of the Council¹³⁰ referred to the difficulties and disruption caused by the collection of copies of statements from outside the Council Chamber. The note stipulated two main arrangements for the distribution of statements: (a) the texts of statements made in the meetings of the Council would,

at the request of the delegation making the statement, be distributed by the Secretariat inside the Council Chamber to Council members and other Member States and permanent observers to the United Nations present at the meeting; and (b) any delegation requesting the distribution of its statement should provide at least 200 copies to the Secretariat sufficiently in advance of the statement being made, without making the statements otherwise available during the meeting. In the event that a delegation provided to the Secretariat fewer than 200 copies of its statement, those copies would be placed outside the Council Chamber at the end of the meeting.

Furthermore, with a view to facilitating understanding by the press regarding its work, a note by the President dated 26 March 2002¹³¹ referred to the following elements, *inter alia*, agreed by the Council: (a) reports by the Secretary-General should specify the date on which the document was physically and electronically distributed in addition to the date of signature by the Secretary-General; and (b) the Secretariat was encouraged, to the extent possible, to distribute its reports in all official languages on the date originally established for publication.

Finally, in November 2001, a new presidential website¹³² was launched by the Secretariat to provide easy access to up-to-date information on the Council's work and decisions.¹³³ Moreover, at the initiative of the President, the Council held its first live webcast in January 2002. Towards the conclusion of the 4460th meeting, held on 29 January 2002 to discuss the situation in Africa, the President informed members that "the Secretariat has confirmed that the live webcast of the Council's proceedings on this particular item will also be provided tomorrow".¹³⁴

¹²⁸ See the introductory note of the section on the Presidency in the present chapter.

¹²⁹ S/2001/640.

¹³⁰ S/2000/274.

¹³¹ S/2002/316.

¹³² <http://www.un.org/docs/sc/presidency.asp>.

¹³³ See the introductory note in part III of the present chapter.

¹³⁴ S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 42.

Chapter II

Agenda

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introductory note	X
Part I. The provisional agenda (rules 6-8 and 12)	27
Note	27
A. Circulation of communications by the Secretary-General (rule 6)	27
B. Preparation of the provisional agenda (rule 7)	27
C. Communication of the provisional agenda (rule 8)	27
Part II. Adoption of the agenda (rule 9)	28
Note	28
Discussions on the adoption of the agenda	28
A. Scope of items on the agenda in relation to the scope of the discussion	28
B. Phrasing of agenda items	29
C. Postponement of consideration of items	29
Part III. The agenda and matters of which the Security Council is seized (rules 10 and 11) ..	30
Note	30
Practice of the Security Council regarding the retention and deletion of items from the list of matters of which the Council is seized (rule 11)	31
Addition, retention and deletion of items during the period under review	31
A. Items added to the list of matters of which the Security Council was seized during the period 2000-2003	32
B. Items that appeared in previous volumes of the <i>Repertoire</i> on which new action by the Security Council was reported in summary statements issued during the period 2000-2003	40
C. Items that were deleted from the list of matters of which the Security Council was seized during the period 2000-2003	48

Introductory note

The present chapter concerns the interpretation and application of rules 6 to 12 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, relating to the agenda. The chapter is divided into three parts. A part concerning the adoption or amendment of rules 6 to 12, included in previous volumes of the *Repertoire*, has been omitted in the present *Supplement* since, during the period under review, the Council did not consider any change in those rules.

Part I, The provisional agenda (rules 6-8 and rule 12), provides information on the circulation of communications by the Secretary-General and on the preparation and communication of the provisional agenda.

Part II, Adoption of the agenda (rule 9), contains material dealing with questions that were discussed in connection with the adoption of the agenda, such as the scope of items on the agenda in relation to the scope of the discussion, the phrasing of agenda items and the postponement of consideration of items. No material was found for treatment concerning the procedure of the Council in voting on the adoption of the agenda, nor was there discussion in the Council of the requirements for the inclusion of an item in the agenda and the effect of such inclusion, or of other questions of procedure.

Part III, The agenda and matters of which the Security Council is seized (rules 10 and 11), relates to the list of matters under the Council's consideration. The tables in Part III supplement the tables in previous volumes of the *Repertoire* and indicate the changes that have since occurred in the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized. Part III also contains a case study concerning the deletion of an agenda item by a decision taken at the close of a Council meeting.

Part I

The provisional agenda (rules 6-8 and 12)

Note

The provisional agenda, prepared by the Secretary-General and approved by the President of the Security Council in accordance with rule 7, includes those items that have been brought to the attention of the Council under rule 6. Under that rule, “the Secretary-General shall immediately bring to the attention of all representatives on the Security Council all communications from States, organs of the United Nations, or the Secretary-General concerning any matter for the consideration of the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of the Charter”. Effect is normally given to this rule by the distribution of communications as documents in the S/-series. Communications from regional arrangements or agencies received pursuant to Article 54 of the Charter are also circulated in the S/-series of documents.

Rule 7 entrusts the drawing up of the provisional agenda for each meeting to the Secretary-General, subject to the approval of the President of the Security Council. The Secretary-General’s discretion with respect to the inclusion of new items is restricted to those items that have been brought to the attention of the Council under rule 6. In addition to the express provisions of rule 7, the Secretary-General also has to take into account whether a specific request to include the item has been made.

Rule 8 concerns communication of the provisional agenda to the representatives on the Security Council, and rule 12, paragraph 1, concerns such communication for periodic meetings. Since, during the period under review, no periodic meetings were convened, no material relating to the latter rule was found.

A. Circulation of communications by the Secretary-General (rule 6)

In accordance with rule 6, the Secretary-General continued the practice of distributing communications as documents in the S/-series. During the period under review, there were no instances in which the question of circulation of communications arose.

B. Preparation of the provisional agenda (rule 7)

In accordance with rule 7, the Secretary-General continued the practice of drawing up the provisional agenda for each meeting, subject to the approval of the President of the Security Council. During the period under review, there was no instance in which the subject of the preparation of the provisional agenda gave rise to a discussion in the Council.

C. Communication of the provisional agenda (rule 8)

In accordance with rule 8, the Secretary-General continued to communicate the provisional agenda to the representatives on the Security Council. Pursuant to prior decisions¹ of the Council, the provisional agendas for meetings of the Council were also listed in the *Journal of the United Nations*, as were the topics to be discussed in informal consultations of the members of the Council.

¹ Note by the President dated 30 June 1993 (S/26015); and statement by the President of 4 November 1994 (S/PRST/1994/62).

Part II

Adoption of the agenda (rule 9)

Note

Under rule 9, the first item on the provisional agenda for each meeting of the Security Council is the adoption of the agenda.² In practice, the Council usually discusses and approves the provisional agenda in prior informal consultations and then adopts it at the formal meeting without a vote. During the period under review, there was no occasion on which an objection was raised on grounds related to the procedure of the Council in voting on the adoption of the agenda or the substance of the item(s) inscribed on the provisional agenda. Objections on the adoption of the agenda were also precluded by the practice of the Council of inscribing a single substantive item on its provisional agenda for each meeting.

In the section below, which covers other questions that were discussed in connection with the adoption of the agenda, three case histories and related material have been included under the following three subheadings: “Scope of items on the agenda in relation to the scope of the discussion” (cases 1 and 2); “Phrasing of agenda items”; and “Postponement of consideration of items” (case 3). No material was found for treatment under the other subheadings included in previous volumes of the *Repertoire*, dealing with the order of discussion of items on the agenda and precedence of the decision on adoption of the agenda.

During the period under review, the Council included 68 new items in its agenda.³ Notably, of the new items, several dealt with thematic issues. Additional items were of a recurring nature, such as those relating to wrap-up discussions on the monthly work of the Security Council, meetings with troop-contributing countries pursuant to resolution 1353

² There were several instances in which, in accordance with past practice, the President of the Council made preliminary remarks before the adoption of the agenda, such as expressions of thanks, congratulations, tributes and expressions of sympathy, including the observation of a minute of silence. For example, at the 4247th meeting on 14 December 2000, the President spoke briefly, welcoming the decision by Ukraine to close the Chernobyl nuclear power station on 15 December.

³ For a complete list of the new items, see table B in part III.

(2001), annex II, sections A and B, and Security Council missions.

With a view to improving clarity and transparency, and to facilitate understanding by the press regarding the work of the Security Council, by a note by the President dated 26 March 2002,⁴ it was agreed that the President of the Council would in public meetings introduce agenda items by specifying the agenda item/issue for consideration, unless otherwise agreed in prior consultations.

Discussions on the adoption of the agenda

A. Scope of items on the agenda in relation to the scope of the discussion

Case 1

While discussions in the Security Council are usually limited to the item on the agenda, on a few occasions representatives asserted that a previous speaker had addressed situations or issues that were not on the Council’s agenda or that did not strictly fall under the scope of the item under consideration.⁵ In

⁴ S/2002/316.

⁵ For instance, at the 4219th meeting, held on 10 November 2000, at which Mrs. Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, briefed the Council, the representative of Canada expressed the view that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) had “spoken eloquently and thoughtfully of the challenges facing refugees and humanitarian organizations in countries which are on the Security Council’s agenda — and of those countries which were not but perhaps should have been” (S/PV.4219, p. 16). At the 4245th meeting, held on 12 December 2000, on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina the representative of the United Kingdom expressed his appreciation that the representative of the United States had “used the occasion to address us not just on the subject on the agenda, but also on the subject that will be uppermost in our minds between now and 22 December [the scales of assessment for the United Nations regular and peacekeeping budgets]” (S/PV.4245, p. 13). At the 4568th meeting, held on 10 July 2002, on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the representative of Yugoslavia noted that the Council was

one instance, at the 4762nd meeting of the Council, held on 22 May 2003, concerning the agenda item entitled “Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq”, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic took the floor in explanation of the vote that had taken place at the 4761st meeting in connection with the item entitled “The situation between Iraq and Kuwait”. Before giving the floor, the President noted that, following informal consultations with Council members and with their concurrence, he was calling on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to make a statement regarding the Council’s proceedings at the previous meeting.⁶ The full statement of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic was recorded in the verbatim record of the 4762nd meeting; a footnote was inserted in the verbatim record of the 4761st meeting, cross-referencing his statement.⁷

Case 2

In another instance, at the 4194th meeting, held on 7 September 2000, the Council had included in its agenda the item entitled “Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa”. At the same meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council in connection with the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁸ Prior to the issuance of the statement, the President noted that he had “one other brief item of business” and announced that the representatives had discussed and agreed on the wording of a presidential statement on the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He asked whether he could assume that the representatives approved that statement and were content that it would

discussing extremely important issues (the International Criminal Court and United Nations peacekeeping) that transcended the item on the Council’s agenda (S/PV.4568 (Resumption 1), p. 13). The issue was subsequently discussed under a new item entitled “United Nations peacekeeping”. At the 4616th meeting, held on 26 September 2002, on the draft report of the Security Council to the General Assembly, the representative of Colombia stated that, as indicated in its agenda, the meeting had been convened to consider the draft report of the Security Council to the General Assembly, and that it should not be made into some kind of wrap-up on the Council’s agenda and performance (S/PV.4616, p. 22).

⁶ For details, see S/PV.4762 (Resumption 1), p. 20.

⁷ See S/PV.4761, p. 2.

⁸ S/PRST/2000/28.

be issued at that meeting. There being no objection, he declared that he would arrange for the statement to be issued as document S/PRST/2000/28.⁹

B. Phrasing of agenda items

In some instances, references were made to the wording or merging of items.¹⁰ In two instances, the wording of existing items was amended, as follows: (a) in accordance with a note by the President dated 27 August 2002,¹¹ the wording of items concerning “Meeting of the Security Council with troop-contributing countries ... pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A” was revised to read “Meeting of the Security Council with troop-contributing countries ... pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B”; and (b) as from the 4646th meeting, held on 14 November 2002, the wording of the item “The situation in East Timor” was revised to read “The situation in Timor-Leste”.¹²

C. Postponement of consideration of items

Case 3

In one instance, immediately following the adoption of the agenda, the consideration of the item was postponed until a specific time and date. At the 4820th meeting on 9 September 2003, the Security Council met to consider the item relating to the

⁹ S/PV.4194, p. 21.

¹⁰ At the 4109th meeting, held on 9 March 2000, on the item entitled “Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council”, the representative of Egypt stated that the title of the item provided a very loose framework for discussion, making it very difficult for many Member States to address the issue accurately or speak about it in specific or definitive terms. He added that the term “humanitarian aspects” could be used to raise various subjects and ideas and involved “too many concepts and measures” (S/PV.4109, p. 20). At the 4684th meeting on the protection of children and armed conflict, held on 14 January 2003, the representative of Japan suggested that, owing to their interrelatedness, the items on children and armed conflict, protection of civilians in armed conflict, and women and peace and security could well be addressed under a single agenda item (S/PV.4684 (Resumption 1), p. 40).

¹¹ S/2002/964.

¹² S/PV.4646.

destruction of Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, in 1988 and UTA flight 772 over Niger in 1989. A sub-item related to voting on a draft resolution¹³ that would lift the sanctions imposed on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President of the Council stated that, in regard to the destruction of Pan Am flight 103, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had accepted responsibility, agreed to pay a substantial sum of compensation and cooperate with any further investigation, and had renounced terrorism. In considering the agenda before it, the Security Council was also conscious of two factors: first, the need to act unanimously; and second, that there were other very legitimate concerns pertaining to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya that still needed resolution. In recognition of those factors, his colleagues on the Council, in a prior informal meeting, had concluded that the most appropriate course would be for the President, invoking rule 33 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, to propose the

¹³ S/2003/824.

adjournment of the present meeting until 10.30 a.m. on 12 September 2003, in the expectation that the agenda that had just been adopted would be the agenda before the Council on 12 September.¹⁴

The President then put the procedural motion to the vote. It was carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.

At the 4820th meeting (Part II) on 12 September 2003, the Council, in accordance with the arrangement approved at the previous meeting, did not subject the item to renewed debate in connection with the adoption of the agenda. The Council continued its consideration of the item and sub-item adopted at the 4820th meeting and voted on the draft resolution, which was adopted as resolution 1506 (2003).¹⁵

¹⁴ S/PV.4820 (Part I), p. 2.

¹⁵ S/PV.4820 (Part II).

Part III

The agenda and matters of which the Security Council is seized (rules 10 and 11)

Note

Rule 10 of the provisional rules of procedure was designed to enable the Security Council to continue, at its next meeting, the consideration of an item of unfinished business without subjecting that item to renewed debate in connection with the adoption of the agenda. No discussion concerning the application of that rule occurred during the period under review. On many occasions, separate consecutive meetings were held on the same agenda item.¹⁶ In other instances, the meeting was suspended and resumed until the Council

¹⁶ For example, the 4233rd and 4234th meetings, held in private on 27 November 2000, on the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question; the 4418th and 4419th meetings, held on 15 November 2001, on the situation in Angola; the 4658th and 4659th meetings, held in private on 9 December 2002, on the situation in the Central Africa Republic; and the 4707th, 4708th and 4709th meetings on the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the 4708th meeting having been held in private, on 14, 18 and 19 February 2003, respectively.

had completed that stage of its consideration of the item.¹⁷ In one instance, following the adoption of a procedural motion to adjourn the meeting until a specific time and date, the Council continued the second part of that meeting at the agreed time and date, three days later.¹⁸

Rule 11 provides for the Secretary-General to communicate each week to the representatives on the Security Council a summary statement of matters of

¹⁷ For example, the 4208th meeting, held on 24 October 2000 and resumed on 24 and 25 October, on women, peace and security; the 4934th meeting, held on 22 October 2001 and resumed on 25 October, on general issues relating to sanctions; the 4522nd meeting, held on 26 April 2002 and resumed on 29 April, on the situation in East Timor; and the 4726th meeting, held on 26 March 2003, on the situation between Iraq and Kuwait.

¹⁸ See the 4820th meeting (Part I), on the letters dated 20 and 23 December 1999 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, held on 9 September 2003 and adjourned until 12 September (Part II). See also case 3 above.

which the Security Council is seized and of the stage reached in their consideration. Items remained on the list of matters of which the Council was seized when the tenor of the Council's discussion or its specific decisions revealed a continuing concern with the matter. Such retention was confirmed when the President of the Council announced, upon conclusion of the debate, that the Council remained seized of a question.

During the period under review, items were deleted from the list of matters of which the Security Council was seized when (a) the item had not been considered in the preceding five years and no request for its retention had been made; or (b) the Council had formally concluded its consideration of the item.

The reformatted and streamlined tables in sections A, B and C supplement the tables contained in the previous volumes of the *Repertoire* and indicate the changes that have since occurred in the list of matters of which the Council is seized.

Practice of the Security Council regarding the retention and deletion of items from the list of matters of which the Council is seized (rule 11)

In what has become usual practice, items which have not been considered in the preceding five years are automatically deleted from the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized, unless a Member State notifies the Secretary-General beforehand of its wish to have the item retained.¹⁹ Thirty-five items were deleted during the period under review using this procedure. Items are also deleted following a request addressed to the Secretary-General by the Member State concerned and in the absence of any objection on the part of the members of the Council. No such

¹⁹ The procedure was set out in two notes by the President of the Council, dated 30 July and 29 August 1996, respectively (S/1996/603 and S/1996/704).

request was made. In addition, items may be deleted by a decision of the Council taken at the close of a Council meeting. One item was deleted using this procedure, details of which are provided below.

Case 4

At the 4820th meeting (Part II) on 12 September 2003, the Security Council adopted resolution 1506 (2003), by which, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, it decided to lift the sanctions against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; decided also to dissolve the Committee established pursuant to resolution 748 (1992); and decided further that it had concluded its consideration of the item entitled "Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America" and thereby removed that item from the list of matters of which the Council was seized.

Addition, retention and deletion of items during the period under review

The tables that follow have been reformatted and streamlined. Table A indicates items added to the list of matters of which the Council was seized during the period under review; table B indicates items that appeared in previous volumes of the *Repertoire* for which new action by the Security Council was reported in the summary statements issued during the period 2000 to 2003; and table C indicates items deleted from the list during that period.²⁰ The tables show that during the period under review the Council included 68 new items in the list of matters of which it was seized and deleted 36 items.

²⁰ Information compiled from the following summary statements: S/2000/40 and Add.1-51; S/2001/15 and Add.1-52; S/2002/30 and Add.1-51; and S/2003/40 and Add.1-51.

A. Items added to the list of matters of which the Security Council was seized during the period 2000-2003

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
Protection of United Nations personnel, associated personnel and humanitarian personnel in conflict zones	4100th meeting 9 February 2000	S/2000/40/Add.5 28 March 2000	Adopted resolution 1502 (2003) 4814th meeting 26 August 2003
Briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans	4105th meeting 28 February 2000	S/2000/40/Add.8 14 April 2000	Heard statements 4164th meeting 23 June 2000
Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council	4109th meeting 9 March 2000	S/2000/40/Add.9 19 April 2000	President made a statement (S/PRST/2000/7) 4110th meeting
General issues relating to sanctions	4128th meeting 17 April 2000	S/2000/40/Add.15 23 May 2000	Heard statements 4713th meeting 25 February 2003
The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations	4172nd meeting 17 July 2000	S/2000/40/Add.28 31 July 2000	Heard statements 4859th meeting 17 November 2003
Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa	4194th meeting 7 September 2000	S/2000/40/Add.35 15 September 2000	President made a statement (S/PRST/2001/10) 4302nd meeting 22 March 2001
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4204th meeting 3, 4 and 5 October 2000	S/2000/40/Add.39 13 October 2000	Heard statements 4879th meeting 12 December 2003
Women and peace and security	4208th meeting 24 and 25 October 2000	S/2000/40/Add.42 3 November 2000	Heard statements 4852nd meeting 29 October 2003
Briefing by Judge Gilbert Guillaume, President of the International Court of Justice	4212th meeting 31 October 2000	S/2000/40/Add.43 10 November 2000	Issued a communiqué 4636th meeting (private) 29 October 2002
Briefing by Mrs. Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	4219th meeting 10 November 2000	S/2000/40/Add.44 17 November 2000	Heard statements 4219th meeting

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security	4220th meeting 13 November 2000	S/2000/40/Add.45 24 November 2000	Adopted resolution 1327 (2000) 4220th meeting
No exit without strategy	4223rd meeting 15 November 2000	S/2000/40/Add.45 24 November 2000	Heard statements 4223rd meeting (res. 1)
Letter dated 10 November 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Solomon Islands to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/1088)	4224th meeting 16 November 2000	S/2000/40/Add.45 24 November 2000	President made a statement (S/PRST/2000/33) 4224th meeting
Briefing by the Secretary-General	4226th meeting 17 November 2000	S/2000/40/Add.45 24 November 2000	Issued a communiqué 4226th meeting (private)
The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone	4252nd meeting 21 December 2000	S/2000/40/Add.50 29 December 2000	President made a statement (S/PRST/2000/41) 4252nd meeting
Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries	4257th meeting 16 January 2001	S/2001/15/Add.3 28 March 2001	Adopted resolution 1353 (2001) 4326th meeting 13 June 2001
Briefing by His Excellency Mr. Mircea Geoana, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Romania, Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe	4266th meeting 29 January 2001	S/2001/15/Add.5 2 April 2001	Issued a communiqué 4266th meeting (private)
Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach	4272nd meeting 5 February 2001	S/2001/15/Add.6 4 April 2001	President made a statement (S/PRST/2001/5) 4278th meeting 20 February 2001
The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its border with Liberia and Sierra Leone The situation in Liberia The situation in Sierra Leone	4276th meeting 12 February 2001	S/2001/15/Add.7 6 April 2001	Issued a communiqué 4276th meeting (private)

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
Letter dated 4 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	4289th meeting 7 March 2001	S/2001/15/Add.10 13 April 2001	Adopted resolution 1345 (2001) 4301st meeting 21 March 2001
The situation along the borders of Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone	4291st meeting 8 March 2001	S/2001/15/Add.10 13 April 2001	Heard statements 4291st meeting
The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone The situation in Sierra Leone	4319th meeting 14 May 2001	S/2001/15/Add.20 25 May 2001	Heard statements 4319th meeting
Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the month of June 2001	4343rd meeting 29 June 2001	S/2001/15/Add.26 6 July 2001	Heard statements 4343rd meeting
Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month	4363rd meeting 31 August 2001	S/2001/15/Add.35 7 September 2001	Heard statements 4818th meeting 28 August 2003
Security Council resolution 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998	4366th meeting 10 September 2001	S/2001/15/Add.37 21 September 2001	Adopted resolution 1367 (2001) 4366th meeting
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Eritrea and Ethiopia pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B ^a	4369th meeting 10 September 2001	S/2001/15/Add.37 21 September 2001	Issued a communiqué 4821st meeting (private) 9 September 2003
Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts	4370th meeting 12 September 2001	S/2001/15/Add.37 21 September 2001	Adopted resolution 1516 (2003) 4867th meeting 20 November 2003
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4371st meeting 13 September 2001	S/2001/15/Add.37 21 September 2001	Issued a communiqué 4827th meeting (private) 16 September 2003

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
Briefing by His Excellency Mr. Nebojša Čović, Deputy Prime Minister of Serbia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia	4373rd meeting 17 September 2001	S/2001/15/Add.38 28 September 2001	Issued a communiqué 4373rd meeting (private)
Security Council resolution 1054 (1996) of 26 April 1996	4384th meeting 28 September 2001	S/2001/15/Add.39 5 October 2001	Adopted resolution 1372 (2001) 4384th meeting
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4386th meeting 2 October 2001	S/2001/15/Add.40 12 October 2001	Issued a communiqué 4781st meeting (private) 1 July 2003
Nobel Peace Prize	4390th meeting 12 October 2001	S/2001/15/Add.41 19 December 2001	President made a statement (S/PRST/2001/28) 4390th meeting
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4391st meeting 18 October 2001	S/2001/15/Add.42 26 December 2001	Issued a communiqué 4767th meeting (private) 4 June 2003
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4397th meeting 25 October 2001	S/2001/15/Add.43 2 November 2001	Issued a communiqué 4527th meeting (private) 6 May 2002
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4425th meeting 21 November 2001	S/2001/15/Add.47 30 November 2001	Issued a communiqué 4878th meeting (private) 11 December 2003

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4426th meeting 21 November 2001	S/2001/15/Add.47 30 November 2001	Issued a communiqué 4847th meeting (private) 23 October 2003
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4435th meeting 7 December 2001	S/2001/Add.49 14 December 2001	Issued a communiqué 4866th meeting (private) 20 November 2003
Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/434)	4439th meeting 18 December 2001	S/2001/15/Add.51 28 December 2001	President made a statement (S/PRST/2001/38) 4440th meeting 19 December 2001
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4446th meeting 10 January 2002	S/2002/30/Add.1 22 March 2002	Issued a communiqué 4620th meeting (private) 10 October 2002
Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations	4447th meeting 14 January 2002	S/2002/30/Add.2 25 March 2002	Issued a communiqué Approved a note by the President (S/2002/56) 4447th meeting (private)
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4455th meeting 21 January 2002	S/2002/30/Add.3 26 March 2002	Issued a communiqué 4795th meeting (private) 25 July 2003

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4457th meeting 24 January 2002	S/2002/30/Add.3 26 March 2002	Issued a communiqué 4796th meeting (private) 25 July 2003
Briefing by Mr. Ruud Lubbers, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	4470th meeting 7 February 2002	S/2002/30/Add.5 1 April 2002	Heard statements 4470th meeting
Food aid in the context of conflict settlement: Afghanistan and other crisis areas	4507th meeting 4 April 2002	S/2002/30/Add.13 9 April 2002	Heard statements 4507th meeting
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4553rd meeting 13 June 2002	S/2002/30/Add.23 21 June 2002	Issued a communiqué 4553rd meeting (private)
United Nations peacekeeping	4572nd meeting 12 July 2002	S/2002/30/Add.27 19 July 2002	Adopted resolution 1487 (2003) 4772nd meeting 12 June 2003
High-level meeting of the Security Council on the anniversary of 11 September 2001: acts of international terrorism	4607th meeting 11 September 2002	S/2002/30/Add.36 20 September 2002	President made a statement (S/PRST/2002/25) 4607th meeting
Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security	4630th meeting 22 October 2002	S/2002/30/Add.42 1 November 2002	President made a statement (S/PRST/2002/31) 4640th meeting 31 October 2002
Africa's food crisis as a threat to peace and security	4652nd meeting 3 December 2002	S/2002/30/Add.48 13 December 2002	Heard statements 4736th meeting 7 April 2003

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
Letter dated 29 November 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1317)	4659th meeting 9 December 2002	S/2002/30/Add.49 20 December 2002	Issued a communiqué 4659th meeting (private)
Briefings by the Chairmen of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia, the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa and the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations	4673rd meeting 18 December 2002	S/2002/30/Add.50 27 December 2002	Heard statements 4673rd meeting
The situation in Côte d'Ivoire	4680th meeting 20 December 2002	S/2002/30/Add.50 27 December 2002	President made a statement (S/PRST/2003/25) 4875th meeting 4 December 2003
High-level meeting of the Security Council: combating terrorism	4688th meeting 20 January 2003	S/2003/40/Add.3 21 February 2003	Adopted resolution 1456 (2003) 4688th meeting
Kimberley Process Certification Scheme	4694th meeting 28 January 2003	S/2003/40/Add.4 24 February 2003	Adopted resolution 1460 (2003) 4694th meeting
Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa	4720th meeting 18 March 2003	S/2003/40/Add.11 28 March 2003	Adopted resolution 1467 (2003) 4720th meeting

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
The Security Council and regional organizations: facing the new challenges to international peace and security	4739th meeting 11 April 2003	S/2003/40/Add.14 26 September 2003	Heard statements 4739th meeting
The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes	4753rd meeting 13 May 2003	S/2003/40/Add.19 23 May 2003	President made a statement (S/PRST/2003/5) 4753rd meeting
Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq	4762nd meeting 22 May 2003	S/2003/40/Add.20 30 May 2003	Heard statements 4762nd meeting
Security Council mission	4775th meeting 18 June 2003	S/2003/40/Add.24 27 June 2003	Heard statements 4855th meeting 11 November 2003
Meeting of the Security Council with the potential troop and civilian police-contributing countries to the proposed United Nations peacekeeping operation in Liberia pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4825th meeting 15 September 2003	S/2003/40/Add.37 26 September 2003	Issued a communiqué 4825th meeting (private)
Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role	4833rd meeting 24 September 2003	S/2003/40/Add.38 3 October 2003	Heard statements 4835th meeting 30 September 2003
Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/939)	4836th meeting 5 October 2003	S/2003/40/Add.40 17 October 2003	Heard statements 4836th meeting
Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/943)			

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
Letter dated 2 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/934)	4839th meeting 10 October 2003	S/2003/40/Add.40 17 October 2003	President made a statement (S/PRST/2003/16) 4839th meeting
Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4854th meeting 7 November 2003	S/2003/Add.44 14 November 2003	Issued a communiqué 4854th meeting (private)
The importance of mine action for peacekeeping operations	4858th meeting 13 November 2003	S/2003/40/Add.45 21 November 2003	President made a statement (S/PRST/2003/22) 4864th meeting 19 November 2003
Central African region	4871st meeting 24 November 2003	S/2003/40/Add.47 5 December 2003	Heard statements 4871st meeting
Briefings by Chairmen of Security Council committees and working groups	4888th meeting 22 December 2003	S/2003/40/Add.51 2 January 2004	Heard statements 4888th meeting

^a In accordance with the note by the President of the Security Council dated 27 August 2002 (S/2002/964), the wording of items concerning "Meeting of the Security Council with troop-contributing countries [...] pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A" was revised to read "Meeting of the Security Council with troop-contributing countries [...] pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B".

B. Items that appeared in previous volumes of the *Repertoire* on which new action by the Security Council was reported in summary statements issued during the period 2000-2003

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in the summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
The situation in the Middle East	1341st meeting 21 May 1967	S/7913 29 May 1967	Adopted resolution 1520 (2003) President made a statement (S/PRST/2003/29) 4889th meeting 22 December 2003

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in the summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
The situation in Cyprus	1779th meeting 16 July 1974	S/11185/Add.28 24 July 1974	Adopted resolution 1517 (2003) 4870th meeting 24 November 2000
The situation concerning Western Sahara	1849th meeting 20 October 1975	S/11593/Add.42 29 October 1975	Adopted resolution 1513 (2003) 4850th meeting 28 October 2003
The situation in Timor-Leste ^a	1864th meeting 15 December 1975	S/11593/Add.50 23 December 1975	Heard statements 4843rd meeting 15 October 2003
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	2932nd meeting 2 August 1990	S/21100/Add.30 10 August 1990	President made a statement (S/PRST/2003/28) 4887th meeting 18 December 2003
The situation in Liberia	2974th meeting 22 January 1991	S/22110/Add.3 and Corr.1 1 and 5 February 1991	Adopted resolution 1521 (2003) 4890th meeting 22 December 2003
The situation in Somalia	3060th meeting 17 March 1992	S/23370/Add.11 27 March 1992	Adopted resolution 1519 (2003) 4885th meeting 16 December 2003
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	3113th meeting 9 September 1992	S/23370/Add.36 14 September 1992	Heard statements 4837th meeting 8 October 2003
The situation in Georgia	3121st meeting 8 October 1992	S/23370/Add.40 12 October 1992	Adopted resolution 1494 (2003) 4800th meeting 30 July 2003
The situation in Angola	3168th meeting 29 January 1993	S/25070/Add.4 4 February 1993	Heard statements 4671st meeting 17 December 2002
The situation concerning Rwanda	3183rd meeting 12 March 1993	S/25070/Add.10 22 March 1993	Heard statements 4127th meeting 14 April 2000
The question concerning Haiti	3238th meeting 16 June 1993	S/25070/Add.24 6 July 1993	President made a statement (S/PRST/2000/8) 4112th meeting 15 March 2000

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in the summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
The situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	3239th meeting 18 June 1993	S/25070/Add.24 6 July 1993	Adopted resolution 1371 (2001) 4381st meeting 26 September 2001
The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border	3266th meeting 23 August 1993	S/25070/Add.34 3 September 1993	President made a statement (S/PRST/2000/17) 4141st meeting 12 May 2000
The situation in Croatia	3275th meeting 14 September 1993	S/25070/Add.37 24 September 1993	President made a statement (S/PRST/2002/34) 4662nd meeting 12 December 2002
The situation in Burundi	3297th meeting 25 October 1993	S/25070/Add.43 4 November 1993	President made a statement (S/PRST/2003/30) 4891st meeting 22 December 2003
The situation in Afghanistan	3330th meeting 24 January 1994	S/1994/20/Add.3 3 February 1994	Heard statements 4848th meeting 24 October 2003
The situation in Sierra Leone	3597th meeting 27 November 1995	S/1995/40/Add.47 8 December 1995	Adopted resolution 1508 (2003) 4829th meeting 19 September 2003
International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	3637th meeting 29 February 1996	S/1996/15/Add.8 8 March 1996	Heard statements 4838th meeting 9 October 2003

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in the summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994			
International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	3663rd meeting 8 May 1996	S/1996/18/Add.18 17 May 1996	Adopted resolution 1481 (2003) 4759th meeting 19 May 2003
The situation in the Great Lakes region	3708th meeting 1 November 1996	S/1996/15/Add.43 8 November 1996	President made a statement (S/PRST/2003/23) 4865th meeting 20 November 2003
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	3784th meeting 29 May 1997	S/1997/40/Add.21	President made a statement (S/PRST/2003/21) 4863rd meeting 19 November 2003
The situation in the Central African Republic	3808th meeting 6 August 1997	S/1997/40/Add.31 15 August 1997	Issued a communiqué 4658th meeting (private) 9 December 2002
The situation in Africa	3819th meeting 25 September 1997	S/1997/40/Add.38 3 October 1997	Heard statements 4577th meeting 18 July 2002

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in the summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1998/287)	3874th meeting 22 April 1998	S/1998/44/Add.16 1 May 1998	Heard statements 4881st meeting 15 December 2003
The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security	3881st meeting 14 May 1998	S/1998/44/Add.19 22 May 1998	President made a statement (S/PRST/2000/38) 4243rd meeting 6 December 2000
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	3895th meeting 26 June 1998	S/1998/44/Add.25 2 July 1998	Adopted resolution 1507 (2003) 4822nd meeting 12 September 2003
Children and armed conflict	3897th meeting 29 June 1998	S/1998/44/Add.26 10 July 1998	Adopted resolution 1460 (2003) 4695th meeting 30 January 2003
International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994	3908th meeting 15 July 1998	S/1998/44/Add.28 24 July 1998	Adopted resolution 1512 (2003) President made a statement (S/PRST/2003/18) 4849th meeting 27 October 2003
The situation in Guinea-Bissau	3940th meeting 6 November 1998	S/1998/44/Add.44 13 November 1998	Issued a communiqué 4860th meeting (private) 18 November 2003

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in the summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peacebuilding	3954th meeting 16 December 1998	S/1998/44/Add.50 24 December 1998	President made a statement (S/PRST/2000/10) 4119th meeting 23 March 2000
Protection of civilians in armed conflict	3977th meeting 12 February 1999	S/1999/25/Add.5 19 February 1999	President made a statement (S/PRST/2003/27) 4882nd meeting 15 December 2003
Promoting peace and security: humanitarian assistance to refugees in Africa	4025th meeting 26 July 1999	S/1999/25/Add.29 6 August 1999	President made a statement (S/PRST/2000/1) 4089th meeting 13 January 2000
Small arms	4048th meeting 24 September 1999	S/1999/25/Add.37 1 October 1999	President made a statement (S/PRST/2002/30) 4639th meeting 31 October 2002
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4061st meeting (private) 5 November 1999	S/1999/25/Add.43 12 November 1999	Heard statements 4886th meeting 17 December 2003
Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts	4072nd meeting 29 and 30 November 1999	S/1999/25/Add.47 10 December 1999	Adopted resolution 1366 (2001) 4360th meeting 30 August 2001
Admission of new Members^b			
Tuvalu	4093rd meeting 28 January 2000	S/2000/40/Add.3 11 March 2000	Recommended 4103rd meeting 17 February 2000
Yugoslavia	4214th meeting 31 October 2000	S/2000/40/Add.43 10 November 2000	Recommended 4215th meeting 31 October 2000
East Timor	4540th meeting 22 May 2002	S/2002/30/Add.20 31 May 2002	Recommended 4542nd meeting 23 May 2002
Swiss Confederation	4584th meeting 24 July 2002	S/2002/30/Add.29 2 August 2002	Recommended 4585th meeting 24 July 2002

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in the summary statement</i>	<i>Last action by the Council as at 31 December 2003</i>
International Court of Justice^c			
Election of a member of the International Court of Justice	4107th meeting 2 March 2000	S/2000/40/Add.8 14 April 2000	Recommended one candidate to fill vacancy 4107th meeting
Date of election to fill a vacancy in the International Court of Justice	4345th meeting 5 July 2001	S/2001/15/Add.27 13 July 2001	Adopted resolution 1361 (2001) 4345th meeting
Election of a member of the International Court of Justice	4389th meeting 12 October 2001	S/2001/15/Add.41 19 December 2001	Recommended one candidate to fill vacancy 4389th meeting
Election of five members of the International Court of Justice	4629th meeting 21 October 2002	S/2002/30/Add.42 1 November 2002	Recommended five candidates to fill vacancies 4629th meeting
Appointment of the Secretary-General^d			
Recommendation for the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations	4337th meeting 27 June 2001	S/2001/15/Add.26 6 July 2001	Adopted resolution 1358 (2001) without vote 4337th meeting (private)
Consideration of the draft report of the Security Council to the General Assembly^e			
Report covering period 16 June 1999-15 June 2000	4192nd meeting 31 August 2000	S/2000/40/Add.34 8 September 2000	Adopted draft report Issued note (S/2000/839) 4192nd meeting
Report covering period 16 June 2000-15 June 2001	4375th meeting 18 September 2001	S/2001/15/Add.38 28 September 2001	Adopted draft report Issued note (S/2001/876) 4375th meeting
Report covering period 16 June 2001-31 July 2002	4616th meeting 26 September 2002	S/2002/30/Add.38 4 October 2002	Adopted draft report Issued note (S/2002/1068) 4616th meeting
Report covering period 1 August 2002-31 July 2003	4831st meeting 19 September 2003	S/2003/40/Add.37 26 September 2003	Adopted draft report Issued note (S/2003/893) 4831st meeting

(Footnotes on following page)

(Footnotes to Table)

-
- ^a As from the 4646th meeting, held on 14 November 2002, the wording of the item “The situation in East Timor” was revised to read “The situation in Timor-Leste”.
- ^b During the period under review, the Security Council completed consideration of four applications for membership under the item “Admission of new Members”. For details, see chapter VII of the present Supplement.
- ^c While Security Council action related to the International Court of Justice does not comprise an item of which the Security Council is seized, such action is described in introductory material contained in the summary statement by the Secretary-General on matters of which the Security Council is seized and on the stage reached in their consideration. It is included in this table for the convenience of the reader.
- ^d While the recommendation regarding the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations is not listed as an item of which the Security Council is seized, Security Council action related to such a recommendation is described in introductory material contained in the summary statement by the Secretary-General on matters of which the Security Council is seized and on the stage reached in their consideration. It is included in this table for the convenience of the reader.
- ^e While action related to consideration by the Security Council of its draft report to the General Assembly is not listed as an item of which the Security Council is seized, Security Council action related to such consideration is described in introductory material contained in the summary statement by the Secretary-General on matters of which the Security Council is seized and on the stage reached in their consideration. It is included in this table for the convenience of the reader.

C. Items that were deleted from the list of matters of which the Security Council was seized during the period 2000-2003

<i>Item^a</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>Last action by the Council</i>	<i>Final entry in the summary statement as at 31 December 2003</i>
(a) The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	3059th meeting 11 and 12 March 1992	President made a statement (S/24843)	S/2001/15
(b) Letter dated 2 April 1991 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/22435)		3139th meeting 23 and 24 November 1992	
<p>Letter dated 4 April 1991 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/22442)</p>			
<p>Letter dated 5 March 1992 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Belgium to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/23685)</p>			
Navigation on the Danube river in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)	3290th meeting 13 October 1993	President made a statement (S/PRST/1994/10)	S/2001/15
Note by the Secretary-General (S/1994/254)	3357th meeting 31 March 1994	President made a statement (S/PRST/1994/13)	S/2001/15
Note by the Secretary-General (S/1994/322)		3357th meeting	
Agreement signed on 4 April 1994 between the Governments of Chad and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya concerning the practical modalities for the implementation of the Judgment delivered by the International Court of Justice on 3 February 1994	3363rd meeting 14 April 1994	Adopted resolution 926 (1994) 3389th meeting 13 June 1994	S/2001/15

<i>Item^a</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>Last action by the Council</i>	<i>Final entry in the summary statement as at 31 December 2003</i>
Note by the Secretary-General transmitting a letter dated 27 May 1994 from the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) addressed to the Secretary-General (S/1994/631)	3383rd meeting 30 May 1994	President made a statement (S/PRST/1994/28) 3383rd meeting	S/2001/15
The situation in the Republic of Yemen	3386th meeting 1st June 1994	President made a statement (S/PRST/1994/30) 3396th meeting 30 June 1994	S/2001/15
Agreed framework of 21 October 1994 between the United States of America and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea	3451st meeting 4 November 1994	President made a statement (S/PRST/1994/64) 3451st meeting	S/2001/15
The situation prevailing in and around the safe area of Bihać	3461st meeting 19 November 1994	Adopted resolution 958 (1994) 3461st meeting	S/2001/15
Letter dated 14 December 1994 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 724 (1991) concerning Yugoslavia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1994/1418)	3480th meeting 14 December 1994	Adopted resolution 967 (1994) 3480th meeting	S/2001/15
An agenda for peace: preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacekeeping	3089th meeting 30 June 1992	President made a statement (S/PRST/1995/61) 3609th meeting 19 December 1995	S/2002/30
The situation in Mozambique	3123rd meeting 13 October 1992	Heard statements 3494th meeting 27 January 1995	S/2002/30
The situation prevailing in and adjacent to the United Nations Protected Areas in Croatia	3163rd meeting 25 January 1993	President made a statement (S/PRST/1995/2) 3491st meeting 17 January 1995	S/2002/30

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item^a</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>Last action by the Council</i>	<i>Final entry in the summary statement as at 31 December 2003</i>
Follow-up to resolution 817 (1993)	3243rd meeting 18 June 1993	President made a statement (S/PRST/1995/46) 3579th meeting 15 September 1995	S/2002/30
United Nations Protection Force	3248th meeting 30 June 1993	President made a statement (S/PRST/1995/40) 3568th meeting 19 August 1995	S/2002/30
An agenda for peace: peacekeeping	3448th meeting 4 November 1994	President made a statement (S/PRST/1996/13), 3645th Meeting 28 March 1996	S/2002/30
Security Council working methods and procedure	3483rd meeting 16 December 1994	President made a statement (S/PRST/1994/81) 3483rd meeting	S/2002/30
An agenda for peace	3492nd meeting 18 and 19 January 1995	President made a statement (S/PRST/1995/9) 3503rd meeting 22 February 1995	S/2002/30
The proposal by China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America on security assurances	3514th meeting 11 April 1995	Adopted resolution 984 (1995) 3514th meeting	S/2002/30
Navigation on the Danube river	3533rd meeting 11 May 1995	Adopted resolution 992 (1995) 3533rd meeting	S/2002/30
The situation relating to Nagorny Karabakh	3072nd meeting 12 May 1992	President made a statement (S/PRST/1995/21) 3525th meeting 26 April 1995	S/2003/40

<i>Item^a</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>Last action by the Council</i>	<i>Final entry in the summary statement as at 31 December 2003</i>
The situation in the former Yugoslavia	3585th meeting 6 October 1995	Adopted resolution 1074 (1996) 3700th meeting 1 October 1996	S/2003/40
Letter dated 9 January 1996 from the Permanent Representative of Ethiopia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, concerning the extradition of the suspects wanted in the assassination attempt on the life of the President of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Addis Ababa on 26 June 1995	3627th meeting 31 January 1996	Adopted resolution 1070 (1996) 3690th meeting 16 August 1996	S/2003/40
Signature of the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Pelindaba)	3651st meeting 12 April 1996	President made a statement (S/PRST/1996/17) 3651st meeting	S/2003/40
Demining in the context of United Nations peacekeeping	3689th meeting 15 August 1996	President made a statement (S/PRST/1996/37) 3693rd meeting 30 August 1996	S/2003/40
Letters dated 23 September and 3 and 11 October 1996 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	3704th meeting 15 October 1996	President made a statement (S/PRST/1996/42) 3704th meeting	S/2003/40
Letters dated 23 and 27 September 1996 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council and to the Secretary-General, respectively			

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item^a</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>Last action by the Council</i>	<i>Final entry in the summary statement as at 31 December 2003</i>
Complaint by Iraq concerning incidents on its frontier with Iran (S/11216)	1762nd meeting 15 February 1974	Adopted resolution 348 (1974) 1770th meeting 28 May 1974	S/2004/20
Complaint by Iraq (S/14509)	2280th meeting 12 June 1981	Adopted resolution 487 (1981) 2288th meeting 19 June 1981	S/2004/20
Central America: efforts toward peace	2871st meeting 27 July 1989	President made a statement (S/PRST/1997/28) 3780th meeting 22 May 1997	S/2004/20
The situation in Cambodia	2941st meeting 20 September 1990	President made a statement (S/PRST/1997/37) 3799th meeting 11 July 1997	S/2004/20
Establishment of an international tribunal for the prosecution of persons responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law committed in the territory of the former Yugoslavia	3175th meeting 22 February 1993	Adopted resolution 1126 (1997) 3813th meeting 27 August 1997	S/2004/20
Security of the United Nations operations	3283rd meeting 29 September 1993	President made a statement (S/PRST/1997/13) 3750th meeting 12 March 1997	S/2004/20
Shooting down of two civil aircraft on 24 February 1996	3634th meeting 27 February 1996	Adopted resolution 1067 (1996) 3683rd meeting 26 July 1996	S/2004/20
The situation in Albania	3751st meeting 13 March 1997	President made a statement (S/PRST/1997/44) 3812th meeting 14 August 1997	S/2004/20

<i>Item^a</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>Last action by the Council</i>	<i>Final entry in the summary statement as at 31 December 2003</i>
Civilian police in peacekeeping operations	3801st meeting 14 July 1997	President made a statement (S/PRST/1997/38) 3801st meeting	S/2004/20
The situation in the Republic of the Congo	3810th meeting 13 August 1997	President made a statement (S/PRST/1997/47) 3823rd meeting 16 October 1997	S/2004/20
Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America	3312th meeting 11 November 1993	Adopted resolution 1506 (2003) 4820th meeting (Part II) 12 September 2003	S/2004/20

^a In accordance with the procedure set out in notes by the President of the Security Council dated 30 July and 29 August 1996 (S/1996/603 and S/1996/704, respectively), the items in this table, with one exception, were deleted from the list of matters of which the Council was seized during the period under review, since the Council had not considered them in a formal meeting during the preceding five-year period, nor had any member of the Council communicated in writing its wish to have the item retained. For details concerning the exception to the procedure, see the study which deals with the item entitled "Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America" (case 4).

Chapter III

Participation in the proceedings of the Security Council

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introductory note	57
Part I. Basis of invitations to participate	58
Note	58
A. Invitations extended under rule 37 (States Members of the United Nations)	58
B. Invitations extended under rule 39 (members of the Secretariat or other persons) ..	59
C. Invitations not expressly extended under rule 37 or rule 39	60
D. Requests for invitations denied or not acted upon	63
Part II. Procedures relating to participation of invited representative or individuals	65
Note	65
A. The stage at which those invited to participate are heard	65
B. Limitations on participation	66
Annexes	
I. Invitations extended under rule 37	67
II. Invitations extended under rule 39	89

Introductory note

Chapter III considers the Security Council's practice in extending invitations to participate in its proceedings. Part I concerns the basis on which invitations were extended. Part II considers procedures relating to participation after an invitation was extended.

Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter and rules 37 and 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council provide for invitations to be extended to non-members of the Security Council in the following circumstances: (a) when a Member of the United Nations brings a dispute or situation to the attention of the Council in accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Charter (rule 37); (b) when a Member of the United Nations or a State that is not a member of the United Nations is "a party to a dispute" (Article 32); (c) when the interests of a Member of the United Nations are "specially affected" (Article 31 and rule 37); and (d) when "members of the Secretariat or other persons" are invited to supply information or give other assistance (rule 39). Only in the second instance ((b) above) does the Security Council have an obligation to extend an invitation.

In practice, in extending invitations, the Council has continued to refrain from referring explicitly to the relevant articles of the Charter. It has continued to make no distinction between a complaint involving a "dispute" within the meaning of Article 32, a "situation" or a matter of another nature. Nonetheless, in one instance, both Articles 31 and 32 were explicitly invoked by a few Member States in support of a request for participation that was subsequently denied (case 7).

During the period under review, invitations to participate in meetings of the Security Council were usually extended "under the relevant provisions of the Charter" and explicitly under rule 37 or rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. The classification of invitations in Part I and in annexes I and II to this chapter reflects that practice, and was based on the relevant rules of procedure where that was indicated. Those instances in which the Council decided to extend invitations to participate in its proceedings without pronouncing itself on the basis for such invitations are treated separately (cases 1-6). As previously mentioned, in one instance (case 7), the Council deemed it inappropriate to extend an invitation.

Part II, which deals with procedures relating to the participation of invited representatives, includes a case (case 8) concerning the stage at which a representative had his invitation renewed and two cases (cases 9 and 10) concerning the limitations imposed on participation.

Part I

Basis of invitations to participate

Note

Security Council practice in connection with the extension of invitations is dealt with in this part in four sections. Section A deals with invitations extended under rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, which was the basis on which Member States not members of the Council were invited to participate in the Council's proceedings. The section describes the Council's general practice in this regard, supplemented by annex I, which contains relevant information on such invitations.

Section B considers the Council's practice in extending invitations under rule 39 the basis on which "members of the Secretariat or other persons" were invited to supply the Council with information or other assistance. This brief overview is supplemented by annex II, which contains relevant information on those invitations. They included the following: (a) representatives of the United Nations Secretariat, Security Council missions and Security Council subsidiary bodies; (b) representatives of United Nations organs, subsidiary bodies or agencies; (c) representatives of regional and other intergovernmental organizations; and (d) other persons.

Section C concerns those invitations that were not expressly extended under either rule 37 or rule 39. Apart from covering various invitations of this type that occurred during the period, the section includes the new provisions for invitations to troop-contributing countries to participate in public or private meetings of the Security Council "without prejudice to the provisional rules of procedure" which were set forth in 2001.¹ It also describes the new practice of allowing incoming members of the Security Council to attend informal consultations of the whole and the formal meetings of its subsidiary bodies.

Section D considers requests for invitations denied or not acted upon.

¹ See resolution 1353 (2001), annex II.A, para. 1.

A. Invitations extended under rule 37 (States Members of the United Nations)

During the period under consideration, States Members of the United Nations not members of the Security Council who were invited to participate in the Council's proceedings were usually invited "under the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure", without explicit reference being made to the relevant Charter articles. Rule 37 provides:

Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council may be invited, as the result of a decision of the Security Council, to participate, without vote, in the discussion of any question brought before the Security Council when the Security Council considers that the interests of that Member are specially affected, or when a Member brings a matter to the attention of the Security Council in accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Charter.

In practice, such invitations were usually extended as a matter of course and without discussion. They were requested in letters from the State concerned addressed to the President of the Council. The President informed the Council at the beginning or during the course of its meetings of the receipt of such letters and proposed that, with the consent of the Council, the invitations be extended. Usually, there being no objection, it was so decided.

Renewals of invitations were not usually mentioned if the meeting was resumed. Moreover, unless otherwise mentioned, invitations extended at the first meeting of consecutive meetings held concerning an agenda item were automatically renewed at each of the meetings.

As in previous years, Member States invited under rule 37 sometimes spoke in other capacities, such as representatives of regional organizations.²

² See, for example, the following instances in which a representative of a Member State invited under rule 37 spoke on behalf of another entity: 4092nd meeting, at which the representative of Algeria spoke on behalf of the President of Algeria and the Chairman of the

The practice regarding invitations to representatives of Member States who spoke in their capacity as representatives of United Nations subsidiary bodies or other organizations was varied. Some were invited under rule 37, some under rule 39 and some were invited under no explicit basis. The extension of an invitation was most often guided by the Member State's request for that invitation, which often explicitly mentioned the basis upon which it wished to be invited. In one instance, a representative spoke twice at the same meeting in two different capacities, being invited once under rule 37 and once under rule 39.³

Organization of African Unity (OAU) (S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1)), p. 6; 4128th meeting, at which the representative of Portugal spoke on behalf of the European Union (S/PV.4128), p. 26; 4139th meeting, at which the representative of Djibouti spoke in his capacity as Coordinator of the Eastern Africa subregion (S/PV.4139), p. 25; 4140th meeting, at which the representative of Austria spoke as the representative of the Chairperson-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) (S/PV.4140), p. 16. On several occasions, the representative of Costa Rica spoke on behalf of the member States of the Rio Group in his capacity as pro tempore Secretary (see S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), p. 10; S/PV.4506 (Resumption 1), p. 12; S/PV.4512 (Resumption 1), p. 2). Similarly, the representative of Peru addressed the Security Council in his capacity as Coordinator of the Rio Group (see S/PV.4710, p. 20 and S/PV.4734 (Resumption 1), p. 4).

³ At the 4588th meeting, held on 24 July 2002 in connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, Mr. Bruno Rodriguez Parilla made a statement first as Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, after having requested an invitation under rule 39 in that capacity. Later, in the same meeting, he spoke under rule 37 as the representative of Cuba. In that capacity, he stated: "A moment ago, I spoke in this debate as Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. But given the seriousness of the issue that prompted the convening of this emergency meeting, Cuba cannot fail to state its national position." (S/PV.4588, p. 34). By contrast, at the 4231st meeting, held on 22 November 2000 in connection with the same agenda item, the representative of Cuba was invited under rule 37 but spoke first in his capacity as Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and subsequently as representative of Cuba (S/PV.4231 and Corr. 1, p. 23).

A list of invitations issued under rule 37 is contained in annex I at the end of this chapter. For ease of reference only, the invitations have been grouped according to agenda item.

B. Invitations extended under rule 39 (members of the Secretariat or other persons)

During the period under review, the Security Council considerably enlarged its practice of inviting a wide range of individuals to participate in its proceedings and to brief it on issues under consideration. As a measure of comparison, 15 invitations were issued in 1990 under rule 39; 56 invitations were issued in 2000 under this rule. In 2003, the invitations issued under rule 39 rose to 159, about 15 times more than in 1990. Rule 39 provides:

The Security Council may invite members of the Secretariat or other persons, whom it considers competent for the purpose, to supply it with information or to give other assistance in examining matters within its competence.

In addition to a significant increase in invitations extended to senior officials of the Secretariat and the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, the period also witnessed a rise in first-time invitations extended, among others, to heads of the principal organs of the United Nations (General Assembly,⁴ Economic and Social Council and International Court of Justice); agencies, programmes and funds of the United Nations system (including the United Nations Development Programme, World Food Programme, United Nations Development Fund for Women and World Health Organization); the Bretton Woods institutions (the World Bank and International Monetary Fund); regional and other intergovernmental organizations (including the Organization of American States, International Organization of la Francophonie,

⁴ The only recorded case of the participation of the General Assembly President in the proceedings of the Council dates back to the 9th Security Council meeting held on 6 February 1946. However, in inviting the General Assembly President to make a statement at that meeting, the Security Council President did not explicitly invoke rule 17 of the provisional rules of procedure, which was later to be replaced by rules 37 to 39.

Economic Community of West African States, Economic Community of Central African States, Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries and Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe); and to Security Council members serving in their dual capacity as heads of Security Council missions and chairpersons of its subsidiary bodies. The period 2000-2003 also saw extension of invitations to representatives of transitional governments (Iraq) and representatives of rebel movements that were party to a ceasefire or peace agreement, as in the case of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Approximately 40 invitations were extended for the first time during this period. A list of invitations issued under rule 39 is contained in annex II at the end of the Chapter. For ease of reference only, persons invited for the first time have been identified, and invitations have been grouped into the following four categories: (a) United Nations Secretariat, Security Council missions and Security Council subsidiary bodies; (b) United Nations organs, subsidiary bodies or agencies; (c) Regional and other intergovernmental organizations; (d) Other persons.

Some general aspects of the Council's practice under rule 39 may be noted. The Council extended invitations to representatives of United Nations organs and subsidiary bodies as a matter of course and without any formal discussion. Letters of request from the body concerned were read into the record of the meeting by the President of the Council and were not issued as documents of the Security Council. Invitations to representatives of United Nations agencies were extended on the same basis. In the case of invitations to representatives of regional or other international organizations, the requests were made by a Member State on behalf of the proposed invitee, and invariably granted without any formal discussion. As for other individuals, they, too, were invited at the request of a Member State. In some instances, the President made it clear at the start of the formal meeting of the Council that members of the Council had agreed in prior consultations to extend an invitation to a particular individual.

In some cases, invitations under rule 39 were extended to representatives of Member States if related to a role other than representative of their State. These included invitations to members of the Council in their functions as heads of Security Council missions and chairpersons of Security Council subsidiary bodies. For

instance, at the 4485th meeting, held on 6 March 2002 in connection with the situation in Eritrea and Ethiopia, the Council, under rule 39, invited the representative of Norway,⁵ head of the Council's mission to Eritrea and Ethiopia, to introduce the mission's report.

C. Invitations not expressly extended under rule 37 or rule 39

While rules 37 or 39 were most often cited as the basis of invitations, some invitations were extended on the basis of prior consultations, past practice or, in some cases, without mention of a basis. These included invitations to Heads of State, representatives of observer missions and others. In those instances, the basis under which individuals were invited did not raise any comment or discussion.

Six cases are set out below. Case 1 describes the new practice concerning invitations to countries contributing troops to United Nations peacekeeping missions; case 2 details the procedure established during the period which allows incoming members of the Security Council to attend informal consultations of the whole and the formal meetings of the subsidiary bodies; and cases 3 to 6 illustrate the Council's practice of issuing invitations that fall under neither rule 37 nor rule 39.

Case 1 Participation of troop-contributing countries

With a view to strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries, the Security Council, by resolution 1353 (2001), annex II.A, decided to hold, at different stages of peacekeeping operations, public or private meetings with the participation of troop-contributing countries, including at their request, and without prejudice to the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, in order to ensure a full and

⁵ When the permanent representative of Norway presented his report, he was seated at the end of the Council table and not at the seat reserved for his delegation. Since Norway was President of the Council for the month of March 2002, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway headed the delegation and served as President for the meeting. See the following for other instances when an invitation under rule 39 was extended to a member of the Council: S/PV.4264, S/PV.4283, S/PV.4325, S/PV.4405; 2002: S/PV.4485, S/PV.4538 and S/PV.4561.

high-level consideration of issues of critical importance to a specific peacekeeping operation.

In a note by the President dated 27 August 2002,⁶ the Council further clarified procedures for participation in private meetings of the Council with troop-contributing countries by deciding that the relevant actors listed in annex II.B of resolution 1353 (2001), paragraph 3 (c)-(h) wishing to participate in a specific meeting should make a request to the President of the Security Council.

Troop-contributing countries, existing as well as prospective, participated in 53 private meetings during the period 2001-2003, in accordance with resolution 1353 (2001).⁷ Invitations were not issued to individual troop-contributing countries under rule 37 when the Council met in accordance with resolution 1353 (2001). Rather, those countries participated in accordance with a prior letter of invitation from the President.⁸

Case 2 Invitations to incoming Council members: informal consultations and formal meetings of the subsidiary bodies

During the period under review, two notes by the President of the Security Council addressed the matter of invitations to newly elected members of the Council. The first note, dated 28 February 2000,⁹ stated that the Council had agreed that newly elected members of the Council would, upon their request, be invited to observe the informal consultations of the Council members for the period of one month immediately preceding their term of membership for the purpose of

acquainting themselves with the activities of the Council. Participation should be at the Permanent Representative or Deputy Permanent Representative level.

The second note, dated 22 November 2002,¹⁰ enlarged upon and superseded the note of February 2000. It stated that newly elected members would be invited to attend the informal consultations of the whole and the formal meetings of the subsidiary bodies of the Council for the period of one month immediately preceding their term of membership (that is, with effect from 1 December 2002).

Members of the Security Council also decided that, if an incoming member would be assuming the Presidency of the Council in the first two months of its term on the Council, it would be invited to attend the informal consultations of the whole for the period of two months immediately preceding its term of membership. The members of the Council further agreed that each of those incoming member delegations should be represented at the level of Permanent Representative or Deputy Permanent Representative at informal consultations and by any one member of their delegations at formal meetings of the subsidiary bodies of the Council. In the latter case, the note added that the Chairmen of the subsidiary bodies of the Security Council should not otherwise deviate from Council practice with regard to attendance by incoming members without guidance from the Council.

Case 3 Invitations to Heads of State

Usually, Heads of State were invited without citing a basis. For instance, at the 4092nd meeting, held on 24 January 2000 in connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Presidents of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Zambia, Mozambique, Uganda, Zimbabwe and Angola were consecutively invited by the President with the following formula:

It is now my high honour and privilege to invite the Secretary-General and the Chief of Protocol to escort His Excellency _____, President of _____, to a seat at the Council table.¹¹

⁶ S/2002/964.

⁷ S/PV.4369, S/PV.4371, S/PV.4386, S/PV.4391, S/PV.4397, S/PV.4425, S/PV.4426, S/PV.4435, S/PV.4446, S/PV.4455, S/PV.4456, S/PV.4457, S/PV.4477, S/PV.4483, S/PV.4491, S/PV.4496, S/PV.4520, S/PV.4527, S/PV.4545, S/PV.4549, S/PV.4550, S/PV.4553, S/PV.4569, S/PV.4576, S/PV.4586, S/PV.4587, S/PV.4599, S/PV.4610, S/PV.4612, S/PV.4617, S/PV.4648, S/PV.4620, S/PV.4669, S/PV.4687, S/PV.4689, S/PV.4690, S/PV.4716, S/PV.4724, S/PV.4733, S/PV.4755, S/PV.4763, S/PV.4767, S/PV.4769, S/PV.4778, S/PV.4781, S/PV.4795, S/PV.4796, S/PV.4821, S/PV.4827, S/PV.4847, S/PV.4854, S/PV.4866 and S/PV.4878.

⁸ S/2002/603, p. 6.

⁹ S/2000/155.

¹⁰ S/2002/1276.

¹¹ Ministers for Foreign Affairs at the same meeting were invited under rule 37 (S/PV.4092, pp. 2-3).

In September 2000, President Ismail Omar Guelleh of the Republic of Djibouti was simply “invited to participate in the discussion” — a private meeting, at which he briefed the Council on the Djibouti peace initiative in connection with the situation in Somalia.

At public meetings on 2 and 7 February 2001, invitations were extended to President Joseph Kabila of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and to President Paul Kagame of Rwanda, respectively, “in accordance with the understanding reached in the Council’s prior consultations”.¹²

Case 4 Invitations to observers

The Permanent Observer of Switzerland. Before Switzerland became a member of the United Nations in September 2002, its Permanent Observer was usually invited to participate in the discussion without the right to vote “in accordance with the understanding reached in the Council’s prior consultations”.¹³ On two occasions, however, no basis was invoked for the invitation to the Permanent Observer of Switzerland to participate in a meeting.¹⁴

The Permanent Observer of the Holy See. The Permanent Observer of the Holy See was invited to participate “in accordance with the understanding reached in prior consultations”.¹⁵

The Permanent Observer of Palestine. The President, with the consent of the Council, usually invited the Permanent Observer of Palestine “to participate in the current debate in accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and the previous practice in this regard”.¹⁶

Case 5 Invitations to representatives of transitional governments

At a private meeting on 11 January 2001, the Prime Minister of the Transitional National Government of Somalia was invited to brief the

Council “in accordance with the understanding reached in the Council’s prior consultations”.¹⁷ No reference was made to rule 37, as the Transitional National Government did not occupy Somalia’s seat at the United Nations. Rule 39 was not invoked either, since the Prime Minister was invited, not in his individual capacity, but as head of the Transitional National Government.

At the 4434th and 4443rd meetings, held on 6 and 20 December 2001, respectively, to discuss the situation in Afghanistan, the President (Mali) informed the Council that he had received a letter from the representative of Afghanistan, in which he requested that he be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council’s agenda. The President did not invoke rule 37 (or any rule) at either meeting as the basis for the invitation, but stated:

In acceding to this request, the Security Council recalls that the Interim Authority in Afghanistan will be established on 22 December 2001. According to paragraph 3 of the Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan Pending the Re-establishment of Permanent Government Institutions, signed in Bonn on 5 December 2001, the Interim Authority shall occupy the seat of Afghanistan at the United Nations and in its specialized agencies, as well as in other institutions and conferences.¹⁸

Case 6 Participation without a formal invitation

At the 4422nd meeting, held on 20 November 2001, on children and armed conflict, the Executive Director of the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), invited under rule 39, introduced Mr. Alhaji Sawaneh, a former child soldier from Sierra Leone, who addressed the Council without being formally invited.¹⁹ Similarly, at the 4528th meeting held on 7 May 2002 to discuss the same agenda item, the Council heard statements from three children (Mr. Wilmot Wungko, Ms. Eliza Kantardzic and Mr. Jose Cabral). The children were not formally

¹² S/PV.4271 and S/PV.4273.

¹³ See, for example, S/PV.4108, S/PV.4109, S/PV.4286, S/PV.4312 and S/PV.4568.

¹⁴ S/PV. 4128 and S/PV.4264.

¹⁵ S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1 and Corr. 1), p. 2.

¹⁶ See, for example, S/PV.4588 and S/PV.4726.

¹⁷ S/PV.4196.

¹⁸ S/PV.4434, p. 2 and S/PV.4443, p. 2. Also of interest are the discussions in Chapter 3 (Participation) of the present *Supplement* concerning States in transition. See part I.A “Invitations under rule 37” and I.C “Invitations not expressly extended under rule 37 or rule 39”.

¹⁹ S/PV.4422, p. 7.

invited, but when the President invited the Executive Director of UNICEF to take a seat at the Council table, he noted that she was to be accompanied by them. Towards the end of her statement, the Executive Director introduced the three children and subsequently they were given the floor by the President.²⁰

At the 4460th meeting, held on 29 January 2002 in connection with the situation in Africa, Mr. Javier Solana, High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Policy and Common Security, addressed the Council without a formal invitation. He was introduced by the representative of Spain at the end of his statement in the latter's capacity as President of the European Union.²¹

Similarly, at the 4472nd meeting, held on 13 February 2002 in connection with the situation in Angola, the Humanitarian Coordinator for Angola, Mr. Erick de Mul, addressed the Council without being formally invited to participate. During that meeting, the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, who was invited to brief the Council under rule 39, had indicated that, with the permission of the President, he would ask Mr. de Mul to answer some of the questions raised. Thereafter, with a view to completing the response that the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator had given to questions put by Council members, the President gave the floor to Mr. de Mul.²²

In another instance, at the 4538th meeting, held on 22 May 2002 in connection with the situation in Africa, the Council heard a statement by Mr. Hans Dahlgren, Special Representative of the Presidency of the European Union to the countries of the Mano River Union. The Special Representative, who was not formally invited, was introduced by the representative of Spain in his capacity as President of the European Union.²³ Before giving him the floor, the President specified that, in his letter to the Presidency requesting participation in the debate, the representative of Spain

had informed the Council that following his introductory remarks he would like to give the floor to Mr. Dahlgren.²⁴

Six individuals addressed the Security Council via videotape without an invitation at the 4090th meeting of the Council on 18 January 2000, held to discuss the situation in Angola. The Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) reported on his recent visit to Angola and included in his presentation videotaped testimony from six individuals who had defected from the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA) or had been captured in recent fighting.²⁵

D. Requests for invitations denied or not acted upon

Note

During the period under review, the Security Council continued its practice of extending invitations as a matter of course and without any formal discussion. However, in one case (case 7) the Council did discuss and formally deny a request for an invitation to participate.

Case 7

At the 4164th meeting, held on 23 June 2000 in connection with the briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans, the President informed the Council that he had received requests to participate in the meeting variously on the basis of rule 37, rule 39 and without reference to either rule 37 or rule 39. He proposed to proceed in three stages. During the first stage, he would ask if there were any objections to giving a favourable response to the requests submitted by representatives of Member States referring to rule 37; during the second he would ask if there were any objections to the two proposed invitations under rule 39. During the third stage he would ask if there were any objections to giving a positive response to the request of Mr. Vladislav Jovanovic, which referred neither to rule 37 nor rule 39. If there was an objection to any of the requests to

²⁰ S/PV.4528, pp. 7-9.

²¹ S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 23. During the period under review, Mr. Solana was also invited in the same capacity on several occasions under rule 39. See the table on invitations under rule 39 in annex to the present chapter.

²² S/PV.4472, p. 20.

²³ S/PV.4538, p. 28.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

²⁵ S/PV.4090, p. 6.

be invited to participate, he would submit the request to a vote of the members of the Council.²⁶

The representative of the Russian Federation noted that when the matter was discussed the previous day in consultations, he had proposed that the Council take a positive view of all requests that had been received for participation in the present meeting. Since that was the first proposal, he would be grateful if there could be a decision on it.²⁷

The President requested the Council to vote on the proposal of the Russian Federation, which was to take a single decision on all the requests, considered as a whole. In other words, the Council would either accept all the requests or reject all the requests for participation.

The result of the voting was 4 in favour, 10 against and 1 abstention. The proposal of the Russian Federation was not adopted because it failed to obtain the required number of votes.

The President then called for the Council to consider successively the requests under rule 37, then rule 39 and, finally, that of Mr. Jovanovic. The Council positively considered the requests for participation under rule 37 and rule 39. Finally, the President asked if there were any objection to giving a favourable response to the request for participation submitted by Mr. Jovanovic.²⁸

The representative of the United States objected to the proposal to allow Mr. Jovanovic “or anyone else purporting to represent his Government” to address the Council since Mr. Jovanovic represented a Government whose senior leadership had been indicted for war crimes and other violations of international humanitarian law. He also noted that allowing any representative of that leadership to participate in the present or any other meeting of the Council would flout the indictments, undermine the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and set a dangerous moral and legal course that would undermine the

seriousness of the gathering. He therefore requested that the proposed invitation be put to the vote.²⁹

The representative of Ukraine, noting that there had been quite a number of important new developments in the Council’s working methods and procedures, the most important of which was the tendency towards increased participation of non-members in the Council’s discussions, underlined an inconsistency between the above-mentioned tendency and the request for a vote on the participation of the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. He added that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia remained a participant in the peace process in the Balkans, a signatory to the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, a host country of the international presence in Kosovo as well as party to the settlement of the Prevlaka dispute. Recalling the provisions of Article 32 of the Charter, under which any State that is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council had to be invited to participate in the discussion relating to the dispute, he stated that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia *de facto* remained a party to every track of the peace process in the Balkans and was therefore allowed to participate in the discussions of the Security Council. In concluding his statement, the representative of Ukraine recalled that the Security Council had adopted a “special form of invitation” when faced with a request for participation from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, according to which the President — in response to a written request from the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia — invited that representative by name to address the Council. He held that he did not see any grounds to abandon that practice, which had been in existence for nearly eight years.³⁰

In the absence of any other speakers, the President called for a vote on the request submitted by Mr. Jovanovic. The result of the voting was 4 in favour, 7 against and 4 abstentions, and the proposal failed because it did not obtain the required number of votes. Following the vote, a number of members made statements.

China noted that excluding the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia from participating in the Security Council and not allowing it to speak would not

²⁶ S/PV.4164, p. 2.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ At the 4012th and 4108th meetings, held on 16 February 2000 and 6 March 2000, respectively, to consider Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999), Mr. Jovanovic was invited “in response to his request”.

²⁹ S/PV.4164, pp. 3-4.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

contribute to resolving the Balkan problem and that “the Council should not deprive a sovereign State of its right to state its position”, which ran counter to the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.³¹

Argentina stated that its abstention was based on “serious doubts regarding the underlying reasons for denying participation in the debate to Mr. Jovanovic”, although that vote in no way implied support for, endorsement of or sympathy for the Belgrade regime.³²

France voted against Mr. Jovanovic’s participation in the meeting because it believed it to be

“inappropriate”, without however disputing the general principle of his participation in a Security Council meeting.³³

The Russian Federation recalled that, according to Article 31 of the Charter, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had the right to participate in the discussion, in the light of the fact that its interests were directly affected by the discussion. He concluded that the Security Council meeting on the Balkans, without the full participation of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, would lose its practical meaning, since one of the key parties was being eliminated from the discussion of the problem of a settlement.³⁴

³¹ Ibid., p. 5.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 5-6.

Part II

Procedures relating to participation of invited representatives or individuals

Note

Part II is concerned with procedures relating to the participation of invited States or individuals after an invitation has been extended. Section A concerns the stage at which invited States are heard, and includes one case (case 8) concerning the timing of an invitation. Section B concerns limitations on participation. It includes one case (case 9) in which a representative not formally invited posed questions through a member of the Council and a second case (case 10) in which an exchange of communications took place between the President of the Council and a non-member State regarding a proposed format that was viewed by the latter as limiting participation.

A. The stage at which those invited to participate are heard

Case 8

At the 4828th meeting, held on 16 September 2003 to consider the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, a draft resolution³⁵ was put to the vote but was not adopted owing to the

³⁵ S/2003/891.

negative vote of a permanent member. Following the vote and statements in explanation of the vote by Council members, the President invited the Permanent Observer of Palestine and the representative of Israel to participate in the meeting “in accordance with the decision taken at the 4824th meeting”.³⁶

In taking the floor, the Permanent Observer of Palestine prefaced his remarks by saying:

For the record, during the years that I have worked here I have never seen the Security Council invite us to sit at the Council table while a specific issue is being deliberated. Then the Council decided to conduct the vote in our absence. I do not know the reason for that, but I understand that that has not been the usual practice at any previous meetings.³⁷

In response to the remarks of the Permanent Observer of Palestine, the President noted that he would like to assure the Council as a whole and those watching that the procedure followed by the presidency accorded with the advice of the Secretariat and conformed to the established practice of the Council.³⁸

³⁶ S/PV.4828, p. 5.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 6.

B. Limitations on participation

During the period under review, no discussion arose regarding the question of duration of participation of those invited to participate. The practice was generally maintained whereby the President, when consideration of a question was extended over several meetings, renewed the invitation at each consecutive meeting immediately after the adoption of the agenda.

The Council continued to follow its general practice of not permitting invited representatives to discuss procedural matters, such as the adoption of the agenda, the extension of invitations and the postponement of consideration of a question.³⁹

An innovation with respect to posing questions during a briefing — through a member of the Council — is covered in case 9. Case 10 covers another instance in which, by prior arrangements, limitations were imposed on the participation of non-member States.

Case 9

At the 4308th meeting, held on 5 April 2001 to discuss the situation in East Timor, Mr. Hedi Annabi, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, was invited to brief the Council under rule 39. The President stated:

Members of the Council are expecting me to handle this meeting in a relaxed manner. We are bringing into the open Chamber — to non-members of the Security Council, our partners in the United Nations — our style of informal consultations, because the Council wishes to increase the transparency of its business and to share more of it with non-members of the Council and the media when there is no reason of discretion or confidentiality for being in the other room....

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ A notable exception were the remarks made by the Permanent Observer of Palestine at the 4828th meeting; see case 8 in part II, section A of this chapter above.

I am glad, too, that non-members of the Council, in participating in this meeting, have been encouraged to pose any questions that they may have about East Timor through members of the Council. They may do that during the course of the discussion. If they have points that they would like to raise, they can ask a friendly member of the Council to raise those questions.⁴⁰

Subsequently, the representative of Colombia submitted four questions to Mr. Annabi on behalf of the delegation of Brazil.⁴¹

Case 10

Prior to the wrap-up session at the end of April 2003, the President (Mexico) circulated a non-paper stating that the presidency would approach the Chairmen of regional groups in order to ensure the participation of two members from each group. By a letter dated 28 April 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁴² India objected to that idea, on the basis that it would be “unreasonable and contrary to normal practice” to expect one or two Member States to represent a region with diverse membership in a debate before the Council. Moreover, it was “illogical” to invite the same number of representatives from different regional groups, as the membership of each group varied. India also believed that limiting the number of States participating in the wrap-up session ran counter to the objective of greater transparency and openness in the functioning of the Council.

By a letter⁴³ dated 1 May 2003, Mexico responded by expressing its strong commitment to the openness and transparency of the Council and noting that it had chosen a format already used with success in previous Council meetings, including several wrap-up meetings in 2002, with the purpose of both maximizing time and ensuring equitable representation from all regions.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ S/PV.4308 and Corr.1, p. 2.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 12.

⁴² S/2003/508, annex.

⁴³ S/2003/516, annex.

⁴⁴ According to the verbatim record of the wrap-up meeting held on 30 April 2003 (S/PV.4748 and Corr.1), the format proposed by the presidency in the non-paper was followed.

Annex I

Invitations extended under rule 37

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
2000		
The situation in Africa	Algeria, Australia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe	4087th
	Algeria, South Africa	4096th
The situation in Croatia	Croatia, Germany, Italy	4088th
The situation in Angola	Angola	4090th
	Angola, Brazil, Japan, Lesotho, Mozambique, Norway	4178th
The situation in Burundi	Burundi	4091st (4201st) ^a
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	Algeria, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Colombia, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Israel, Japan, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, United Republic of Tanzania	4092nd
	Democratic Republic of the Congo	4237th
	Democratic Republic of the Congo, Portugal	4104th (4132nd (Private))
	Algeria	4156th
	Algeria, Botswana, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Portugal, Rwanda, South Africa, Swaziland, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe	4143rd (4207th, 4247th)
The situation in Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	4099th (4111th, 4134th, 4253rd, 4145th, 4168th, 4184th, 4186th, 4199th, 4216th)
	Algeria, Djibouti, India, Japan, Jordan, Mozambique, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Sierra Leone	4139th
	Mali, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Nigeria, Togo	4163rd

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
Protection of United Nations personnel, associated personnel and humanitarian personnel in conflict zones	Australia, Belarus, Brazil, Egypt, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Slovenia, South Africa, Uruguay	4100th
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999), 1244 (1999)	Albania, Australia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey	4102nd
	Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey	4108th
	Albania, Austria, Yugoslavia	4225th, 4232nd, 4249th
	Albania, Portugal, Spain	4153rd
Briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans	Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	4105th
	Albania, Austria, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Iraq, Japan, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey	4164th
Maintaining peace and security: Humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council	Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, South Africa	4109th
The question concerning Haiti	Haiti	4112th
The situation in Angola	Angola, Belarus, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Morocco, Rwanda, South Africa, Togo, Zambia	4113th
	Angola	4126th

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
	Angola, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Gabon, Mozambique, New Zealand, Portugal, Rwanda, Spain, Togo, United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe	4129th
The situation in East Timor	Indonesia	4114th, 4198th, 4206th
	Australia, Brazil, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea	4165th, 4191st
	Australia, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal	4180th
	Australia, Brazil, Indonesia, Japan, Mozambique, New Zealand	4203rd
The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border	Tajikistan	4115th
	Austria, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Portugal, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan	4140th
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Germany, Italy, Portugal and Turkey	4117th (4169th, 4209th, 4245th)
	Germany, Italy	4162nd
	Austria, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia	4222nd
Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peacebuilding	Algeria, Bahrain, Costa Rica, Croatia, Egypt, Indonesia, Japan, Mongolia, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Singapore, South Africa	4118th
The situation in Guinea-Bissau	Guinea-Bissau	4121st
	Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Senegal	4238th
The situation in Afghanistan	Afghanistan	4124th
	Afghanistan, India, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan	4251st
	Afghanistan, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan, Uzbekistan	4325th
The situation concerning Rwanda	Rwanda	4127th
General issues relating to sanctions	Australia, Bulgaria, Cuba, Germany, Iraq, Italy, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, New Zealand, Pakistan, Portugal, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey	4128th

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
Protection of civilians in armed conflicts	Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Colombia, Egypt, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Pakistan, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sudan	4130th
The situation in the Middle East	Lebanon	4146th
International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	Rwanda	4150th
International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994		
The situation in Somalia	Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Portugal, Yemen	4166th
The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations	Indonesia, Malawi, Uganda, Zimbabwe	4172nd
Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts	Austria, Brazil, Colombia, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Norway, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Senegal, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania	4174th
Children and armed conflict	Austria, Barbados, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania	4176th
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	Japan, Norway, Eritrea, Ethiopia	4187th

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen	4204th
	Israel	4218th (Private), 4234th (Private), 4248th
	Cuba, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, South Africa	4231st
Women and peace and security	Australia, Belarus, Botswana, Croatia, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Singapore, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe	4208th
No exit without strategy	Australia, Austria, Belarus, Croatia, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Thailand	4223rd
Letter dated 10 November 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Solomon Islands to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	Solomon Islands	4224th
The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone	Guinea	4252nd
2001		
Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries	Argentina, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Egypt, Fiji, India, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, South Africa, Sweden, Zambia	4257th

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	Sweden, Yugoslavia Belgium, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Yugoslavia Argentina, Bulgaria, Canada, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Turkey, Yugoslavia	4258th (4277th) 4359th 4286th
The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations	Canada, Costa Rica, India, Nigeria, Sweden	4259th
The situation in the Central African Republic	Central African Republic Belgium, Central African Republic, Egypt Central African Republic	4261st 4380th 4382nd
The situation in Sierra Leone	Belgium, Burkina Faso, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Guinea, Liberia, Niger, Sierra Leone, Sweden Sierra Leone Canada, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Sweden	4264th 4306th 4340th (4374th)
The situation in East Timor	Australia, Brazil, Chile, Fiji, Japan, Indonesia, Mozambique, New Zealand, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sweden Australia, Brazil, Canada, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sweden Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sweden Australia, Belgium, Chile, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Mozambique, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Thailand	4265th 4321st 4351st 4358th 4367th 4403rd

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
Briefing by His Excellency Mr. Mircea Geoana, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Romania, Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe	Romania	4266th
The situation in Georgia	Georgia	4269th
Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach	Algeria, Argentina, Croatia, Egypt, Guatemala, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Romania, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Sweden	4272nd
The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its border with Liberia, the situation in Liberia and the situation in Sierra Leone	Gambia, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Togo	4276th
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	Togo	4279th
	Angola, Burundi, Canada, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, Namibia, Rwanda, Sudan, Sweden, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe	4317th
	Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Japan, Namibia, Rwanda, Sweden, Uganda	4327th
	Belgium, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Namibia, Rwanda, Zimbabwe	4348th (4361st)
	Belgium, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mozambique, Namibia, Zambia, Zimbabwe	4395th
	Angola, Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Namibia, Rwanda, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe	4410th
	Belgium	4412th
	Angola, Belgium, Burundi, Canada, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe	4437th
The situation in Angola	Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Mozambique, Namibia, Portugal, Romania, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Zimbabwe	4283rd
	Angola	4311th (4376th)

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
	Angola, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Cape Verde, Malawi, Namibia, Zimbabwe	4418th
The situation in Burundi	Burundi	4285th (4338th), 4297th (4341st, 4383rd)
	Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia	4406th (4417th)
Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa	Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Croatia, Egypt, Japan, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, Sweden	4288th
Letter dated 4 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Slovenia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Yugoslavia	4289th
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	Israel	4292nd (4305th)
	Algeria, Bahrain, Belgium, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Yemen	4295th
	Cuba, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Mauritania, Morocco	4295th
	Algeria, Bahrain, Belgium, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sudan, Turkey, Yemen	4357th
	Cuba, Cyprus, Lebanon, Mexico, Namibia	4357th
	Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Malaysia, South Africa	4438th

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	Albania, Bulgaria, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Yugoslavia	4296th
	Yugoslavia	4309th (4331st, 4409th)
	Albania, Sweden, Yugoslavia	4335th
	Belgium, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Albania, Belgium, Yugoslavia	4350th (4430th)
The situation in Georgia	Argentina, Armenia, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Netherlands, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey	4299th
	Georgia, Sweden	4313th
	Belgium, Georgia	4400th
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Sweden, Yugoslavia	4303rd
	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sweden, Yugoslavia	4330th
	Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina	4379th (4433rd)
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	4333rd
Protection of civilians in armed conflict	Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Canada, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Yemen	4312th
The situation in the Great Lakes region	Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Namibia, Rwanda, South Africa, Uganda	4323rd
Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts	Argentina, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Sweden	4334th
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Canada, Germany, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Yemen	4336th
The situation in Croatia	Croatia	4346th

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
Small arms	Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Egypt, Ghana, India, Japan, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Thailand, Venezuela	4355th
Security Council resolution 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998	Yugoslavia	4366th
Briefing by His Excellency Nebojša Čović, Deputy Prime Minister of Serbia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia	Yugoslavia	4373rd
The situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	4381st
Security Council resolution 1054 (1996) of 26 April 1996	Sudan	4384th
The situation in Somalia	Iraq, Kenya	4392nd
General issues relating to sanctions	Germany, Sweden	4394th
The situation in Liberia	Belgium, Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone	4405th
The situation in Afghanistan	Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Egypt, Germany, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan	4414th
	Afghanistan	4415th
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	Eritrea	4420th
	Ethiopia	4421st
Children and armed conflict	Belgium, Canada, Egypt, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, South Africa	4422nd
International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Rwanda, Yugoslavia	4429th

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States, between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994		
Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council	Belgium, Egypt, Guinea, Morocco, Nigeria, Sierra Leone	4439th
2002		
The situation in Croatia	Croatia	4448th (4574th, 4622nd, 4662nd)
The situation in Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	4451st (4500th, 4615th)
Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts	Bangladesh, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Costa Rica, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Mongolia, Morocco, Nauru, Nepal, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Spain, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan	4453rd
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	Albania, Spain, Ukraine, Yugoslavia	4454th (4473rd, 4498th, 4518th, 4533rd)
	Germany, Italy, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Yugoslavia	4543rd
	Spain, Yugoslavia	4559th
	Albania, Denmark, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Yugoslavia	4592nd (4605th, 4633rd, 4676th)
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	Democratic Republic of the Congo	4459th (4495th, 4548th, 4554th, 4583rd, 4626th, 4634th)

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
	Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, South Africa	4596th (4597th, 4602nd, 4608th)
	Angola, Belgium, Denmark, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Oman, Rwanda, South Africa, Uganda, Zimbabwe	4642nd
The situation in Africa	Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Canada, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, Zambia	4460th
	Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, India, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia	4538th
	Denmark, Japan, Morocco, Sierra Leone	4577th
The situation in Afghanistan	Afghanistan	4461st (4501st, 4521st, 4557th, 4560th, 4611th, 4638th, 4651st, 4664th)
	Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Kazakhstan, New Zealand, Pakistan, Spain, Tajikistan, Turkey	4497th (4541st)
	Afghanistan, Canada, Denmark, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine	4579th
The situation in Timor-Leste ^b	Bangladesh, Brazil, Fiji, Japan, Indonesia, New Zealand, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Spain	4462nd
	Australia, Brazil, Chile, Egypt, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Spain, Thailand, Ukraine	4522nd

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
	Australia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Costa Rica, Cuba, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Spain, Thailand, Venezuela, Ukraine	4537th
	Brazil, India, Indonesia, Japan, Portugal	4598th
	Australia, Chile, Denmark, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Ukraine	4646th
The situation in Burundi	Burundi, South Africa	4467th (4609th, 4655th, 4675th)
The situation in Angola	Angola, Portugal	4472nd (4514th, 4517th, 4575th, 4595th, 4603rd, 4604th, 4628th, 4657th, 4671st)
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	Israel, Yemen	4474th
	Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine	4478th
	Israel	4488th (4489th, 4504th, 4508th, 4511th)
	Algeria, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey	4503rd
	Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, New Zealand, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen	4506th

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
	Algeria, Bahrain, Canada, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen	4510th
	Algeria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of) Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates	4515th
	Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Morocco, Pakistan, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates	4525th
	Bahrain, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Morocco, Pakistan, South Africa, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey	4552nd
	Bahrain, Chile, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sudan, Tunisia, Yemen	4588th
	Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey	4614th (4681st)
	Cyprus, Indonesia, Iraq, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal	4614th res. 1
Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month	Angola, Argentina, Burundi, Chile, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, Nepal, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine	4482nd
	Angola, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Spain, Thailand, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania	4547th
	Bahrain, Egypt, Spain, Ukraine	4562nd

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Spain, Ukraine, Yugoslavia	4484th (4558th, 4564th, 4661st)
	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Germany, Italy	4563rd
	Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Denmark, Fiji, Germany, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Mongolia, New Zealand, Samoa, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Thailand, Ukraine, Venezuela	4568th (4573rd)
	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Denmark, Japan, Slovenia, Ukraine, Yugoslavia	4631st
The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	Eritrea, Ethiopia, Japan, Netherlands, Spain	4485th (4529th, 4530th)
The situation in Somalia	Somalia	4486th (4502nd, 4524th, 4663rd)
	Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Somalia, Spain	4487th
The situation in the Great Lakes region	Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain	4532nd
Women and peace and security	Australia, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Grenada, Jamaica, Japan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Nigeria, Republic of Korea	4589th
	Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Liechtenstein, Morocco, Namibia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Venezuela	4635th
The situation in Georgia	Georgia	4590th (4591st)
Small arms	Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Denmark, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Malawi, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Senegal, South Africa, Switzerland, Ukraine, Zambia	4623rd

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Cambodia, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Malawi, Mauritania, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Ukraine, Zambia, Zimbabwe	4625th
The situation in the Central African Republic	Central African Republic	4627th (4658th)
Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security	Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Japan	4630th
International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Rwanda, Yugoslavia	4637th (4666th)
International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States, between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994		
Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	Australia, Fiji, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea	4647th

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
Letter dated 29 November 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	Chad	4659th
Protection of civilians in armed conflict	Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Ukraine	4660th
The situation in Côte d'Ivoire	Côte d'Ivoire, Senegal	4680th (4804th)
2003		
Children and armed conflict	Austria, Bahrain, Burundi, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Monaco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Switzerland, Ukraine	4684th
The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda	4691st (4705th, 4756th, 4764th, 4784th, 4797th, 4807th, 4813th, 4863rd)
	Bangladesh, Brazil, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Nepal, Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa	4790th
The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	Iraq	4692nd (4707th, 4701st (4714th, 4721st, 4883rd, 4884th))

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
	Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Gambia, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe	4709th
	Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Georgia, Greece, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Japan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Malaysia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe	4717th
	Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malaysia, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe	4726th
	Kuwait	4887th

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
The situation in Afghanistan	Afghanistan	4699th (4711th, 4727th, 4730th, 4750th, 4840th, 4848th)
	Afghanistan, Colombia, Greece, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Kazakhstan, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan	4774th
The situation in Côte d'Ivoire	Côte d'Ivoire	4700th (4754th, 4793rd, 4804th, 4857th, 4875th)
	Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal	4746th (4873rd, 4874th)
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	Greece, Norway, Serbia and Montenegro	4702nd (4880th)
	Albania, Greece, Serbia and Montenegro	4742nd (4770th)
	Albania, Italy, Japan, Serbia and Montenegro	4782nd (4809th, 4823rd, 4886th)
	Albania, Italy, Japan, Serbia and Montenegro, Ukraine	4853rd
Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts	Colombia	4706th
	Albania, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Myanmar, Peru, South Africa, Turkey, Ukraine, Yemen	4710th (4867th)
	Afghanistan, Australia, Belarus, Brazil, Cambodia, Colombia, Fiji, Greece, India, Israel, Japan, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea	4734th
	Colombia, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Nepal, Peru, Republic of Korea, Uganda, Ukraine	4792nd
	Argentina, Australia, Colombia, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Ukraine	4798th
	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Peru, South Africa, Switzerland, Uganda, Yemen	4845th
	Sweden	4713th
General issues relating to sanctions	Sweden	4713th

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
The situation in Timor-Leste	Australia, Indonesia, Japan, Portugal, Timor-Leste	4715th (4735th)
	Australia, Brazil, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal, Timor-Leste	4744th (4758th)
	Australia, India, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, Timor-Leste	4843rd
Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa	Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo	4720th
Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	Australia, Fiji, Japan, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea	4728th (4805th, 4881st)
The situation in Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	4729th (4829th)
The situation in Somalia	Somalia	4737th (4856th, 4885th)
The Security Council and regional organizations: facing the new challenges to international peace and security	Greece	4739th
Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month	Brazil, Canada, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Indonesia, Japan, South Africa	4748th
	Brazil, Burundi, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Greece, Japan, Malaysia, Mauritius, Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay	4766th
The situation in Burundi	Burundi	4749th (4832nd)
	Burundi, South Africa	4876th (4876th)
The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Colombia, Ethiopia, Greece, Honduras, India, Indonesia	4753rd

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
United Nations peacekeeping	Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Peru, South Africa, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay	4772nd
Security Council mission	Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, United Republic of Tanzania	4775th
	Afghanistan	4855th
The situation in Guinea-Bissau	Gambia, Guinea-Bissau	4776th (4834th, 4860th)
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Italy	4786th (4837th)
The situation in Georgia	Georgia	4799th, 4800th
The situation in Liberia	Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal	4815th (4816th)
	Liberia	4830th
Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	4820th (Part II)
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Nepal, Norway	4824th
	Argentina, Bahrain, Brazil, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen	4841st (4862nd)
Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role	Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Brazil, Canada, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay	4835th

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Item</i>	<i>State invited</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: meetings at which invitations extended and renewed</i>
Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen	4836th
International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Rwanda, Serbia and Montenegro	4838th
Letter dated 2 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	Sudan	4839th
Women and peace and security	Australia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Fiji, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Timor-Leste, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania	4852nd
The situation in the Great Lakes region	Italy, Mozambique, United Republic of Tanzania	4865th
Central African region	Chad, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Italy, Rwanda	4871st
Protection of civilians in armed conflict	Azerbaijan, Canada, Colombia, Egypt, Italy, Japan, Norway, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Ukraine	4877th

^a The meetings at which the initiations were renewed are indicated in parentheses.

^b As from the 4646th meeting, held on 14 November 2002, the item “The situation in East Timor” was revised to read “The situation in Timor-Leste”.

Annex II

Invitations extended under rule 39

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
2000			
Invitations under rule 39 to representatives of the United Nations Secretariat, Security Council missions and Security Council subsidiary bodies			
Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women Ms. Angela King	The situation in Afghanistan	4124th	7 April 2000
	Women and peace and security	4208th	24 and 25 October 2000
Emergency Relief Coordinator ad interim, Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Ms. Carolyn McAskie	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of Congo	4237th	28 November 2000
President of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 Judge Claude Jorda	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	4161st	20 June 2000
Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 and the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States, between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994 Ms. Carla Del Ponte	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	4150th	2 June 2000
	International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States, between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994	4229th	21 November 2000

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans Mr. Carl Bildt	Briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans	4105th	28 February 2000
Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of United Nations Operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina Mr. Jacques Paul Klein	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4154th	13 June 2000
		4245th	12 December 2000
Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Dr. Bernard Kouchner	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4108th	6 March 2000
		4153rd	9 June 2000
		4200th	27 September 2000
		4225th	16 November 2000
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict Mr. Olara Otunnu	Children and armed conflict	4176th	26 July 2000
Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the Mission in Tajikistan Mr. Ivo Petrov	The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border	4140th	12 May 2000
Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Transitional Administrator in East Timor Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello	The situation in East Timor	4097th	3 February 2000
		4165th	27 June 2000
		4203rd	29 September 2000
		4236th	28 November 2000
Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa Mr. Ibrahim Gambari	The situation in Angola	4178th	27 July 2000
Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs, Legal Counsel Mr. Hans Corell	The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security	4242nd	6 December 2000

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Invitations under rule 39 to representatives of United Nations organs, subsidiary bodies or agencies			
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People ^a Chairman	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4204th	4 October 2000
International Court of Justice Judge Gilbert Guillaume, President, International Court of Justice	Briefing by Judge Gilbert Guillaume, President of the International Court of Justice	4212th (private)	31 October 2000
Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS ^b Dr. Peter Piot, Executive Director	The situation in Africa: the impact of AIDS on peace and security in Africa	4087th	10 January 2000
	The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations	4172nd	17 July 2000
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Ms. Carol Bellamy, Executive Director	Children and armed conflict	4176th	26 July 2000
United Nations Development Fund for Women Ms. Noeleen Heyzer, Executive Director ^b	Women and peace and security	4208th	24 and 25 October 2000
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Mr. Mark Malloch Brown, ^b Administrator	The situation in Africa: the impact of AIDS on peace and security in Africa	4087th	10 January 2000
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Mrs. Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	Promoting peace and security: humanitarian assistance to refugees	4089th	13 January 2000
	Briefing by Mrs. Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	4219th	10 November 2000

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
World Bank ^b Mr. Callisto Madavo, Vice-President, Africa Region	The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4238th	29 November 2000
World Bank Mr. James Wolfensohn, President	The situation in Africa: the impact of AIDS on peace and security in Africa	4087th	10 January 2000
World Food Programme (WFP) Ms. Catherine Bertini, Executive Director	Protection of United Nations personnel, associated personnel and humanitarian personnel in conflict zones	4100th	9 February 2000
Invitations under rule 39 to regional and other intergovernmental organizations			
Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries ^b Mrs. Dulce Maria Pereira, Executive Secretary	The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4238th	29 November 2000
Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) ^b Executive Secretary	The situation in Sierra Leone	4163rd	21 June 2000
European Union Delegation of the European Commission to the United Nations	Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council	4109th	9 March 2000
European Union Mr. Javier Solana, Secretary-General of the Council of the European Union and High Representative for the European Union Common Foreign and Security Policy	Briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary- General for the Balkans	4164th	23 June 2000
European Union Mr. Wolfgang Petristch, High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4136th 4209th	9 May 2000 26 October 2000
International Security Presence in Kosovo ^b General Klaus Reinhardt, Head	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4108th (private)	6 March 2000

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
League of Arab States (LAS)	The situation in Somalia	4166th	29 June 2000
Dr. Hussein Hassouna, Permanent Observer to the United Nations	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4204th	4 October 2000
Organization of African Unity (OAU) Mr. Amadou Kebe, Permanent Observer to the United Nations	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4204th	5 October 2000
Organization of African Unity Mr. Salim Ahmed Salim, Secretary-General	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4092nd	24 January 2000
Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) Mr. Mokhtar Lamani, Permanent Observer to the United Nations	The role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts	4174th	20 July 2000
	Children and armed conflict	4176th	26 July 2000
	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4204th	4 October 2000
Invitations under rule 39 to other persons			
Assistant Secretary for Health and Surgeon-General of the United States ^b Dr. David Satcher	The situation in Africa: the impact of AIDS on peace and security in Africa	4087th	10 January 2000
Facilitator of the Arusha peace process for Burundi Mr. Nelson Mandela	The situation in Burundi	4091st 4201st 4202nd (private)	19 January 2000 29 September 2000 29 September 2000
Facilitator of the Inter-Congolese Dialogue Sir Ketumile Masire	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4092nd	24 January 2000
Head of the delegation of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) to the United Nations Mrs. Sylvie Junod	Protection of United Nations personnel, associated personnel and humanitarian personnel in conflict zones	4100th	9 February 2000
Head of delegation of the Congolese Rally for Democracy (RCD-ML) ^b Mr. Claver Pashi	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4156th	15 June 2000

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Head of External Relations of the Movement for the Liberation of the Congo (MLC) ^b Mr. Dominique Kanku	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4156th	15 June 2000
President of the International Committee of the Red Cross Mr. Jakob Kellenberger	Protection of civilians in armed conflicts	4130th	19 April 2000
2001			
Invitations under rule 39 to representatives of the United Nations Secretariat, Security Council missions and Security Council subsidiary bodies			
Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs Mr. Ibrahima Fall	General issues relating to sanctions	4394th	25 October 2001
Chairman of the Committee of Experts on Afghanistan appointed pursuant to Security Council resolution 1333 (2000) ^b Mr. Haile Menkerios	The situation in Afghanistan	4325th	5 June 2001
Chairperson of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and other Forms of Wealth in the Democratic Republic of the Congo ^b Ms. Safiatou Ba-N'Daw Mr. Mahmoud Kassem	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4317th	3 May 2001
		4437th	14 December 2001
Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Afghanistan ^b Amb. Alfonso Valdivieso of Colombia	The situation in Afghanistan	4325th	5 June 2001
Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning Angola Mr. Richard Ryan	The situation in Angola	4283rd	22 February 2001

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone Mr. Anwarul Karim Chowdhury	The situation in Sierra Leone	4264th	25 January 2001
Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia ^b Mr. Kishore Mahbubani	The situation in Liberia	4405th	5 November 2001
Director of Europe and Latin America Division of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations Mr. Joachim Hütter	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4435th	7 December 2001
Director of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Mr. Edward Tsui	The situation in Liberia	4405th	5 November 2001
Force Commander of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) Major General Mountaga Diallo	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4391st	22 October 2001
President of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 Judge Claude Jorda	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violation of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations	4429th	27 November 2001

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
	Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994		
President of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994 Judge Navanethem Pillay	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violation of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994	4429th	27 November 2001
Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 and the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994 Ms. Carla Del Ponte	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States, between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994	4429th	27 November 2001

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>	
Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Peace-building Support Office in the Central African Republic General Lamine Cissé Mr. Cheikh Tidiane Sy	The situation in the Central African Republic	4261st	23 January 2001	
		4380th	21 September 2001	
Representative of the Secretary-General for Somalia Mr. David Stephen	The situation in Somalia	4392nd	19 October 2001	
Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of the United Nations Operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina Mr. Jacques Paul Klein	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4330th	15 June 2001	
		4379th	21 September 2001	
Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Mission in Georgia Mr. Dieter Boden	The situation in Georgia	4299th	21 March 2001	
		4313th	24 April 2001	
		4400th	30 October 2001	
Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone Mr. Oluyemi Adeniji	The situation in Sierra Leone	4340th	28 June 2001	
Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo Mr. Hans Haekkerup	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4296th	16 March 2001	
		4387th	5 October 2001	
Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Transitional Administrator of East Timor Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello	Briefing by His Excellency Nebojša Čović, Deputy Prime Minister of Serbia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia	4373rd	17 September 2001	
		The situation in East Timor	4265th	26 January 2001
			4351st	30 July 2001
		4403rd	31 October 2001	

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi	The situation in Afghanistan	4414th	13 November 2001
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Democratic Republic of Congo Mr. Kamel Morjane	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4279th 4348th	21 February 2001 24 July 2001
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Democratic Republic of the Congo Mr. A. Namanga Ngongi	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4391st	22 October 2001
	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4395th 4410th 4411th (private)	24 October 2001 9 November 2001 9 November 2001
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes Region and Chairman of the Implementation Monitoring Committee	The situation in Burundi	4407th (private)	8 November 2001
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea Mr. Legwaila Joseph Legwaila	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4369th	10 September 2001
Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser of the Secretary-General on Africa Mr. Ibrahim Gambari	The situation in Angola	4418th 4444th	15 November 2001 21 December 2001
Under-Secretary-General and Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict Mr. Olara Otunnu	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo Children and armed conflict	4327th 4422nd	13 June 2001 20 November 2001

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator	Protection of civilians in armed conflict	4312th	23 April 2001
		4424th	21 November 2001
Mr. Kenzo Oshima			
Invitations under rule 39 to representatives of United Nations organs, subsidiary bodies or agencies			
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4295th	15 March 2001
		Mr. Ibra Deguène Ka, Chairman	
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4357th	20 August 2001
		Acting Chairman	
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4438th	14 December 2001
		Mr. Papa Louis Fall, Chairman	
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4295th	19 March 2001
		Mr. Ibra Deguène Ka, Chairman	
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People	Letter dated 30 April 2001 from Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/434)	4439th	18 December 2001
		Mr. Papa Louis Fall, Chairman	
General Assembly	The situation in East Timor	4265th	26 January 2001
		Mr. Harri Holkeri, President	
International Court of Justice Judge Gilbert Guillaume, President	Briefing by Judge Gilbert Guillaume, President of the International Court of Justice	4398th	29 October 2001
		International Monetary Fund ^b	The situation in East Timor
Mr. Luis Valdivieso, Adviser, Asia and Pacific Department			

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS	The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations	4259th	19 January 2001
Dr. Peter Piot, Executive Director		4339th	28 June 2001
Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights	Protection of civilians in armed conflict	4312th	23 April 2001
Mrs. Mary Robinson, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights			
United Nations Children's Programme	Children and armed conflict	4422nd	20 November 2001
Ms. Carol Bellamy, Executive Director			
United Nations Development Programme	The situation in East Timor	4265th	26 January 2001
Mr. Mark Malloch Brown, Administrator			
United Nations Development Programme	The situation in East Timor	4403rd	31 October 2001
Mr. Zephirin Diabre, Associate Administrator			
United Nations Development Programme	The situation in the Central African Republic	4261st	23 January 2001
Mr. Frederick Lyons, Acting Deputy Director of the Regional Bureau for Africa			
World Bank	The situation in the Central African Republic	4380th	21 September 2001
Mr. Robert Calderisi, Country Director			
World Bank	The situation in the Central African Republic	4261st	23 January 2001
Mr. Mats Karlsson, Vice President for External Affairs and United Nations Affairs	The situation in East Timor	4403rd	31 October 2001
Mr. Klaus Rohland, Country Director for East Timor, Papua New Guinea and Pacific Islands	The situation in East Timor	4265th	26 January 2001

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Invitations under rule 39 to regional and other intergovernmental organizations			
Economic Commission of West Asian States Executive Secretary	The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its border with Liberia and Sierra Leone, the situation in Liberia and the situation in Sierra Leone	4276th	12 February 2001
European Union Mr. Wolfgang Petritsch, High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4303rd	22 March 2001
		4379th	21 September 2001
European Union Mr. Richard Wyatt, Chargé d' affaires a.i. of the Delegation of the European Commission	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4286th	6 March 2001
International Organization of la Francophonie ^b Mr. Ridha Bouabid, Permanent Observer	The situation in the Central African Republic	4261st	23 January 2001
League of Arab States Mr. Ali Ahmed Abbas, Deputy Permanent Observer to the United Nations	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4295th	19 March 2001
		4357th	20 August 2001
		4357th	21 August 2001
Organization of African Unity Mr. Saïd Djennit, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4279th	21 February 2001
Organization of African Unity Mr. Amadou Kébé, Permanent Observer	The situation in Burundi	4406th	8 November 2001
		4407th (private)	8 November 2001
		4410th	9 November 2001
		4411th (private)	9 November 2001
Organization of the Islamic Conference Mr. Mokhtar Lamani, Permanent Observer	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4295th	19 March 2001
	Protection of civilians in armed conflict	4312th	23 April 2001

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
	The situation in Somalia	4392nd	19 October 2001
Organization of the Islamic Conference Mr. Ahmad Hajihosseini, Deputy Permanent Observer	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4357th	20 and 21 August 2001
Invitations under rule 39 to other persons			
Chief Minister of the Second Transitional Government of East Timor ^b Mr. Mari Alkatiri	The situation in East Timor	4403rd	31 October 2001
Facilitator of the Arusha Peace Process for Burundi ^b Mr. Nelson Mandela	The situation in Burundi	4416th	15 November 2001
Facilitator of the Inter-Congolese Dialogue Sir Ketumile Masire	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4281st (private) 4364th (private)	22 February 2001 5 September 2001
Members of the Political Committee of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement Burundi and Zambia ^b	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4411th (private)	9 November 2001
Members of the Regional Peace Initiative on Burundi	The situation in Burundi	4407th (private)	8 November 2001
Member of the Transitional Cabinet of East Timor responsible for Foreign Affairs Mr. José Ramos-Horta	The situation in East Timor	4265th 4321st 4351st	26 January 2001 18 May 2001 30 July 2001
President of the National Council of Timorese Resistance ^b Mr. Xanana Gusmão	The situation in East Timor	4321st	18 May 2001
Representative of the Congolese Rally for Democracy-Kisangani (RCD-K) Prof. Pashi-Claver	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4279th 4410th	21 February 2001 9 November 2001

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Representative of the facilitator for the inter-Congolese Dialogue Mr. Archibald M. Mogwe	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4410th	9 November 2001
Representative of the Facilitator of the Burundi Peace Process Judge Mark Bomani	The situation in Burundi	4378th	20 September 2001
Representative of the Facilitator to the Implementation Monitoring Committee Prof. Nicholas Haysom	The situation in Burundi	4378th	20 September 2001
Representative of the Movement for the Liberation of the Congo (MLC) to the Joint Military Commission Mr. Valentine Senga	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4279th	21 February 2001
Secretary-General of the Congolese Rally for Democracy (RCD) ^b Mr. Azarias Ruberwa	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4279th 4410th	21 February 2001 9 November 2001
Secretary-General of the Movement for the Liberation of the Congo Mr. Olivier Kamitatu	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4410th	9 November 2001
2002			
Invitations under rule 39 to representatives of the United Nations Secretariat, Security Council missions and Security Council subsidiary bodies			
Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women Ms. Angela King	Women and peace and security	4589th	25 July 2002
Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations Mr. Hédi Annabi	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Observers Mission in Prevlaka (UNMOP) pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4446th (private) 4620th (private)	10 January 2002 10 October 2002
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4455th	21 January 2002

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4456th (private)	23 January 2002
	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4475th (private)	25 February 2002
4498th		27 March 2002	
4605th		5 September 2002	
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4477th (private)	25 February 2002
4520th (private)		24 April 2002	
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4483rd (private)	4 March 2002
4612th (private)		19 September 2002	
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Eritrea and Ethiopia (UNMEE) pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4491st (private)	14 March 2002
4599th (private)		13 August 2002	
	The situation in East Timor	4522nd	26 April 2002
4598th (private)		13 August 2002	
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Organization Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4553rd (private)	13 June 2002

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM) pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4617th (private)	2 October 2002
	The situation in Afghanistan	4664th	13 December 2002
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4669th (private)	17 December 2002
Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs Mr. Danilo Türk	The situation in Afghanistan	4497th	26 March 2002
Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs Mr. Ibrahima Fall	The situation in Africa: Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa	4538th	22 May 2002
Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs Mr. Tuliameni Kalomoh	Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security	4630th	22 October 2002
Chairman of the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa Mr. Jagdish Koonjul	The situation in Africa: Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa	4538th	22 May 2002
	Briefings by the Chairmen of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola, the Security Council Committee established pursuant	4673rd	18 December 2002

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
	to resolution 1267 (1999), the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia, the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa and the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations		
Chairman of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait Mr. Ole Peter Kolby	Briefings by the Chairmen of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia, the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa and the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations	4673rd	18 December 2002
Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola Mr. Richard Ryan	Briefings by the Chairmen of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), the Security Council Committee established pursuant to	4673rd	18 December 2002

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
	resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia, the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa and the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations		
Chairman of the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Mr. Wegger Christian Strommen	Briefings by the Chairmen of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia, the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa and the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations	4673rd	18 December 2002
Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia Mr. Kishore Mahbubani	Briefings by the Chairmen of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia, the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict	4673rd	18 December 2002

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
	Prevention and Resolution in Africa and the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations		
Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism Sir Jeremy Greenstock	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts	4453rd	18 January 2002
		4512th	15 April 2002
		4561st	27 June 2002
		4618th	4 October 2002
Deputy Director, Asia and Middle East Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Ms. Louise Laheurte	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4545th	24 May 2002
		4576th (private)	17 July 2002
Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator Ms. Carolyn McAskie	The situation in Africa	4577th	18 July 2002
Director of the Europe and Latin America Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Mr. Joachim Hütter	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B ^c	4549th (private)	5 June 2002
		4648th (private)	21 November 2002
		4586th	24 July 2002
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG) pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A		

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Former Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations ^b Mr. Curtis Ward	Third report of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations (S/2001/1335)	4447th	14 January 2002
Head of the Security Council Mission to Eritrea and Ethiopia ^b Mr. Ole Peter Kolby	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	4485th	6 March 2002
Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and the Advancement of Women Ms. Carolyn Hannan, O.I.C.	Women and peace and security	4635th	28 October 2002
President of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 Judge Claude Jorda	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	4581st	23 July 2002
		4637th	29 October 2002
President of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994 Judge Navanethem Pillay	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	4637th	29 October 2002
		International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law	

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
	Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994		
Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 and the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994	International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994	4637th	29 October 2002
Ms. Carla Del Ponte			
Prosecutor for the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	4581st	23 July 2002
Ms. Carla del Ponte			
Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Peace-building Support Office in Guinea-Bissau	The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4567th (private)	8 July 2002
Mr. David Stephen			
Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Political Office for Somalia	The situation in Somalia	4565th (private)	3 July 2002
Mr. Winston Tubman			

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General	The situation in the Middle East including the Palestinian question	4613th	20 September 2002
		4668th	16 December 2002
Mr. Terje Roed-Larsen			
Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Transitional Administrator for East Timor	The situation in East Timor	4462nd	30 January 2002
Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello			
Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of United Nations Operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4484th	5 March 2002
		4555th	19 June 2002
		4631st	23 October 2002
Mr. Jacques Paul Klein		4661st	12 December 2002
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan	The situation in Afghanistan	4469th	6 February 2002
		4579th	19 July 2002
		4611th	19 September 2002
Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi		4638th	30 October 2002
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Angola and Head of the United Nations Mission in Angola	The situation in Angola	4671st	17 December 2002
Mr. Ibrahim Gambari			
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict	Children and armed conflict	4528th	7 May 2002
Mr. Olara Otunnu			
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Kosovo and Head of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4518th	24 April 2002
		4592nd	30 July 2002
Mr. Michael Steiner			

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Democratic Republic of Congo and Chief of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo Mr. Amos Namanga Ngongi	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4550th	11 June 2002
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Sierra Leone and Head of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone Mr. Oluyemi Adeniji	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B ^c	4496th (private)	20 March 2002
		4610th (private)	18 September 2002
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Western Sahara and Chief of Mission Mr. William Lacy Swing	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A	4587th (private)	24 July 2002
Special Representative of the Secretary-General to Timor-Leste Mr. Kamallesh Sharma	The situation in Timor-Leste ^d	4646th	14 November 2002
Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser of the Secretary-General for Special Assignments in Africa Mr. Ibrahim Gambari	The situation in Angola	4517th	23 April 2002
		4595th	7 August 2002
Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs Mr. Jayantha Dhanapala	Small arms	4623rd	11 October 2002
Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator Mr. Kenzo Oshima	The situation in Angola	4472nd	13 February 2002
		4575th	17 July 2002
	Protection of civilians in armed conflict	4492nd	15 March 2002
Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4660th	10 December 2002
		4454th	21 January 2002
		4533rd	16 May 2002
		4559th	26 June 2002
		4643rd	6 November 2002

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
	The situation in Sierra Leone	4570th (private)	11 July 2002
	The situation in Africa	4577th	18 July 2002
	Women and peace and security	4589th	25 July 2002
	The situation in Croatia	4662nd	12 December 2002
Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs	The situation in Afghanistan	4479th	27 February 2002
Mr. Kieran Prendergast		4490th	13 March 2002
		4521st	25 April 2002
		4541st	23 May 2002
		4557th	21 June 2002
	The situation in Africa	4577th	18 July 2002
	The situation in the Middle East including the Palestinian question	4645th	12 November 2002
	Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires, a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1998/287)	4647th	21 November 2002
Invitations under rule 39 to representatives of United Nations organs, subsidiary bodies or agencies			
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4478th	26 February 2002
Chairman		4506th	3 April 2002
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4552nd	13 June 2002
Mr. Papa Louis Fall, Chairman		4614th	23 September 2002
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4525th	3 May 2002
Mr. Ravan A. G. Farhâdi, Vice- Chairman			

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People Mr. Bruno Rodriguez Parilla, Acting Chairman	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4588th	24 July 2002
Economic and Social Council ^b Mr. Ivan Šimonovič, President	The situation in Africa	4460th	29 January 2002
		4538th	27 March 2002
		4577th	18 July 2002
	Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security	4630th	22 October 2002
	Women and peace and security	4635th	28 October 2002
International Court of Justice Judge Gilbert Guillaume, President	Briefing by Judge Gilbert Guillaume, President of the International Court of Justice	4636th	29 October 2002
United Nations Children's Fund Ms. Carol Bellamy, Executive Director	Children and armed conflict	4528th	7 May 2002
United Nations Development Programme Mr. Abdoulaye Mar Dieye, Director for West Africa	The situation in Africa	4577th	18 July 2002
United Nations Development Programme Ms. Julia Taft, Director for the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery	Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security	4630th	22 October 2002
United Nations Development Fund for Women Ms. Noeleen Heyzer, Executive Director	Women and peace and security	4589th	25 July 2002
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Mr. Ruud Lubbers, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	Briefing by Mr. Ruud Lubbers, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	4470th	7 February 2002

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
World Bank Mr. Florian Fichtl, Senior Social Protection Specialist for Regional Human Development	The situation in Africa	4577th	18 July 2002
World Bank Mr. Emmanuel Mbi, Country Director for South-Central Africa and the Great Lakes Region	Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security	4630th	22 October 2002
World Food Programme Ms. Catherine Bertini, Executive Director	Food aid in the context of conflict settlement: Afghanistan and other crisis areas	4507th	4 April 2002
World Food Programme Mr. James Morris, Executive Director	Africa's food crises as a threat to peace and security	4652nd	3 December 2002
Invitations under rule 39 to regional and other intergovernmental organizations			
Economic Community of Central African States ^b Mr. Nelson Cosme, Deputy Secretary-General	Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security	4630th	22 October 2002
Economic Community of West African States General Chekh Omar Diarra, Deputy Executive Secretary	The situation in Africa	4577th	18 July 2002
European Union Mr. Javier Solana, Secretary-General of the Council and High Representative for Foreign Policy and Common Security	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4484th	5 March 2002
League of Arab States Mr. Yahya Mahmassani, Permanent Observer to the United Nations	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4588th	24 July 2002
		4614th	23 September 2002
	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4625th	16 October 2002

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Office of the High Representative of the International Community in Bosnia and Herzegovina Mr. Wolfgang Petristch, High Representative	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4484th	5 March 2002
Office of the High Representative of the International Community in Bosnia and Herzegovina Lord Paddy Ashdown, High Representative	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4631st	23 October 2002
Organization of African Unity (OAU)/ African Union (AU) Mr. Amara Essy, Secretary-General	The situation in Africa	4460th	29 January 2002
Organization of African Unity/African Union Mr. Amadou Kébé, Permanent Observer to the United Nations	The situation in Africa	4538th	22 May 2002
	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4614th	23 September 2002
	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts	4618th	4 October 2002
	Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security	4630th	22 October 2002
Organization of African Unity/African Union Mr. Sylvian Ngung, Deputy Permanent Observer to the United Nations	The situation in Africa	4577th	18 July 2002
Organization of the Islamic Conference Mr. Mokhtar Lamani, Permanent Observer to the United Nations	The situation in Afghanistan	4579th	19 July 2002
	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts	4618th	4 October 2002
	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4625th	16 October 2002

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Invitations under rule 39 to other persons			
Chief Minister of East Timor (Timor-Leste) Mr. Mari Bin Amude Alkatiri	The situation in East Timor	4522nd	26 April 2002
Director General of the International Committee of the Red Cross Mr. Angelo Gnaedinger	Protection of civilians in armed conflict	4660th	10 December 2002
Former Minister of Education for Mozambique, former Independent Expert of the Secretary-General on the Impact of Armed Conflict on Children ^b Ms. Graça Machel	Children and armed conflict	4528th	7 May 2002
President-Elect of East Timor (Timor-Leste) ^b Mr. Xanana Gusmão	The situation in East Timor	4522nd	26 April 2002
Senior Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of East Timor (Timor-Leste) Mr. José Ramos-Horta	The situation in East Timor	4462nd	30 January 2002
2003			
Invitations under rule 39 to representatives of the United Nations Secretariat, Security Council missions and Security Council subsidiary bodies			
Acting Director, Asia and Middle East Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Mr. Julian Harston	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4781st (private)	1 July 2003
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4878th (private)	11 December 2003

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4795th (private)	25 July 2003
Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations Mr. Hédi Annabi	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4689th (private)	21 January 2003
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4690th 4763rd	22 January 2003 28 May 2003
	The situation in Afghanistan	4727th	27 March 2003
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4733rd	2 April 2003
	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4742nd	23 April 2003
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4767th (private)	4 June 2003
	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4823rd	12 September 2003

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4827th (private)	16 September 2003
Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs	General issues relating to sanctions	4713th	25 February 2003
Mr. Danilo Türk	Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires, a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	4728th 4881st	28 March 2003 15 December 2003
	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4741st 4810th	16 April 2003 19 August 2003
Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs	The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4834th	29 September 2003
Mr. Tuliameni Kalomoh	Central African region	4871st	24 November 2003
Chairman of the Monitoring Group established pursuant to resolution 1363 (2001)	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts	4798th	29 July 2003
Mr. Michael Chandler			
Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait	Briefings by Chairmen of Security Council committees and working groups	4888th	22 December 2003
Mr. Pleuger			
Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 918 (1994) concerning Rwanda	Briefings by Chairmen of Security Council committees and working groups	4888th	22 December 2003
Mr. Fayssal Mekdad, on behalf of the Chairman			

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone Mrs. Maria Angelica Arce de Jeannet, on behalf of the Chairman	Briefings by Chairmen of Security Council committees and working groups	4888th	22 December 2003
Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) Mr. Heraldo Munoz	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts	4798th	29 July 2003
Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism ^b Sir Jeremy Greenstock	High-level meeting of the Security Council: combating terrorism	4688th	20 January 2003
	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts	4710th	20 February 2003
		4734th	4 April 2003
	Report of the Security Council mission to West Africa from 26 June to 5 July 2003	4785th	9 July 2003
Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism Mr. Inocencio Arias	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts	4845th	16 October 2003
Chairman of the Working Group on General Issues on Sanctions ^b Mr. Martin Belinga-Eboutou	Briefings by Chairmen of Security Council committees and working groups	4888th	22 December 2003
Chief Military Observer, UNOMIG Major General Kazi Ashfag Ahmed	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4687th	17 January 2003
Deputy Military Adviser, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Major General Martin L. Agwai	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4778th	23 June 2003

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Director, Africa Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Mr. Dmitry Titov	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4847th (private)	23 October 2003
Director General of the United Nations Office at Vienna and Executive Director, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime Mr. Antonio Maria Costa	The situation in Afghanistan	4774th	17 June 2003
Director, Europe and Latin America Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Mr. Joachim Hütter	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4687th (private)	17 January 2003
Executive Chairman, United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission ^b Mr. Hans Blix	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4692nd 4708th 4714th 4721st	27 January 2003 14 February 2003 7 March 2004 19 March 2003
Executive Director, Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS Mr. Peter Piot	The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations	4859th	17 November 2003
Executive Director, Office of the Iraq Programme Mr. Benon Sevan	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4851st	28 October 2003
Force Commander, UNIFIL ^b Major General Lalit Mohan Tewari	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4689th (private)	21 January 2003

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Head of Mission in Guinea-Bissau and Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone Mr. Adolfo Aguilar Zinser	Report of the Security Council mission to West Africa from 26 June to 5 July 2003	4785th	9 July 2003
Head of the Political Office in Bougainville Mr. Noel Sinclair	Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires, a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	4805th	6 August 2003
Head of the Security Council mission to Afghanistan Amb. Gunter Pleuger	Security Council mission: report of the Security Council mission to Afghanistan from 31 October to 7 November 2003	4855th	11 November 2003
Head of the Security Council mission to Central Africa Mr. Jean-Marc de la Sablière	Security Council mission: report of the Security Council mission to Central Africa from 7 to 16 June 2003	4775th	18 June 2003
Legal Counsel of the United Nations ^b Mr. Hans Corell	Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role	4835th	30 September 2003
Military Adviser, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Major General Patrick Commaert	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISSET) pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4755th	16 May 2003
Officer-in-Charge of the Europe and Latin America Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Mr. Wolfgang Weisbrod-Weber	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4866th	20 November 2003

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
<p>President of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991</p> <p>Judge Theodor Meron</p>	<p>International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991</p> <p>International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994</p>	4838th	9 October 2003
<p>Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991</p> <p>Ms. Carla Del Ponte</p>	<p>International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991</p>	4838th	9 October 2003
<p>Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 and the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994</p> <p>Ms. Carla Del Ponte</p>	<p>International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991</p> <p>International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994</p>	4806th (private)	8 August 2003

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994 Mr. Hassan Bubacar Jallow	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994	4838th	9 October 2003
Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNOGBIS) Mr. David Stephen	The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4776th	19 June 2003
Senior Gender Adviser, United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo Ms. Amy Smythe	Women and peace and security	4852nd	29 October 2003
Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General Mr. Terje Roed-Larsen	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4722nd 4757th 4788th 4824th 4879th	19 March 2003 19 May 2003 17 July 2003 15 September 2003 12 December 2003
Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head, United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) Mr. Harri Holkeri	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4853rd	30 October 2003

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi	The situation in Afghanistan	4699th	31 January 2003
		4750th	6 May 2003
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict Mr. Olara Otunnu	Report of the Secretary-General on children and armed conflict	4684th	14 January 2003
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Côte d'Ivoire Mr. Albert Tevoedjre	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (MINUCI) pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4854th (private)	7 November 2003
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Georgia and Head of Mission Ms. Heidi Tagliavini	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG) pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4796th (private)	25 July 2003
		The situation in Georgia	4799th (private)
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Kosovo and Head of the United Nations Interim Administration in Kosovo Mr. Michael Steiner	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4702nd	6 February 2003
		4782nd	3 July 2003
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Iraq Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4791st	22 July 2003
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Liberia Mr. Jacques Paul Klein	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop- and civilian police-contributing countries to the proposed United Nations peacekeeping operation in Liberia pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4825th	15 September 2003
		The situation in Liberia	4826th

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Sierra Leone and Head of the United Nations mission in Sierra Leone Mr. Oluyemi Adeniji	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations mission in Sierra Leone pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4724th	20 March 2003
Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations Mr. Hédi Annabi	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4763rd (private)	28 May 2003
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes Region Mr. Ibrahima Fall	The situation in the Great Lakes region	4865th	20 November 2003
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Timor-Leste and Head of Mission Mr. Kamallesh Sharma	The situation in Timor-Leste	4744th 4843rd	28 April 2003 15 October 2003
Special Representative of the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea Mr. Legwaila Joseph Legwaila	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B	4716th (private) 4821st	10 March 2003 9 September 2003
United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights Mr. Bertrand Gangapersaud Ramcharan	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4784th	7 July 2003
United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4705th	13 February 2003
Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Cyprus Mr. Alvaro de Soto	The situation in Cyprus	4738th	10 April 2003

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator Mr. Kenzo Oshima	Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq	4762nd	22 May 2003
	Protection of civilians in armed conflict	4777th	20 June 2003
Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4705th	13 February 2003
		4784th	7 July 2003
	The situation in Afghanistan	4711th	24 February 2003
		4712th (private)	24 February 2003
		4774th	17 June 2003
		4848th	24 October 2003
	The situation in Timor-Leste	4715th	10 March 2003
	Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role	4835th	30 September 2003
	Women and peace and security	4852nd	29 October 2003
	The importance of mine action for peacekeeping operations	4858th	13 November 2003
The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations	4859th	17 November 2003	
Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)	4886th	17 December 2003	
Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs Mr. Kieran Prendergast	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4685th	16 January 2003
		4704th	13 February 2003
		4774th	13 June 2003
		4846th	21 October 2003
		4861st	19 November 2003

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Invitations under rule 39 to representatives of United Nations organs, subsidiary bodies or agencies			
Economic and Social Council Mr. Gert Rosenthal, President	Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month	4748th	30 April 2003
	The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4860th	18 November 2003
	The situation in Burundi	4876th	4 December 2003
Economic and Social Council Mr. Dumisani Kumalo, Chairman, Ad hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau	The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4776th	19 June 2003
International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Mr. Mohamed El Baradei, Director General	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4692nd 4708th 4714th	27 January 2003 14 February 2003 7 March 2003
Mr. Gustavo Zlauvinen, Representative of the Director General	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4721st	19 March 2003
International Court of Justice Mr. Nabil Elaraby, Judge	The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes	4753rd	13 May 2003
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Ms. Carol Bellamy, Executive Director ^e	Report of the Secretary-General on children and armed conflict	4684th	14 January 2003
United Nations Children's Fund Mr. Nils Kastberg, Director, Emergency Programmes	Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq	4762nd	22 May 2003
United Nations Development Programme Mr. Mark Malloch Brown, Administrator	Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq	4762nd	22 May 2003
World Food Programme Mr. James Morris, Executive Director	Africa's food crisis as a threat to peace and security: briefing by Mr. James Morris, Executive Director of the World Food Programme	4736th	7 April 2003
	Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq	4762nd	22 May 2003

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
World Health Organization (WHO) ^b Mr. David Nabarro, Senior Policy Adviser to the Director-General, Executive Director, Sustainable Development and Healthy Environments	Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq	4762nd	22 May 2003
Invitations under rule 39 to regional and other intergovernmental organizations			
African Union Mr. Said Djinnit, Interim Commissioner for Peace, Security and Political Affairs	Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa	4720th	18 March 2003
African Union Ambassador Amadou Kébé, Permanent Observer to the United Nations	Central African region	4871st	24 November 2003
African Union Mr. Alpha Omar Konaré, Chairperson of the Commission of the African Union	The situation in Burundi	4832nd (private)	22 September 2003
African Union Mr. Fholisani Sydney Mufamadi, Representative of the Presidency, African Union and Minister for Provincial and Local Government, South Africa	The Security Council and regional organizations: facing new challenges to international peace and security	4739th	11 April 2003
African Union Mr. Keli Walubita, Special Envoy of the Chairperson of the Commission of the African Union for the Great Lakes Region	The situation in the Great Lakes region	4865th	20 November 2003
Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries ^b Mr. Henrique Valle, Representative	The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4860th (private)	18 November 2003
Economic Community of Central African States Mr. Nelson Cosme, Deputy Secretary- General for Political Affairs	Central African region	4871st	24 November 2003

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Economic Community of West African States Mr. Mohamed Ibn Chambas, Executive Secretary	Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa	4720th	18 March 2003
	The Security Council and regional organizations: facing new challenges to international peace and security	4739th	11 April 2003
	The situation in Liberia	4815th	27 August 2003
		4816th (private)	27 August 2003
	The situation in Côte d'Ivoire	4873rd	24 November 2003
		4874th (private)	24 November 2003
		4746th	29 April 2003
Economic Community of West African States Mr. Nana Effah-Apenteng, Representative of the Chairman	The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4860th (private)	18 November 2003
European Union Mr. Javier Solana, Secretary-General and High Representative for the Common Foreign Policy and Security Policy	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4790th	18 July 2003
European Union Lord Paddy Ashdown, High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4837th	8 October 2003
League of Arab States Mr. Yahya Mahmassani, Permanent Observer to the United Nations	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4709th	18 and 19 February 2003
		4717th	11 March 2003
		4726th	26 and 27 March 2003
	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4824th	15 September 2003
		4841st	14 October 2003

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
	Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic	4836th	5 October 2003
	Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council		
League of Arab States Mr. Amre Moussa, Secretary-General	The Security Council and regional organizations: facing new challenges to international peace and security	4739th	11 April 2003
Organization of American States (OAS) Mr. César Gaviria, Secretary-General	The Security Council and regional organizations: facing new challenges to international peace and security	4739th	11 April 2003
Organization of the Islamic Conference Mr. Mokhtar Lamani, Permanent Observer to the United Nations	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4717th 4726th	11 March 2003 26 and 27 March 2003
Organization of the Islamic Conference Mr. Ahmad Hajihosseini, Deputy Permanent Observer to the United Nations, Chargé d'affaires, a.i.	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4841st	14 October 2003
Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) ^b Mr. Jan Kubis, Secretary-General	The Security Council and regional organizations: facing new challenges to international peace and security	4739th	11 April 2003
Program for Coordination and Assistance for Security and Development ^b Mr. Ibrahima Sall, Regional Director	Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa	4720th	18 March 2003
Invitations under rule 39 to other persons			
Ambassador of Japan in charge of Afghan Aid Coordination ^b Mr. Mutsuyoshi Nishimura	The situation in Afghanistan	4711th	24 February 2003

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Director of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining ^b Mr. Martin Dahinden	The importance of mine action for peacekeeping operations	4858th	13 November 2003
Former Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Democratic Republic of the Congo ^b Mr. Amos Namanga Ngongi	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	4790th	18 July 2003
Former Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs ^b Sir Brian Urquhart	The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes	4753rd	13 May 2003
Members of the Iraqi Governing Council ^b Mr. Adnan Pachachi Mr. Ahmad Chalabi Ms. Aqeela al-Hashemi	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4791st	22 July 2003
Minister for Foreign Affairs, Timor-Leste, and Special Envoy of the Community of Portuguese Speaking Countries to Guinea-Bissau Mr. José Ramos-Horta	The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4834th	29 September 2003
President of the International Committee of the Red Cross Mr. Jakob Kellenberger	Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq	4762nd	22 May 2003
Special Representative of the German Government for the training of the Afghan police force Mr. Harald Braun	The situation in Afghanistan	4711th 4712th (private)	24 February 2003 24 February 2003

^a The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People is a Committee of the General Assembly.

^b First-time invitation.

^c In accordance with a note by the President of the Security Council dated 27 August 2002 (S/2002/964), the wording of the items concerning "Meeting of the Security Council with troop-contributing countries... pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A" was revised to read "Meeting of the Security Council with troop-contributing countries... pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B".

^d As from the 4646th meeting, held on 14 November 2002, the item "The situation in East Timor" was revised to read "The situation in Timor-Leste".

^e At the resumed session of the 4684th meeting, Mr. Kaul Gantam, Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF, spoke on behalf of Ms. Bellamy and by her invitation.

Chapter IV

Voting

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introductory note	135
Part I. Procedures relating to decision-making and voting.	135
Part II. Procedural and non-procedural matters.	136
Note	136
Cases in which the vote indicated the non-procedural character of the matter	137
Part III. Proceedings of the Security Council regarding voting upon the question whether the matter was procedural within the meaning of Article 27, paragraph 2, of the Charter	138
Part IV. Abstention, non-participation or absence in relation to Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter	138
Note	138
A. Obligatory abstention	138
B. Voluntary abstention, non-participation or absence in relation to Article 27, paragraph 3	139
1. Cases in which permanent and/or elected members abstained otherwise than in accordance with the proviso to Article 27, paragraph 3.	139
2. Cases in which elected members did not participate or were absent during the voting.	142
Part V. Adoption of resolutions and decisions without a vote	143
Note	143
A. Cases in which the Security Council adopted resolutions without a vote.	144
B. Cases in which Security Council decisions were announced in presidential statements issued after being agreed upon by the members of the Council at consultations	144
C. Cases in which Security Council decisions were recorded in notes by the President of the Security Council	151
D. Cases in which Security Council decisions were recorded in letters from the President of the Security Council	154

Introductory note

The present chapter contains material relating to the practice of the Security Council on decision-making and voting under Article 27 of the Charter.¹ The arrangement of the material basically follows that of the corresponding chapter in earlier volumes of the *Repertoire*, but also includes a new part I.

Part I presents developments in procedures related to decision-making and voting during the period 2000-2003. Part II relates to the distinction between procedural and non-procedural matters. It lists those instances in which the vote indicated the procedural or non-procedural nature of the decision. Part III deals with the practice of the Council in voting upon the question whether a matter was procedural within the meaning of Article 27, paragraph 2. Part IV is concerned with the abstention, non-participation or absence of a Council member in relation to the requirements of Article 27, paragraph 3. Part V deals with decisions adopted without a vote.

Article 27

1. *Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.*
2. *Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members.*
3. *Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.*

Part I Procedures relating to decision-making and voting

Note

During the period under review, recognizing the importance of timely, full and effective dissemination of its resolutions and presidential statements to the international community, in particular their communication to those concerned, the Security Council strengthened its practice in this regard. On 29 June 2001, in a note by the President, the Council stipulated, inter alia, that (a) the President of the Security Council should, when requested by the Council members, draw the attention of Member State(s) as well as regional organizations and arrangements concerned to the relevant decisions of the Council and statements to the press made by the President on behalf of Council members; and (b) the Secretariat should continue to bring to the attention of those concerned, including non-State actors, through the relevant special representatives, representatives and envoys of the

¹ Material relating to voting in connection with the election of judges under Article 10 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice is included in chapter VI. Material on the voting procedure employed by the Council in connection with the applications for admission to membership in the United Nations is contained in chapter VII.

Secretary-General and United Nations resident coordinators, Council decisions and press statements and ensure their promptest communication and widest possible dissemination.²

Furthermore, with a view to streamlining the working methods of the Council and in conformity with the President's guidelines for the month,³ during April 2001 there was no call for negative votes by the President after a unanimous vote in favour of a draft resolution.⁴ It subsequently became Council practice, in the event that all 15 members voted in favour, for the President not to ask for negative votes or abstentions.⁵

Part II

Procedural and non-procedural matters

Note

The result of a vote in the Council does not indicate whether the matter voted upon is procedural or non-procedural when a proposal is adopted by a unanimous vote; when all permanent members vote in favour of a proposal; or when a proposal fails to obtain the necessary nine votes in its favour. The procedural or non-procedural character of the matter may be indicated by the result of the voting when a proposal obtains nine or more votes in favour, with one or more permanent members casting a negative vote. Adoption by the Council in such circumstances indicates the procedural character of the matter; rejection by the Council in such circumstances indicates the matter is non-procedural.

During the period from 2000 to 2003, there was no instance in which the vote indicated the procedural character of the matter under consideration.⁶ There were three occasions in which the Council voted, respectively, on the adjournment of a meeting,⁷

² S/2001/640.

³ S/2001/596, annex, p.10.

⁴ Voting in the Council has customarily taken place by show of hands, the President asking for those in favour, those against and those abstaining. In one instance, at the 4370th meeting, held on 12 September 2001, upon the invitation of the President, the members of the Council voted not by raising their hands but by standing, "in a show of unity in the face of the scourge of terrorism". Resolution 1368 (2001), by which, inter alia, the Council condemned the terrorist attacks that took place on 11 September in New York, Washington, D.C. and Pennsylvania, was adopted unanimously (see S/PV.4370, p. 8).

⁵ S/2002/603, p. 9.

⁶ In previous volumes of the *Repertoire*, such instances were categorized as follows: (a) inclusion of items in the agenda; (b) order of items on the agenda; (c) deferment of consideration of items on the agenda; (d) removal of an item from the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized; (e) rulings of the President of the Security Council; (f) suspension of a meeting; (g) adjournment of a meeting; (h) invitation to participate in the proceedings; (i) conduct of business; and (j) convocation of an emergency special session of the General Assembly.

⁷ At its 4820th meeting (Part I) on 9 October 2003, the Council considered the item entitled "Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America". The proposal was adopted by a vote of 15-0-0 (S/PV.4829, p. 2).

on an invitation to participate in the proceedings,⁸ and on a matter related to the conduct of business.⁹ In each case, the voting did not indicate by itself whether the Council considered the matter as procedural or non-procedural. In the first instance, the proposal was adopted unanimously; in the two remaining instances, the proposal failed to obtain the necessary nine votes in favour.

There were, however, instances in which the voting indicated the non-procedural character of the matter. These instances, all of which related to matters considered by the Security Council under its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, are listed below. During the period under review, there was no discussion on the procedural or non-procedural nature of the questions under consideration.

Cases in which the vote indicated the non-procedural character of the matter

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Proposals (draft resolutions, etc.)</i>	<i>Submitted by</i>	<i>Vote (proposal not adopted)</i>	<i>Permanent members casting negative vote^a</i>
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4305th, 27 March 2001	S/2001/270	Bangladesh, Colombia, Jamaica, Mali, Mauritius, Singapore and Tunisia	9-1-4	1
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4438th, 14 December 2001	S/2001/1199	Egypt and Tunisia	12-1-2	1
The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4563rd, 30 June 2002	S/2002/712	Bulgaria, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Russian Federation and United Kingdom	13-1-1	1
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4681st, 20 December 2002	S/2002/1385	Syrian Arab Republic	12-1-2	1
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4828th, 16 September 2003	S/2003/891	Pakistan, South Africa, Sudan and Syrian Arab Republic	11-1-3	1
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4842nd, 14 October 2003	S/2003/980	Guinea, Malaysia, Pakistan and Syrian Arab Republic	10-1-4	1

^a For the context and explanations of the voting, see the relevant sections of chapter VIII.

⁸ At the 4164th meeting on 23 June 2000, the Council heard a briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans. The proposal failed to obtain the necessary nine votes in its favour (S/PV.4164, pp. 2-5).

⁹ At the same meeting, a separate proposal failed to obtain the necessary nine votes in its favour (S/PV.4164, pp. 2-3).

Part III

Proceedings of the Security Council regarding voting upon the question whether the matter was procedural within the meaning of Article 27, paragraph 2, of the Charter

On certain occasions the Security Council has found it necessary to decide, by vote, the question of whether the matter under consideration was procedural within the context of Article 27 (2). That question has come to be termed, in line with the language used in the San Francisco statement on voting procedure,¹⁰ “the preliminary question”.

There were no instances of voting on the preliminary question during the period under review.

¹⁰ Statement at San Francisco by the delegations of the four Sponsoring Governments on the “The Yalta Formula” on Voting in the Security Council, 8 June 1945. France subsequently indicated that it shared the views of the four Sponsoring Governments (China, United Kingdom, United States and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). In Sydney D. Bailey and Sam Daws, editors, *The Procedure of the United Nations Security Council* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2005).

Part IV

Abstention, non-participation or absence in relation to Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter

Note

According to Article 27 (3) of the Charter, decisions of the Security Council on non-procedural (substantive) matters require “an affirmative vote of nine members” including “the concurring votes of the permanent members”. Part IV concerns the application of this requirement: (a) in the light of the proviso to Article 27 (3) (requiring abstention); and (b) in circumstances when a permanent and/or elected member voluntarily abstains, does not participate in the vote or is absent at the time of the vote.

A. Obligatory abstention

The proviso to Article 27 (3) states:

provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.

During the period under review, there was no instance in which a member abstained in accordance

with the proviso to Article 27 (3), nor was there any discussion of the issue of obligatory abstention.¹¹

¹¹ Two explicit references were made to Article 27 (3) in the deliberations of the Council. At the 4128th meeting on 17 April 2000, held in connection with the item “General issues relating to sanctions”, a speaker maintained that, if any member of the Council was party to a dispute with a non-member, it had to remain neutral when the issue was debated in the Security Council with the objective of imposing sanctions against that State; this was, according to the speaker, in accordance with Article 27 (3) (S/PV.4128, p. 30 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya). At the 4753rd meeting on 13 May 2003, held in connection with the item “The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes”, a speaker emphasized that the Council should consider “the strict and faithful application” of Article 27 (3), adding that a State “should not be allowed to be party, judge and jury at the same time” (S/PV.4753, p. 8 (Mr. Elaraby, speaking in his personal capacity)).

B. Voluntary abstention, non-participation or absence in relation to Article 27, paragraph 3

Subsection 1 lists those instances in which permanent and/or elected members voluntarily abstained from voting. In addition, it describes in detail two particular instances of abstention in which (a) the abstaining member was also a co-sponsor of the draft resolution under consideration (case 1); and (b) the

abstaining members indicated that they would have preferred a paragraph-by-paragraph vote (case 2). Subsection 2 lists those instances in which elected members did not participate or were absent during the voting. It also describes an instance of absence in which the absent member took the floor in connection with the vote at a subsequent meeting of the Council (case 3). During the period under review, there were no instances of non-participation by permanent members or of votes taken in their absence.

1. Cases in which permanent and/or elected members abstained otherwise than in accordance with the proviso to Article 27, paragraph 3

<i>Resolutions or proposals</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Abstaining</i>
1290 (2000)	Admission of new Members (Tuvalu)	4103rd, 17 February 2000	14-0-1	Permanent member: China
1301 (2000) ^a	The situation concerning Western Sahara	4149th, 31 May 2000	12-1-2	Elected members: Jamaica, Mali
1305 (2000)	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4162nd, 21 June 2000	14-0-1	Permanent member: Russian Federation
1306 (2000)	The situation in Sierra Leone	4168th, 5 July 2000	14-0-1	Elected member: Mali
1322 (2000)	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4205th, 7 October 2000	14-0-1	Permanent member: United States
S/2000/1171 (not adopted, having failed to obtain the necessary nine votes in favour)	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4248th, 18 December 2000	8-0-7	Permanent members: France, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, United States Elected members: Argentina, Canada and Netherlands
1333 (2000)	The situation in Afghanistan	4251st, 19 December 2000	13-0-2	Permanent member: China Elected member: Malaysia

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Resolutions or proposals</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Abstaining</i>
S/2001/270 (not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member)	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4305th, 27 March 2001	9-1-4	Permanent members: France, United Kingdom Elected members: Ireland, Norway
1372 (2001)	Security Council resolution 1054 (1996) of 26 April 1996	4384th, 28 September 2001	14-0-1	Permanent member: United States
S/2001/1199 (not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member)	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4438th, 14 December 2001	12-1-2	Permanent member: United Kingdom Elected member: Norway
1397 (2002)	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4489th, 12 March 2002	14-0-1	Elected member: Syrian Arab Republic
S/2002/712 (not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member)	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	4563rd, 30 June 2002	13-1-1	Elected member: Bulgaria ^b
1435 (2002)	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4614th, 24 September 2002	14-0-1	Permanent member: United States
S/2002/1385 (not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member)	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4681st, 20 December 2002	12-1-2	Elected members: Bulgaria, Cameroon
1454 (2002)	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4683rd, 30 December 2002	13-0-2	Permanent member: Russian Federation Elected member: Syrian Arab Republic
1487 (2003)	United Nations peacekeeping	4772nd, 12 June 2003	12-0-3	Permanent member: France Elected members: Germany, Syrian Arab Republic

<i>Resolutions or proposals</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Abstaining</i>
1497 (2003)	The situation in Liberia	4803rd, 1 August 2003	12-0-3 ^c	Permanent member: France Elected members: Germany, Mexico
1500 (2003)	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4808th, 14 August 2003	14-0-1	Elected member: Syrian Arab Republic
1506 (2003)	Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991, from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America	4820th (Part II), 12 September 2003	13-0-2	Permanent members: France, United States
S/2003/891 (not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member)	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4828th, 16 September 2003	11-1-3	Permanent member: United Kingdom Elected members: Bulgaria, Germany
S/2003/980 (not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member)	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4842nd, 14 October 2003	10-1-4	Permanent member: United Kingdom Elected members: Bulgaria, Cameroon, Germany

^a Negative vote cast by an elected member.

^b A sponsor of the draft resolution under consideration. For details, see case 1.

^c For details, see case 2 below.

Case 1

At the 4563rd meeting, held on 20 June 2002 in connection with the item entitled “The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, the Council had before it a draft resolution.¹² When it was put to the vote, one of the sponsors abstained in the vote to draw attention to “the lack of unity in the Council” on the issue under consideration.¹³ The draft resolution was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

¹² S/2002/712.

¹³ S/PV.4563, p. 4 (Bulgaria).

Case 2

At the 4803rd meeting on 1 August 2003, held in connection with the item “The situation in Liberia”, three Council members abstained in the vote on the draft resolution,¹⁴ which was adopted as resolution 1497 (2003). Speaking before and after the vote the abstaining members indicated they would have preferred a paragraph-by-paragraph vote to make clear that, with the exception of a single paragraph of the draft resolution, they fully supported the entire text along with the other Council members.¹⁵

¹⁴ S/2003/784.

¹⁵ S/PV.4803, p. 2 (Mexico); p. 4 (Germany); p. 7 (France).

2. Cases in which elected members did not participate or were absent during the voting

<i>Resolutions or proposals</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Non-participation or absence</i>
1287 (2000)	The situation in Georgia	4094th, 31 January 2000	14-0-0	Jamaica (absent) ^a
S/2001/270	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4305th, 27 March 2001	9-1-4	Ukraine (President, did not participate)
1402 (2002)	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4503rd, 30 May 2002	14-0-0	Syrian Arab Republic (absent)
1483 (2003)	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	4761st, 22 May 2003	14-0-0	Syrian Arab Republic (absent) ^b

^a The record of the meeting (S/PV.4094, p. 2) notes in square brackets, “Subsequently the Permanent Representative of Jamaica indicated that she would have voted in favour had she been present at the time of voting”.

^b The record of the meeting (S/PV.4761, p. 2) notes in a footnote, “At the 4762nd (resumed) meeting, in the afternoon of 22 May, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic took the floor in connection with this vote, explaining that the Syrian Arab Republic would have voted in favour of this resolution had it been granted the additional time before the voting that it had requested on more than one occasion. The text of his statement is in the official record of the 4762nd (resumed) meeting”. See also letter dated 22 May 2003 from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/567, annex).

Case 3

At the 4305th meeting, on 27 March 2001, held in connection with “The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question”, the Council considered a draft resolution,¹⁶ which was put to the vote but not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member. Before giving the floor to members of the Council who wished to make statements before the voting, the President said that he wished to speak in his capacity as the representative of Ukraine.

The representative noted that Ukraine had always stood for appropriate and effective actions by the Council to put an end to the increasing Israeli-Palestinian confrontation. However, without the necessary unanimity of the members of the Council, his delegation did not believe that the vote on the draft resolution would either achieve its original goal with regard to the protection of Palestinian civilians or send any positive signal to the peoples in the region. Therefore, while supporting the contents of the draft resolution and being well aware of the outcome of the voting exercise upon which the Council was about to embark, he announced that his delegation would not take part in the vote. The

¹⁶ S/2001/270.

representative hoped that there was still a chance to reach consensus on another draft resolution.¹⁷

Case 4

At the 4761st meeting, held on 22 May 2003 in connection with the item “The situation between Iraq and Kuwait”, the Council had before it a draft resolution,¹⁸ which was put to the vote and adopted as resolution 1483 (2003). The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic was absent during the vote. Subsequently, during the 4762nd meeting, he took the floor in connection with the vote, explaining that his delegation would have voted in favour of resolution 1483 (2003) had it been granted the additional time for deliberation before the voting that had been requested on more than one occasion.¹⁹ His statement was cross-referenced in the verbatim record of the 4761st meeting²⁰ and also reproduced in a letter dated 22 May 2003²¹ addressed to the President of the Council.

¹⁷ S/2003/556.

¹⁸ S/PV.4305, pp. 2-3.

¹⁹ S/PV.4762 (Resumption 1), p. 20.

²⁰ S/PV.4761, p. 2.

²¹ S/2003/567.

Part V

Adoption of resolutions and decisions without a vote

Note

Most procedural motions during the period were adopted without a vote.²²

Certain decisions of substance were also taken without a vote, as in the case of five resolutions shown in section A below. Of the remaining 232 resolutions that were adopted by a vote, 214 were adopted unanimously. A large majority of the latter consisted of texts “prepared in the course of the Council’s prior consultations”; other texts were submitted (sponsored) by one or more delegations.²³

Votes were not taken on decisions that took the form of statements by the President on behalf of the Council. Such presidential statements were issued after having been agreed upon by members of the Council during consultations. In the periods covered by previous volumes of the *Repertoire*, some statements were announced at a formal meeting of the Council, while others were simply issued in written form. In the period 2000 to 2003, all but 3 of the 151 statements were read out at a formal meeting (see section B). In the those three cases,²⁴ the President referred to the

document symbol under which the presidential statement would be issued at the meeting; however, he did not read out the text of the statement. On occasion, a presidential statement was read out immediately following the adoption of a resolution, as a complementary text.²⁵ In one instance, a presidential statement was withdrawn and reissued as a note by the President.²⁶

In other instances, Security Council decisions were recorded in notes by or letters from the President of the Council, with no reference to a vote having been taken (see sections C and D, respectively). While generally such notes and letters were simply issued in written form, the content of one note was read out by the President at a formal meeting of the Council prior to its issuance.²⁷ The contents of two letters were also agreed upon and announced at a formal meeting.²⁸

²² Exceptions were the votes on the adjournment of a meeting, on an invitation to participate and on a matter related to the conduct of business. See part II of the present chapter.

²³ On occasion, the unanimous adoption of a resolution was preceded or followed by an explanation of vote or explanations of vote by individual delegations. See for example, S/PV.4344 (with respect to resolution 1360 (2001) on the situation between Iraq and Kuwait); S/PV.4399 (with respect to resolution 1375 (2001) on the situation in Burundi); S/PV.4644 (with respect to resolution 1441 (2002) on the situation between Iraq and Kuwait); and S/PV.4840 (with respect to resolution 1510 (2003) on the situation in Afghanistan). Furthermore, at the 4644th meeting, with respect to resolution 1441 (2002) on the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, in addition to making their individual explanations of vote at the meeting, three Council members prepared a joint statement, which was annexed to a letter (S/2002/1236, letter dated 8 November 2002 from the representatives of China, France and the Russian Federation), on the interpretation of the resolution.

²⁴ S/PRST/2000/25, S/PRST/2000/28 and S/PRST/2000/29. For details, see the entries identified in the footnote in section B.

²⁵ This was the case, in accordance with the usual practice, in connection with resolutions adopted on the admission of new Members and on the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) (see S/PV.4103, S/PV.4148, S/PV.4215, S/PV.4235, S/PV.4322, S/PV.4428, S/PV.4542, S/PV.4546, S/PV.4585, S/PV.4670, S/PV.4779 and S/PV.4889). This was also the case in connection with a resolution adopted on the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), a resolution adopted on the International Tribunal for Rwanda and a resolution adopted on the situation in Côte d’Ivoire (see S/PV.4095, S/PV.4849 and S/PV.4857, respectively).

²⁶ S/PRST/2000/27 was withdrawn and reissued as S/2000/772 (note by the President) (see S/PRST/2000/27 and Corr.1).

²⁷ Note by the President dated 19 September 2003, reflecting the Council’s decision to adopt the annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly (S/2003/901), read out at the 4831st meeting.

²⁸ Letter from the President dated 19 January 2001, informing the Secretary-General of the Council’s decision to extend the deadline for nominations of judges of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia until 31 January 2001 (S/2001/63), agreed upon and announced at the 4260th meeting; and letter from the President, dated 11 October 2002, informing the Secretary-General of the Council’s decision to extend the deadline for nominations of judges of the International Tribunal for Rwanda until 15 November 2002 (S/2002/1131), agreed upon and announced at the 4621st meeting.

A. Cases in which the Security Council adopted resolutions without a vote

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Item</i>
1326 (2000)	4215th, 31 October 2000	Admission of new Members (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia)
1358 (2001)	4337th (private), 27 June 2001	The question of the recommendation for the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations
1361 (2001)	4345th, 5 July 2001	Date of election to fill a vacancy in the International Court of Justice
1414 (2002)	4542nd, 23 May 2002	Admission of new Members (Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste)
1426 (2002)	4585th, 24 July 2002	Admission of new Members (Swiss Confederation)

B. Cases in which Security Council decisions were announced in presidential statements issued after being agreed upon by the members of the Council at consultations

<i>Statement by the President</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/PRST/2000/1	4089th, 13 January 2000	Promoting peace and security: humanitarian assistance to refugees in Africa
S/PRST/2000/2	4092nd, 26 January 2000	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2000/3	4095th, 31 January 2000	The situation in the Middle East
S/PRST/2000/4	4100th, 9 February 2000	Protection of United Nations personnel, associated personnel and humanitarian personnel in conflict zones
S/PRST/2000/5	4101st, 10 February 2000	The situation in the Central African Republic
S/PRST/2000/6	4103rd, 17 February 2000	Admission of new Members (Tuvalu)
S/PRST/2000/7	4110th, 9 March 2000	Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council
S/PRST/2000/8	4112th, 15 March 2000	The question concerning Haiti
S/PRST/2000/9	4116th, 21 March 2000	The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border
S/PRST/2000/10	4119th, 23 March 2000	Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peacebuilding
S/PRST/2000/11	4122nd, 29 March 2000	The situation in Guinea-Bissau

<i>Statement by the President</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/PRST/2000/12	4125th, 7 April 2000	The situation in Afghanistan
S/PRST/2000/13	4131st, 20 April 2000	The situation in the Middle East
S/PRST/2000/14	4134th, 4 May 2000	The situation in Sierra Leone
S/PRST/2000/15	4135th, 5 May 2000	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2000/16	4137th, 11 May 2000	The situation in Georgia
S/PRST/2000/17	4141st, 12 May 2000	The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border
S/PRST/2000/18	4146th, 23 May 2000	The situation in the Middle East
S/PRST/2000/19	4148th, 31 May 2000	The situation in the Middle East
S/PRST/2000/20	4151st, 2 June 2000	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2000/21	4160th, 18 June 2000	The situation in the Middle East
S/PRST/2000/22	4167th, 29 June 2000	The situation in Somalia
S/PRST/2000/23	4169th, 13 July 2000	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina
S/PRST/2000/24	4173rd, 17 July 2000	The situation in Sierra Leone
S/PRST/2000/25 ^a	4174th, 20 July 2000	Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts
S/PRST/2000/26	4182nd, 3 August 2000	The situation in East Timor
S/PRST/2000/28 ^a	4194th, 7 September 2000	Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa
S/PRST/2000/29 ^a	4201st, 29 September 2000	The situation in Burundi
S/PRST/2000/30	4215th, 31 October 2000	Admission of new Members (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia)
S/PRST/2000/31	4216th, 3 November 2000	The situation in Sierra Leone
S/PRST/2000/32	4221st, 14 November 2000	The situation in Georgia
S/PRST/2000/33	4224th, 16 November 2000	Letter dated 10 November 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Solomon Islands to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council
S/PRST/2000/34	4230th, 21 November 2000	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Statement by the President</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/PRST/2000/35	4232nd, 22 November 2000	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/PRST/2000/36	4235th, 27 November 2000	The situation in the Middle East
S/PRST/2000/37	4239th, 29 November 2000	The situation in Guinea-Bissau
S/PRST/2000/38	4243rd, 6 December 2000	The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security
S/PRST/2000/39	4244th, 6 December 2000	The situation in East Timor
S/PRST/2000/40	4250th, 19 December 2000	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/PRST/2000/41	4252nd, 21 December 2000	The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone
S/PRST/2001/1	4255th, 11 January 2001	The situation in Somalia
S/PRST/2001/2	4262nd, 23 January 2001	The situation in the Central African Republic
S/PRST/2001/3	4270th, 31 January 2001	Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries
S/PRST/2001/4	4275th, 9 February 2001	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
S/PRST/2001/5	4278th, 20 February 2001	Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach
S/PRST/2001/6	4285th, 2 March 2001	The situation in Burundi
S/PRST/2001/7	4290th, 7 March 2001	Letter dated 4 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council
S/PRST/2001/8	4298th, 16 March 2001	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/PRST/2001/9	4300th, 21 March 2001	The situation in Georgia
S/PRST/2001/10	4302nd, 22 March 2001	Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa
S/PRST/2001/11	4304th, 22 March 2001	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina
S/PRST/2001/12	4314th, 24 April 2001	The situation in Georgia
S/PRST/2001/13	4318th, 3 May 2001	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2001/14	4320th, 15 May 2001	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
S/PRST/2001/15	4322nd, 30 May 2001	The situation in the Middle East

<i>Statement by the President</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/PRST/2001/16	4339th, 28 June 2001	The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations
S/PRST/2001/17	4341st, 29 June 2001	The situation in Burundi
S/PRST/2001/18	4347th, 17 July 2001	The situation in the Central African Republic
S/PRST/2001/19	4349th, 24 July 2001	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2001/20	4356th, 13 August 2001	The situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
S/PRST/2001/21	4362nd, 31 August 2001	Small arms
S/PRST/2001/22	4365th, 5 September 2001	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2001/23	4368th, 10 September 2001	The situation in East Timor
S/PRST/2001/24	4377th, 20 September 2001	The situation in Angola
S/PRST/2001/25	4382nd, 26 September 2001	The situation in the Central African Republic
S/PRST/2001/26	4383rd, 26 September 2001	The situation in Burundi
S/PRST/2001/27	4388th, 5 October 2001	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/PRST/2001/28	4390th, 12 October 2001	Nobel Peace Prize
S/PRST/2001/29	4396th, 24 October 2001	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2001/30	4401st, 31 October 2001	The situation in Somalia
S/PRST/2001/31	4402nd, 31 October 2001	Women and peace and security
S/PRST/2001/32	4404th, 31 October 2001	The situation in East Timor
S/PRST/2001/33	4408th, 8 November 2001	The situation in Burundi
S/PRST/2001/34	4409th, 9 November 2001	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/PRST/2001/35	4417th, 15 November 2001	The situation in Burundi
S/PRST/2001/36	4419th, 15 November 2001	The situation in Angola
S/PRST/2001/37	4428th, 27 November 2001	The situation in the Middle East
S/PRST/2001/38	4440th, 19 December 2001	Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Statement by the President</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/PRST/2001/39	4441st, 19 December 2001	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2002/1	4450th, 16 January 2002	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
S/PRST/2002/2	4465th, 31 January 2002	The situation in Africa
S/PRST/2002/3	4471st, 7 February 2002	The situation in Burundi
S/PRST/2002/4	4473rd, 13 February 2002	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/PRST/2002/5	4476th, 25 February 2002	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2002/6	4493rd, 15 March 2002	Protection of civilians in armed conflict
S/PRST/2002/7	4499th, 28 March 2002	The situation in Angola
S/PRST/2002/8	4502nd, 28 March 2002	The situation in Somalia
S/PRST/2002/9	4511th, 10 April 2002	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question
S/PRST/2002/10	4513th, 15 April 2002	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts
S/PRST/2002/11	4519th, 24 April 2002	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/PRST/2002/12	4528th, 7 May 2002	Children and armed conflict
S/PRST/2002/13	4537th, 20 May 2002	The situation in East Timor
S/PRST/2002/14	4539th, 22 May 2002	The situation in Sierra Leone
S/PRST/2002/15	4542nd, 23 May 2002	Admission of new Members (Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste)
S/PRST/2002/16	4543rd, 24 May 2002	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/PRST/2002/17	4544th, 24 May 2002	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2002/18	4546th, 30 May 2002	The situation in the Middle East
S/PRST/2002/19	4548th, 5 June 2002	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2002/20	4578th, 18 July 2002	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

<i>Statement by the President</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/PRST/2002/21	4582nd, 23 July 2002	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991
S/PRST/2002/22	4583rd, 23 July 2002	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2002/23	4585th, 24 July 2002	Admission of new Members (Swiss Confederation)
S/PRST/2002/24	4602nd, 15 August 2002	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2002/25	4607th, 11 September 2002	High-level meeting of the Security Council on the anniversary of 11 September 2001: acts of international terrorism
S/PRST/2002/26	4619th, 8 October 2002	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts
S/PRST/2002/27	4626th, 18 October 2002	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2002/28	4627th, 18 October 2002	The situation in the Central African Republic
S/PRST/2002/29	4633rd, 24 October 2002	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/PRST/2002/30	4639th, 31 October 2002	Small arms
S/PRST/2002/31	4640th, 31 October 2002	Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security
S/PRST/2002/32	4641st, 31 October 2002	Women and peace and security
S/PRST/2002/33	4661st, 12 December 2002	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina
S/PRST/2002/34	4662nd, 12 December 2002	The situation in Croatia
S/PRST/2002/35	4663rd, 12 December 2002	The situation in Somalia
S/PRST/2002/36	4665th, 13 December 2002	The situation in Liberia
S/PRST/2002/37	4670th, 17 December 2002	The situation in the Middle East
S/PRST/2002/38	4672nd, 17 December 2002	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts
S/PRST/2002/39	4674th, 18 December 2002	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Statement by the President</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Item</i>
		International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994
S/PRST/2002/40	4675th, 18 December 2002	The situation in Burundi
S/PRST/2002/41	4679th, 20 December 2002	Protection of civilians in armed conflict
S/PRST/2002/42	4680th, 20 December 2003	The situation in Côte d'Ivoire
S/PRST/2003/1	4703rd, 6 February 2003	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/PRST/2003/2	4718th, 12 March 2003	The situation in Somalia
S/PRST/2003/3	4734th, 4 April 2003	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts
S/PRST/2003/4	4749th, 2 May 2003	The situation in Burundi
S/PRST/2003/5	4753rd, 13 May 2003	The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes
S/PRST/2003/6	4756th, 16 May 2003	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2003/7	4774th, 17 June 2003	The situation in Afghanistan
S/PRST/2003/8	4776th, 19 June 2003	The situation in Guinea-Bissau
S/PRST/2003/9	4779th, 26 June 2003	The situation in the Middle East
S/PRST/2003/10	4787th, 17 July 2003	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
S/PRST/2003/11	4793rd, 25 July 2003	The situation in Côte d'Ivoire
S/PRST/2003/12	4794th, 25 July 2003	Security Council mission
S/PRST/2003/13	4811th, 20 August 2003	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts
S/PRST/2003/14	4815th, 27 August 2003	The situation in Liberia
S/PRST/2003/15	4833rd, 24 September 2003	Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role
S/PRST/2003/16	4839th, 10 October 2003	Letter dated 2 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

<i>Statement by the President</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/PRST/2003/17	4845th, 16 October 2003	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts
S/PRST/2003/18	4849th, 27 October 2003	International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994
S/PRST/2003/19	4856th, 11 November 2003	The situation in Somalia
S/PRST/2003/20	4857th, 13 November 2003	The situation in Côte d'Ivoire
S/PRST/2003/21	4863rd, 19 November 2003	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/PRST/2003/22	4864th, 19 November 2003	The importance of mine action for peacekeeping operations
S/PRST/2003/23	4865th, 20 November 2003	The situation in the Great Lakes region
S/PRST/2003/24	4868th, 20 November 2003	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/PRST/2003/25	4875th, 4 December 2003	The situation in Côte d'Ivoire
S/PRST/2003/26	4880th, 12 December 2003	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/PRST/2003/27	4882nd, 15 December 2003	Protection of civilians in armed conflict
S/PRST/2003/28	4887th, 18 December 2003	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/PRST/2003/29	4889th, 22 December 2003	The situation in the Middle East
S/PRST/2003/30	4891st, 22 December 2003	The situation in Burundi

^a Statements not read out at a formal meeting.

C. Cases in which Security Council decisions were recorded in notes by the President of the Security Council

<i>Note by the President</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Subject</i>
S/2000/27	17 January 2000	Election of chairpersons and vice-chairpersons of sanctions committees
S/2000/155	28 February 2000	Security Council working methods and procedure
S/2000/274	31 March 2000	Security Council working methods and procedure
S/2000/319	17 April 2000	General issues relating to sanctions

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Note by the President</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Subject</i>
S/2000/684	13 July 2000	Election of chairmen and vice-chairmen of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 918 (1994) concerning Rwanda and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1298 (2000) concerning the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
S/2000/772	9 August 2000	Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa
S/2000/839	31 August 2000	Consideration of the draft report of the Security Council to the General Assembly
S/2001/10	5 January 2001	Election of the chairpersons and vice-chairpersons of sanctions committees
S/2001/135	14 February 2001	Selection of the Chairman of the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations
S/2001/215	12 March 2001	Election of the chairman and vice-chairmen of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia
S/2001/363	18 April 2001	The situation in Angola
S/2001/564	6 June 2001	Election of the chairman and vice-chairmen of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 751 (1992) concerning Somalia
S/2001/640	29 June 2001	Security Council documentation and related matters
S/2001/876	18 September 2001	Consideration of the draft report of the Security Council to the General Assembly
S/2001/905	25 September 2001	No exit without strategy
S/2001/935	4 October 2001	Election of the chairperson and vice-chairpersons of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism
S/2001/1130	29 November 2001	Election of the chairman and vice-chairmen of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone
S/2002/21	4 January 2002	Election of chairpersons and vice-chairpersons of sanctions committees
S/2002/22	4 January 2002	Selection of the Chairman of the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations
S/2002/56	14 January 2002	Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations
S/2002/70	15 January 2002	Selection of the Chairman of the informal working group on general issues relating to sanctions

<i>Note by the President</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Subject</i>
S/2002/74	11 January 2002	The situation in Afghanistan
S/2002/124	28 January 2002	Election of the chairman and vice-chairmen of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone
S/2002/199	22 May 2002	Consideration of the draft report of the Security Council to the General Assembly
S/2002/207	1 March 2002	Terms of reference for the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa
S/2002/316	26 March 2002	Security Council working methods and procedures
S/2002/591	29 May 2002	Security Council working methods and procedures
S/2002/597	30 May 2002	Statement by the President of the Security Council in commemoration of Africa Day
S/2002/607	31 May 2002	The situation in Africa
S/2002/964	27 August 2002	Security Council working methods and procedure
S/2002/1068	26 September 2002	Consideration of the draft report of the Security Council to the General Assembly
S/2002/1276	22 November 2002	Security Council working methods and procedure
S/2002/1352	12 December 2002	Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa
S/2003/10	7 January 2003	Election of the chairpersons and vice-chairpersons of sanctions committees
S/2003/11	7 January 2003	Selection of the Chairman of the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa
S/2003/12	7 January 2003	Selection of the Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations
S/2003/30	8 January 2003	Election of the chairman and vice-chairmen of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism
S/2003/235	28 February 2003	Selection of the Chairman of the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa
S/2003/337	18 March 2003	Humanitarian situation in Iraq
S/2003/340	24 March 2003	Panel of Experts on the illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/2003/660	19 June 2003	Election of the chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999)

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Note by the President</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Subject</i>
S/2003/901	19 September 2003	Draft report of the Security Council to the General Assembly
S/2003/935	3 October 2003	Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism
S/2003/1183	18 December 2003	Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa
S/2003/1184	18 December 2003	Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations
S/2003/1185	18 December 2003	Informal working group on general issues relating to sanctions
S/2003/1188	22 December 2003	Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa

D. Cases in which Security Council decisions were recorded in letters from the President of the Security Council

<i>Letter</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/2000/16	12 January 2000	The situation in Georgia
S/2000/21	14 January 2000	The situation in Afghanistan
S/2000/61	27 January 2000	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2000/63	28 January 2000	The situation in East Timor
S/2000/64	28 January 2000	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2000/75	31 January 2000	The situation in Africa
S/2000/113	14 February 2000	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2000/118	14 February 2000	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina
S/2000/137	18 February 2000	The situation in East Timor
S/2000/167	1 March 2000	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2000/173	2 March 2000	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/2000/189	3 March 2000	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991
S/2000/202	10 March 2000	The situation in Guinea-Bissau
S/2000/224	17 March 2000	The situation in the Middle East
S/2000/264	24 March 2000	Security Council working methods and procedure
S/2000/286	5 April 2000	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

<i>Letter</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/2000/311	13 April 2000	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2000/320	14 April 2000	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/2000/344	24 April 2000	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/2000/359	28 April 2000	The situation in Croatia
S/2000/362	28 April 2000	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/2000/367	1 May 2000	The situation in the Central African Republic
S/2000/392	7 May 2000	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
S/2000/424	11 May 2000	The situation in Burundi
S/2000/432	15 May 2000	The situation in Cyprus
S/2000/451	18 May 2000	The situation in East Timor
S/2000/519	1 June 2000	The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border
S/2000/574	14 June 2000	Exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council concerning the India-Pakistan question
S/2000/599	19 June 2000	The situation in the Middle East
S/2000/651	5 July 2000	The situation in Burundi
S/2000/676	7 July 2000	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
S/2000/663	10 July 2000	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2000/665	10 July 2000	The situation in the Middle East
S/2000/672	10 July 2000	The situation in East Timor
S/2000/761	2 August 2000	The situation in Angola
S/2000/779	8 August 2000	The situation in the Middle East
S/2000/797	14 August 2000	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/2000/842	31 August 2000	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
S/2000/886	20 September 2000	The situation in Sierra Leone
S/2000/903	26 September 2000	The situation in Sierra Leone
S/2000/908	26 September 2000	The situation in the Great Lakes region
S/2000/910	26 September 2000	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
S/2000/942	3 October 2000	The situation in Guinea-Bissau
S/2000/944	3 October 2000	The situation in the Central African Republic

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Letter</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/2000/946	3 October 2000	The situation in Liberia
S/2000/948	3 October 2000	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
S/2000/960	5 October 2000	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2000/987	13 October 2000	The situation in Angola
S/2000/1019	24 October 2000	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
S/2000/1030	25 October 2000	The situation in East Timor
S/2000/1061	2 November 2000	The situation in Sierra Leone
S/2000/1083	10 November 2000	The situation in Africa
S/2000/1097	15 November 2000	The situation in Burundi
S/2000/1099	15 November 2000	The situation in Burundi
S/2000/1141	30 November 2000	No exit without strategy
S/2000/1168	8 December 2000	The situation in the Middle East
S/2000/1189	14 December 2000	The situation in Cyprus
S/2000/1234	22 December 2000	The situation in Sierra Leone
S/2001/48	16 January 2001	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991
S/2001/95	31 January 2001	The situation in Sierra Leone
S/2001/195	6 March 2001	Briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans
S/2001/276	27 March 2001	The situation in Cyprus
S/2001/289	28 March 2001	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/2001/328	5 April 2001	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2001/339	6 April 2001	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/2001/387	19 April 2001	The situation in Angola
S/2001/406	24 April 2001	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/2001/408	25 April 2001	The situation in the Great Lakes region
S/2001/446	7 May 2001	The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border
S/2001/482	15 May 2001	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)

<i>Letter</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/2001/500	18 May 2001	The situation in the Middle East
S/2001/510	22 May 2001	The situation in East Timor
S/2001/551	30 May 2001	International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 2004
S/2001/557	5 June 2001	The situation in Cyprus
S/2001/614	21 June 2001	Protection of civilians in armed conflict
S/2001/711	18 July 2001	Exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council concerning the India-Pakistan question
S/2001/722	23 July 2001	The situation in Sierra Leone
S/2001/761	2 August 2001	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A ^a
S/2001/767	6 August 2001	Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries: meetings of the Security Council with troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon
S/2001/782	13 August 2001	The situation in East Timor
S/2001/873	17 September 2001	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A
S/2001/936	4 October 2001	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2001/937	4 October 2001	The situation in Afghanistan
S/2001/951	8 October 2001	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/2001/961	10 October 2001	The situation in Guinea-Bissau
S/2001/973	16 October 2001	The situation in Angola
S/2001/982	18 October 2001	The situation in Liberia
S/2001/1028	31 October 2001	Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council
S/2001/1030	31 October 2001	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2001/1032	31 October 2001	The situation in Africa

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Letter</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/2001/1042	2 November 2001	Meeting of the Security Council with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A
S/2001/1065	12 November 2001	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2001/1083	16 November 2001	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2001/1096	21 November 2001	The situation in the Great Lakes region
S/2001/1098	21 November 2001	The situation in Somalia
S/2001/1129	29 November 2001	Letter dated 30 April 2001 from Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council
S/2001/1207	7 December 2001	The situation in Burundi
S/2001/1183	12 December 2001	The situation in Cyprus
S/2001/1185	12 December 2001	The situation in Cyprus
S/2001/1179	12 December 2001	The situation in Africa
S/2001/1181	12 December 2001	The situation in Guinea-Bissau
S/2001/1203	14 December 2001	Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council
S/2002/24	4 January 2002	The situation in Liberia
S/2002/106	23 January 2002	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/2002/129	31 January 2002	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
S/2002/157	8 February 2002	The situation in Afghanistan
S/2002/177	19 February 2002	The situation in Somalia
S/2002/285	18 March 2002	The situation in Cyprus
S/2002/295	19 March 2002	Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council
S/2002/327	28 March 2002	The situation in the Middle East
S/2002/349	4 April 2002	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2002/351	4 April 2002	The situation in East Timor
S/2002/412	12 April 2002	The situation in Angola
S/2002/430	17 April 2002	The situation in the Great Lakes region
S/2002/502	1 May 2002	The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border

<i>Letter</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/2002/530	7 May 2002	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina
S/2002/594	29 May 2002	Exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council concerning the India-Pakistan question
S/2002/644	7 June 2002	The situation in Georgia
S/2002/715	28 June 2002	The situation in Angola
S/2002/720	2 July 2002	The situation in Burundi
S/2002/763	12 July 2002	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
S/2002/767	16 July 2002	The situation concerning Western Sahara
S/2002/769	16 July 2002	The situation in Angola
S/2002/771	15 July 2002	Letter dated 15 July 2002 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General
S/2002/773	16 July 2002	The situation in the Great Lakes region
S/2002/840	26 July 2002	The situation in East Timor
S/2002/917	9 August 2002	The situation in Guinea-Bissau
S/2002/930	12 August 2002	The situation in the Central African Republic
S/2002/947	21 August 2002	Exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council concerning the India-Pakistan question
S/2002/1000	6 September 2002	Security Council documentation and procedure
S/2002/1027	12 September 2002	The situation in Angola
S/2002/1041	18 September 2002	The situation in Liberia
S/2002/1109	3 October 2002	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2002/1121	8 October 2002	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
S/2002/1130	9 October 2002	The situation in Liberia
S/2002/1131	11 October 2002	International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 2004
S/2002/1175	18 October 2002	The situation in the Great Lakes region
S/2002/1271	21 November 2002	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Letter</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/2002/1305	29 November 2002	The situation in Liberia
S/2002/1382	19 December 2002	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2002/1380	19 December 2002	Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council
S/2002/1403	20 December 2002	The situation in Cyprus
S/2003/28	9 January 2003	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2003/67	20 January 2003	The situation in Africa
S/2003/126	31 January 2003	The situation in Africa
S/2003/169	12 February 2003	The situation Côte d'Ivoire
S/2003/193	18 February 2003	The situation concerning Western Sahara
S/2003/241	3 March 2003	The situation in Cyprus
S/2003/285	7 March 2003	Communication concerning standby arrangements for peacekeeping
S/2003/382	28 March 2003	International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 2004
S/2003/469	21 April 2003	The situation in Liberia
S/2003/504	23 April 2003	The situation in Afghanistan
S/2003/550	30 April 2003	International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 2004
S/2003/525	5 May 2003	Security Council mission
S/2003/543	13 May 2003	The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border
S/2003/558	21 May 2003	Security Council mission
S/2003/563	22 May 2003	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

<i>Letter</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/2003/604	23 May 2003	International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 2004
S/2003/571	27 May 2003	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2003/607	3 June 2003	The situation in Côte d'Ivoire
S/2003/664	23 June 2003	The situation in Liberia
S/2003/690	2 July 2003	International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 2004
S/2003/696	10 July 2003	The situation in Liberia
S/2003/717	17 July 2003	The situation in East Timor ^b
S/2003/727	18 July 2003	The situation in the Middle East
S/2003/762	28 July 2003	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
S/2003/797	8 August 2003	The situation concerning Western Sahara
S/2003/831	22 August 2003	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2003/883	29 August 2003	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991
S/2003/890	11 September 2003	The situation in the Central African Republic
S/2003/921	29 September 2003	The situation in Burundi
S/2003/922	30 September 2003	The situation in Afghanistan
S/2003/927	1 October 2003	The situation in Liberia
S/2003/930	1 October 2003	The situation in Afghanistan
S/2003/1052	28 October 2003	The situation in Somalia
S/2003/1055	31 October 2003	Women and peace and security
S/2003/1067	4 November 2003	The situation in the Great Lakes region

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Letter</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Item</i>
S/2003/1088	10 November 2003	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991
S/2003/1093	13 November 2003	The situation in Somalia
S/2003/1097	14 November 2003	The situation in Guinea-Bissau
S/2003/1109	20 November 2003	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2003/1111	20 November 2003	The situation between Iraq and Kuwait
S/2003/1139	21 November 2003	The situation in Africa
S/2003/1143	3 December 2003	The situation in Sierra Leone
S/2003/1199	23 December 2003	Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council
S/2003/1215	30 December 2003	The situation in Cyprus

^a In accordance with a note by the President of the Security Council dated 27 August 2002 (S/2002/964), the wording of the items concerning "Meeting of the Security Council with troop-contributing countries... pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section A" was revised to read "Meeting of the Security Council with troop-contributing countries... pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B".

^b As from the 4646th meeting of the Security Council, held on 14 November 2002, the item "The situation in East Timor" was revised to read "The situation in Timor-Leste".

Chapter V

Subsidiary organs of the Security Council

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introductory note	165
Part I. Subsidiary organs of the Security Council established or continuing during the period 2000-2003.	166
A. Standing committees and ad hoc committees	166
B. Security Council committees	166
C. Informal and ad hoc working groups	182
D. Investigative bodies	183
E. Peacekeeping operations and political missions	184
F. Ad hoc commissions and ad hoc international tribunals	206
Part II. Subsidiary organs of the Security Council whose mandate was completed or terminated during the period 2000-2003	210
Part III. Subsidiary organs of the Security Council proposed but not established	212

Introductory note

The present chapter covers procedures of the Security Council relating to the establishment and control of subsidiary organs deemed necessary for the performance of its functions under the Charter of the United Nations. The Council's power to establish subsidiary organs is set out in Article 29 of the Charter and reflected in rule 28 of its provisional rules of procedure.

Article 29

The Security Council may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

Rule 28

The Security Council may appoint a commission or committee or a rapporteur for a specified question.

During the period 2000 to 2003, the Council mandated the establishment of three new peacekeeping operations and five new political missions, and established four new committees to oversee the implementation of measures adopted pursuant to Article 41. Following the terrorist attacks on the United States on 11 September 2001, the Council further decided to establish a committee concerning counter-terrorism to monitor the measures of all States Members of the United Nations against terrorism. In addition, the Council set up four new informal and ad hoc working groups to make recommendations regarding substantive and procedural matters before it.

Part I of this chapter considers these new organs, together with those established prior to 2000 and continuing during part or all of the period under review. The organs are divided into six main categories, reflecting their main character or functions: (a) standing committees and ad hoc committees; (b) committees to oversee the implementation of measures adopted pursuant to Article 41 and other committees; (c) informal and ad hoc working groups; (d) investigative bodies; (e) peacekeeping operations and political missions; and (f) ad hoc international tribunals. Seven peacekeeping and three political missions were terminated during the period under review, as were six Security Council committees. This is reflected in part II. Part III describes two instances in which a subsidiary organ was formally proposed but not established.

Part I

Subsidiary organs of the Security Council established or continuing during the period 2000-2003

A. Standing committees and ad hoc committees

During the period from 2000 to 2003, the Committee of Experts on Rules of Procedure and the Committee on Council Meetings away from Headquarters continued to exist but did not meet. The Committee on the Admission of New Members was asked to consider the applications for admission to membership in the United Nations of four States,¹ referred to it by the Council under rule 59 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.² The Committee of Experts established at the 1506th meeting to study the question of associate membership continued to exist but did not meet.

Other ad hoc subsidiary organs established prior to 2000 that continued to exist during the period under review included the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979), concerning the situation in the occupied Arab territories; and the Ad Hoc Committee established under Security Council resolution 507 (1982), concerning the Seychelles. There was no activity during the period under review on the part of either body.

B. Security Council Committees

Note

During the period under review, the Council established several committees to monitor the implementation of measures adopted pursuant to Chapter VII³ and extended the mandate of previously established ones. The first part of this section deals with Security Council committees monitoring specific

¹ The Democratic Republic of East-Timor, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Swiss Confederation and Tuvalu.

² The recommendations made by the Committee and the Council concerning admissions are considered in chapter VII.

³ The primary responsibility for the implementation of such measures rests with Member States.

sanctions measures. The second part deals with other Security Council Committees with a broader mandate.

Security Council committees monitoring specific sanctions measures

Between 2000 and 2003, the Security Council established four new committees to supervise the implementation of measures adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter in connection with Eritrea and Ethiopia,⁴ Liberia⁵ and Iraq.⁶ Two resolutions that newly imposed sanctions in the year 2000 contained time limit provisions, which had not been the case in the past.⁷ In addition, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish a panel of experts on the illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁸

During the same period, the Council oversaw a total of thirteen committees, including Committees that had been established in prior periods, and terminated the following seven: Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait; Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 748 (1992) concerning the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola; Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 985 (1995) concerning Liberia; Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001)

⁴ Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1298 (2000) concerning the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia.

⁵ Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia; and Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1521 (2003) concerning Liberia.

⁶ Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1518 (2003).

⁷ Arms embargo imposed against Eritrea and Ethiopia by resolution 1298 (2000) of 17 May 2000; and diamond embargo imposed against Sierra Leone by resolution 1306 (2000) of 5 July 2000.

⁸ S/PRST/2000/20.

concerning Liberia; Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1160 (1998); and Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1298 (2000) concerning the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia. In two instances, the work of a Security Council Committee extended beyond the formal expiration of its mandate.⁹

In addition, on several occasions, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish monitoring bodies, in the form of panels or committees of experts and monitoring groups or mechanisms, in order to assist the work of committees or to look into the question of the illegal exploitation of natural resources.¹⁰ The first of these monitoring bodies was established in the year 2000.¹¹

During the period under review, the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations of the Charter, established all committees to undertake tasks related to sanctions measures in accordance with rule 28 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council. The tasks that committees were mandated to undertake during the period under review included the following: (a) seeking information

regarding the implementation of measures imposed under Article 41; (b) considering information concerning the violations of the measures and recommending appropriate measures in response thereto; (c) reporting to the Council on the information regarding alleged violations; (d) giving consideration to and deciding upon requests for exemptions from the measures; (e) examining reports submitted to them, including those from monitoring bodies; (f) identifying individuals and entities subject to the measures and maintaining a corresponding list; and (g) making recommendations to the Council as to how to improve the effectiveness of the measures.

The Committees consisted of all fifteen members of the Council. They held their meetings in private sessions, unless the Committee itself decided otherwise, and reached their decisions by consensus. The Bureaux of the Committees were elected by the Council annually and announced through notes by the President of the Council.¹²

In accordance with the transparency measures outlined by the President of the Council in his note of 29 March 1995,¹³ Committees continued to submit their annual reports to the Council. In addition, since 2002, the Council has held public meetings in which it heard briefings by Chairpersons of several Committees on their activities.¹⁴ In some instances, the Council

⁹ In the first instance, after the arms embargo against Eritrea and Ethiopia expired on 16 May 2001, pursuant to S/PRST/2001/14, owing to a possible violation, which had occurred while the embargo was still in effect, the former Chairman of the Committee was authorized by a letter from the President of the Council (not published) to continue to work with the former members of the Committee to conclude the work on the outstanding case and report thereon (report not published). In the second instance, after dissolving Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1160 (1998), the former Chairperson submitted, upon request by the President of the Council (S/2001/931), a report covering major activities of the Committee from 1 January to 10 September 2001.

¹⁰ Monitoring bodies were established in connection with the measures imposed against Liberia, Sierra Leone and Somalia; against the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA); and against Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities. In the case of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, no measures against the Democratic Republic of the Congo were imposed at the establishment of the Panel, nor did a Council committee concerning that country exist.

¹¹ By resolution 1295 (2000) of 18 April 2000, the Council established a monitoring mechanism for the implementation of sanctions against UNITA.

¹² For the bureaux of the committees during the period under review, see S/2000/27, S/2000/684, S/2001/10, S/2001/215, S/2001/564, S/2002/21, S/2002/124 and S/2003/10.

¹³ S/1995/234.

¹⁴ At the 4673rd meeting on 18 December 2002: briefings by the Chairpersons of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia; and at the 4888th meeting on 22 December 2003: briefings by Chairpersons of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 751 (1992) concerning Somalia, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 918 (1994) concerning Rwanda and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone.

decided to send a mission of a given Committee to the relevant region to demonstrate the Council's determination to give full effect to the measures imposed. In addition, in April 2000, the Council established, with a view to improving the effectiveness of United Nations sanctions, the Informal Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions.¹⁵

In this section, all thirteen Security Council Committees are dealt with in the order of their establishment, while interlinked Committees are dealt with jointly. Monitoring bodies whose work is closely linked with that of the Committees are featured with the relevant Committees under the subheading of "Monitoring". For clarification purposes only and when required, summarized descriptions of the mandatory measures, based on their nature, are added, including, for example, such measures as an arms embargo, a freeze on assets, travel restrictions, a ban on the import of diamonds, a petroleum embargo, restriction of air traffic, restrictions on diplomatic representation, and prohibitions on round logs and timber products. The above-mentioned descriptions are not intended to serve as legal definitions of measures. The measures imposed by the Council pursuant to Article 41 are described in chapter XI of this volume.

1. Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait

The Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait continued to exercise its responsibility for monitoring the measures imposed by resolution 687 (1991), and for supervising the implementation of the oil-for-food programme¹⁶ established by resolution 986 (1995).

Mandate implementation

During the period under review, the oil-for-food programme was continuously renewed by a series of

¹⁵ For details of the mandate of the Working Group, see section C, and the Statement by the Chairman of the Working Group (S/2003/1197), in which he reported on their work during the period 2002-2003.

¹⁶ Under the oil-for-food programme, revenues generated from oil sales could be used to fund humanitarian and certain other expenses incurred in connection with Iraq.

resolutions.¹⁷ By resolution 1409 (2002) of 14 May 2002, the Council significantly changed the modalities of the oil-for-food programme, easing the supply of humanitarian goods to Iraq, while strengthening control over dual-use items. By resolution 1472 (2003) of 28 March 2003, the Council recognized that, in view of the exceptional military and security circumstances which prevailed in Iraq at that time, technical and temporary adjustments should be made to the oil-for-food programme so as to ensure the continued provision of humanitarian relief in Iraq and directed the Committee to closely monitor the implementation of some of the main provisions of that resolution.¹⁸ Those measures were extended by resolution 1476 (2003) of 24 April 2003 and resolution 1483 (2003) of 22 May 2003. By resolution 1483 (2003), the Council decided that the Committee would identify the individuals and entities affiliated with the previous Government of Iraq and the former Iraq regime, whose funds or other financial assets or economic resources Member States were obligated to freeze pursuant to that resolution.¹⁹

Monitoring and reporting

The Committee submitted four annual reports on its activities²⁰ during the period under review, including a report on the implementation of resolution 986 (1995) and humanitarian exemptions under resolution 661 (1990). The Committee also submitted a number of reports²¹ at 90-day intervals on the implementation of the embargo imposed against Iraq by the relevant resolutions, and reported to the Council on seven occasions²² on the implementation of the oil-for-food programme.

Termination of mandate

By resolution 1483 (2003) of 22 May 2003, the Council lifted the comprehensive measures against

¹⁷ Resolutions 1302 (2000), 1330 (2000), 1352 (2001), 1360 (2001), 1382 (2001), 1409 (2002), 1443 (2002), 1447 (2002), 1454 (2002) and 1483 (2003).

¹⁸ Resolution 1472 (2003), para. 9.

¹⁹ Resolution 1483 (2003), para. 23.

²⁰ S/2000/133, S/2001/738, S/2002/647 and S/2003/300.

²¹ S/2000/72, S/2000/365, S/2000/748, S/2000/1033, S/2001/72, S/2001/400, S/2001/721, S/2001/1003, S/2002/84, S/2002/476, S/2002/802, S/2002/1167, S/2003/61, S/2003/507, S/2003/714 and S/2003/1032.

²² S/2000/242, S/2000/536, S/2001/321, S/2001/842, S/2001/1341, S/2002/1261 and S/2003/331.

Iraq, keeping in place only the arms embargo, and terminated the mandate of the Committee effective 21 November 2003.

2. Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1518 (2003)

Establishment and mandate

By resolution 1518 (2003) of 24 November 2003, the Security Council established a Committee to continue to identify, in accordance with paragraphs 19 and 23 of resolution 1483 (2003), individuals and entities referred to in paragraph 19 of that resolution,²³ including by updating the list of individuals and entities identified by the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990), and to report on its work to the Council. By that resolution, the Council further decided to adopt the guidelines and definitions for the Committee's work, previously agreed by the Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990), while permitting the Committee to amend those guidelines and definitions in the light of further considerations. The Council also decided to keep the mandate of the Committee under review and to consider the possible authorization of the additional task of observing Member States' fulfilment of their obligations under resolution 1483 (2000).²⁴

3. Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 748 (1992) concerning the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

Mandate implementation Monitoring and reporting

The Committee established pursuant to resolution 748 (1992) concerning the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya did not meet during the period under review, nor did it submit any reports to the Council.

Termination of mandate

By resolution 1506 (2003) of 12 September 2003, the Council decided to lift, with immediate effect, the

²³ The Committee was established as the successor body to the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990) concerning Iraq and Kuwait. It was mandated to continue to identify senior officials of the former Iraqi regime and their immediate family members, including entities owned or controlled by them or by persons acting on their behalf.

²⁴ Resolution 1518 (2003), para. 3.

measures imposed by resolutions 748 (1992) and 883 (1993)²⁵ and dissolved the Committee.

4. Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 751 (1992) concerning Somalia

During the period under review, the Committee established pursuant to resolution 751 (1992) concerning Somalia continued to monitor the arms embargo imposed by resolution 733 (1992).

Mandate implementation

By resolution 1356 (2001) of 19 June 2001, the Council requested the Committee to give consideration to and decide upon requests for exemptions to the arms embargo imposed by resolution 733 (1992).²⁶

By resolution 1474 (2003) of 8 April 2003, the Council decided to send a mission of the Committee to the region, led by its Chairman, to demonstrate the Council's determination to give full effect to the arms embargo.²⁷ The mission visited the region between 11 and 21 November 2003.²⁸

Monitoring and reporting

The Committee submitted four annual reports²⁹ covering the period under review, which, inter alia, dealt with its activities as well as those of the panels of experts. In particular, the Committee reported that, while in the past it had relied on the cooperation of States and organizations in a position to provide information on violations of the arms embargo, its level of activities and engagement increased markedly in 2002 and 2003, mainly as a result of the increased attention given to the arms embargo against Somalia by the Council, the Council's decision to establish a panel

²⁵ Resolution 1506 (2003), para. 1.

²⁶ Resolution 1356 (2001), paras. 2-4.

²⁷ By a presidential statement of 11 November 2003 (S/PRST/2003/19), the Council welcomed the forthcoming mission of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 751 (1992) to Somalia and States in the region from 11 to 21 November 2003 as a step towards giving full effect to the arms embargo and called on relevant States and organizations to cooperate with the mission.

²⁸ S/2003/1216, para. 14.

²⁹ S/2000/1226, S/2001/1259, S/2002/1430 and S/2003/1216.

of experts and later a monitoring group, and the Committee's mission to the region.³⁰

By resolution 1425 (2002) of 22 July 2002, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish a panel of experts consisting of three members to be based in Nairobi for a period of six months, to generate independent information on violations of the arms embargo and as a step towards giving effect to and strengthening the embargo.³¹ Pursuant to that resolution, the Secretary-General established a three-member panel on 22 August 2002.³² By a letter dated 25 March 2003 addressed to the President,³³ the Chairman of the Committee transmitted the report of the Panel of Experts on Somalia. By resolution 1474 (2003) of 8 April 2003, the Council decided to re-establish the Panel of Experts for a period of six months to further investigate violations of the arms embargo.³⁴ The Secretary-General appointed four members of the Panel of Experts on 30 April 2003.³⁵ Its report³⁶ of 4 November 2003 was transmitted to the Council through the Committee.

By resolution 1519 (2003) of 16 December 2003, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish a monitoring group, composed of up to four experts, for a period of six months, to be based in Nairobi, with a mandate focused on the ongoing arms embargo violations, including transfers of ammunition, single use weapons and small arms.³⁷

5. Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola

The Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) continued to fulfil, during the period under review, its mandate to monitor the measures imposed against the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA) by that resolution and modified by resolutions 1127 (1997) and 1173 (1998), ranging from arms and petroleum embargoes, travel restrictions, a ban on the import of diamonds and the freezing of assets to restrictions on diplomatic representation, until its dissolution on 9 December 2002.

Mandate implementation Monitoring and reporting

The Committee submitted three annual reports³⁸ during the period under review on its activities and those of the Monitoring Mechanism, and on the implementation of resolution 1295 (2000).

The Panel of Experts established pursuant to resolution 1237 (1999)³⁹ submitted its final report⁴⁰ on 10 March 2000.

By resolution 1295 (2000) of 18 April 2000, the Council requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Committee, to establish a monitoring mechanism composed of up to five experts, to collect additional relevant information and investigate relevant leads relating to allegations of violations of resolutions 864 (1993), 1127 (1997) and 1173 (1998). Pursuant to that resolution, on 11 July 2000, the Secretary-General appointed five experts.⁴¹ By a series of resolutions,⁴² the Council extended the mandate of the monitoring mechanism on five more occasions for periods of two to six months. The Secretary-General reappointed the members of the monitoring mechanism accordingly.⁴³ Pursuant to the

³⁰ S/2002/1430, para. 20, and S/2003/1216, para. 21.

³¹ Prior to the establishment of the Panel, by resolution 1407 (2002) of 3 May 2002, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish a two-member team of experts, for a period of 30 days, in preparation for a panel of experts, to provide the Committee with an action plan detailing the resources and expertise that the panel of experts would require to be able to generate independent information on violations and for improving the enforcement of the weapons and military equipment embargo established by paragraph 5 of resolution 733 (1992). The report of the team of experts (S/2002/722) was transmitted to the Council on 3 July 2002.

³² S/2002/951.

³³ S/2003/223.

³⁴ For details of the Panel's mandate, see resolution 1474 (2003), para. 3.

³⁵ S/2003/515.

³⁶ S/2003/1035.

³⁷ Resolution 1519 (2003), para. 2.

³⁸ S/2000/1255, S/2002/243 and S/2002/1413.

³⁹ The Panel of Experts was mandated to trace violations regarding arms, petroleum, representation, travel and diamonds, as well as the movement of UNITA funds.

⁴⁰ S/2000/203.

⁴¹ S/2000/677.

⁴² Resolutions 1336 (2001), 1348 (2001), 1374 (2001), 1404 (2002) and 1439 (2002).

⁴³ Pursuant to resolution 1374 (2001), the Secretary-General appointed four experts on 24 October 2001 (S/2001/1109); pursuant to resolution 1404 (2002), by which the Council extended the Mechanism's mandate,

relevant resolutions,⁴⁴ the monitoring mechanism submitted seven reports⁴⁵ to the Council through the Committee.

Termination of mandate

By resolution 1448 (2002) of 9 December 2002, the Council, welcoming the steps taken in connection with the Angolan peace process, terminated the measures that it had imposed against UNITA⁴⁶ and dissolved the Committee.

6. Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 918 (1994) concerning Rwanda

The Committee established pursuant to resolution 918 (1994) concerning Rwanda continued to fulfil its mandate to monitor the arms embargo that was imposed by that resolution and modified by resolution 1011 (1995).⁴⁷

Mandate implementation Monitoring and reporting

The Committee submitted, during the period under review, four annual reports.⁴⁸ In those reports, the Committee observed that it did not have any specific monitoring mechanism to ensure the effective

the Secretary-General, on 26 April 2002, reappointed the four members of the Mechanism (S/2002/487); pursuant to resolution 1439 (2002), on 25 October 2002, the Secretary-General reappointed two members (S/2002/1204).

⁴⁴ Resolutions 1295 (2000), 1336 (2001), 1348 (2001), 1374 (2001), 1404 (2002), and 1439 (2002).

⁴⁵ S/2000/1026; S/2000/1225 and Corr.1 and 2; S/2001/363; S/2001/966; S/2002/486; S/2002/1119; and S/2002/1339.

⁴⁶ Resolution 1448 (2002), para. 2.

⁴⁷ See the twelfth Supplement to the *Repertoire*, chap. V, sect. D, for additional information concerning the establishment and mandate of the Committee. While the restrictions imposed by paragraph 13 of resolution 918 (1994) on the sale or supply of arms and related materiel to the Government of Rwanda were terminated on 1 September 1996, in accordance with paragraph 8 of resolution 1011 (1995), with a view to preventing the sale and supply of arms and related materiel to non-governmental forces for use in Rwanda, all States were required to continue to implement those restrictions on the sale or supply of such items other than to the Government of Rwanda.

⁴⁸ S/2000/1227; S/2002/49; S/2002/1406; and S/2004/134.

implementation of the arms embargo and that it relied solely on the cooperation of States and organizations in a position to provide pertinent information. The Committee further reported that no violations of the arms embargo were brought to its attention.⁴⁹

7. Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone

During the period under review, the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone continued to fulfil its mandate to monitor the measures imposed under that resolution, including the arms embargo, travel restrictions and the diamond ban on the direct or indirect import of rough diamonds.⁵⁰

Mandate implementation

By resolution 1306 (2000) of 5 July 2000, the Council decided that the Committee should undertake the following tasks: (a) to seek from all States further information regarding the action taken by them with a view to implementing effectively the ban on the import of diamonds; (b) to consider information brought to its attention concerning violations of the measures, and make periodic reports to the Council on information submitted to it regarding alleged violations of the diamond ban, identifying where possible persons or entities, including vessels, reported to be engaged in such violations; (c) to promulgate such guidelines as might be necessary to facilitate the implementation of the ban; and (d) to continue its cooperation with other relevant sanctions committees, in particular those established pursuant to resolution 985 (1995) of 13 April 1995 concerning the situation in Liberia and resolution 864 (1993) of 15 September 1993 concerning the situation in Angola.

By resolution 1306 (2000), the Council also requested the Committee (a) to hold an exploratory hearing in New York no later than 31 July 2000 to assess the role of diamonds in the Sierra Leone conflict and the link between trade in Sierra Leone diamonds and trade in arms and related materiel in violation of resolution 1171 (1998) and report on the hearing to the

⁴⁹ S/2000/1227, para. 5; S/2002/49, para. 5; S/2002/1406, para. 7; S/2004/134, para. 6.

⁵⁰ The ban, which was renewed by resolution 1446 (2002), expired on 4 June 2003.

Council; (b) to strengthen existing contacts with regional organizations, in particular the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and international organizations, including Interpol, with a view to identifying ways to improve effective implementation of the measures prohibiting the sale and supply of arms and materiel imposed by resolution 1171 (1998);⁵¹ and (c) to make information it considered relevant publicly available through appropriate media.⁵² By the same resolution, the Council requested the Government of Sierra Leone to notify the Committee of the details of a Certificate of Origin regime when it was fully in operation.⁵³ By a letter dated 30 March 2001 addressed to the President of the Council,⁵⁴ the Chairman of the Committee informed the Council that the new certificate of origin for the trade in Sierra Leone diamonds was effectively in operation.

Monitoring and reporting

The Committee submitted to the Council four annual reports⁵⁵ during the period under review on its activities, including its exploratory hearing, and on violations and alleged violations of the sanctions regime. In accordance with paragraph 4 of resolution 1171 (1998), the Committee reported regularly to the Council on notifications it had received concerning the movement of arms and related materiel into Sierra Leone.⁵⁶ In its annual reports during the period under review, the Committee continued to urge all States and organizations in a position to provide it with pertinent information to do so, in the absence of a specific monitoring mechanism to ensure the effective implementation of the sanctions regime.⁵⁷

In addition to the above-mentioned measures, by resolution 1306 (2000), the Council requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Committee, to establish a five-member panel of experts for an initial period of four months. The Panel of Experts

was, inter alia, to collect information on possible violations of the arms embargo imposed by resolution 1171 (1998) and the link between trade in diamonds and trade in arms and related materiel and to consider the adequacy of air traffic control systems in the region.⁵⁸ The Secretary-General established the Panel of Experts on 2 August 2000.⁵⁹ The report of the Panel of Experts was transmitted to the Council, through the Committee, in a note by the President dated 20 December 2000.⁶⁰

8. Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1160 (1998)

The Committee established pursuant to resolution 1160 (1998) continued to fulfil its mandate to monitor the implementation of the arms embargo imposed by that resolution against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including Kosovo.

Mandate implementation Monitoring and reporting

The Committee submitted two reports⁶¹ to the Council during the period under review, touching upon, inter alia, the status of the implementation of resolution 1160 (1998), cooperation with regional organizations, violations and allegations of violations. In particular, in the report covering its work in 2000, the Committee observed that the work continued to be affected by the absence of an effective comprehensive monitoring mechanism to ensure the effective implementation of the arms embargo and other prohibitions and by the lack of information on possible violations, and that the limited information provided by the Secretariat, from public sources on possible violations, had not allowed it to discharge its mandate fully.⁶²

Termination of mandate

The Secretary-General, in a letter dated 6 September 2001, addressed to the President of the Council,⁶³ informed the Council that he believed that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had complied with the provisions of resolution 1160 (1998) and that,

⁵¹ Resolution 1306 (2000), para. 22.

⁵² *Ibid.*, para. 23.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, para. 4.

⁵⁴ S/2001/300.

⁵⁵ S/2000/1238, S/2002/50, S/2002/1414 and S/2004/166.

⁵⁶ S/2000/659, S/2000/660, S/2000/730, S/2000/739, S/2000/1127, S/2001/105, S/2001/126, S/2001/261, S/2001/492, S/2001/493, S/2001/664, S/2001/718 and S/2002/498.

⁵⁷ S/2000/1238, para. 26; S/2002/50, para. 20; S/2002/1414, para. 24; and S/2004/166, para. 20.

⁵⁸ For a full description of the mandate of the Panel of Experts, see resolution 1306 (2000), para. 19.

⁵⁹ S/2000/756.

⁶⁰ S/2000/1195.

⁶¹ S/2001/102 (2001) and S/2001/931.

⁶² S/2001/102, para. 17.

⁶³ S/2001/849.

therefore, the Council might wish to reconsider the prohibitions imposed by that resolution. By resolution 1367 (2001) of 10 September 2001, the Council, noting with satisfaction that the conditions listed in paragraph 16 of resolution 1160 (1998) had been satisfied, decided to terminate the prohibitions established by paragraph 8 of resolution 1160 (1998) and dissolve the Committee.

9. Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities

The Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) continued to fulfil its mandate to monitor the implementation of the measures imposed against Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities.⁶⁴

Mandate implementation

By resolution 1333 (2000) of 19 December 2000, the Council decided to impose an arms embargo, and restrictions on diplomatic representation. By that resolution, the Committee was requested to fulfil its mandate by undertaking the following tasks in addition to those set out in resolution 1267 (1999): (a) to establish and maintain updated lists based on information provided by States, regional, and international organizations of all points of entry and landing areas for aircraft within the territory of Afghanistan under control by the Taliban and to notify Member States of the contents of such lists; (b) to establish and maintain updated lists, based on information provided by States and regional organizations, of individuals and entities designated as being associated with Osama bin Laden, in accordance with the provision in the resolution; (c) to give consideration to, and decide upon, requests for the exceptions set out in the resolution; (d) to establish and maintain an updated list of approved organizations and governmental relief agencies, which were providing humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan, in accordance

⁶⁴ On 2 September 2003, the Committee changed its name from “Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999)” to “Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities” (see S/2004/281, para. 9).

with the resolution; (e) to make relevant information regarding implementation of those measures publicly available through appropriate media; (f) to consider, where and when appropriate, a visit to countries in the region by the Chairman of the Committee and such other members as might be required to enhance the full and effective implementation of the measures imposed by resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000) with a view to urging States to comply with relevant Council resolutions; and (g) to make periodic reports to the Council on information submitted to it regarding this resolution and resolution 1267 (1999), including possible violations of the measures reported to the Committee and recommendations for strengthening the effectiveness of those measures.⁶⁵

By resolution 1455 (2003) of 17 January 2003, the Council requested the following: (a) that the Chairman of the Committee report orally to the Council at least every 90 days on the overall work of the Committee and the Monitoring Group established pursuant to paragraph 4 (a) of resolution 1363 (2001); (b) that the Committee consider a visit to selected countries by the Chairman of the Committee and/or its members to enhance the full and effective implementation of the measures, with a view to encouraging States to implement all relevant Council resolutions; (c) that the Committee provide the Council by 1 August 2003 and by 15 December 2003 with detailed oral assessments of Member State implementation of the measures imposed by the same resolution, with a view to recommending further measures for Council consideration to improve the measures; and (d) that the Committee prepare and then circulate a written assessment to the Council of actions taken by States to implement the measures imposed by the same resolution.⁶⁶

Monitoring and reporting

The Committee submitted three annual reports⁶⁷ covering the period under review, which informed the Council of activities of the Committee, the Committee of Experts established pursuant to resolution 1333 (2000), and the Monitoring Group, as well as responses from Member States on their implementation of

⁶⁵ Resolution 1333 (2000), paras. 5, 6, 7, 8 (c), 11, 12 and 16.

⁶⁶ Resolution 1455 (2003), paras. 1, 9, 11, 14 and 15.

⁶⁷ S/2000/1254, S/2002/101 and S/2002/1423.

resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000), and humanitarian implications of the measures.

By resolution 1333 (2000), the Council requested the Secretary-General to appoint a committee of experts, for a period of 60 days, to make recommendations to it regarding possible means for monitoring the arms embargo and the closure of terrorist training camps demanded by that resolution.⁶⁸ Pursuant to that resolution, the Secretary-General established the five-member Committee of Experts on 8 March 2001.⁶⁹ The Committee of Experts submitted its report⁷⁰ of 21 May 2001 through the Secretary-General to the Council.

By resolution 1363 (2001) of 30 July 2001, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish, in consultation with the Committee, a mechanism for a period of 12 months (a) to monitor the implementation of the measures imposed by resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000); (b) to offer assistance to States bordering the territory of Afghanistan under Taliban control and other States in order to increase their capacity regarding the implementation of the measures imposed by the aforementioned resolutions; and (c) to collate, assess, verify wherever possible, report and make recommendations on information regarding violations of the measures imposed by the above resolutions.⁷¹ The Secretary-General appointed five

members of the Monitoring Group on 18 September 2001.⁷² By resolution 1390 (2002) of 28 January 2002, the Council requested the Secretary-General to assign the Monitoring Group to monitor, for a period of 12 months, the implementation of the measures, including the freezing of assets, travel restrictions and an arms embargo, imposed and strengthened by the same resolution.⁷³ In accordance with its mandate under resolutions 1363 (2001) and 1390 (2002), the Monitoring Group submitted four reports⁷⁴ to the Council through the Committee.

By resolution 1455 (2003) of 17 January 2003, the Council requested the Secretary-General to reappoint five experts to monitor for an additional period of 12 months the implementation of the measures and to follow up on relevant leads relating to any incomplete implementation of those measures.⁷⁵ The Monitoring Group was requested to submit two written reports to the Committee, and to brief the Committee when it so requested. The Secretary-General appointed five members of the Monitoring Group on 3 February 2003.⁷⁶ The Monitoring Group submitted its reports⁷⁷ to the Council through the Committee on two occasions.

10. Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1298 (2000) concerning the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia

Establishment and mandate

By resolution 1298 (2000) of 17 May 2000, the Security Council established a Committee to monitor the implementation of the arms embargo imposed by the same resolution.

The Committee was mandated to undertake the following tasks, and to report on its work to the Council with its observations and recommendations: (a) to seek from all States further information regarding the action taken by them with a view to

⁶⁸ Resolution 1333 (2000), paras. 3 and 5.

⁶⁹ S/2001/206.

⁷⁰ S/2001/511.

⁷¹ In accordance with resolution 1363 (2001), the monitoring mechanism was comprised of two components: (a) a monitoring group in New York composed of five experts to monitor the implementation of all the measures imposed by resolutions 1267 (2000) and 1333 (2000); and (b) a sanctions enforcement support team, under the coordination of the Monitoring Group, of up to 15 members, to be located in the States bordering the territory of Afghanistan under Taliban control, in full consultation and in close cooperation with those States. The support team was requested to report at least once a month to the Monitoring Group, which reported to the Committee. The Secretary-General was requested to make the necessary arrangements to support the work of the monitoring mechanism, as an expense of the Organization and through a United Nations trust fund established for that purpose. In subsequent resolution 1390 (2002), however, no reference was made to the sanctions enforcement support team that was to be deployed pursuant to resolution 1363 (2001).

⁷² Of the five appointees, three were subsequently unable to assume their functions and were replaced (S/2001/887, S/2001/952 and S/2001/1056). For the changes in the composition of the Monitoring Group, see S/2002/516.

⁷³ Resolution 1390 (2002), para. 2.

⁷⁴ S/2002/65, S/2002/541, S/2002/1050 and Corr.1, and S/2002/1338.

⁷⁵ Resolution 1455 (2003), para. 8.

⁷⁶ S/2003/143.

⁷⁷ S/2003/669 and Corr.1, and S/2003/1070.

implementing effectively the arms embargo, and thereafter to request from them whatever further information it might consider necessary; (b) to consider any information brought to its attention by States concerning violations of the arms embargo, and to recommend appropriate measures in response thereto; (c) to make periodic reports to the Council on information submitted to it regarding alleged violations of the arms embargo, identifying where possible persons or entities reportedly to be engaged in such violations; (d) to promulgate such guidelines as might be necessary to facilitate the implementation of the arms embargo; (e) to give consideration to, and decide upon, requests for the exceptions set out in the resolution; and (f) to examine the reports submitted pursuant to the resolution by States, relevant United Nations bodies and, as appropriate, other organizations and interested parties.

Mandate implementation Monitoring and reporting

The Committee submitted three reports⁷⁸ to the Council during the period under review, providing, *inter alia*, information on its activities and the status of the implementation of resolution 1298 (2000). Throughout the reporting period, the Committee observed that it did not have any specific monitoring mechanism to ensure the effective implementation of the arms embargo and relied solely on the cooperation of States and organizations in a position to provide pertinent information.⁷⁹

Termination of mandate

By a presidential statement of 15 May 2001,⁸⁰ the Council noted that, in accordance with paragraph 16 of resolution 1298 (2000), the arms embargo on the parties expired on 16 May 2001, and recognized that the Algiers Agreements⁸¹ were consistent with

⁷⁸ S/2000/1259; S/2001/39; and S/2001/503.

⁷⁹ S/2000/1259, para. 7, and S/2001/503, para. 8.

⁸⁰ S/PRST/2001/14.

⁸¹ Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities between the Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia and the Government of the State of Eritrea, signed in Algiers on 18 June 2000; Agreement between the Government of the State of Eritrea and the Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, signed in Algiers on 12 December 2000.

paragraphs 2 through 4 of resolution 1298 (2000). Subsequently, the Committee was dissolved.⁸²

11. Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 985 (1995) concerning Liberia

The Committee established pursuant to resolution 985 (1995) concerning Liberia continued to fulfil its mandate to oversee the implementation of the arms embargo imposed by resolution 788 (1992).

Mandate implementation Monitoring and reporting

In its final annual report⁸³ to the Council dated 22 December 2000, the Committee observed that it did not have any specific monitoring mechanism to ensure the effective implementation of the arms embargo, and therefore urged all Member States and organizations to provide information pertinent to the effective implementation of the embargo to the Committee.⁸⁴

Termination of mandate

By resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001, noting that the conflict in Liberia had been resolved, that national elections had taken place within the framework of the Yamoussoukro IV Agreement of 30 October 1991⁸⁵ and that the final communiqué of the informal consultative group meeting of the ECOWAS Committee of Five on Liberia issued at Geneva on 7 April 1992⁸⁶ had been implemented, and determining therefore that the embargo imposed by resolution 788 (1992) should be terminated, the Council dissolved the Committee.

⁸² After the arms embargo against Eritrea and Ethiopia expired on 16 May 2001, owing to a possible violation that had occurred while the embargo was still in effect, the former Chairman of the Committee was authorized by a letter from the President of the Council (not published) to continue to work with the former members of the Committee to conclude the work on the outstanding case and report thereon (report not published).

⁸³ S/2000/1233.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, annex, para. 7.

⁸⁵ S/24815, annex.

⁸⁶ S/23863.

12. Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia

Establishment and mandate

By resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001, the Council established a Committee to ensure the effective implementation of the measures of the arms embargo for a 14-month period, as well as of additional measures concerning diamonds and restrictions on travel,⁸⁷ to come into effect if Liberia did not cease its support for the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) and other armed rebel groups in the region within two months. On 7 May 2001, in accordance with resolution 1343 (2001), the measures concerning the ban on the direct or indirect import of diamonds and travel restrictions came into force for a period of 12 months.

Pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001), the Committee was mandated to undertake the following tasks, and to report on its work to the Council with its observations and recommendations: (a) to seek from all States information regarding the actions taken by them to implement the measures imposed by the same resolution and thereafter to request from them whatever further information it might consider necessary; (b) to consider, and to take appropriate action on, information brought to its attention by States concerning alleged violations of the measures imposed by the resolution, and to make periodic reports to the Council; (c) to promulgate guidelines facilitating the implementation of the measures; (d) to give consideration to and decide upon requests for exemptions to the imposed arms embargo and on the travel restrictions; (e) to designate the individuals subject to the travel restrictions and to update that list regularly; (f) to make information it considered relevant publicly available through appropriate media; (g) to make recommendations to the Council on ways of increasing the effectiveness of the measures imposed and on ways to limit unintended effects of those measures on the Liberian population; (h) to cooperate with other relevant Security Council Sanctions Committees, in particular those established pursuant to resolutions 1132 (1997) and 864 (1993); and (i) to establish a list of RUF members present in Liberia.

⁸⁷ Resolution 1343 (2001), paras. 6-7.

Mandate implementation

By resolutions 1408 (2002) of 6 May 2002 and 1478 (2003) of 6 May 2003, the Council successively extended the measures imposed by resolution 1343 (2001), namely the arms embargo, the ban on the import of diamonds and travel restrictions, for an additional period of 12 months. By resolution 1478 (2003), the Council also imposed prohibitions on the import of all round logs and timber products, which took effect on 7 July 2003. By those resolutions, the Council requested the Committee to carry out the tasks set out in them and to continue with its mandate as set out in resolution 1343 (2001). By resolution 1408 (2002), the Council also requested the Committee to consider and take appropriate action on information brought to its attention concerning any alleged violations of the measures imposed by resolution 788 (1992), while that resolution was in force.

Monitoring and reporting

The Committee transmitted three annual reports⁸⁸ to the Council during the period under review, dealing with such aspects as activities of the Committee, violations and alleged violations of the sanctions regime. In two of the reports, the Committee observed that in the absence of any specific monitoring mechanism to ensure the effective implementation of the sanctions regime, it urged all States and organizations in a position to provide it with pertinent information to do so.⁸⁹

By resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish a five-member Panel of Experts for a period of six months to, inter alia, monitor the implementation of the measures imposed and to investigate any violations thereof.⁹⁰ The Panel was appointed by the Secretary-General on 23 March 2001,⁹¹ and its report of 26 October 2001⁹² was transmitted to the Council through the Committee.

By resolution 1395 (2002) of 27 February 2002, the Council decided to re-establish the Panel of Experts for a further period of five weeks to conduct a follow-up assessment mission to Liberia and neighbouring

⁸⁸ S/2002/83, S/2002/1394 and S/2004/139.

⁸⁹ S/2002/83, para. 19; S/2002/1394, para. 23.

⁹⁰ Resolution 1343 (2001), para. 19.

⁹¹ See S/2001/268.

⁹² S/2001/1015.

States, in order to investigate and compile a brief independent audit of compliance by the Government of Liberia with the Council's demand, made in resolution 1343 (2001), concerning cessation of its support for RUF in Sierra Leone and other armed rebel groups in the region, and of any violations of measures imposed by the same resolution.⁹³ The Secretary-General appointed a Panel of Experts on 6 March 2002.⁹⁴ By a letter dated 19 April 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Chairman of the Committee transmitted the report of the Panel of Experts to the Council.⁹⁵

By resolution 1408 (2002) of 6 May 2002, the Council requested the Secretary-General to re-establish the Panel of Experts for a further period of three months to conduct a follow-up assessment mission to Liberia and neighbouring States, to investigate and compile a report (a) on compliance by the Government of Liberia with the Council's demand in resolution 1343 (2001) concerning cessation of the Government's support for RUF in Sierra Leone and other armed rebel groups in the region; (b) on the potential economic, humanitarian and social impact on the Liberian population of the measures imposed by resolution 1343 (2001); and (c) on any violations thereof.⁹⁶ The Panel of Experts was appointed by the Secretary-General on 17 July 2002,⁹⁷ and its report of 25 October 2002⁹⁸ was transmitted to the Council, through the Committee.

By resolution 1458 (2003) of 28 January 2003, the Council requested the Secretary-General to re-establish the Panel of Experts for a period of three months to conduct a follow-up assessment mission to Liberia and neighbouring States. The members of the Panel of Experts were appointed by the Secretary-General on 14 February and 5 March 2003, respectively,⁹⁹ and its report of 24 April 2003 was transmitted to the Council,¹⁰⁰ through the Committee.

By resolution 1478 (2003) of 6 May 2003, the Council requested the Secretary-General to re-establish the Panel of Experts for a period of five months to conduct a follow-up assessment mission to Liberia and

neighbouring States. The Secretary-General appointed the Panel of Experts on 6 June 2003.¹⁰¹ The Panel issued its humanitarian and socio-economic impact assessment report on 7 August 2003,¹⁰² and its final report on 28 October 2003.¹⁰³

Termination of mandate

By resolution 1521 (2003) of 22 December 2003, noting the changed circumstances in Liberia, in particular, the departure of former President Charles Taylor, the formation of the National Transitional Government of Liberia and progress with the peace process in Sierra Leone, the Council dissolved the Committee and terminated the prohibitions imposed by resolutions 1343 (2001) and 1478 (2003).¹⁰⁴ By the same resolution, the Council established a Committee to oversee the implementation of the modified measures.

13. Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1521 (2003) concerning Liberia

Establishment

By resolution 1521 (2003) of 22 December 2003, in the light of the changed circumstances described in the preceding paragraph, the Council established a Committee to oversee the implementation of the measures modified and re-imposed by that resolution, including an arms embargo, travel restrictions, a ban on the import of diamonds and prohibitions on the import of round logs and timber products originating in Liberia.¹⁰⁵

Mandate implementation Monitoring and reporting

By resolution 1521 (2003), the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish a five-member Panel of Experts for a period of five months (a) to conduct a follow-up assessment mission to Liberia and neighbouring States; (b) to report on the implementation of the sanctions measures, and to assess progress made towards the goals set out by the Council for the lifting of sanctions; and (c) to report to the Council through

⁹³ Resolution 1395 (2002), para. 4.

⁹⁴ S/2002/237.

⁹⁵ S/2002/470.

⁹⁶ Resolution 1395 (2002), para. 4.

⁹⁷ S/2002/774.

⁹⁸ S/2002/1115.

⁹⁹ See S/2003/185 and S/2003/251.

¹⁰⁰ S/2003/498.

¹⁰¹ S/2003/618.

¹⁰² S/2003/779.

¹⁰³ S/2003/937 and Add.1.

¹⁰⁴ Resolution 1521 (2003), para. 1.

¹⁰⁵ Resolution 1521 (2003), para. 21.

the Committee no later than 30 May 2004 with observations and recommendations, including, inter alia, how to minimize any humanitarian and socio-economic impact of the measures imposed by the same resolution.¹⁰⁶

14. Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Establishment and mandate

By resolution 1291 (2000) of 24 February 2000, the Council expressed serious concern at reports of illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including in violation of the sovereignty of that country, called for an end to such activities, and requested the Secretary-General to report to it within 90 days to achieve that goal.¹⁰⁷ Pursuant to that resolution, the Secretary-General, by his letter dated 18 April 2000 addressed to the President of the Council,¹⁰⁸ proposed to the Council the establishment of a panel of experts to undertake a preliminary investigation into the situation and to revert to the Council thereafter with its recommendations.¹⁰⁹ Subsequently, the President of the Council, in a letter dated 24 April 2000, informed the Secretary-General of the Council's decision to send a mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.¹¹⁰ Following the recommendation of the mission with respect to the early establishment of a panel of experts by the Council,¹¹¹ the Council, in a statement by the President dated 2 June 2000,¹¹² requested the Secretary-General to establish a panel of experts on the illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth in the Democratic Republic of the Congo for an

initial period of six months, to be based in Nairobi, and requested the Secretary-General to appoint the members of the panel, in consultation with the Council.

By its presidential statement of 2 June 2000,¹¹³ the Council mandated the Panel (a) to follow up on reports and collect information on all activities of illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including in violation of the sovereignty of that country; (b) to research and analyse the links between the exploitation of the natural resources and other forms of wealth in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the continuation of the conflict; and (c) to revert to the Council with recommendations.

Mandate implementation

By a letter dated 31 January 2000 addressed to the President of the Council,¹¹⁴ the Secretary-General informed the Council of the composition of the Panel. By his letter dated 12 April 2001,¹¹⁵ the Secretary-General transmitted the report of the Panel¹¹⁶ to the Council.

By a presidential statement dated 3 May 2001,¹¹⁷ the Council extended the mandate of the Panel of Experts for three months, and requested that the Panel submit, through the Secretary-General, an addendum to its final report which would include the following: (a) an update of relevant data and an analysis of further information, including as pointed out in the action plan submitted by the Panel to the Council; (b) relevant information on the activities of countries and other actors for which the necessary quantity and quality of data had not been made available earlier; (c) a response, based as far as possible on corroborated evidence, to the comments and reactions of the States and actors cited in the final report of the Panel; (d) an evaluation of the situation at the end of the extension of the mandate of the Panel, and of its conclusions, assessing whether progress had been made on the issues which came under the responsibility of the

¹⁰⁶ Resolution 1521 (2003), para. 22.

¹⁰⁷ Resolution 1291 (2000), para. 17.

¹⁰⁸ S/2000/334.

¹⁰⁹ By a letter dated 26 April 2000 addressed to the President of the Council, the Democratic Republic of the Congo expressed its agreement with the Secretary-General's proposal concerning the establishment of a group of independent experts, and requested the Council to do so (S/2000/350).

¹¹⁰ S/2000/344.

¹¹¹ S/2000/416, para. 77. By a letter dated 1 June 2000 addressed to the President of the Council (S/2000/515), the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo welcomed that recommendation.

¹¹² S/PRST/2000/20.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁴ S/2000/796.

¹¹⁵ Prior to the submission of the report, the Secretary-General and the President of the Council exchanged letters concerning the timing of the submission (see S/2001/288 and S/2001/289, and S/2001/338 and S/2001/339).

¹¹⁶ S/2001/357.

¹¹⁷ S/PRST/2001/13.

Panel. By his letter dated 25 June 2001 addressed to the President of the Council,¹¹⁸ the Secretary-General informed the Council of the appointment of the Chairman of the Panel.¹¹⁹ Through an exchange of letters dated 3 and 8 October 2001,¹²⁰ respectively, between the Secretary-General and the President of the Council, the Council again extended the mandate of the Panel until 30 November 2001. By a letter dated 10 November 2001 addressed to the President of the Council, the Secretary-General transmitted to the Council an addendum to the report of the Panel.¹²¹ At the 4437th meeting, held on 14 December 2001, the Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Panel on the addendum to the report. By a presidential statement dated 19 December 2001,¹²² the Council thanked the Panel for its recommendations on the institutional, financial and technical aspects of the issue, and for its advice on possible measures to be imposed by the Council.

By the same presidential statement,¹²³ the Council requested the Secretary-General to renew the mandate of the Panel for a period of six months, and asked the Panel to submit both an interim and a final report. The new mandate stipulated that the report should include the following: (a) an update of relevant data and an analysis of further information from all relevant countries; (b) an evaluation of the possible actions that could be taken by the Council, including those recommended by the Panel in the report and its addendum,¹²⁴ to help bring to an end the plundering of natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, taking into account the impact of such actions on the financing of the conflict and their potential impact on the humanitarian and economic situation of that country; (c) recommendations on specific actions that the international community, in support of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, might take, working through existing international organizations, mechanisms and United Nations bodies, to address the issues in the report and its addendum; and (d) recommendations on possible steps that might be taken by transit countries as well as end-users to

contribute to ending illegal exploitation of the natural resources and other forms of wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Council also stressed the importance of the Panel maintaining a high level of collaboration with all the Congolese players, governmental as well as non-governmental, throughout the national territory. The Panel submitted to the Council an interim report on 22 May 2002,¹²⁵ through the Secretary-General. By an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Council, dated 9 and 12 July 2002,¹²⁶ respectively, the mandate of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was extended until 31 October 2002 to enable the Panel to finalize its work. By a letter dated 15 October 2002 addressed to the President, the Secretary-General transmitted the final report of the Panel.¹²⁷ By resolution 1457 (2003) of 24 January 2003, the Council took note of the final report.

By its resolution 1457 (2003), the Council also requested the Secretary-General to give a new mandate to the Panel of Experts for a six-month period, during which time the Panel should submit both an interim and final report to the Council. The Council stressed that the new mandate of the Panel should include the following: (a) further review of relevant data and analysis of information previously gathered by the Panel, as well as any new information, including specifically material provided by individuals and entities named in the previous reports of the Panel, in order to verify, reinforce and, where necessary, update the Panel's findings, and/or clear parties named in the Panel's previous reports, with a view to adjusting accordingly the lists attached to those reports; (b) information on actions taken by Governments in response to the Panel's previous recommendations, including information on how capacity-building and reforms in the region were affecting exploitation activities; (c) an assessment of the actions taken by all those named in the reports in respect of paragraphs 12 and 15 of the resolution; (d) recommendations on measures a transitional Government in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and other Governments in the region could take to develop and enhance their policies, legal framework and administrative capacity

¹¹⁸ S/2001/632.

¹¹⁹ For the composition of the Panel, see S/2001/1072, para. 3.

¹²⁰ S/2001/950 and S/2001/951, respectively.

¹²¹ S/2001/1072.

¹²² S/PRST/2001/39.

¹²³ *Ibid.*

¹²⁴ S/2001/357 and S/2001/1072, respectively.

¹²⁵ S/2002/565.

¹²⁶ S/2002/762 and S/2002/763, respectively.

¹²⁷ S/2002/1146 and Add.1 and Corr.1.

to ensure the resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo were exploited legally and on a fair commercial basis to benefit the Congolese people. By the same resolution, the Council requested the Panel to establish a procedure to provide to Member States, upon request, information previously collected by the Panel to help them take the necessary investigative action.

By a letter dated 26 February 2003 addressed to the President of the Council,¹²⁸ the Secretary-General informed the Council of his intention to appoint four experts as members of the reconstituted Panel of Experts and an additional member in the near future, and noted that the reconstituted Panel was expected to reassemble in early March 2003 in New York for consultations, including with Member States, before proceeding to the Great Lakes region.

By resolution 1499 (2003) of 13 August 2003, the Council requested the Secretary-General to extend the mandate of the Panel of Experts until 31 October 2003 to enable it to complete the remaining elements of its mandate, at the end of which the Panel would submit a final report to the Council. By that resolution, the Council took note of the Panel's intent, in accordance with paragraph 9 of resolution 1457 (2003), to remove from the annexes attached to its report the names of those parties, with which it had or would have reached a resolution by the end of its mandate, and renewed its support to the Panel in its efforts to secure, including through dialogue with parties named in its last report, particularly with the Governments concerned, a clearer picture of activities related to the illegal exploitation of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and to update its findings during the remainder of its mandate period.

Termination of mandate

In a presidential statement dated 19 November 2003,¹²⁹ the Council took note of the final report of the Panel,¹³⁰ submitted on 23 October 2003, which concluded its work, and emphasized the connection, in the context of the continuing conflict, between the illegal exploitation of natural resources and trafficking in raw materials and arms, which the Panel had highlighted. The Council also reaffirmed its

determination to monitor closely compliance with the arms embargo imposed in resolution 1493 (2003) of 28 July 2003 and expressed its intention to address the problem posed by the illicit flow of weapons into the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including by considering the possible establishment of a monitoring mechanism.

Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism

Establishment and mandate

On 28 September 2001, by resolution 1373 (2001), the Council reaffirmed its unequivocal condemnation of the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 in New York, Washington, D.C., and Pennsylvania, and acting under Chapter VII, decided that all States should cooperate in a wide range of areas, from suppressing the financing of terrorism to providing early warning, as well as cooperating in criminal investigations, exchanging information on possible terrorist acts, and reporting on the steps they had taken to implement that resolution.

By resolution 1373 (2001), the Council also decided to establish, in accordance with rule 28 of its provisional rules of procedure, a committee of the Security Council, consisting of all members of the Council, to monitor implementation of that resolution, with the assistance of appropriate expertise.¹³¹ The Council called upon all States to report to the Committee no later than 90 days from the date of adoption of the resolution and, thereafter, according to a timetable to be proposed by the Committee on the steps they had taken to implement the resolution. Furthermore, the Council directed the Committee to delineate its tasks, submit a work programme within 30 days of the adoption of the resolution and consider the support it required, in consultation with the Secretary-General.

¹³¹ The Counter-Terrorism Committee is not a sanctions committee and does not maintain a list of individuals or entities.

¹²⁸ S/2003/226.

¹²⁹ S/PRST/2003/21.

¹³⁰ S/2003/1027.

Composition

On 16 October 2001, pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001), the Counter-Terrorism Committee adopted guidelines for the conduct of its work. The Committee pursued its agenda as set out in its work programmes, each designed to be in effect for a period of ninety days.¹³²

According to the guidelines, the Chairman of the Committee should be appointed by the Security Council and should also be the Permanent Representative of a State member of the Security Council. As set forth in its first programme of work,¹³³ the Committee took steps to furnish itself with the appropriate expertise it needed to do its work. The Secretariat appointed expert advisers with the approval of the Committee, taking account of relevant expertise and the principle of equitable geographical representation.¹³⁴

As set forth in its second programme of work,¹³⁵ the Committee established three subcommittees, each composed of five of its members and chaired by one of the Committee's vice-chairmen, to have an initial discussion of each report between members of the subcommittee and the experts on the Committee's response to the report. The three relevant subcommittees also invited the States concerned to attend part of the subcommittees' discussion of the reports.

Mandate implementation

By resolution 1377 (2001) of 12 November 2001,¹³⁶ the Security Council, meeting at the ministerial level, adopted a declaration on the global effort to combat terrorism, in which it recognized that many States would require assistance in implementing all the requirements of resolution 1373 (2001), and invited States to inform the Committee of areas in which they required such support. In that context, the Council invited the Committee to explore ways in

which States could be assisted, and in particular to explore with international, regional and subregional organizations (a) the promotion of best practice in the areas covered by resolution 1373 (2001), including the preparation of model laws as appropriate; (b) the availability of existing technical, financial, regulatory, legislative or other assistance programmes which might facilitate the implementation of the resolution; and (c) the promotion of possible synergies between those assistance programmes.

By resolution 1456 (2003),¹³⁷ the Security Council adopted, at the Council's high-level meeting on combating terrorism on 20 January 2003, the declaration by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs on the issue of combating terrorism, and called on the Committee to intensify its efforts to promote the implementation by Member States of all aspects of resolution 1373 (2001), in particular through reviewing States' reports and facilitating international assistance and cooperation, and through continuing to operate in a transparent and effective manner. Pursuant to paragraph 12 of the declaration, the Secretary-General submitted a report summarizing the proposals made during the ministerial meeting and the comments and responses to the proposals received from the Security Council members.¹³⁸

By a letter dated 14 February 2003 addressed to the President of the Council,¹³⁹ the Chairman of the Committee set out the action to be taken by the Committee to take forward the matters contained in the annex to resolution 1456 (2003).

Reports to the Security Council

In statements made by the President on its behalf, the Council reviewed the structure and activities of the Committee at regular intervals.¹⁴⁰ In accordance with guideline No. 9, the Chairman of the Committee briefed the Council on the work of the Committee several times during the period under review.

¹³² S/2001/986, S/2002/67, S/2002/318, S/2002/700, S/2002/1075, S/2003/72, S/2003/387, S/2003/710 and S/2003/995.

¹³³ S/2001/986.

¹³⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 2 (A/57/2)*, part VI, chap. 13.

¹³⁵ S/2002/67.

¹³⁶ Resolution 1377 (2001), annex.

¹³⁷ Resolution 1456 (2003), annex.

¹³⁸ S/2003/191 and Add.1.

¹³⁹ S/2003/198.

¹⁴⁰ S/PRST/2002/10, S/PRST/2002/26, S/PRST/2003/3 and S/PRST/2003/17.

C. Informal and ad hoc working groups

Note

During the period under review, the Council's Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions continued to exist. In addition, the Council established four new informal working groups. These included the Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions, the Working Group on

International Criminal Tribunals, the Working Group of the Whole on United Nations peacekeeping operations, and the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa. The working groups consisted of all fifteen members of the Council, held their meetings in private sessions, and reached their decisions by consensus. A brief overview of the establishment and mandate of the working groups is provided in the table below.

Informal and ad hoc working groups

<i>Title</i>	<i>Establishment</i>	<i>Mandate</i>
Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions	June 1993 (no formal decision was taken)	To deal with issues related to documentation and other procedural questions.
Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions	Note by the President of the Council of 17 April 2000 (S/2000/319)	To develop general recommendations on how to improve the effectiveness of United Nations sanctions. Issues to be examined by the Working Group were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Working methods of sanctions committees and inter-committee coordination; (b) Capacity of the United Nations Secretariat; (c) Coordination within the United Nations system and cooperation with regional and other international organizations; (d) Design of sanctions resolutions including the conditions for the maintaining/lifting of sanctions; (e) Pre- and post-assessment reports and the ongoing evaluation of sanctions regimes; (f) Monitoring and enforcement of sanctions; (g) Unintended impacts of sanctions; (h) Humanitarian exemptions; (i) Targeted sanctions; (j) Assisting member States in implementing sanctions; (k) Implementation of the recommendations of the note by the President of 29 January 1999 (S/1999/92).

<i>Title</i>	<i>Establishment</i>	<i>Mandate</i>
Working Group on International Criminal Tribunals	June 2000 (no formal decision was taken). It was established pursuant to a proposal by some Council members (Canada, Bangladesh, Tunisia) at the 4161st meeting held on 20 June 2000	The working group on International Criminal Tribunals was convened to deal with a specific issue pertaining to the Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and was subsequently mandated to deal with other (legal) issues pertaining to the tribunals.
Working Group of the Whole on United Nations peacekeeping operations	Presidential Statement of 31 January 2001 (S/PRST/2001/3)	<p>(a) To address both generic peacekeeping issues relevant to the responsibilities of the Council and technical aspects of individual peacekeeping operations, without prejudice to the competence of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations;</p> <p>(b) Where appropriate, to seek the views of the troop-contributing countries, including through meetings between the Working Group and the troop-contributing countries, with a view to their views being taken into account by the Council.</p>
Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa	Note by the President of the Council dated 1 March 2002 (S/2002/207)	<p>(a) To monitor the implementation of recommendations contained in the presidential statement S/PRST/2002/2 and previous presidential statements and resolutions regarding conflict prevention and resolution in Africa;</p> <p>(b) To propose recommendations on the enhancement of cooperation between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council as well as with other United Nations agencies dealing with Africa;</p> <p>(c) To examine, in particular, regional and cross-conflict issues that affect the Council's work on African conflict prevention and resolution;</p> <p>(d) To propose recommendations to the Security Council to enhance cooperation in conflict prevention and resolution, between the United Nations and regional (OAU) and subregional organizations.</p>

D. Investigative bodies

During the period under review, there were no subsidiary investigative bodies authorized by the Council. However, the Council undertook 13 missions

of its own, and welcomed a number of such initiatives by the Secretary-General.¹⁴¹

¹⁴¹ For details, see chapters I and X.

E. Peacekeeping operations and political missions

Note

As stated by the Secretary-General in his report on the work of the Organization for 2003,¹⁴² peacekeeping and peacebuilding are two sides of the same coin. During the period under review, beyond the deployment of peacekeeping missions to support the transition from conflict in a number of places around the world, the Security Council continued with its peacebuilding efforts to provide political, humanitarian and development assistance to meet immediate emergency and reconstruction needs, as well as to establish viable institutions. The record for the period examined below displays a number of successfully completed mandates of missions such as the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) and the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH), as well as the establishment of new, or the reinforcement of existing, missions.

Therefore, between 2000 and 2003 the Council, often acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, mandated the establishment of three new peacekeeping operations, in Côte d'Ivoire,¹⁴³ East Timor¹⁴⁴ and Ethiopia and Eritrea,¹⁴⁵ while authorizing the termination or transition to new peacekeeping missions of seven operations.¹⁴⁶ During that period, the Council further authorized the establishment of five political missions — in Afghanistan,¹⁴⁷ Angola,¹⁴⁸ the Central

African Republic,¹⁴⁹ Iraq¹⁵⁰ and Tajikistan¹⁵¹ — and authorized, upon the recommendation of the Secretary-General, the termination or transition to new missions of three other political missions.¹⁵² In some cases, the Council authorized significant changes and expansions in the mandates of peacekeeping operations, including a number of those established during an earlier period.

A total of 21 peacekeeping operations and 11 political missions are considered below, by geographic region. The studies of the operations and missions in each region generally appear in the order of their establishment, while interlinked operations are dealt with jointly. As a more detailed account of Council proceedings, such as the deliberations by the Council on the specific agenda item and the content of the reports of the Secretary-General on the situations on the ground is set out in chapter VIII of this volume, the present section focuses on procedures of the Council concerning the establishment, mandate, composition, implementation of mandate, and termination or transition of peacekeeping operations and political missions during the period from 2000 to 2003. It is noted that, in accordance with the general principles set out in General Assembly resolutions 874 (S-IV) of 27 June 1963 and 3101 (XXVIII) of 11 December 1973, peacekeeping operations during the period from 2000 to 2003 were financed through assessed contributions by Member States, except as stated otherwise.

Africa

1. United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara

During the period under review, the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO), established pursuant to resolution 690 (1991), continued its efforts in support of the implementation of the Settlement Plan and agreements adopted by the Government of Morocco and the Frente

¹⁴² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/58/1)*, para. 39.

¹⁴³ United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (MINUCI).

¹⁴⁴ United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISSET).

¹⁴⁵ United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE).

¹⁴⁶ United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (MIPONUH), United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT), UNTAET, United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (UNMOP), UNMIBH, the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA), and the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM).

¹⁴⁷ United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA).

¹⁴⁸ United Nations Mission in Angola (UNMA).

¹⁴⁹ United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic (BONUCA).

¹⁵⁰ United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI).

¹⁵¹ United Nations Tajikistan Office of Peacebuilding (UNTOP).

¹⁵² United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Liberia (UNOL), United Nations Political Office in Bougainville (UNPOB) and United Nations Office in Angola (UNOA).

Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro (Frente Polisario) to hold a free, fair and impartial referendum that would allow the people of Western Sahara to decide the future status of the territory. By a series of resolutions,¹⁵³ adopted on the basis of the Secretary-General's reports¹⁵⁴ and a letter dated 12 November 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President,¹⁵⁵ the Security Council successively extended the mandate of MINURSO for additional periods of two to six months, with the expectation that the parties would meet in direct talks under the auspices of the Personal Envoy of the Secretary-General to try to resolve the multiple problems relating to the implementation of the Settlement plan, and to try to agree upon a mutually acceptable political solution to their dispute over Western Sahara.

2. United Nations Office in Burundi

During the period under review, the United Nations Office in Burundi (UNOB), established in October 1993, continued to facilitate the restoration of constitutional rule in Burundi through the implementation of the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi and subsequent ceasefire agreements.

Mandate implementation

By a letter dated 15 November 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Burundi peace process had culminated in the signing of the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi on 28 August 2000.¹⁵⁶ The Agreement requested the United Nations to chair the Arusha Agreement Implementation Monitoring Committee and to provide support to a wide range of activities together with other actors. The requested activities included supervising and ensuring the effective implementation of the Agreement; ensuring respect for the implementation

timetable and accurate interpretation of the Agreement; arbitrating and ruling on disputes that might arise among the signatories; providing guidance to and coordinating the activities of the commissions and subcommissions set up to implement the Agreement; and assisting the transitional Government in mobilizing the resources required to implement the Agreement. Following the first meeting of the Committee, the Secretary-General hoped to be in a position to submit to the Security Council proposals on an extended mandate for the United Nations Office in Burundi and the ways in which the United Nations capacity there could be strengthened to help it carry out the functions entrusted to it as the Chairman of the Committee. In the meantime and until such time as the details of the new tasks requested were clarified, the mandate of UNOB was extended until 31 December 2001 through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council.¹⁵⁷

In his report dated 14 November 2001,¹⁵⁸ the Secretary-General stated that with the repatriation of the Implementation Monitoring Committee to Burundi, the primary role of UNOB would need to be adjusted and refocused. Noting that the political role of the United Nations in Burundi came primarily from its responsibilities as Chairman of the Committee, the staff and resources of the Office would be restructured and strengthened to support also the Chairman, including the servicing of the meetings of the Committee and its Executive Council. That would necessitate an increase in the staffing and resources of the United Nations Office in Burundi. The new political presence of the United Nations in Burundi would group together, under the Office of the Chairman of the Committee, the activities of the Committee secretariat and the political role previously entrusted to the United Nations Office in Burundi. The net additional staff requirements would amount to 16 international posts, including the Committee Chairman (Assistant Secretary-General); a small number of military advisers and civilian police would also be attached in order to continue contingency planning for the possible deployment of a peacekeeping mission. In a letter dated 7 December 2001 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General, the members of the Security Council

¹⁵³ Resolutions 1292 (2000), 1301 (2000), 1308 (2000), 1309 (2000), 1324 (2000), 1342 (2001), 1349 (2001), 1359 (2001), 1380 (2001), 1394 (2002), 1406 (2002), 1429 (2002), 1463 (2003), 1469 (2003), 1485 (2003), 1495 (2003) and 1513 (2003).

¹⁵⁴ S/21360, S/2001/148, S/2001/398, S/2001/613, S/2002/178, S/2003/59 and S/2003/341.

¹⁵⁵ S/2001/1067.

¹⁵⁶ S/2000/1096.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, and S/2000/1097.

¹⁵⁸ S/2001/1076.

expressed support for the proposal to strengthen the Office to help implement the Arusha Agreement.¹⁵⁹

In his report dated 18 November 2002,¹⁶⁰ the Secretary-General stated that for 2003, the net additional staff requirement would amount to two international posts, to accommodate a spokesperson and a close protection officer for the Special Representative, as well as eight local staff. Three military advisers and civilian police would also be attached to UNOB to continue contingency planning for the possible deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping mission. In a statement by the President dated 18 December 2002,¹⁶¹ the Council approved the recommendations of the Secretary-General with a view to increasing the resources of UNOB.

Following the signing of the ceasefire agreements between the Government of Burundi and the armed groups, the staffing and resources of the Office were strengthened to enable the Chairman of the Arusha Agreement Implementation Monitoring Committee to provide the substantive and administrative support needed for the activities of the Commission, by an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council on 29 September 2003.¹⁶² The additional staff included the Chairman of the Joint Ceasefire Commission, a subsidiary body of the Implementation Monitoring Committee; a civil police/rule of law adviser; two political affairs officers; one disarmament, demobilization and reintegration adviser; and the necessary support staff.

In a report dated 4 December 2003 on the situation in Burundi,¹⁶³ the Secretary-General informed the Council that in order to respond to the increasing needs in peacekeeping-related issues and other priorities such as security sector reform and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, it would be necessary to augment the staff of the Office slightly. By a statement by the President of 22 December 2003,¹⁶⁴ the Security Council approved the recommendations of the Secretary-General regarding the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Office in Burundi.

¹⁵⁹ S/2001/1207.

¹⁶⁰ S/2002/1259.

¹⁶¹ S/PRST/2002/40..

¹⁶² S/2003/920 and S/2003/921.

¹⁶³ S/2003/1146.

¹⁶⁴ S/PRST/2003/30.

3. The United Nations Political Office for Somalia

During the period under review, the United Nations Political Office for Somalia (UNPOS), established on 15 April 1995, continued to help to advance the cause of peace and reconciliation through contacts with Somali leaders, civic organizations and the States and organizations concerned; monitor the situation in Somalia; and keep the Council informed in particular about developments. Furthermore, in the period following September 1999, UNPOS made sustained efforts in support of the initiative taken by the Government of Djibouti that led to the formation of the Transitional National Government of Somalia.¹⁶⁵

Mandate implementation

The mandate of the Office was extended for the biennium 2000-2001 by an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Council.¹⁶⁶ In a statement made by the President on behalf of the Council on 11 January 2001,¹⁶⁷ the members of the Council invited the Secretary-General to prepare a proposal for a peacebuilding mission in Somalia. However, the Secretary-General indicated in his report dated 11 October 2001¹⁶⁸ that the security situation did not make it possible to deploy a peacebuilding office in the country and recommended that, due to its valuable role in monitoring and reporting on the situation in Somalia, the mandate of UNPOS be renewed for another two years. In a statement by the President dated 31 October 2001,¹⁶⁹ the Council requested the Secretary-General to consider the scope for adjustment, as appropriate, to the mandate for UNPOS. In a letter dated 16 November 2001 addressed to the President,¹⁷⁰ the Secretary-General took note of the request of the Council and stated that it was his intention to continue the activities of UNPOS for the biennium 2002-2003, at the current resource level, pending an improvement in the security situation that would allow him to submit a proposal for

¹⁶⁵ S/2001/1097.

¹⁶⁶ S/1999/1134 and S/1999/1135, respectively. Since its establishment on 14 April 1995, UNPOS has had its mandate renewed for periods of two calendar years, starting with 1998/1999 (S/1997/715, para. 36 (b) and S/1997/756).

¹⁶⁷ S/PRST/2001/1.

¹⁶⁸ S/2001/963.

¹⁶⁹ S/PRST/2001/30.

¹⁷⁰ S/2001/1097.

the establishment of a peacebuilding office in Somalia. The mandate of UNPOS was therefore extended for the biennium 2002-2003 through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council.¹⁷¹

In a statement by the President dated 28 March 2002,¹⁷² the Council reiterated that a comprehensive post-conflict peacebuilding mission should be deployed once security conditions permitted. In a report dated 13 October 2003,¹⁷³ the Secretary-General indicated that pending an agreement at the National Reconciliation Conference in Mbagathi, Kenya and improvement of the security situation that would allow him to submit a proposal on the establishment of a peace-building office in Somalia and adjustments that might be needed to the mandate of the Political Office, it was his intention to continue the activities of the Office for the biennium 2004-2005.

4. United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Liberia

During the period under review, the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Liberia (UNOL), established on 1 November 1997, continued to support the efforts of the Government of Liberia to consolidate peace and democracy, and to promote national reconciliation and the rule of law, including the protection of human rights.

Mandate implementation

During the period under review, the mandate of UNOL was extended three times through exchanges of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Council for periods of one year, the last of which ended 31 December 2003.¹⁷⁴

By a letter dated 29 November 2002 addressed to the Secretary-General, the President of the Security Council requested that the Secretary-General submit recommendations for a detailed revised mandate for UNOL in order to increase its capacity for objective reporting on the situation in Liberia.¹⁷⁵ In a statement

by the President dated 13 December 2002,¹⁷⁶ the Council stated that it was committed to promoting an expanded role for UNOL, along with the more active participation of the United Nations Office for West Africa.¹⁷⁷ In the statement, the Council further outlined the tasks it wanted UNOL to carry out, which included the following: offering assistance to the authorities of Liberia and to the public for strengthening democratic institutions and the rule of law, including the promotion of an independent press and an enabling environment for political parties to operate freely in Liberia; contributing to and monitoring the preparation of free and fair elections in 2003, especially through the promotion of an independent electoral commission; enhancing and monitoring respect for human rights in Liberia, including through constructive dialogue with the Government of Liberia, with particular attention to reaching out to local civil society groups and to encouraging the establishment of an independent and functional human rights commission; promoting national reconciliation and resolution of the conflict, including through support for initiatives on the ground; supporting the Government of Liberia in the implementation of peace agreements to be adopted; and engaging in an educational campaign to present accurately United Nations policies and activities regarding Liberia.

In a letter dated 15 January 2003 addressed to the President of the Council,¹⁷⁸ the Secretary-General stated that he had provided the Government of Liberia with a draft revised mandate for UNOL, which took into account the situation on the ground and the above-mentioned statement by the President. Following the agreement of the Government of Liberia, the mandate of UNOL was revised through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council.¹⁷⁹ In his letter dated 11 April 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹⁸⁰ the Secretary-General stated that, in finalizing the draft revised mandate, consideration had been given to the capacity-building needs of the Government in the areas of human rights and the conduct of elections and that he had received concurrence from the Government of Liberia to the revised mandate. The revised mandate

¹⁷¹ S/2001/1097 and S/2001/1098.

¹⁷² S/PRST/2002/8, para. 15.

¹⁷³ S/2003/987, paras. 13-18.

¹⁷⁴ S/2000/945 and S/2000/946; S/2001/981 and S/2001/982; and S/2002/1129 and S/2002/1130.

¹⁷⁵ S/2002/1305.

¹⁷⁶ S/PRST/2002/36.

¹⁷⁷ See chapter X.

¹⁷⁸ S/2003/49.

¹⁷⁹ S/2003/468 and S/2003/469.

¹⁸⁰ S/2003/468.

was (a) to provide, as appropriate, good offices and other services to defuse tensions through promoting national reconciliation and resolution of conflicts, including through support for initiatives on the ground; (b) to support the Government of Liberia in the implementation of the peace agreements to be adopted; (c) to monitor the political and security situation in Liberia and report thereon; (d) to enhance respect for human rights in Liberia, including through constructive dialogue with the Government of Liberia, with particular attention to strengthening the Government's capacity in this domain and providing human rights training for the security agencies; (e) to offer assistance to the Liberian authorities and to the public for strengthening democratic institutions and the rule of law, including the promotion of an independent press and an enabling environment for political parties to operate freely in Liberia; (f) to contribute to the preparation of free and fair elections in 2003, while helping to promote the independence of the Elections Commission; (g) to promote dialogue between the Government of Liberia, the United Nations and the international community at large on matters relating to peace and security in Liberia; (h) to develop, in close cooperation with the United Nations country team and other international partners, a peacebuilding strategy for Liberia in which political objectives, programme assistance and human rights considerations were fully integrated; (i) to mobilize national and international political support for such a strategy and monitor its implementation so as to ensure its continued relevance to Liberia's post-conflict peacebuilding priorities; (j) to provide substantive support and backup as appropriate to the United Nations Office in West Africa, in particular pertaining to developments in the Mano River Union subregion as they related to Liberia; (k) to engage in an educational campaign to present accurately United Nations policies and activities regarding Liberia; and (l) to develop and implement, in cooperation with the Government, sensitization/information strategies and programmes to facilitate the implementation of (a) and (g) above.

By resolution 1478 (2003) of 6 May 2003, the Council welcomed the Government of Liberia's agreement to the revised mandate.

Termination of mandate

By a letter dated 29 July 2003 addressed to the President of the Council,¹⁸¹ the Secretary-General informed the Council that, in view of the appointment of his Special Representative, and the envisaged establishment of a United Nations operation in Liberia, the mandate of UNOL would be terminated and the staff and assets absorbed by the office of his Special Representative. In his report dated 11 September 2003,¹⁸² the Secretary-General informed the Council that the major functions performed by UNOL would be transferred to the new United Nations operation in Liberia.

By a letter dated 16 September 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹⁸³ the Secretary-General informed the Council that he had decided to terminate the mandate of UNOL and stated that he intended to bring to a close the operations of UNOL as soon as the deployment of the peacekeeping mission was authorized by the Council. By resolution 1509 (2003) of 19 September 2003, the Council took note of the Secretary-General's intention to terminate the mandate of UNOL.

5. United Nations Mission in Liberia

Establishment, mandate and composition

Following the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement¹⁸⁴ in Accra on 18 August 2003, which requested the United Nations to deploy a force in Liberia under Chapter VII of the Charter to support the National Transitional Government of Liberia and assist in the implementation of the Agreement, the Council adopted, on 1 August 2003, resolution 1497 (2003), by which it authorized the establishment of a multinational force in Liberia and declared its readiness to establish a follow-on United Nations stabilization force to be deployed no later than 1 October 2003.

By resolution 1509 (2003) of 19 September 2003, the Council welcomed the Secretary-General's report dated 11 September 2003¹⁸⁵ and its recommendations and, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the

¹⁸¹ S/2003/769.

¹⁸² S/2003/875.

¹⁸³ S/2003/899.

¹⁸⁴ S/2003/850.

¹⁸⁵ S/2003/875.

United Nations, decided to establish the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), the stabilization force called for in resolution 1497 (2003), for a period of 12 months. By that resolution, the Council requested the Secretary-General to transfer authority from the ECOWAS Mission in Liberia (ECOMIL) forces to UNMIL on 1 October 2003.

The mandate of the Mission, as set out in resolution 1509 (2003), was (a) to support the implementation of the ceasefire agreement signed by the Liberian parties on 17 June 2003;¹⁸⁶ (b) to protect United Nations staff, facilities and civilians; (c) to facilitate support for the humanitarian and human rights assistance; (d) to provide support for security reform, including national police training and formation of a new, restructured military; and (e) to support the implementation of the peace process.

Up to 15,000 United Nations military personnel were initially authorized for UNMIL, including up to 250 military observers and 160 staff officers, and up to 1,115 civilian police officers, including formed units to assist in the maintenance of law and order throughout Liberia, and the appropriate civilian component. By resolution 1509 (2003), the Council welcomed the appointment by the Secretary-General of his Special Representative for Liberia to direct the operations of UNMIL and coordinate all United Nations activities in Liberia. The Force Commander of UNMIL was appointed through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Council.¹⁸⁷

6. The United Nations Office in Angola

During the period under review, the United Nations Office in Angola (UNOA), established pursuant to resolution 1268 (1999), continued to contribute to the promotion of peace, national reconciliation, human rights and regional security.

Mandate implementation

Through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council,¹⁸⁸ the Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of UNOA was appointed.

On the basis of the recommendations in the report of the Secretary-General dated 11 April 2000,¹⁸⁹ the Council, by resolution 1294 (2000) of 13 April 2000, extended the mandate of UNOA until 15 October 2000.¹⁹⁰ Subsequently, on the basis of the recommendations in the reports of the Secretary-General,¹⁹¹ the Council, by a series of letters addressed to the Secretary-General,¹⁹² extended the mandate of UNOA three times, for periods of six months, the last of which was until 15 April 2002. The mandate was then extended twice more through exchanges of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council,¹⁹³ for periods of three months and one month, respectively, until 15 August 2002.

Termination of mandate and transition to a new mission

In a report to the Council dated 26 July 2002,¹⁹⁴ the Secretary-General noted that the signing on 4 April 2002 of the memorandum of understanding to complement the Lusaka Protocol marked a new era in the Angolan peace process and presented new challenges for the United Nations presence in Angola. He recommended that the Council establish a new mission in Angola to succeed UNOA. Following the end of the final one-month extension on 15 August 2002, the mandate of UNOA was terminated,¹⁹⁵ and the Council established the United Nations Mission in Angola (UNMA) as a follow-on mission.¹⁹⁶

7. The United Nations Mission in Angola

Establishment, mandate and composition

On the basis of the report of the Secretary-General of 26 July 2002,¹⁹⁷ by resolution 1433 (2002) of 15 August 2002, the Security Council established the United Nations Mission in Angola (UNMA) for an initial period of six months, until 15 February 2003, as

¹⁸⁹ S/2000/304 and Corr. 1.

¹⁹⁰ Resolution 1294 (2000), para. 1.

¹⁹¹ S/2000/977, S/2001/351 and S/2001/956.

¹⁹² S/2000/987, S/2001/387 and S/2001/973.

¹⁹³ S/2002/411 and S/2002/412; and S/2002/768 and S/2002/769.

¹⁹⁴ S/2002/834.

¹⁹⁵ S/2002/768 and S/2002/769.

¹⁹⁶ Resolution 1433 (2002), para. 1.

¹⁹⁷ S/2002/834.

¹⁸⁶ S/2003/657.

¹⁸⁷ S/2003/926 and S/2003/927.

¹⁸⁸ S/2000/760 and S/2000/761.

a follow-on mission to the United Nations Office in Angola.¹⁹⁸

The mandate of UNMA was (a) to assist the parties in concluding the Lusaka Protocol by chairing the Joint Commission and leading the completion of the agreed list of tasks which remain pending under the Lusaka Protocol; and (b) to assist the Government of Angola in undertaking the following tasks: protection and promotion of human rights; building of institutions to consolidate peace and enhance the rule of law; provision of technical advice and support for mine action; facilitation and coordination of delivery of humanitarian assistance to vulnerable groups including internally displaced persons and families in quartering areas, with special concern for children and women; support for social and professional reintegration of the demobilized through appropriate United Nations agencies; promotion of economic recovery through relevant United Nations agencies; mobilization of resources of the international community, to include international donors conferences, as appropriate; and provision of technical assistance to the Government of Angola in the preparation of elections.¹⁹⁹

The Mission was headed by a Special Representative of the Secretary-General and was comprised of two components. The first component, under the direct supervision of the Special Representative, dealt with the political, military and human rights aspects. The second component, supervised by the Resident Coordinator, who would be concurrently designated as Deputy, dealt with humanitarian, economic recovery and development tasks, through the coordination of the work of the various United Nations agencies involved.²⁰⁰ The Special Representative was appointed through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council.²⁰¹

Mandate implementation Termination of mandate

In his report of 7 February 2003,²⁰² the Secretary-General stated that UNMA had completed its mandated political tasks. The United Nations agencies and

programmes had provided essential humanitarian and development assistance throughout the period covered by the mandate of the mission and had continued to work closely with the Government to implement a post-conflict strategy. However, the residual tasks foreseen under resolution 1433 (2002), including in the areas of human rights, mine action, reintegration and resettlement of ex-combatants, humanitarian assistance, economic recovery and electoral assistance, required continued attention and support. The Secretary-General, therefore, proposed that the United Nations Resident Coordinator resume the responsibility for United Nations activities in the country upon the conclusion of the mandate of UNMA on 15 February 2003, including assisting the efforts of the Government to implement the residual tasks under resolution 1433 (2002). Consequently, the mandate of UNMA was terminated on 15 February 2003, pursuant to resolution 1433 (2002), and the Office of the Resident Coordinator was strengthened for the transitional period by adding a unit under his supervision to address the residual tasks.²⁰³

8. United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone

During the period under review, the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL), established pursuant to resolution 1270 (1999), continued to monitor and assist in the implementation of the Lomé ceasefire agreement.

Mandate implementation

By a series of resolutions,²⁰⁴ adopted on the basis of the Secretary-General's reports,²⁰⁵ the Council continuously extended the mandate of UNAMSIL for various time periods, the last of which was until 31 March 2004.

In his reports dated 6 December 1999²⁰⁶ and 11 January 2000,²⁰⁷ and in his letter dated 28 December 1999 addressed to the President of the

¹⁹⁸ Resolution 1433 (2002), para. 1.

¹⁹⁹ Resolution 1433 (2002), para. 3.

²⁰⁰ S/2002/834, para. 59.

²⁰¹ S/2002/1026 and S/2002/1027.

²⁰² S/2003/158.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, para. 47.

²⁰⁴ Resolutions 1289 (2000), 1299 (2000), 1313 (2000), 1317 (2000), 1321 (2000), 1334 (2000), 1346 (2001), 1370 (2001), 1400 (2002), 1436 (2002) and 1470 (2003).

²⁰⁵ S/1999/1223, S/2000/13, S/2000/455, S/2000/751, S/2000/832, S/2000/1199, S/2001/228, S/2001/857, S/2002/267, S/2002/987, S/2003/321 and S/2003/863.

²⁰⁶ S/1999/1223.

²⁰⁷ S/2000/13.

Council,²⁰⁸ the Secretary-General recommended an expanded role of and increased troop deployment for UNAMSIL in the light of the deterioration of the humanitarian and security situation and the redeployment of contingents of the Military Observer Group of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOMOG), which had so far performed vital security functions. Following the Secretary-General's recommendations, the Council expanded, by resolution 1289 (2000) of 7 February 2000, the mandate of UNAMSIL to accommodate the security functions previously performed by ECOMOG and authorized the deployment of 11,100 troops to that effect. By that resolution, the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, further authorized UNAMSIL to take all necessary action to fulfil its additional functions and protect civilians under threat of imminent physical danger.

By a letter dated 17 May 2000 addressed to the President of the Council,²⁰⁹ the Secretary-General advised the Council that recent attacks by the Revolutionary United Front against UNAMSIL personnel had warranted a reinforcement of troops of up to 13,000 military personnel, and asked the Council to authorize this interim expansion of the force. At its 4145th meeting on 19 May 2000, the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted resolution 1299 (2000), by which it authorized the interim reinforcement.

In subsequent reports submitted pursuant to resolution 1289 (2000),²¹⁰ the Secretary-General reported serious setbacks to the peace process, with disarmament and demobilization at a standstill, increased attacks by RUF against government forces, and the abduction and mutilation of civilians. While the solution to the conflict remained political, the Secretary-General considered a "robust and credible" international military presence indispensable to providing conducive conditions for the democratic elections agreed to under the Lomé Agreement. He therefore advised further expansion of UNAMSIL. Following the recommendations of the Secretary-General, the Council decided, by resolution 1313 (2000) of 4 August 2000, that UNAMSIL deter and decisively counter the threat of RUF attack by

responding robustly to hostile actions or threat of imminent or direct use of force, protect civilians under imminent threat of physical danger and assist the Government of Sierra Leone in the extension of State authority. To that end, the Council, by that resolution and on the basis of the Secretary-General's report and the findings of the United Nations assessment mission,²¹¹ requested the Secretary-General to provide recommendations on a new operational structure, command and control for a strengthened and expanded mission.

In his report dated 24 August 2000,²¹² the Secretary-General outlined a new concept of operations and gave recommendations as to force structure and organization. He stated that the main objectives of the Mission would be to extend State authority, restore law and order and stabilize the security situation which would require the progressive deployment of troops in a coherent operational structure and in sufficient number and density in coordination with political steps. To that effect, the Secretary-General further recommended that the Council authorize an increase to 20,500 military personnel. At its 4036th meeting, on 30 March 2001, the Council adopted resolution 1346 (2001), by which it authorized increasing the military component of the mission to a strength of 17,500 personnel, approving the Secretary-General's updated concept of operations.

In his report of 5 September 2002,²¹³ the Secretary-General outlined a phased drawdown plan and proposed adjustments to the composition of the Mission. He recommended a phased drawback beginning with the "pruning" of unessential troops and phased redeployment from areas under effective government control and the deployment of United Nations civilian police to strengthen the police force of Sierra Leone in order to avoid a security vacuum. By resolution 1436 (2002) of 24 September 2002, the Council took note of the planned adjustments to the

²⁰⁸ S/1999/1285.

²⁰⁹ S/2000/446.

²¹⁰ S/2000/455 dated 19 May 2000 and S/2000/751 dated 31 July 2000.

²¹¹ The assessment team visited Sierra Leone from 2 to 8 June 2000. In its report to the Secretary-General, the team noted a serious lack of cohesion within the mission, lack of understanding of the mandate and rules of engagement, insufficient preparation to deal with the logistical and environmental challenges of the theatre and serious shortfalls in equipment. See S/2000/751, part VIII.

²¹² S/2000/832.

²¹³ S/2002/987.

size and composition of the Mission, and supported the deployment of up to 170 United Nations civilian police.

9. United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

During the period under review, the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), established pursuant to resolution 1279 (1999), continued to, inter alia, maintain liaison with the Joint Military Commission, as well as with all parties to the Ceasefire Agreement signed at Lusaka on 10 July 1999²¹⁴ to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance to displaced persons, refugees, children and other affected persons.

Mandate implementation

At the 4104th meeting, on 24 February 2000, the Council, recalling the report of the Secretary-General of 17 January 2000²¹⁵ and acting under Chapter VII, adopted resolution 1291 (2000), by which it decided that, in cooperation with the Joint Military Commission, MONUC would undertake, inter alia, the following tasks: (a) establish and maintain continuous liaison with the field headquarters of the military forces of all the parties to the Ceasefire Agreement; (b) monitor the implementation of the Ceasefire Agreement and investigate violations of the ceasefire; (c) facilitate humanitarian assistance and human rights monitoring, with particular attention to vulnerable groups, as well as work with the parties to obtain the release of all prisoners of war, military captives and remains, in close cooperation with other agencies and organizations; (d) provide support and assistance to the Facilitator of the National Dialogue; and (e) deploy mine experts to develop a mine action plan and coordinate activities. By the same resolution, the Council also decided that MONUC might take the necessary action, in the areas of deployment of its infantry battalions and as it deemed it within its capabilities, to protect United Nations and co-located Joint Military Commission personnel, facilities, installations and equipment, ensure the security and freedom of movement of its personnel, and protect civilians under imminent threat of physical violence.

²¹⁴ S/1999/815, annex.

²¹⁵ S/2000/30.

By resolution 1291 (2000), the Council also authorized the expansion of MONUC up to 5,537 military personnel, including up to 500 observers, or more, and appropriate civilian support staff in the areas of, inter alia, human rights, humanitarian affairs, public information, child protection, political affairs, medical support and administrative support, and requested the Secretary-General to recommend immediately any additional force requirements that might become necessary to enhance force protection.

On the basis of a letter and reports of the Secretary-General,²¹⁶ the mandate of the Mission was continuously extended, by a series of resolutions,²¹⁷ for various periods of up to one year, the last of which ended 30 July 2004.

By resolution 1355 (2001) of 15 June 2001, the Council approved the updated concept of operations²¹⁸ put forward by the Secretary-General in his report of 8 June 2001,²¹⁹ including, inter alia, the creation of a civilian police component and of an integrated civilian/military section to coordinate disarmament, demobilization, repatriation and reintegration operations, and authorized in that regard MONUC, consistent with the report of the Secretary-General, to assist, upon request, in the early implementation of the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation and reintegration of armed groups, and requested the Secretary-General to deploy military observers in locations where early withdrawal was implemented, with a view to monitoring the process. By that resolution, the Council also requested the Secretary-General to expand the civilian component of the Mission, in order to assign to areas in which MONUC was deployed human rights personnel, so as to establish a human rights monitoring capacity, as well as civilian political affairs and humanitarian affairs personnel.

²¹⁶ S/2000/30, S/2000/766, S/2000/888, S/2000/1156, S/2001/572, S/2002/621 and S/2003/566.

²¹⁷ Resolutions 1291 (2000), 1316 (2000), 1323 (2000), 1332 (2000), 1355 (2001), 1417 (2002), 1489 (2003) and 1493 (2003).

²¹⁸ By resolution 1332 (2000) of 14 December 2000, the Council requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Council a review of the implementation of the mandate of MONUC, including an updated concept of operations.

²¹⁹ S/2001/572.

In the light of the signing of the Pretoria Agreement²²⁰ between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda and the Luanda Agreement between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda concerning the withdrawal of their forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo,²²¹ the President, on 15 August 2002, made a statement on behalf of the members of the Council,²²² requesting the Secretary-General to submit a report to recommend how MONUC, through coordination with other United Nations agencies, could assist the parties in the fulfilment of their responsibilities under the agreements. On 10 September 2002, the Secretary-General submitted a report²²³ pursuant to that request, recommending that MONUC have an active role in the monitoring and implementation of the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation and reintegration of the troops. In consideration of this new role, the Secretary-General recommended the deployment of up to 8,700 military personnel. At its 4653rd meeting on 4 December 2002, the Council adopted resolution 1445 (2002), by which it took note of the Secretary-General's report and authorized the deployment accordingly.

By a letter dated 15 May 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,²²⁴ the Secretary-General requested the deployment of a multinational force to address the deteriorating security situation in Bunia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and reinforce MONUC until a considerably reinforced United Nations presence could be deployed. On the basis of that request, the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, authorized, by resolution 1484 (2003) of 30 May 2003, the deployment of a multinational force for an interim period until 1 September 2003 to contribute to the

stabilization of the security conditions and the improvement of the humanitarian situation in Bunia. By that resolution, the Council also authorized the Secretary-General to deploy, within the overall authorized MONUC ceiling, a reinforced United Nations presence to Bunia, and requested him to do so by mid-August 2003.

By a letter dated 14 August 2003 addressed to the President of the Council,²²⁵ the Secretary-General informed the Council that preparations for the deployment of MONUC were well under way but recommended, in order to maintain peace and security in the area during the transition period, that the Council consider authorizing the interim multinational force to provide assistance to the MONUC troops deployed in and around Bunia. By resolution 1501 (2003) of 26 August 2003, the Council authorized the States members of the interim multinational force to provide assistance to the MONUC contingent deployed in Bunia and its immediate surroundings, if MONUC requested them to do so and if exceptional circumstances demanded it.

By resolution 1493 (2003), adopted on 28 July 2003 at its 4797th meeting, the Council authorized increasing the military strength of MONUC to 10,800 personnel and authorized MONUC to assist the Government of National Unity and Transition in disarming and demobilizing those Congolese combatants who might voluntarily decide to enter the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process.²²⁶

10. United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau

During the period under review, the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNOGBIS), established pursuant to resolution 1233 (1999),²²⁷ continued to provide the political

²²⁰ Letter dated 9 August 2000 from the Permanent Representative of South Africa to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/914, annex). The agreement, signed on 30 July 2002 in Pretoria, concerned the dismantling of the ex-FAR and Interhamwe Forces in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

²²¹ Signed in Luanda on 6 September 2002. The agreement concerned both the withdrawal of the Ugandan People's Defence Force (UPDF) and the normalization of relations between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda.

²²² S/PRST/2002/24.

²²³ S/2002/1005.

²²⁴ S/2003/574.

²²⁵ S/2003/821.

²²⁶ For recommendations concerning MONUC, see the second special report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (S/2003/566 and Corr.1) and the report of the Security Council Mission to Central Africa (S/2003/653).

²²⁷ The Office was established through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (S/1999/232 and S/1999/233). By resolution 1233 (1999), the Council reiterated its

framework and leadership for harmonizing and integrating the activities of the United Nations system in Guinea-Bissau during the transitional period leading up to general and presidential elections. It also continued to facilitate, in close cooperation with the parties concerned, ECOWAS and ECOMOG as well as other national and international partners, the implementation of the Abuja Agreement.

Mandate implementation

During the period under review, a new Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Guinea-Bissau and Chief of UNOGBIS was appointed through an exchange of letters²²⁸ between the Secretary-General and the President of the Council.

During the period under review, the mandate of UNOGBIS was extended five times through exchanges of letters²²⁹ between the Secretary-General and the President of the Council.

During the period under review, the mandate of UNOGBIS was twice revised through exchanges of letters²³⁰ between the Secretary-General and the President of the Council in order to cope with the post-electoral challenges in Guinea-Bissau, to facilitate dialogue among all actors and promote national reconciliation.

11. United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea

Establishment, mandate and composition

Following a ceasefire agreement between Ethiopia and Eritrea on 18 June 2000,²³¹ and on the

support of the decision of the Secretary-General to establish UNOGBIS.

²²⁸ S/2000/1180 and S/2000/1181.

²²⁹ S/2000/201 and S/2000/202; S/2000/941 and S/2000/942; S/2001/960 and S/2001/961; S/2002/916 and S/2002/917; and S/2003/1096 and S/2003/1097.

²³⁰ S/2000/201 and S/2000/202; and S/2003/1096 and S/2003/1097.

²³¹ On 30 May 2000, proximity talks had begun between the two parties under the chairmanship of the Minister of Justice of Algeria and the Personal Envoy of the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity in Algiers, which culminated in the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities (S/2000/601). On 12 December 2000, the Governments of Ethiopia and Eritrea signed the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (S/2000/1183), by which the parties agreed to permanently terminate military hostilities and respect and fully implement the

basis of the report of the Secretary-General of 30 June 2000,²³² as well as communications received from both parties,²³³ the Council adopted, at its 4181st meeting on 31 July 2000, resolution 1312 (2000), by which it decided to establish the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) until 31 January 2001, in anticipation of a peacekeeping operation subject to future Council authorization.²³⁴

The mandate of UNMEE, as set out in resolution 1312 (2000), was to (a) to establish and maintain liaison with the parties; (b) to visit the parties' military headquarters and other units in all areas of operation of the mission deemed necessary by the Secretary-General; (c) to establish and put into operation the mechanism for verifying the cessation of hostilities; and (d) to prepare for the establishment of the Military Coordination Commission provided for in the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement.

By resolution 1312 (2000), the Council initially authorized up to 100 military observers and the necessary civilian support staff for the Mission.

Mandate implementation

During the period under review, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Ethiopia and Eritrea²³⁵ and the Force Commander of UNMEE²³⁶ were appointed, and the list of States contributing military personnel to UNMEE²³⁷ was confirmed through exchanges of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Council.

Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities. The Agreement also provided for, inter alia, the establishment of a neutral boundary commission mandated to delimit and demarcate the colonial treaty border based on pertinent colonial treaties and applicable international law.

²³² S/2000/643.

²³³ S/2000/612 and S/2000/627.

²³⁴ By a letter dated 7 July 2000 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2000/676), the members of the Council had previously endorsed the Secretary-General's proposal to send a reconnaissance and liaison mission to the region to discuss with the parties and OAU a concept of operations for the mission.

²³⁵ S/2000/947 and S/2000/948.

²³⁶ S/2000/1037 and S/2000/1038.

²³⁷ S/2000/1018 and S/2000/1019.

On the basis of the reports submitted by the Secretary-General,²³⁸ the mandate of UNMEE was extended on seven occasions for additional periods of six months,²³⁹ the last of which was until 15 March 2004.

Following the signing of the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities between Ethiopia and Eritrea in Algiers on 18 June 2000,²⁴⁰ the Secretary-General outlined, in a report dated 9 August 2000,²⁴¹ proposals for an expanded mandate for UNMEE and set out its structure and concept of operations in detail. The Secretary-General proposed that UNMEE have a mandate to monitor the cessation of hostilities; assist in the observance of the parties' security commitments; monitor and verify the redeployment of Ethiopian troops and monitor their positions once redeployed; monitor the positions of Eritrean forces to remain 25 kilometres from those positions; monitor the Temporary Security Zone (TSZ); chair the Military Coordination Committee; and coordinate and provide technical assistance for humanitarian assistance and mine action activities in the TSZ and adjacent areas. The Mission would be composed of political, military, public information, mine action and administrative components and be headed by the Secretary-General's representative. To fulfil its proposed mandate, UNMEE required 4,200 personnel including 220 military observers, three infantry battalions and the necessary support units. By resolution 1320 (2000) of 15 September 2000, the Council expanded the mandate of UNMEE accordingly and authorized the deployment within UNMEE of up to 4,200 troops until 15 March 2001. By that resolution, the Council also emphasized that the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities between Ethiopia and Eritrea linked the termination of the United Nations peacekeeping mission with the completion of the process of delimitation and demarcation of the Ethiopian-Eritrean border and requested the Secretary-General to provide regular updates on the status of that issue.

By resolution 1430 (2002) of 14 August 2002, the Council authorized UNMEE to assist the Eritrea-

Ethiopia Boundary Commission²⁴² in the expeditious and orderly implementation of its delimitation decision including, with immediate effect, demining in key areas to support demarcation, and the provision of administrative and logistical support to its Field Offices.²⁴³

12. United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic

Until its termination, the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA), established pursuant to resolution 1159 (1998), continued to supervise the final disposition of all weapons retrieved in the course of the disarmament exercise.

Termination of mandate and transition to a new mission

By resolution 1271 (1999) of 22 October 1999, the Security Council decided to extend the mandate of MINURCA until 15 February 2000, with a view to ensuring a short and gradual transition from United Nations peacekeeping to a post-conflict peacebuilding presence.²⁴⁴ The mission was therefore terminated on 15 February 2000.

13. United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic

Establishment, mandate and composition

Following the withdrawal of MINURCA, the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic (BONUCA) was established on 15 February 2000 for one year through an exchange of letters²⁴⁵ between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council. In a presidential statement made on 10 February 2000 on behalf of the

²³⁸ S/2000/785, S/2001/202, S/2001/843, S/2002/245, S/2002/977, S/2003/257 and S/2003/858.

²³⁹ Resolutions 1320 (2000), 1344 (2001), 1369 (2001), 1398 (2002), 1434 (2002), 1466 (2003) and 1507 (2003).

²⁴⁰ S/2000/601.

²⁴¹ S/2000/785.

²⁴² The Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission was established pursuant to the Agreement of 12 December 2000 between Eritrea and Ethiopia (S/2000/183) with a mandate to delimit and demarcate the colonial treaty border based on pertinent colonial treaties (1900, 1902 and 1908) and applicable international law.

²⁴³ For the recommendation of the Secretary-General, see his report of 10 July 2002 on Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2002/744).

²⁴⁴ Resolution 1271 (1999), para. 1.

²⁴⁵ S/1999/1235 and S/1999/1236.

Council,²⁴⁶ the Council welcomed the decision by the Secretary-General to establish BONUCA.

The mandate of BONUCA was to support the Transitional Government's efforts to consolidate peace and national reconciliation, strengthen democratic institutions and facilitate the mobilization at the international level of political support and resources for national reconstruction and economic recovery in the country. The Office was to include a small number of military and civilian police advisers to follow up on security-related reforms and to assist in the implementation of the training programmes for the national police.²⁴⁷

Mandate implementation

During the period under review, on the basis of the recommendations of the Secretary-General,²⁴⁸ the Council decided²⁴⁹ to extend the mandate of BONUCA for four additional periods, the last of which ended 31 December 2004.

Pursuant to a request by the Security Council,²⁵⁰ the Secretary-General proposed, in his report dated 21 September 2001,²⁵¹ various measures for the strengthening of the mandate of BONUCA, particularly in the areas of the judicial system, institution-building, enhancing the effectiveness of its early-warning capabilities and human rights. By a presidential statement dated 26 September 2001,²⁵² the Council approved the revised mandate of BONUCA.

14. United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire

Establishment, mandate and composition

By resolution 1479 (2003) of 13 May 2003, the Security Council decided to establish the United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (MINUCI) for an initial period of six months.²⁵³

²⁴⁶ S/PRST/2000/5.

²⁴⁷ For further details, see S/1999/35.

²⁴⁸ S/2000/943, S/2001/886, S/2002/929 and S/2003/889.

²⁴⁹ S/2000/944, S/PRST/2001/25, S/2002/930 and S/2003/890.

²⁵⁰ S/PRST/2001/18.

²⁵¹ S/2001/886.

²⁵² S/PRST/2001/25.

²⁵³ For the recommendations of the Secretary-General, see the report of 26 March 2003 on Côte d'Ivoire (S/2003/374 and Corr.1 and Add.1).

The mandate of MINUCI, as set out in resolution 1479 (2003), was to facilitate the implementation by the Ivorian parties of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement,²⁵⁴ complementing the operations of the French and ECOWAS forces.

By resolution 1479 (2003), the Council stressed that the military liaison group should initially be composed of 26 military officers, and that up to 50 additional officers might be deployed progressively, if security conditions permitted, and approved the establishment of a small support staff for the Special Representative. The Chief Military Liaison Officer of MINUCI was appointed through an exchange of letters²⁵⁵ between the Secretary-General and the President of the Council.

Mandate implementation

On the basis of the recommendations of the Secretary-General,²⁵⁶ the Council extended, by resolution 1514 (2003) of 13 November 2003, the mandate of MINUCI for a further period until 4 February 2004.

Americas

15. United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti

During the period under review, the United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (MIPONUH), established pursuant to resolution 1141 (1997), continued to assist the Government of Haiti in the professionalization of the Haitian National Police.

Mandate implementation

Termination of mandate

In his report of 25 February 2000,²⁵⁷ the Secretary-General stated that by early February 2000, the withdrawal plans for the Mission's civilian police personnel had been finalized and their repatriation was

²⁵⁴ The Linas-Marcoussis Agreement was signed in January 2003 by all Ivorian political forces. For details, see S/2003/99, annex 1.

²⁵⁵ S/2003/606 and S/2003/607.

²⁵⁶ S/2003/1069.

²⁵⁷ S/2000/150.

expected to be concluded by 15 March 2000.²⁵⁸ By a presidential statement on 15 March 2000,²⁵⁹ the Council commended the Secretary-General for ensuring a phased transition from MIPONUH to the International Civilian Support Mission in Haiti (MICAH).²⁶⁰

Asia

16. The United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan

Establishment, mandate and composition

On the basis of the report of the Secretary-General of 18 March 2002,²⁶¹ by resolution 1401 (2002) of 28 March 2002, the Security Council established the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA), for an initial period of 12 months.

The mandate of UNAMA consisted of the following: (a) fulfilling the tasks and responsibilities, including those related to human rights, the rule of law and gender issues, entrusted to the United Nations in the Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan Pending the Re-establishment of Permanent Government Institutions,²⁶² endorsed in resolution 1383 (2001); (b) promoting national reconciliation and rapprochement throughout the country, through the good offices of the Secretary-General's Special Representative; and (c) managing all United Nations humanitarian relief, recovery and reconstruction activities, under the overall authority of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and in coordination with the Interim Authority and successor administrations of Afghanistan.²⁶³

²⁵⁸ See S/2000/150, para. 43. The Mission had earmarked some assets to be retained in MICAH. The liquidation phase was expected to be completed by 30 June 2000.

²⁵⁹ S/PRST/2000/8.

²⁶⁰ The General Assembly, by its resolution 54/193 of 17 December 1999, decided to establish the International Civilian Support Mission in Haiti; the transition from MIPONUH to MICAH occurred on 16 March 2000.

²⁶¹ S/2002/278.

²⁶² The Agreement (Bonn Agreement) was signed in Bonn, Germany, on 5 December 2001. It established an interim Afghan Government following the fall of the Taliban and prescribed the drafting of a new constitution and the holding of general elections (S/2001/1154).

²⁶³ S/2002/278, p. 15.

In addition to an office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and an administrative and logistical support component, it was proposed that the mission have two main arms, or "pillars". Each of the two pillars would be headed by a Deputy Special Representative, at the rank of Assistant Secretary-General, reporting directly to the Secretary-General's Special Representative. Pillar I dealt with political affairs. In the initial phase, pillar I consisted of approximately 30 to 40 international political/civil affairs officers, supported by teams of national staff, based at mission headquarters in Kabul and deployed in small teams (of up to four officers) to each of the seven regions. Pillar II dealt with relief, recovery and reconstruction. In the initial phase, pillar II consisted of approximately 50 international personnel, based at mission headquarters in Kabul or in the seven regional offices, and also included up to 10 international staff located in the semi-autonomous information and data management facility. The mission support component of UNAMA comprised around 100 international mission support staff, headed by a Chief Administrative Officer at the D-1 level. Fifty mission support staff were based in Kabul, with up to seven mission support staff (including security officers) deployed to each of the seven regional offices.²⁶⁴

Mandate implementation

In his report of 18 March 2003,²⁶⁵ the Secretary-General recommended that within the Office of the Special Representative in UNAMA the Military Advisory Unit be enlarged to a total of eight officers; the civilian police advisory unit be expanded to a total of eight police advisers; and that one Corrections Adviser be attached to the Office of the Special Representative. He also recommended that Pillar I, which dealt with political affairs, provide support and assistance to the Government in the preparation for national elections, including the registration of voters and coordination of international assistance, which would require the establishment of an electoral section headed by an internationally recognized senior expert supported by an appropriate team in Kabul and in the provinces.

By resolution 1471 (2003) of 28 March 2003, the Security Council welcomed the recommendations of

²⁶⁴ S/2002/278.

²⁶⁵ S/2003/333.

the Secretary-General and endorsed his proposal that an electoral unit be established within UNAMA. The Council also extended the mandate of UNAMA for an additional period of 12 months, until 28 March 2004.

17. United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan

During the period under review, the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP), established pursuant to resolution 47 (1949), continued to monitor the ceasefire between India and Pakistan in the State of Jammu and Kashmir on the basis of Security Council resolution 91 (1951).²⁶⁶

18. United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan

During the period under review, the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT), established pursuant to resolution 968 (1994), continued to monitor the ceasefire agreement between the Government of Tajikistan and the United Tajik Opposition.

Termination of mandate and transition to a new mission

In his report dated 14 March 2000,²⁶⁷ the Secretary-General observed that, with the holding of the first multiparty parliamentary election in Tajikistan, the transition period envisaged in the General Agreement on the Establishment of Peace and National Accord in Tajikistan was coming to a close and thus so was the process that UNMOT had been set up to support. He therefore recommended that UNMOT withdraw when its mandate expired on 15 May 2000 in accordance with resolution 1274 (1999) of 12 November 1999. In its presidential statements of 21 March²⁶⁸ and 12 May 2000,²⁶⁹ the Council supported the intention of the Secretary-General to withdraw the Mission as scheduled, and stated that it expected the Secretary-General to inform it about the outcome of his consultations with the Government of Tajikistan on a

²⁶⁶ Since 1971, the Council has not formally discussed UNMOGIP, which is funded from the regular United Nations budget without the requirement of a periodic renewal procedure.

²⁶⁷ S/2000/214.

²⁶⁸ S/PRST/2000/9.

²⁶⁹ S/PRST/2000/17.

role for the United Nations in the period of post-conflict peacebuilding and consolidation.

Following the successful completion of its mandate, UNMOT was terminated on 15 May 2000, in accordance with the expiration of its mandate. The United Nations Tajikistan Office of Peacebuilding was subsequently established on 1 June 2000.

19. The United Nations Tajikistan Office of Peacebuilding

Establishment, mandate and composition

Prior to the withdrawal of the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT), in his report of 5 May 2000, the Secretary-General recommended the establishment of a peacebuilding office in Tajikistan. The Council, in a statement by the President dated 12 May 2000, expressed its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his intention to inform the Council of the modalities of the establishment and functioning of a United Nations post-conflict peacebuilding office in Tajikistan, in order to consolidate peace and promote democracy. The United Nations Tajikistan Office of Peacebuilding (UNTOP) was subsequently established through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council,²⁷⁰ for an initial period of one year, starting on 1 June 2000.

The mandate of UNTOP was (a) to provide the political framework and leadership for post-conflict peacebuilding activities of the United Nations system in the country, which included supporting the efforts of the Resident Coordinator and the United Nations system, including the Bretton Woods institutions, in promoting an integrated approach to the development and implementation of post-conflict peacebuilding programmes aimed at national reconstruction, economic recovery, poverty alleviation and good governance; (b) to mobilize, in close cooperation with the United Nations country team, international support for the implementation of targeted programmes aimed at strengthening the rule of law, demobilization, voluntary arms collection and employment creation for former irregular fighters; (c) to help in creating an enabling environment for consolidating peace, democracy and the rule of law; and (d) to work in liaison with the Government, political parties and other

²⁷⁰ S/2000/518 and S/2000/519.

representatives of civic society in broadening national consensus and reconciliation.²⁷¹

The United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Tajikistan was headed by a Representative of the Secretary-General at the D-2 level, assisted by a small team of internationally recruited professional and support staff.²⁷²

Mandate implementation

During the period under review, through exchanges of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, the mandate of UNTOP was extended three times for periods of one year, the last of which ended 1 June 2004.²⁷³

20. United Nations Political Office in Bougainville

During the period under review, the United Nations Political Office in Bougainville (UNPOB) continued to work in conjunction with the Peace Monitoring Group in order to monitor and report on the implementation of the Lincoln Agreement on Peace, Security and Development on Bougainville and the Arawa Agreement,²⁷⁴ including the activities of the Peace Monitoring Group in relation to its mandate; to chair the Peace Process Consultative Committee; and to assist in other areas as agreed by the parties.²⁷⁵

Mandate implementation

During the period under review, the mandate of UNPOB was extended on three occasions through exchanges of letters²⁷⁶ between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council for additional periods of 12 months, the last of which ended on 31 December 2003.

In a letter dated 22 October 2001,²⁷⁷ the Secretary-General informed the Council that UNPOB would perform additional functions in the area of weapons collection and disposal as spelled out in part E of the Bougainville Peace Agreement.²⁷⁸

Termination of mandate and transition to a new mission

On the basis of the recommendations of the Secretary-General,²⁷⁹ the Council endorsed a final extension of the mandate of UNPOB until 31 December 2003.

By a letter dated 19 December 2003 addressed to the President of the Council,²⁸⁰ the Secretary-General stated that, in accordance with the request of the Government of Papua New Guinea, he intended to establish a small, follow-on United Nations Observer Mission in Bougainville (UNOMB) for six months. The Office should finish the residual tasks of UNPOB and support the efforts of the parties in the transitional period leading to the elections. In a letter dated 23 December 2003 from the President of the Council addressed to the Secretary-General,²⁸¹ the Council took note of the Secretary-General's intention.

21. United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor

The United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), established pursuant to resolution 1272 (1999), continued, inter alia, to administer the territory of East Timor, exercising legislative and executive authority during the transition period and to support capacity-building for self-government of East Timor.

²⁷¹ S/2000/518.

²⁷² *Ibid.*

²⁷³ S/2001/445, S/2001/446, S/2002/501, S/2002/502, S/2003/542 and S/2003/543.

²⁷⁴ The Arawa Agreement concerns the modalities of the ceasefire between the parties. See S/1998/506, annex.

²⁷⁵ The Office was established in 1998 through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (S/1998/506 and S/1998/507).

²⁷⁶ S/2000/1139 and S/2000/1140, S/2001/1202 and S/2001/1203, and S/2002/1379 and 1380.

²⁷⁷ S/2001/988.

²⁷⁸ See S/2001/988, enclosure II.

²⁷⁹ S/2002/1379.

²⁸⁰ S/2003/1198.

²⁸¹ S/2003/1199.

Mandate implementation

On the basis of reports of the Secretary-General,²⁸² the Council decided twice²⁸³ during the period under review to extend the mandate of UNTAET for further periods, the last of which ended on 20 May 2002, the date of the independence of East Timor.

Termination of mandate

At the Council's 4244th meeting, held on 6 December 2000, the President made a statement²⁸⁴ on behalf of the members of the Council, by which the Council endorsed the recommendations contained in the report of the Security Council Mission to East Timor and Indonesia dated 21 November 2000,²⁸⁵ noting in particular the view of the Mission that a strong international presence would be required in East Timor after independence.

By a presidential statement dated 31 October 2001,²⁸⁶ the Council endorsed the proposal of the Constituent Assembly that independence be declared on 20 May 2002. By that statement, the Council also took note of the Secretary-General's observation²⁸⁷ that the mandate of UNTAET should be extended until independence and endorsed his plan for adjusting the size and configuration of UNTAET in the months prior to independence.

On 31 January 2002, the Council adopted resolution 1392 (2002), by which it endorsed the recommendation²⁸⁸ by the Secretary-General to extend the mandate of UNTAET until 20 May 2002, the date of independence of East Timor. By that resolution, the Council also stated it was looking forward to receiving further specific proposals from the Secretary-General for the mandate and structure for a successor United Nations mission after independence at least one month before the date of independence.

In accordance with resolution 1392 (2002), the mandate of UNTAET was terminated on 20 May 2002.

²⁸² S/2001/42 and S/2002/80.

²⁸³ Resolutions 1338 (2001) and 1392 (2002).

²⁸⁴ S/PRST/2000/39 (2000).

²⁸⁵ S/2000/1105 (2000).

²⁸⁶ S/PRST/2001/32.

²⁸⁷ See S/2001/983.

²⁸⁸ See S/2002/80.

22. United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor

Establishment, mandate and composition

By resolution 1410 (2002) of 17 May 2002, the Council decided to establish, as of 20 May 2002, and for an initial period of 12 months, the United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISET).

The mandate of UNMISET, as set out in resolution 1410 (2002), was to provide assistance to core administrative structures critical to the viability and political stability of East Timor; to provide interim law enforcement and public security and to assist in the development of a new law enforcement agency in East Timor, the East Timor Police Service; and to contribute to the maintenance of the external and internal security of East Timor. By that resolution, the Council also authorized UNMISET, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to take the necessary actions, for the duration of its mandate, to fulfil its mandate.

The Mission was to be headed by a Special Representative of the Secretary-General and was to consist of a civilian component comprising an office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General with focal points for gender and HIV/AIDS, a civilian support group of up to 100 personnel filling core functions, a serious crimes unit and a human rights unit; a civilian police component initially comprising 1,250 officers; and a military component with an initial strength of up to 5,000 troops including 120 military observers.

Mandate implementation

By resolution 1480 (2003) of 19 May 2003, the Council extended the mandate of UNMISET until 20 May 2004.

On 4 April 2003, the Council decided, by resolution 1473 (2003), that the composition and strength of the police component of UNMISET and the schedule for its downsizing would be adjusted in line with the report of the Secretary-General.²⁸⁹ In addition, UNMISET would include, *inter alia*, an internationally formed unit for one year and put greater emphasis on human rights and rule of law elements. By that resolution, the Council also decided that the schedule for the downsizing of the military component of

²⁸⁹ S/2003/243.

UNMISSET for the period ending December 2003 would be adjusted in line with the letter dated 28 March 2003²⁹⁰ from the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations addressed to the members of the Security Council.

Europe

23. United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus

During the period under review, the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), established pursuant to resolution 186 (1964), continued to perform its mandate to use its best efforts to prevent a recurrence of fighting. On the basis of reports of the Secretary-General,²⁹¹ the Council successively extended, on eight occasions,²⁹² the mandate of UNFICYP for additional periods of six months, the last of which ended on 15 June 2004.

24. United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia

During the period under review, the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG), established pursuant to resolution 858 (1993), continued to verify compliance with the ceasefire agreement between the Government of Georgia and the Abkhaz authorities in Georgia, to investigate reported or alleged violations of the Agreement and to resolve or contribute to the resolution of such incidents.

Mandate implementation

The Security Council adopted eight resolutions²⁹³ on the basis of the recommendations of the Secretary-General,²⁹⁴ extending the mandate of UNOMIG for

additional periods of six months, the last of which ended 31 January 2004.

By resolution 1494 (2003),²⁹⁵ the Security Council endorsed the recommendations of the Secretary-General in his report of 21 July 2003 that a civilian police component of 20 officers be added to UNOMIG, inter alia, to strengthen its capacity to carry out its mandate and, in particular, to contribute to the conditions conducive to the safe and dignified return of internally displaced persons and refugees.²⁹⁶

25. United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina

The United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH), established pursuant to resolution 1035 (1995), composed of the International Police Task Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina and a civilian office, continued to implement the reform and restructuring of law enforcement agencies in Bosnia and Herzegovina and thus to contribute to strengthening the rule of law in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as set out in the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina.²⁹⁷

Mandate implementation

On the basis of reports of the Secretary-General,²⁹⁸ the Council extended the mandate of UNMIBH by a series of resolutions²⁹⁹ for various time periods, the last of which ended on 31 December 2002.

²⁹⁵ Resolution 1494 (2003), para. 17.

²⁹⁶ S/2003/751, para. 30.

²⁹⁷ Negotiated at Dayton, Ohio, and signed in Paris on 14 December 1995 (S/1995/999). It has become customary to refer to this Agreement as the "Dayton Agreement".

²⁹⁸ S/2000/529, S/2001/571 and S/2002/618.

²⁹⁹ Resolutions 1305 (2000), 1357 (2001), 1418 (2002), 1420 (2002), 1421 (2002) and 1423 (2002). The final extension of the Mission's mandate until 31 December 2002 by resolution 1423 (2002) of 12 July 2002 followed the adoption of resolution 1422 (2002) on the same day, by which the Council requested, consistent with Article 16 of the Rome Statute, that the International Criminal Court should not, for a twelve-month period starting 1 July 2002, commence or proceed with investigation or prosecution of any case that arose involving current or former officials or personnel from a contributing State not a Party to the Rome Statute over acts or omissions relating to a United Nations established or authorized operation.

²⁹⁰ Transmitted in a letter dated 3 April 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/379, annex).

²⁹¹ S/2000/496, S/2000/1138, S/2001/534, S/2001/1122, S/2002/590, S/2002/1243, S/2003/572 and S/2003/1078.

²⁹² Resolutions 1303 (2000), 1331 (2000), 1354 (2001), 1384 (2001), 1416 (2002), 1442 (2002), 1486 (2003) and 1517 (2003).

²⁹³ Resolutions 1287 (2000), 1311 (2000), 1339 (2001), 1364 (2001), 1427 (2002), 1393 (2002), 1462 (2003) and 1494 (2003).

²⁹⁴ S/2000/39, S/2000/697, S/2001/59, S/2001/713, S/2002/88, S/2002/742, S/2003/39 and S/2003/751.

Termination of mandate and transition to a new mission

By resolution 1396 (2002) of 5 March 2002, the Council welcomed the acceptance by the Steering Board of the Peace Implementation Council,³⁰⁰ on 28 February 2002, of the offer made by the European Union to provide a European Union police mission from 1 January 2003, to follow the end of the mandate of UNMIBH as part of a coordinated rule of law programme.³⁰¹

In a report dated 5 June 2002,³⁰² the Secretary-General indicated that UNMIBH was rapidly moving towards the completion of its core tasks by the end of 2002, as envisaged by the mandate implementation plan.³⁰³ The Secretary-General recommended extending the mandate of UNMIBH at an authorized strength of 1,600 police officers, to be drawn down after the 5 October general elections to 460 officers by 31 December 2002.

By resolution 1423 (2002) of 12 July 2002, the Council decided to extend the mandate of UNMIBH for an additional period terminating on 31 December 2002. It also welcomed the decision of the European Union to send the European Union Police Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1 January 2003 as well as the close coordination between the European Union, UNMIBH and the High Representative to ensure a seamless transition, and the invitation of the European Union to States that are not members of the European Union to participate in the European Union Police Mission. In accordance with that resolution and

following the successful conclusion of its mandate, UNMIBH was terminated on 31 December 2002.

26. United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka

During the period under review, the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (UNMOP), established pursuant to resolution 1038 (1996), continued to monitor the demilitarization of the Prevlaka peninsula and of the neighbouring areas in Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Mandate implementation

During the period under review, the Council decided, by a series of resolutions,³⁰⁴ to extend the mandate of UNMOP on the basis of the reports by the Secretary-General³⁰⁵ for additional periods, the last of which ended on 15 December 2002.

Termination of mandate

In his report dated 2 October 2002,³⁰⁶ the Secretary-General expressed his conviction that the parties would be able to narrow their remaining differences to the point where the presence of the Mission was no longer needed. In that light, and given that the area of responsibility of UNMOP had remained calm and stable for a long period of time, the Secretary-General recommended that the Security Council extend the mandate of UNMOP for a period of two months, until 15 December 2002, with the Mission preparing for its withdrawal by 31 December 2002. By resolution 1437 (2002) of 11 October 2002, the Council commended the role played by UNMOP, and authorized UNMOP to continue monitoring the demilitarization of the Prevlaka peninsula, as a final extension of its mandate, until 15 December 2002. By that resolution, the Council also requested the Secretary-General to prepare for the termination of the mandate of UNMOP on 15 December 2002 and to report to it upon the completion of the mandate of UNMOP.

³⁰⁰ Following the successful negotiation of the Dayton Agreement in November 1995, a peace implementation Conference was held in London on 8 and 9 December 1995, to mobilize international support for the Agreement. The meeting resulted in the establishment of the Peace Implementation Council. The Peace Implementation Council comprised 55 countries and agencies that support the peace process. The Steering Board members were Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, United Kingdom, United States, the Presidency of the European Union, the European Commission, and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, represented by Turkey (see S/2002/230).

³⁰¹ The European Union intended also to invite States not members of the European Union to participate in the European Union Police Mission.

³⁰² S/2002/618.

³⁰³ See S/2000/529, para. 34; and S/PV.4154 and Corr.1, p. 6.

³⁰⁴ Resolutions 1285 (2000), 1307 (2000), 1335 (2001), 1362 (2001), 1387 (2001), 1424 (2002) and 1437 (2002).

³⁰⁵ S/2000/647, S/2000/661, S/2000/1251, S/2002/1, S/2002/713 and S/2002/1101.

³⁰⁶ S/2002/1101.

Pursuant to resolution 1437 (2002), the Secretary-General provided a final report³⁰⁷ on the completion of the mandate of UNMOP and stated that it was his intention to keep a small core staff for a few days beyond 15 December 2002, but not beyond 31 December 2002, to ensure that the handover was conducted in a safe and orderly fashion.

27. United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo

During the period under review, the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), established pursuant to resolution 1244 (1999), continued to work towards the establishment of fully functioning democratic provisional institutions of self-government in line with paragraph 10 of resolution 1244 (1999). The Mission monitored benchmarks which had been established by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to measure progress in the critical areas of Kosovo's democratic provisional self-government in line with paragraph 11 (e) of resolution 1244 (1999). During the period 2000-2003, UNMIK also launched the process of transferring further responsibilities to the Kosovo Provisional Institutions of Self-Government (the Provisional Institutions), consistent with paragraph 11 of resolution 1244 (1999).³⁰⁸

Mandate implementation

During the period under review, following resolution 1244 (1999), the Security Council did not adopt any new resolutions to modify the Mission's mandate. As set out in paragraph 19 of that resolution, the Council decided to establish UNMIK for "an initial period of twelve months, to continue thereafter unless the Security Council decides otherwise." During the period 2000-2003, the Council reaffirmed by various statements,³⁰⁹ that resolution 1244 (1999) remained the basis for building Kosovo's future.³¹⁰

³⁰⁷ S/2002/1341.

³⁰⁸ S/2003/421.

³⁰⁹ S/PRST/2001/34, S/PRST/2002/11 and S/PRST/2003/1.

³¹⁰ During the period under review, the Secretary-General submitted the following reports: S/2000/177, S/2000/363, S/2000/538, S/2000/1196, S/2001/218, S/2001/565, S/2001/926, S/2002/62, S/2002/436, S/2002/779, S/2002/878, S/2002/1126, S/2003/113 and S/2003/421.

In his report of 6 June 2000, the Secretary-General informed³¹¹ the Council that the humanitarian affairs pillar would cease to exist as a formal component within the UNMIK structure by the end of June 2000, as the emergency relief need of Kosovo had been successfully met.

In his report dated 7 June 2001,³¹² the Secretary-General informed the Security Council of the formal launch within UNMIK of the new police and justice pillar on 21 May 2001. The Secretary-General welcomed the support of the Security Council regarding the creation of this new pillar as expressed by members of the Council during its 4309th meeting on 9 April 2001.³¹³

Middle East

28. United Nations Truce Supervision Organization

During the period under review, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), established pursuant to resolution 50 (1948), continued to assist and cooperate with the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) in the Golan Heights and the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), in accordance with its terms of reference.³¹⁴

29. United Nations Disengagement Observer Force

During the period under review, the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF), established pursuant to resolution 350 (1974), continued to monitor the ceasefire between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic and supervise the disengagement of Israeli and Syrian forces. On the basis of the reports of the Secretary-General,³¹⁵ the

³¹¹ S/2000/538.

³¹² S/2001/565.

³¹³ S/PV.4309.

³¹⁴ Since its establishment, the Council has assigned UNTSO different tasks without formally changing its mandate: the supervision of the General Armistice, the supervision of the ceasefire between Egypt and Israel in the Sinai, and the supervision of the truce between Israel and Lebanon and Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic, in collaboration with UNIFIL and UNDOF, respectively.

³¹⁵ S/2000/459, S/2000/1103, S/2001/1079, S/2002/542, S/2002/1328, S/2003/655 and S/2003/1148.

Council decided on eight occasions³¹⁶ to extend its mandate for additional periods, the last of which ended 30 June 2004.

30. United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon

During the period under review, the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), established pursuant to resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), continued to fulfil its mandate to confirm the withdrawal of Israeli forces, restore international peace and security and assist the Government of Lebanon in restoring its effective authority in the area.

Mandate implementation

On the basis of the reports and interim reports by the Secretary-General,³¹⁷ and at the request of the Government of Lebanon,³¹⁸ the Council adopted, during the period under review, eight resolutions successively extending the Force's mandate for additional periods of six months, the last of which ended 31 January 2004.³¹⁹

In his report of 22 January 2001,³²⁰ the Secretary-General stated that over the last six months, UNIFIL had undergone an augmentation and carried out a major redeployment. As of 30 December 2000, UNIFIL comprised 5,800 troops and 480 civilian staff. It was assisted in its tasks by 51 military observers of UNTSO. He also observed that of the three parts of its mandate, UNIFIL had essentially completed two. It had confirmed the withdrawal of Israeli forces and assisted, to the extent it could, the Lebanese authorities as they returned to the area vacated by Israel. UNIFIL could not, however, compel the Lebanese Government to take the last step and deploy its personnel down to the Blue Line. By resolution 1337 (2001) of 30 January 2001, the Council decided to return the military personnel of UNIFIL to the operational level of about 4,500 all

ranks. By that resolution, the Council also requested the Secretary-General to submit a reconfiguration plan regarding UNIFIL and UNTSO.

Pursuant to resolution 1337 (2001), the Secretary-General submitted, in his interim report dated 30 April 2001,³²¹ a plan that envisaged the reconfiguration of UNIFIL to close to 2,000 all ranks and elaborated the tasks carried out by the unarmed military observers of UNTSO.³²² By a letter dated 18 May 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General,³²³ the Council endorsed the plan.

By resolution 1365 (2001) of 31 July 2001, the Council requested the Secretary-General to continue to take the necessary measures to implement the reconfiguration and redeployment of UNIFIL as outlined in his report of 30 April 2001, taking into account the possible reconfiguration of UNIFIL to an observer mission. By resolution 1461 (2003) of 30 January 2003, the Council took note of the completion of the reconfiguration of UNIFIL at the level of 2,000 all ranks at the end of 2002. The strength of the Force was stabilized at that level throughout the remaining period under review.³²⁴

31. United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission

During the period under review, the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM), established under Chapter VII pursuant to resolution 689 (1991), continued to monitor the demilitarized zone (DMZ) and the Khawr 'Abd Allah waterway between Iraq and Kuwait; to deter violations of the boundary; and to observe any hostile action mounted from the territory of one State against the other.

Mandate implementation

Prior to its termination on 6 October 2003, the Council extended the mandate of UNIKOM eight

³¹⁶ Resolutions 1300 (2000), 1328 (2000), 1351 (2001), 1381 (2001), 1415 (2002), 1451 (2002), 1488 (2003) and 1520 (2003).

³¹⁷ S/2000/28, S/2000/460, S/2000/590 and Corr.1, S/2000/718, S/2000/1049, S/2001/66, S/2001/423, S/2001/714, S/2002/55, S/2002/746, S/2003/38 and S/2003/728.

³¹⁸ S/2001/14, S/2001/677, S/2002/40, S/2002/739, S/2003/36 and S/2003/685.

³¹⁹ Resolutions 1288 (2000), 1310 (2000), 1337 (2001), 1365 (2001), 1391 (2002), 1428 (2002), 1461 (2003) and 1496 (2003).

³²⁰ S/2001/66.

³²¹ S/2001/423.

³²² *Ibid.*, paras. 6-10.

³²³ S/2001/500.

³²⁴ See S/2003/728.

times,³²⁵ in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary-General.³²⁶

Termination of mandate

In a report dated 31 March 2003,³²⁷ the Secretary-General informed the Security Council that owing to security reasons and the fact that UNIKOM could no longer fulfil its mandate, he had decided to suspend its operations on 17 March 2003. However, a small headquarters, consisting of 12 military officers, 20 essential civilian staff and some local staff, remained in Kuwait City. The Secretary-General recommended that this residual peacekeeping presence should be maintained at an appropriate level for a further three months, until 6 July 2003, subject to any further decisions the Council might take regarding the UNIKOM mandate. By a letter dated 3 April 2003, the Council concurred with the recommended extension.

Reporting to the Council on 17 June 2003,³²⁸ the Secretary-General recommended that the residual peacekeeping presence of UNIKOM should be maintained for a final three months, until 6 October 2003, when the Mission would be closed.

On 3 July 2003, the Security Council adopted resolution 1490 (2003), whereby it decided, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to continue the mandate of UNIKOM for a final period until 6 October 2003. Furthermore, the Council decided to end the demilitarized zone extending 10 kilometres into Iraq and 5 kilometres into Kuwait from the Iraq-Kuwait border at the end of the mandate of UNIKOM on 6 October 2003. In accordance with resolution 1490 (2003), UNIKOM was closed on 6 October 2003.

32. United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq

Establishment, mandate and composition

By resolution 1500 (2003) of 14 August 2003, the Security Council established the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI) to support the Secretary-General in the fulfilment of his mandate

under resolution 1483 (2003) in accordance with the structure and responsibilities set out in his report of 15 July 2003,³²⁹ for an initial period of 12 months.

By resolution 1483 (2003) of 22 May 2003, the Council decided that the independent responsibilities of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Iraq should involve, *inter alia*, coordinating activities of the United Nations in post-conflict processes in Iraq; coordinating among United Nations and international agencies engaged in humanitarian assistance and reconstruction activities in Iraq; in coordination with the Authority, assisting the people of Iraq through promoting the safe, orderly and voluntary return of refugees and displaced persons; and working with the Authority, the people of Iraq and others concerned to advance efforts to restore and establish national and local institutions for representative governance, including by working together to facilitate a process leading to an internationally recognized, representative government of Iraq.

As set out in the Secretary-General's report of 15 July 2003, and decided by the Council,³³⁰ the staff strength of UNAMI was to consist of over 300 civilian staff combined. That figure was to include international and local substantive and support personnel in Baghdad and each of the regions. The concept envisaged maximum reliance on the existing capacity and structure of the Office of the Humanitarian Coordinator and on the Humanitarian Coordinator himself. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Iraq was appointed through an exchange of letters³³¹ between the Secretary-General and the President of the Council.

Mandate implementation

Following a fatal terrorist attack on United Nations headquarters in Baghdad on 19 August 2003, the Secretary-General, by a letter dated 22 August 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,³³² informed the Council that, due to the untimely death of his Special Representative, Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello, he had appointed, on an interim basis, Mr. Ramiro Lopes da Silva as his acting Special Representative.

³²⁵ S/2000/286, S/2000/960, S/2001/328, S/2001/936, S/2002/349, S/2002/1109 and S/2003/400, and resolution 1490 (2003), para. 1.

³²⁶ S/2000/269, S/2000/914, S/2001/287, S/2001/913, S/2002/323, S/2002/1039, S/2003/393 and S/2003/656.

³²⁷ S/2003/393.

³²⁸ S/2003/656.

³²⁹ S/2003/715.

³³⁰ Resolution 1500 (2003).

³³¹ S/2003/570 and S/2003/571.

³³² S/2003/830.

Subsequently, in a report dated 5 December 2003,³³³ the Secretary-General stated that he had decided on 4 November, following a series of attacks and the report of the Independent Panel on the Safety and Security of United Nations Personnel in Iraq, to relocate all international United Nations staff in Baghdad, many of whom had already moved, pending a comprehensive review of United Nations operations in Iraq and their security implications, leaving only a small core presence of international personnel in Erbil. Therefore, the Secretary-General informed the Council that he had decided to commence the process of establishing the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq by setting up the core of the Mission outside of Iraq, with the bulk of UNAMI staff located temporarily in Nicosia and additional UNAMI staff deployed to a small office in Amman and to other locations in the region, as required. He envisaged an integrated core team of approximately 40 international UNAMI staff in total, consisting of political, human rights, public information, humanitarian and developmental programme officers, as well as security and administrative/logistics support specialists, to be in place by early 2004. That number would be expected to increase to up to 60 international staff once a new Special Representative had been appointed.

F. Ad hoc commissions and ad hoc international tribunals

Ad hoc commissions

During the period under review, the Security Council continued to oversee two ad hoc commissions: the United Nations Compensation Commission established pursuant to resolution 687 (1991) and 692 (1991), and the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission established pursuant to Security Council resolution 1284 (1999) and set up in 2000.

1. United Nations Compensation Commission established pursuant to resolutions 687 (1991) and 692 (1991)

During the period under review, the United Nations Compensation Commission, established by resolution 687 (1991) under Chapter VII of the Charter,

³³³ S/2003/1149.

continued to verify and evaluate the claims of loss, damage and injury to foreign Governments, national and corporations resulting from Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait, and to administer the payment of compensation.³³⁴

Mandate implementation

By resolution 1330 (2000), the proceeds received by the Commission were reduced from 30 to 25 per cent, which permitted it to continue its operations uninterrupted and begin to make regular compensation payments to successful claimants. On 22 May 2003, the Council adopted resolution 1483 (2003), by which it, *inter alia*, lifted the civilian sanctions imposed on Iraq following its invasion of Kuwait in 1990 and requested the Secretary-General to terminate the oil-for-food programme within six months of the adoption of the resolution. By paragraph 21 of that resolution, the Council further reduced the levels of proceeds of all export sales of Iraqi petroleum, petroleum products and natural gas to be deposited into the Compensation Fund to 5 per cent. That requirement would be binding on the future government of Iraq, unless it was decided otherwise.

2. United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission established pursuant to Security Council resolution 1284 (1999)

During the period under review, the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission,³³⁵ established by resolution 1284 (1999), continued to verify the compliance of Iraq with its obligations under paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 of resolution 687 (1991) to be rid of its weapons of mass destruction, and to operate a system of ongoing monitoring and verification to ascertain that Iraq did not reacquire the same weapons prohibited to it by the Security Council.

³³⁴ See resolutions 1293 (2000), 1302 (2000), 1330 (2000), 1352 (2001), 1360 (2001), 1382 (2001), 1409 (2002), 1447 (2002), 1454 (2002), 1472 (2003), 1476 (2003) and 1483 (2003).

³³⁵ Pursuant to para. 1 of resolution 1284 (1999), the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission replaced the United Nations Special Commission established pursuant to paragraph 9 (b) of resolution 687 (1991). The Secretary-General outlined the organizational plan for the Commission to the Security Council in his report of 6 April 2000 (S/2000/292 and Corr.1, paras. 17-30).

Mandate implementation

By a series of resolutions,³³⁶ the Council decided to continue the provisions of resolution 986 (1995) except those contained in paragraphs 4, 11 and 12 and subject to paragraph 15 of resolution 1284 (1999), for successive periods of 180 days. During the period under review, the Commission submitted 12 quarterly reports.³³⁷

By resolution 1441 (2002) of 8 November 2002, the Council decided to afford Iraq a final opportunity to comply with its disarmament obligations under relevant resolutions of the Council and accordingly decided to set up an enhanced inspection regime with the aim of bringing to full and verified completion the disarmament process established by resolution 687 (1991) and subsequent resolutions of the Council. By resolution 1441 (2002), the Council also decided that, in order to begin to comply with its disarmament obligations, in addition to submitting the required biannual declarations, the Government of Iraq should provide to the Commission, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the Council, not later than 30 days from the date of that resolution, a currently accurate, full, and complete declaration of all aspects of its programmes to develop chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, ballistic missiles and other delivery systems, including any holdings and precise locations of such weapons, components, subcomponents, stocks of agents, and related material and equipment, the locations and work of its research, development and production facilities, as well as all other chemical, biological and nuclear programmes, including any which it claimed were for purposes not related to weapon production or material. In addition, the Council decided that, by that resolution, Iraq should provide the Commission and IAEA immediate, unimpeded, unconditional, and unrestricted access to any and all, including those underground, areas, facilities, buildings, equipment, records, and means of transport which they wished to inspect.

By resolution 1483 (2003) of 22 May 2003, the Council reaffirmed that Iraq must meet its disarmament

obligations, encouraged the United Kingdom and the United States to keep the Council informed of their activities in this regard, and underlined the intention of the Council to revisit the mandate of the Commission.

Ad hoc international tribunals

During the period under review, the Council continued to oversee the work of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda, as set out below.

1. International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991

The International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991, established pursuant to Security Council resolution 827 (1993) of 25 May 1993, continued its work during the period under review.

Annexes to the Statute

On 30 November 2000, pursuant to the letter from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,³³⁸ and its annexed letters from the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda, the Council adopted resolution 1329 (2000) in order to enable the Tribunals to expedite the conclusion of their work at the earliest possible date. By that resolution, the Council, acting under Chapter VII, decided to amend the Statute and to enlarge the membership of the Appeals Chambers of the Tribunals. To that end, the Council decided that two additional judges should be elected as soon as possible as judges of the International Tribunal for Rwanda and also, without prejudice to Article 12, paragraph 4, of the Statute of that Tribunal, that, once elected, they should serve until the date of the expiry of the terms of office of the existing judges. The Council further decided that, once two judges had been elected and had taken up office, the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda should, in accordance with Article 13, paragraph 3, of

³³⁶ Resolutions 1330 (2000), 1382 (2001), 1409 (2002), 1441 (2002), 1483 (2003) and 1490 (2003).

³³⁷ S/2000/516, S/2000/835, S/2000/1134, S/2001/177, S/2001/515, S/2001/833, S/2001/1126, S/2002/195, S/2002/606, S/2002/981, S/2002/1303, S/2003/232, S/2003/580, S/2003/844 and S/2003/1135.

³³⁸ S/2000/865.

the Statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda and Article 14, paragraph 4, of the Statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, take the necessary steps as soon as was practicable to assign two of the judges elected or appointed in accordance with Article 12 of the Statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda to be members of the Appeals Chambers of the International Tribunals. The Council also requested the Secretary-General to make practical arrangements for the elections of the two additional judges.

At its 4535th meeting, on 17 May 2002, the Council adopted resolution 1411 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, decided to amend the Statutes of the Tribunals. By the same resolution, the Council recognized that a person who for the purposes of membership of the Chambers of the Tribunals could be regarded as a national of more than one State should be deemed to be a national of the State in which that person ordinarily exercised civil and political rights.

At its 4061st meeting, on 14 August 2002, the Council adopted resolution 1431 (2002), by which it decided to amend articles 13 bis and 14 of the Statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and to replace those articles with the provisions set out in annex II of the resolution.

At its 4760th meeting, on 19 May 2003, having considered, at the urging of the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, Judge Theodor Meron,³³⁹ the letter of his predecessor, Judge Claude Jorda, the Council adopted resolution 1481 (2003). By that resolution the Council, acting under Chapter VII, decided to amend the Statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia by enhancing the power of ad litem judges. Article 13 quater of the Statute permitted ad litem judges to carry out pretrial work in addition to participating in the trials to which they were assigned.

³³⁹ See the letter dated 18 March 2002 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President (S/2002/304) and the letter dated 7 May 2003 from the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/530).

Election of judges

The Council, at its 4274th meeting, on 8 February 2001, in consideration of the nominations for permanent judges of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia received by the Secretary-General and in accordance with article 13 bis, 1 (d), of the Statute of the Tribunal, adopted resolution 1340 (2001), by which it established a list of 26 candidates from which the General Assembly could elect 14 permanent judges of the Tribunal.

In consideration of the nominations for ad litem judges of the Tribunal received by the Secretary-General and in accordance with article 13 ter, 1 (d), of the Statute of the Tribunal, the Council, at its 4316th meeting, on 27 April 2001 adopted resolution 1350 (2001), by which it established a list of 64 candidates, from which the General Assembly could elect 28 ad litem judges of the Tribunal.

Appointment of the Prosecutor

At its 4819th meeting, on 4 September 2003, in accordance with article 16 (4) of the Statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the Council adopted resolution 1504 (2003), by which it appointed the Secretary-General's nominee, Mrs. Carla Del Ponte, as Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia with effect from 15 September 2003 for a term of four years.

Annual reports to the Security Council and the General Assembly

During the period under review, in accordance with article 34 of the Statute of the Tribunal, the President of the Tribunal submitted through the Secretary-General four annual reports³⁴⁰ of the Tribunal to the Security Council and General Assembly.

Time frame for completion of trials

By a letter dated 10 June 2002 addressed to the Secretary-General,³⁴¹ the President of the Tribunal reported on the judicial status of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the prospects of referring certain cases to national courts in order to complete the Tribunal's work by 2008.

³⁴⁰ S/2000/777, S/2001/865, S/2002/985 and S/2003/829.

³⁴¹ S/2002/678.

2. International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994

The International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994, established pursuant to Security Council resolution 955 (1994) of 8 November 1994, continued its work during the period under review.

Annexes to the Statute

At its 4240th meeting on 30 November 2000, pursuant to the letter from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council³⁴² and the annexed letters from the Presidents of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda, the Council adopted resolution 1329 (2000).³⁴³

By resolution 1411 (2002), adopted at the 4535th meeting, on 17 May 2002, the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, decided to amend the Statutes of the Tribunals and recognized that a person who for the purposes of membership of the Chambers of the Tribunals could be regarded as a national of more than one State should be deemed to be a national of the State in which that person ordinarily exercised civil and political rights.

By a letter dated 14 September 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,³⁴⁴ the Secretary-General transmitted a letter dated 9 July 2001 from the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda containing a request from the Tribunal for ad litem judges. In her report, the President of the International

Tribunal for Rwanda, Judge Navanethem Pillay, proposed the creation of a pool of 18 ad litem judges for the Tribunal, similar to the solution adopted for the judicial backlog at the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, to ensure the timely completion of the mandate of the International Tribunal for Rwanda. By a letter dated 4 March 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General transmitted a revised summary of the request for ad litem judges.³⁴⁵

At its 4061st meeting, on 14 August 2002, the Security Council adopted resolution 1431 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII, decided to amend the Statute of the Tribunal and to establish a pool of 18 ad litem judges.

At its 4849th meeting, on 27 October 2003, the Council adopted resolution 1512 (2003), whereby the Council, acting under Chapter VII, decided to amend the Statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda to enhance the power of ad litem judges, pursuant to two requests by the President of the Tribunal, Judge Erik Møse, for the improvement of its judicial capacity.³⁴⁶ As amended, article 12 quater of the Statute permitted ad litem judges to carry out pretrial work in addition to participating in the trials to which they were assigned. The Council further decided to increase the number of ad litem judges that might be appointed at any one time to serve in the Trial Chambers of the Tribunal.

Election of Judges

At its 4307th meeting, on 30 March 2001, in consideration of the nominations for judges of the International Tribunal for Rwanda received by the Secretary-General and in accordance with article 12, paragraph 2 (d), of the Statute of the Tribunal, the Council adopted resolution 1347 (2001), by which it established a list of five candidates from which the General Assembly could elect the two additional judges of the Tribunal.

At its 4666th meeting, on 13 December 2002, in consideration of the nominations for permanent judges of the International Tribunal for Rwanda received by the Secretary-General and in accordance with article 12 bis, paragraph 1 (d), of the Statute of the Tribunal, the Council adopted resolution 1449 (2002), whereby it

³⁴² S/2000/865.

³⁴³ For the details of resolution 1329 (2000), see the preceding section on the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

³⁴⁴ S/2011/764 and Corr.1, annex.

³⁴⁵ S/2002/241.

³⁴⁶ S/2003/879 and S/2003/946.

established a list of 23 candidates from which the General Assembly could elect the 11 permanent judges of the Tribunal.

At its 4745th meeting, on 29 April 2003, in consideration of the nominations for ad litem judges of the International Tribunal for Rwanda received by the Secretary-General and in accordance with article 12 quater, paragraph 1 (d), of the Statute of the Tribunal, the Council adopted resolution 1477 (2003), whereby it established a list of 35 candidates from which the General Assembly could elect 18 ad litem judges of the Tribunal.

Appointment of the Prosecutor

By resolution 1503 (2003) of 28 August 2003, the Council, convinced that the Tribunals could most efficiently and expeditiously meet their respective responsibilities if each had its own Prosecutor, amended the Statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda and created a new position of Prosecutor for the International Tribunal for Rwanda. By resolution 1505 (2003) of 4 September 2003, the Council, in accordance with article 15 (4) of the Statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, appointed the nominee of the Secretary-General, Mr. Hassan Bubacar Jallow, as Prosecutor of the Tribunal with effect from 15 September 2003 for a term of four years.

Annual reports to the Security Council and to the General Assembly

During the period under review, in accordance with article 34 of the Statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, the President of the Tribunal submitted through the Secretary-General four annual reports³⁴⁷ of the Tribunal to the Council and the General Assembly.

Time frame for completion of trials

By resolution 1503 (2003) of 28 August 2003, the Council urged the International Tribunal for Rwanda to formalize a detailed strategy, modelled on the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia Completion Strategy, to transfer cases involving intermediate- and lower-rank accused to competent national jurisdictions, as appropriate, including Rwanda, to allow the International Tribunal for Rwanda to achieve its objective of completing investigations by the end of 2004, all trial activities at first instance by the end of the 2008, and all of its work in 2010 (International Tribunal for Rwanda Completion Strategy). By a letter dated 3 October 2003 addressed to the President of the Security-Council,³⁴⁸ the Secretary-General transmitted a letter dated 29 September 2003 from the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, Judge Erik Møse, containing the Completion Strategy of that Tribunal.

³⁴⁷ S/2000/927, S/2001/863, S/2002/733 and S/2003/707.

³⁴⁸ S/2003/946.

Part II

Subsidiary organs of the Security Council whose mandate was completed or terminated during the period 2000-2003

<i>Subsidiary organ</i>	<i>Established by resolution/letter/ exchange of letters</i>	<i>Completion of mandate/termination^a</i>
Peacekeeping operations/political missions		
United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA)	Resolution 1159 (1998)	15 February 2000
United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (MIPONUH)	Resolution 1141 (1997)	15 March 2000

<i>Subsidiary organ</i>	<i>Established by resolution/letter/ exchange of letters</i>	<i>Completion of mandate/termination^a</i>
United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT)	Resolution 968 (1994)	15 May 2000
United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET)	Resolution 1272 (1999)	20 May 2002
United Nations Office in Angola (UNOA)	Resolution 1268 (1999)	15 August 2002
United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (UNMOP)	Resolution 1038 (1996)	15 December 2002
United Nations mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH)	Resolution 1035 (1995)	31 December 2002
United Nations Peace-building Support Office in Liberia (UNOL)	S/1997/817	19 September 2003
United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM)	Resolution 689 (1991)	6 October 2003
United Nations Political Office in Bougainville (UNPOB)	S/1998/506 and S/1998/507	31 December 2003
Security Council committees		
Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 985 (1995) concerning Liberia		7 March 2001
Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1298 (2000) concerning the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia		16 May 2001
Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1160 (1998)		10 September 2001
Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola		9 December 2002
Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 748 (1992) concerning the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		12 September 2003
Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait		21 November 2003
Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia		22 December 2003

^a For details of termination, see the relevant sections of part I.

Part III

Subsidiary organs of the Security Council proposed but not established

Note

During the period under review, there were two instances in which a subsidiary organ was formally proposed but not created. The suggestions were submitted in the form of draft resolutions and related to the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question. They are set out in the case studies below.³⁴⁹

Case 1

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

At the 4248th meeting of the Council, on 18 December 2000, during consideration of the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, the President of the Security Council drew the attention of the members to a draft resolution³⁵⁰ submitted by Bangladesh, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mali, Namibia and Tunisia. By that draft resolution, the Council would have expressed its determination to establish a United Nations Force of military and police observers to be dispatched throughout the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, with the aim of contributing to the implementation of the Sharm El-Sheikh agreements, the cessation of violence and enhancing the safety and security of Palestinian civilians. Further, it would have requested the Secretary-General to consult both sides on the

³⁴⁹ Instances in which members of the Council, during Council proceedings, or Member States, in communications to the President of the Council, proposed the creation of subsidiary organs without submitting their suggestions in the form of draft resolutions are not considered.

³⁵⁰ S/2000/1171.

composition, modalities of deployment and functioning of such a Force, and to report back to the Council on the force no later than 8 January 2001. The draft resolution was put to the vote and received 8 votes in favour, with 7 abstentions (Argentina, Canada, France, the Netherlands, Russian Federation, United Kingdom and United States), and was not adopted since it did not obtain the required majority.³⁵¹

Case 2

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

At the 4305th meeting of the Security Council, held on 27 March 2001, during consideration of the item entitled “The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question”, the President of the Council drew the attention of the members to a draft resolution³⁵² submitted by Bangladesh, Colombia, Jamaica, Mali, Mauritius, Singapore and Tunisia. The President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of Ukraine, recalled the voting on the draft resolution of 18 December 2000 (see case 1), as did the representative of Bangladesh. The draft resolution was put to the vote and received nine votes in favour, one vote against (United States), with four abstentions (France, Ireland, Norway and United Kingdom) and with one Council member not participating (Ukraine), but failed to be adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.³⁵³

³⁵¹ See S/PV.4248.

³⁵² S/2001/270.

³⁵³ See S/PV.4305.

Chapter VI

Relations with other United Nations organs

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introductory note	216
Part I. Relations with the General Assembly	216
Note	216
A. Election by the General Assembly of non-permanent members of the Security Council	216
B. Recommendations by the General Assembly to the Security Council in the form of resolutions under Articles 10 and 11 of the Charter	218
Note	218
1. Recommendations on matters relating to the Council's powers and functions or with regard to the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security	219
2. Recommendations with regard to questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security or requesting action on such questions by the Council	221
C. Practice in relation to Article 12 of the Charter	221
Note	221
D. Practice in relation to provisions of the Charter involving recommendations by the Security Council to the General Assembly	223
Note	223
1. Membership in the United Nations	223
2. Appointment of the Secretary-General	224
E. Reports of the Security Council to the General Assembly	224
F. Relations with subsidiary organs established by the General Assembly	226
Note	226
Communications from subsidiary organs established by the General Assembly	229
Part II. Relations with the Economic and Social Council: practice in relation to Article 65 of the Charter	231
Note	231
A. Requests or references to the Economic and Social Council in decisions of the Security Council	231
Note	231
1. Resolutions containing references to the Economic and Social Council	232
2. Presidential statements containing references to the Economic and Social Council	232

B. Constitutional discussion arising in connection with the Economic and Social Council	233
Note	233
Part III. Relations with the Trusteeship Council	241
Part IV. Relations with the International Court of Justice	242
Note	242
A. Practice in relation to the election of members of the International Court of Justice	242
Note	242
B. Consideration of the relationship between the Security Council and the Court	243
Note	243
Part V. Relations with the Secretariat	245
Note	245
A. Functions other than those of an administrative nature entrusted to the Secretary-General by the Security Council	245
Note	245
B. Matters brought to the attention of the Security Council by the Secretary-General	249
Part VI. Relations with the Military Staff Committee	250
Note	250

Introductory note

Chapter VI addresses in parts I-V, the relations of the Security Council with the other principal organs of the United Nations: the General Assembly (part I); the Economic and Social Council (part II); the Trusteeship Council (part III); the International Court of Justice (part IV); and the Secretariat (part V). It also includes, in part VI, material relating to the Military Staff Committee, which has been placed, by Articles 45, 46 and 47 of the Charter, in a special relationship with the Security Council.

Part I Relations with the General Assembly

Note

Part I concerns various aspects of the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Section A deals with the election by the Assembly of non-permanent members of the Council. Section B considers the General Assembly's practice in making recommendations to the Council under Articles 10 and 11 of the Charter, and calling its attention under Article 11 (3) to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security. Section C concerns the limitation imposed by Article 12 (1) on the authority of the General Assembly to make recommendations with respect to any dispute or situation while the Council is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter in respect of that dispute or situation. It also describes the procedure under Article 12 (2) by which the Secretary-General notifies the Assembly of matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which are being dealt with by the Council, and when the Council ceases to deal with them. Section D considers those instances in which a decision by the Council must be taken prior to that of the General Assembly: for example, the admission, suspension or expulsion of Members, the appointment of the Secretary-General, and the election of the Judges of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, respectively. Section E describes the annual and special reports submitted by the Council to the General Assembly. Lastly, section F concerns relations between the Security Council and certain subsidiary organs established by the General Assembly which have reported to or otherwise played a part in the work of the Council.

A. Election by the General Assembly of non-permanent members of the Security Council

Article 23

1. *The Security Council shall consist of fifteen Members of the United Nations. The Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,¹ the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America shall be permanent members of the Security Council. The General Assembly shall elect ten other Members of the United Nations to be non-permanent members of the Security Council, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution.*

¹ By a letter dated 24 December 1991, the Secretary-General requested the President of the Security Council to bring to the attention of the members of the Council a letter of the same date from the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, transmitting a letter, also of the same date, from the President of the Russian Federation, in which he informed the Secretary-General that the membership of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the United Nations was being continued by the Russian Federation.

2. *The non-permanent members of the Security Council shall be elected for a term of two years. In the first election of the non-permanent members after the increase of the membership of the Security Council from eleven to fifteen, two of the four additional members shall be chosen for a term of one year. A retiring member shall not be eligible for immediate re-election.*

3. *Each member of the Security Council shall have one representative.*

During the period under review, in accordance with Article 23 of the Charter, the General Assembly, at each regular session, elected five non-permanent members of the Security Council to replace those members whose terms of office were to expire on 31 December of the respective year. In each instance, the Assembly elected the five non-permanent members in the course of one plenary meeting. A table of those elections is set out below.

<i>General Assembly decision</i>	<i>Plenary meeting and date of election</i>	<i>Members elected to two-year terms beginning January of the following year</i>
55/305	32nd, 10 October 2000	Colombia Ireland Mauritius Norway Singapore
56/305	23rd, 13 September 2001	Bulgaria Cameroon Guinea Mexico Syrian Arab Republic
57/402	20th, 27 September 2002	Angola Chile Germany Pakistan Spain
58/403	42nd, 23 October 2003	Algeria Benin Brazil Philippines Romania

B. Recommendations by the General Assembly to the Security Council in the form of resolutions under Articles 10 and 11 of the Charter

Article 10

The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter, and except as provided in Article 12, may make recommendations to the Members of the United Nations or to the Security Council or to both on any such questions or matters.

Article 11

1. The General Assembly may consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and may make recommendations with regard to such principles to the Members or to the Security Council or to both.

2. The General Assembly may discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any Member of the United Nations, or by the Security Council or by a state which is not a Member of the United Nations in accordance with Article 35, paragraph 2, and, except as provided in Article 12, may make recommendations with regard to any such questions to the state or states concerned or to the Security Council or to both. Any such question on which action is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion.

3. The General Assembly may call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security.

4. The powers of the General Assembly set forth in this Article shall not limit the general scope of Article 10.

Note

During the period under review, the General Assembly made a number of recommendations to the Security Council, in the form of resolutions, regarding the maintenance of international peace and security. Several of the recommendations were of a general nature, touching upon the “powers and functions” of the Council under the Charter, and/or upon the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security. As such, they may be seen to be illustrative of the General Assembly’s recommendation-making powers under Articles 10 and 11 (1) of the Charter, respectively. A table of those recommendations is set out in section 1 below.

In other instances, the General Assembly made recommendations to the Council with regard to specific questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security, or requesting action from the Council with regard to such questions, in accordance with Article 11 (2) of the Charter. A table of recommendations related to Article 11 (2), which concern items already in the Council’s agenda, is set out in section 2.

During the period, the General Assembly did not draw the attention of the Security Council to any situations under Article 11 (3).

1. Recommendations on matters relating to the Council's powers and functions or with regard to the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security

<i>General Assembly resolution</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
55/217 21 December 2000	Causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa	Invites the Security Council to pursue its consideration of the follow-up to the recommendations in the areas of peace and security, with a view to ensuring coordinated and integrated implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General.
56/87 12 December 2001	Implementation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations related to the assistance to third States affected by the application of sanctions	Renews its invitation to the Security Council to consider the establishment of further mechanisms or procedures, as appropriate, for consultations as early as possible under Article 50 of the Charter of the United Nations with third States which are or may be confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of preventative or enforcement measures imposed by the Council under Chapter VII of the Charter, with regard to a solution of those problems, including appropriate ways and means for increasing the effectiveness of its methods and procedures applied in the consideration of requests by the affected States for assistance;
57/25 19 November 2002		Strongly recommends that the Council continue its efforts to enhance further the effectiveness and transparency of the sanctions committees, to streamline their working procedures and to facilitate access to them by representatives of States that find themselves confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of sanctions;
58/80 9 December 2003		Invites the Security Council [...] to continue to ensure, as appropriate, that: [...] (d) where economic sanctions have had severe effects on third States, the Security Council is able to request the Secretary-General to consider appointing a special representative or dispatching, as necessary, fact-finding missions on the ground to undertake necessary assessments and to identify, as appropriate, possible ways of assistance; (e) The Security Council is able, in the context of situations referred to in subparagraph (d) above, to consider establishing working groups to consider such situations.

<i>General Assembly resolution</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
57/337 annex 3 July 2003	Prevention of armed conflict	<p>Encourages the Security Council to give prompt consideration to early warning or prevention cases brought to its attention by the Secretary-General, and to use appropriate mechanisms [...] in accordance with Article 99 of the Charter of the United Nations;</p> <p>Further encourages the Security Council to keep under close review situations of potential armed conflict and to consider seriously cases of potential armed conflict brought to its attention by a State or the General Assembly or on the basis of information furnished by the Economic and Social Council;</p> <p>Recommends that the Security Council continue to mandate peacekeeping operations and include, as appropriate, peacebuilding elements therein, in such a way as to generate conditions which, to the maximum extent possible, help to avoid the recurrence of armed conflict;</p> <p>Encourages the Security Council to continue to invite the office of the United Nations Emergency Relief Coordinator and other relevant United Nations agencies to brief its members on emergency situations which it deems to represent a threat to international peace and security, and to support the implementation of protection and assistance activities by relevant United Nations agencies in accordance with their respective mandates;</p> <p>Encourages the Security Council to give, as appropriate, greater attention to gender perspectives in all its activities aimed at the prevention of armed conflict;</p> <p>Encourages the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council to strengthen their mutual cooperation and coordination, in accordance with their respective mandates, for the prevention of armed conflict.</p>

<i>General Assembly resolution</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
58/187 22 December 2003	Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism	Encourages the Security Council and its Counter-Terrorism Committee to continue to develop the cooperation with relevant human rights bodies, in particular with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, giving due regard to the promotion and protection of human rights in the ongoing work pursuant to relevant Security Council resolutions relating to terrorism.

2. Recommendations with regard to questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security or requesting action on such questions by the Council

<i>General Assembly resolution</i>	<i>Title of agenda item</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
ES-10/7 20 October 2000	Illegal Israeli actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the occupied Palestinian Territory	Calls upon the members of the Security Council to follow the situation closely, including the implementation of Council resolution 1322 (2000), in fulfilment of the Council's primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

C. Practice in relation to Article 12 of the Charter

Article 12

1. *While the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the present Charter, the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests.*

2. *The Secretary-General, with the consent of the Security Council, shall notify the General Assembly at each session of any matters relative to the maintenance of international peace and security which are being dealt with by the Security Council and shall similarly notify the General Assembly, or the Members of the United Nations if the General Assembly is not in session, immediately the Security Council ceases to deal with such matters.*

Note

During the period under review, there was no discussion in the Security Council of the nature of the

limitation placed by Article 12 (1) upon the authority of the General Assembly to make recommendations. Neither did the Council request that the General Assembly make a recommendation in respect of a dispute or situation in accordance with the exception provided for in Article 12 (1). The General Assembly, however, after resuming the tenth emergency special session, adopted a resolution which in large part reproduced a draft resolution rejected earlier by the Security Council, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member. Thus, in effect, the Security Council and the General Assembly would have considered and made decisions on the same agenda item (case 1).

In accordance with Article 12 (2), the Secretary-General continued to notify the General Assembly of matters relative to the maintenance of international peace and security which were being dealt with by the Security Council and of matters with which the Council had ceased to deal.² The notifications were

² See notes by the Secretary-General entitled "Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations" (A/55/366, A/56/366, A/57/392 and A/58/354).

based upon the summary statement of matters of which the Security Council is seized and of the stage reached in their consideration, circulated each week to the members of the Security Council, in accordance with rule 11 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council.³ The items in the notifications were the same as those in the summary statements for the relevant period, apart from the omission of those items not considered to relate to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The matters being dealt with by the Security Council were divided in the notifications into two categories: (a) matters discussed during the period since the last notification; and (b) other matters of which the Council remained seized, but which it had not discussed at a formal meeting since the last notification. As a matter of practice, when the Council subsequently ceased to deal with a matter listed in a notification, the Secretary-General so informed the General Assembly through the circulation of an addendum to the relevant notification. However, no such addendum was issued during the period under review.

The consent of the Council, required by Article 12 (2), was obtained through the circulation by the Secretary-General to the members of the Council of copies of the draft notifications. The General Assembly formally took note of the various notifications.

Case 1

At the 4828th meeting of the Security Council, held on 16 September 2003 in connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, a permanent member of the Council exercised its negative vote on the text of a draft resolution.⁴ Following the meeting of the Council, the 22 members of the Arab League,⁵ supported by the Non-Aligned Movement,⁶ requested a resumption of the tenth emergency special session⁷ of the General

Assembly “in the light of the inability of the Security Council to fulfil its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security due to the exercise by one of its permanent members of the veto”.⁸ At the resumed tenth emergency session on the item entitled “Illegal Israeli actions in occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the occupied Palestinian Territory”, convened on 19 September 2003 under the “Uniting for peace” formula, several speakers regretted the failure of the Security Council to discharge its responsibilities.⁹ Condemning the exercise of the veto, several speakers underscored the need for the General Assembly to “assume that responsibility” and “try to remedy what occurred in the Security Council”.¹⁰ At the end of the session, the General Assembly adopted resolution ES-10/12, which was similar in substance to the draft resolution vetoed in the Security Council, with identical provisions in two of the four paragraphs, which read:¹¹

The General Assembly,

... *Reiterates* its demand for the complete cessation of all acts of terrorism, provocation, incitement and destruction;

Demands that Israel, the occupying Power, desist from any act of deportation and cease any threat to the safety of the elected President of the Palestinian Authority.

special session shall be convened within 24 hours at the request of the Security Council or a majority of the members of the United Nations. In recent practice, requests have tended to originate from, and be supported by, regional blocs.

⁸ A/ES-10/237.

⁹ A/ES-10/PV.20, pp. 1-4 (Palestine); pp. 4-5 (Sudan); pp. 7-9 (Cuba); pp. 9-10 (Malaysia); pp. 12-13 (South Africa); and pp. 15-16 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-4 (Palestine); pp. 4-5 (Sudan); pp. 7-9 (Cuba); pp. 9-10 (Malaysia); p. 11 (Russian Federation); pp. 12-13 (South Africa); and p. 20 (Chile).

¹¹ Initially, draft resolution A/ES-10/L.12 was almost identical to the draft resolution submitted to the Council; however, following intensive consultations between the sponsors and the European Union, amendments to the draft resolution were introduced orally. For details, see A/ES-10/PV.20, p. 18.

³ Rule 11 reads as follows: “The Secretary-General shall communicate each week to the representatives on the Security Council a summary statement of matters of which the Security Council is seized and of the stage reached in their consideration”.

⁴ S/2003/891.

⁵ A/ES-10/237.

⁶ A/ES-10/238.

⁷ Under resolution 377 A (V) on uniting for peace, adopted by the General Assembly in 1950, an emergency

D. Practice in relation to provisions of the Charter involving recommendations by the Security Council to the General Assembly

Note

On a number of matters, the Charter provides for joint decision-making by the Security Council and the General Assembly, but requires the decision by the Council to be taken first. This is the case, for instance, with respect to the admission, suspension or expulsion of Members (Articles 4, 5, and 6), the appointment of the Secretary-General (Article 97) and the conditions under which a State which is not a member of the United Nations may become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice (Article 93 (2)).¹² In addition, the Statutes of the International Tribunal for Rwanda¹³ and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia provide for the Council to submit a list of candidates to the General Assembly, from which the Assembly would elect the judges of the Tribunals (Article 12 of the Statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia; Article 13 of the Statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda).¹⁴

¹² The Statute of the International Court of Justice provides for the Security Council to make recommendations to the General Assembly regarding the conditions under which a State that is a party to the Statute but not a Member of the United Nations may participate in electing members of the Court, and in making amendments to the Statute (Article 4 (3) and 69 of the Statute).

¹³ The official titles of the two Tribunals are as follows: International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994; and International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991.

¹⁴ The procedure for the election of judges of the Tribunals is set out in Article 13 (2), (3) and (4) of the Statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and Article 12 (2), (3), (4) and (5) of the Statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda. In each case, in accordance with the Statute, the Secretary-General forwarded to the President of the Security Council the nominations received. The Security Council then

Section D considers briefly Security Council practice during the period under review in relation to the admission of Members and the appointment of the Secretary-General. No questions arose concerning the conditions of accession to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

1. Membership in the United Nations

The admission of a State to membership in the United Nations, and the suspension or expulsion of a Member State from the Organization, is effected by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council (Articles 4 (2), 5 and 6 of the Charter). In accordance with rule 60 of its provisional rules of procedure, the Council submits to the General Assembly within specified time limits its recommendation concerning each application for membership together with a record of its discussion of the application.

During the period under review, the Council recommended the admission of four States to membership in the United Nations.¹⁵ It made no negative recommendations, requiring it to submit a special report to the General Assembly. The Council

convened a meeting, in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, and adopted a resolution establishing the list of candidates for judges. Subsequently, the President of the Security Council formally transmitted to the President of the General Assembly the text of the resolution. The Assembly then proceeded to elect the judges from the list contained in that resolution. During the period under review, the General Assembly reviewed the recommendations of the Council and elected 13 judges for the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. In Respect of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the General Assembly recommended 14 judges and 27 ad litem judges.

¹⁵ Tuvalu (A/54/758 and Security Council resolution 1290 (2000) of 17 February 2000); Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (A/55/535 and Security Council resolution 1326 (2000) of 31 October 2000; as from 4 February 2003, the name of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was changed to Serbia and Montenegro); Timor-Leste (A/57/258 and Security Council resolution 1414 (2002) of 23 May 2002); and Switzerland (A/57/259 and Security Council resolution 1426 (2002) of 24 July 2002). For details relating to the consideration by the Council of the aforementioned applications, see chapter VII of the present Supplement.

did not discuss or recommend the suspension or expulsion of any Member.

2. Appointment of the Secretary-General

Article 97

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.

Rule 48

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

In accordance with rule 48 of the provisional rules of procedure, the meetings of the Security Council to consider the question of a recommendation to the General Assembly regarding the appointment of the Secretary-General have been held in private, and the Council has voted by secret ballot. A communiqué circulated at the end of each meeting, in accordance with rule 55, has indicated the stage reached in the consideration of the recommendation. During the period under review, the Council considered and unanimously adopted a recommendation of this nature (case 2).

Case 2

At its 4337th meeting, held in private on 27 June 2001, the Security Council considered the question of the recommendation for the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Resolution 1358 (2001), recommending that Mr. Kofi Annan be appointed Secretary-General of the United Nations for a second term of office from 1 January 2001 to 31 December 2006, was adopted by acclamation.¹⁶ The nomination took place several months before the

¹⁶ This was the third time a resolution had been adopted by acclamation in the Security Council. In 1996, the Security Council adopted by acclamation resolution 1090 (1996) recommending Mr. Annan's appointment as Secretary-General of the United Nations. At the same meeting, the Council also adopted by acclamation resolution 1091 (1996), recognizing Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali's service to the United Nations.

expiration of his first term in office. By letter dated 27 June 2001,¹⁷ the President of the Security Council transmitted the recommendation to the President of the General Assembly.¹⁸

E. Reports of the Security Council to the General Assembly

Article 24, paragraph 3

The Security Council shall submit annual and, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly for its consideration.

Article 15, paragraph 1

The General Assembly shall receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council; these reports shall include an account of the measures that the Security Council has decided upon or taken to maintain international peace and security.

In accordance with Article 24 (3) of the Charter, during the period under review, the Security Council continued to submit annual reports to the General Assembly.¹⁹

At its 4375th meeting, the Council adopted, without a vote, its draft annual report to the General Assembly for the period from 16 June 2000 to 15 June 2001. After an explanatory statement by the Secretariat, a number of members made a statement. Noting at the outset that his delegation was not criticizing their colleagues or members of the

¹⁷ A/55/999.

¹⁸ At its 105th plenary meeting, held on 29 June 2001, the General Assembly adopted resolution 55/277, by which it appointed Mr. Kofi Annan for a second term of office.

¹⁹ Annual reports were adopted by the Security Council at the following public meetings: 55th report (covering the period 16 June 1999-15 June 2000), adopted at the 4192nd meeting held on 31 August 2000; 56th report (covering the period 16 June 2000-15 June 2001), adopted at the 4375th meeting held on 18 September 2001; 57th report (covering the period 16 June 2001-31 July 2002), adopted at the 4616th meeting held on 26 September 2002; 58th report (covering the period 1 August 2002-31 July 2003), adopted at the 4831st meeting held on 19 September 2003; 59th report (covering the period 1 August 2003 to 31 July 2004), adopted at the 5044th meeting held on 28 September 2004.

Secretariat, the representative of Singapore expressed reservations regarding the present format of the report and, echoed by the representative of Colombia, stated that it failed to achieve its objective of “illuminating the work of the Council to the General Assembly”.²⁰ Both speakers stressed that the analytical nature of the report had not been improved and looked forward to the participation of States Members of the United Nations at the General Assembly in suggesting changes to the report. At the same meeting, the President noted the decision, taken by Council members in prior consultations, to refer the matter to the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Procedural Questions, for review and possible change to the report’s format.

In a note by the President of the Security Council, dated 22 May 2002,²¹ Council members, taking into account the views expressed during the debate on the Council’s annual report at the fifty-sixth session of the General Assembly, agreed to make a number of changes to the format and content of the report. In addition, members agreed that the report presented to the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session would cover the period from 16 June 2001 to 31 July 2002.²² Thereafter, the period of coverage for all future reports would be from 1 August of one year to 31 July of the next. The note by the President provided for an introduction to the report and the possibility for members of the Council who wished to do so to comment on the work of the Council at the meeting devoted to the adoption of the report. It also envisaged that the President of the Council for the month in which the report was presented to the Assembly would have the opportunity to make reference to the verbatim record of the Council’s discussion on the report. The note further stated that the Secretariat should post the annual report of the Security Council on the United Nations website.

The new format of the report comprised six main parts: part I provided a brief statistical description of the key activities of the Security Council in relation to all questions considered under its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security; part II provided a summary of the questions considered by the Security Council under its responsibility for the

maintenance of international peace and security organized by agenda item; part III dealt with “other matters” considered by the Council, such as the admission of new members, the appointment of the Secretary-General and the Council’s responsibilities regarding the election of members of the International Court of Justice; part IV provided an account of the work of the Military Staff Committee; part V contained matters that were brought to the attention of the Council but not discussed during the period covered by the report; and part VI dealt with the work of the subsidiary bodies of the Security Council.

At its 4616th meeting, held on 26 September 2002, the Security Council adopted the first draft report prepared in accordance with the provisions of the note by the President of the Council.²³ For the first time, the draft annual report was adopted at an open meeting of the Security Council during which Council members, following introductory remarks by the Secretariat, commented on the format and substance of the report before submitting it to the General Assembly. All speakers stated that they supported the report’s transformation. Speakers noted that it was “shorter, more analytical and more reflective”,²⁴ as well as “more focused and more organized”²⁵ and had become a “genuine working tool”.²⁶ The representative of Colombia noted that the new format was a concrete sign of a collective effort towards transparency and a clear signal of the Council’s intention to keep the General Assembly better informed. He further added that the new annual report was an acknowledgment of the existence of political points of connection between the two bodies.²⁷ In addition, several speakers commented on the improvement of the Council’s working methods during the period covered by the report,²⁸ with one speaker noting that the report itself clearly reflected the concrete steps taken by the Council to improve its working methods.²⁹

²⁰ S/PV.4375, pp. 2-3 (Singapore); p. 3 (Colombia).

²¹ S/2002/199.

²² Since 1970, the report had covered the period of 16 June of one year to 15 June of the next.

²³ The decision was reflected in a note by the President (S/2002/1068).

²⁴ S/PV.4616, p. 7 (France).

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 17 (Mauritius).

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 12 (Ireland).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 21 (Colombia).

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-6 (Singapore); p. 7 (France); p. 11 (China); pp. 14-15 (Mexico); p. 16 (Guinea); p. 18 (Mauritius); p. 19 (United States).

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 22 (Russian Federation).

At its 4831st meeting, held on 19 September 2003, the Council adopted, without a discussion or formal vote,³⁰ its draft annual report to the General Assembly for the period 1 August 2002 to 31 July 2003, together with a corrigendum containing changes requested by two Council members. In his explanatory statement,³¹ the Director of the Security Council Affairs Division noted that it was the second report prepared by the Secretariat in line with the revised format agreed upon by the Security Council in 2002. He noted that the introduction to the report was of particular interest, as it provided an analytical summary of the Council's work for the period covered.

During the period covered by this Supplement, the Council did not submit any special reports to the Assembly, under, for example, rule 60 (3) of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.³²

F. Relations with subsidiary organs established by the General Assembly

Note

Certain subsidiary organs established by the General Assembly have played a part in the work of the Security Council, either because they have been placed in a special relationship to the Council by resolution of the General Assembly, or because the Council has made use of the services of a subsidiary organ or invited its officers to participate in its meetings.

During the period under review, there was no constitutional discussion bearing on the relations between such subsidiary organs and the Security Council. Subsidiary organs still active included the following: the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; the Open-Ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters Related to the Security Council; the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations; the

International Civilian Support Mission in Haiti (MICAH); and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

Those entities submitted reports and recommendations to the Security Council and/or the General Assembly. The table at the end of this section gives an account of communications from those organs to the Council.

During the period under consideration, no decisions adopted by the Security Council contained references to the Open-Ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters Related to the Security Council or the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. However, in a presidential statement dated 20 May 2002³³ in connection with the situation in East Timor, the Council expressed its appreciation for the efforts made by the General Assembly and the Special Committee on the situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples towards East Timor's achievement of independence. In a presidential statement of 15 March 2000,³⁴ the Council commended the Secretary-General for ensuring a phased transition to the International Civilian Support Mission in Haiti. In several instances, the Council made references to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations established by the General Assembly (case 3).

Occasionally, during the period under review, invitations to attend Security Council meetings were addressed to representatives of a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly (see table).³⁵ Invitations were extended as a matter of course and without any discussion. The letters of request were read into the record of the meeting by the President of the Security Council and were generally not issued as documents. During the period under consideration, the President of the Security Council attended meetings of two subsidiary organs of the General Assembly (case 4).

³⁰ See note by the President (S/2003/901).

³¹ S/PV.4831, p.2.

³² The rule provides that if the Security Council does not recommend an applicant State for membership or postpones the consideration of the application, it "shall submit a special report to the General Assembly with a complete record of the discussion".

³³ S/PRST/2002/13.

³⁴ S/PRST/2000/8.

³⁵ The participation of the representatives of these organs in meetings of the Council is also covered in chapter 3 of the present Supplement.

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People ^a Chairman/Acting Chairman	The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	4204th	4 October 2000
		4295th	15 March 2001
		4295th	19 March 2001
		4357th	20 August 2001
		4438th	14 December 2001
		4478th	26 February 2002
		4506th	3 April 2002
		4525th	3 May 2002
		4552nd	13 June 2002
		4588th	24 July 2002
		4614th	23 September 2002

^a The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People is a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly.

Case 3

In a letter dated 14 February 2000 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the President of the General Assembly,³⁶ the Council informed the General Assembly that the informal working group, established by the Council to consider the report of the Secretary-General³⁷ on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, had suggested that four recommendations contained in the above-mentioned report be referred to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations of the General Assembly for consideration. Therein, the Council requested the appropriate consideration by the General Assembly, and guidance on how those recommendations might be acted upon, including any views of the Special Committee with regard to other recommendations relating to peacekeeping.

At its 4130th meeting, held on 19 April 2000 in connection with the protection of civilians in armed conflict, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 1296 (2000), in which it recalled the letter from its President to the President of the General Assembly dated 14 February 2000; took note of the letter to its President from the President of the General Assembly dated 7 April 2000 transmitting a letter dated 1 April 2000 from the Chairman of the Special Committee on

Peacekeeping Operations; welcomed in that regard the work by the Committee with reference to the recommendations in the report of the Secretary-General of 8 September 1999 which related to its mandate; and encouraged the General Assembly to continue consideration of those aspects of the protection of civilians in armed conflict.³⁸

At its 4172nd meeting, held on 17 July 2000 in connection with the responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 1308 (2000) by which it recognized the need to incorporate HIV/AIDS prevention awareness skills and advice in aspects of the training provided to peacekeeping personnel by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, and welcomed the report of the United Nations Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations of 20 March 2000, which affirmed that need and the efforts already made by the Secretariat in that regard.

In a statement by the president dated on 31 January 2001,³⁹ the Council decided to establish a Working Group of the Whole on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations, with a view to addressing generic peacekeeping issues relevant to the Council's

³⁶ S/2000/119.

³⁷ S/1999/957.

³⁸ Resolution 1296 (2000), para. 23.

³⁹ S/PRST/2001/3.

responsibilities “without prejudice to the competence of the [General Assembly] Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations”.

In the first report of the Working Group,⁴⁰ the Chairman noted that on 10 May 2001, he had given a comprehensive briefing to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and had responded to questions raised by the members. All members of the Working Group were present at the meeting and members of the Working Group, during subsequent deliberations, considered the points made by the members of the Special Committee. In the third report of the Working Group,⁴¹ it was further noted that the Working Group had requested a meeting with the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations on 14 December 2001 to hear the views of a wide group of troop-contributing countries.

In a letter dated 7 March 2003 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General,⁴² the Council informed the Secretary-General that the Council had agreed to his proposal to consolidate the reporting on the progress of the arrangements for stand-by units in the annual report to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations.

Case 4

During the period under consideration, the President of the Security Council attended the meetings of two subsidiary organs of the General Assembly.

In March 2000, the President of the Security Council and two Council members represented the Council at a meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters Related to the Security Council. It was the first time that Council members had represented the Council at a meeting of the Working Group.⁴³ Members of the Council subsequently participated in meetings of the Working Group in 2001, 2002 and 2003.

In November 2000, the President of the Council made a statement at a meeting of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, in observance of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People.⁴⁴ Conversely, the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People participated in several meetings of the Council.⁴⁵

⁴³ S/2002/603, p. 14.

⁴⁴ A/AC.183/PV.255. During the period under review, each year, the President of the Council participated in meetings of the Committee commemorating the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People (A/AC.183/PV.261, A/AC.183/PV.268 and A/AC.183/PV.276).

⁴⁵ Details concerning the participation of the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People are set out in chapter 3 of the present Supplement.

⁴⁰ S/2001/546, p. 2.

⁴¹ S/2001/1335, p. 6.

⁴² S/2003/285.

Communications from subsidiary organs established by the General Assembly

Communications from the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People

<i>Document symbol</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Subject</i>
S/2000/253	24 March 2000	Letter dated 24 March 2000 from the Chairman reiterating the Committee's objection to the deletion from the list of items of which the Council is seized of matters related to the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the Palestine question and the Middle East problem.
S/2000/936	2 October 2000	Letter dated 2 October 2000 from the Chairman drawing attention, to the violent confrontations between the Israel Defence Forces (IDF) and police and Palestinian worshippers at Al-Aqsa Mosque and throughout the Haram al-Sharif compound that erupted on 28 September 2000, and appealing to the Secretary-General and all the parties concerned to take the necessary steps in order to induce Israel to abide by its obligations and responsibilities under the Fourth Geneva Convention, to guarantee its respect for the Holy Places and to ensure international protection of the Palestinian people.
S/2001/207	7 March 2001	Letter dated 7 March 2001 from the Chairman drawing attention to the alarming situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem, and raising concern over the impending fiscal crisis of the Palestinian Authority and its capacity to continue to function.
S/2001/208	7 March 2001	Letter dated 7 March 2001 from the Chairman drawing the attention of the Secretary-General to the fact that Palestinian speakers were unable to attend the United Nations Seminar on Assistance to the Palestinian People, held on 20-21 February 2001, owing to the general closure and travel restrictions imposed by Israel.
S/2001/296	24 March 2001	Letter dated 24 March 2001 from the Chairman reiterating the Committee's objection to the deletion from the list of items of which the Security Council is seized of matters relating to the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East.
S/2001/335	5 April 2001	Letter dated 5 April 2001 from the Chairman drawing attention to the escalating conflict in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem, and urging the Secretary-General to continue to remain actively and closely engaged with the parties, directly as well through the United Nations Special Coordinator, in an effort to end the violence and resume the dialogue between Israel and the Palestinians.
S/2001/336	5 April 2001	Letter dated 5 April 2001 from the Chairman drawing attention to the dangerously escalating conflict in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and the continuing violence on the ground and appealing to the international community to take prompt, concrete and resolute steps with a view to preventing any further exacerbation of the situation and bringing the parties back to the negotiating table.

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Document symbol</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Subject</i>
S/2001/390	19 April 2001	Letter dated 19 April 2001 from the Chairman drawing attention to the dangerously rapid escalation of military actions by the Israel Defence Forces in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and appealing to the international community to take prompt and decisive action to stop the violence and resume peace negotiations.
S/2001/392	19 April 2001	Letter dated 19 April 2001 from the Chairman drawing attention to the dangerously rapid escalation in the past several days of military actions by the Israel Defence Forces (IDF) in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem, and urging the Secretary-General to intensify contacts with all the parties concerned in order to help bring the crisis to an end and restart the Israeli-Palestinian dialogue.
S/2001/819	22 August 2001	Letter dated 22 August 2001 from the Chairman drawing attention to the dramatic escalation of tensions and violence in and around East Jerusalem and in areas under full Palestinian control and calling upon United Nations bodies, especially the Security Council and the General Assembly, to take concrete steps aimed at addressing the continuing Israeli-Palestinian crisis.
S/2001/920	28 September 2001	Letter dated 28 September 2001 from the Chairman sharing thoughts on the anniversary of the Palestinian uprising (known as the “Al-Aqsa intifada”) and appealing to the United Nations to continue to maintain its permanent responsibility with respect to all aspects of the question of Palestine.
S/2001/1000	23 October 2001	Letter dated 23 October 2001 from the Chairman drawing attention to the worsening of the security situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem, and appealing to the Security Council to discharge its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security and act decisively in order to prevent further bloodshed and destruction.
S/2001/1147	4 December 2001	Letter dated 4 December 2001 from the Chairman drawing attention to the worsening of the security situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem, and appealing to the Security Council to discharge its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security and to engage itself in the matter to prevent further escalation of the situation.
S/2002/234	5 March 2002	Letter dated 5 March 2002 from the Chairman drawing attention to the alarming situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem, and other areas of particular concern to the Committee.
S/2002/477	23 April 2002	Letter dated 23 April 2002 from the Chairman reiterating the Committee’s continued objection to the deletion from the list of items of which the Security Council is seized of matters relating to the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East.
S/2002/933	14 August 2002	Letter dated 14 August 2002 from the Chairman drawing attention to the alarming humanitarian situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem, and urging a prompt resumption of political negotiations.

<i>Document symbol</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Subject</i>
S/2003/450	21 April 2003	Letter dated 21 April 2003 from the Chairman reiterating the Committee's continued objection to the deletion from the list of items of which the Security Council is seized of matters relating to the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East.
S/2003/730	17 July 2003	Letter dated 17 July 2003 from the Chairman expressing concern over the closure order by the Israeli army of the Palestine Polytechnic University and urging the Secretary-General to use his good offices with the Government of Israel to redress the situation.

Part II

Relations with the Economic and Social Council: practice in relation to Article 65 of the Charter

Article 65

The Economic and Social Council may furnish information to the Security Council and shall assist the Security Council upon its request.

Note

This part concerns the relationship between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Section A considers decisions of the Council which contain references to either Article 65 of the Charter or the Economic and Social Council. Section B considers deliberations (cases 5-12) of the Council during the course of which the importance of closer ties between the two organs was stressed, particularly in the context of post-conflict peacebuilding and cooperation between their working groups.

A. Requests or references to the Economic and Social Council in decisions of the Security Council

⁴⁶

Note

During the period under consideration, the Security Council did not formally address a request for information or assistance to the Economic and Social Council. However, in its decisions, the Council made two explicit⁴⁶ references to Article 65 of the Charter. In several other decisions, in the context of different agenda items, the Council made a reference to the Economic and Social Council (see subsections 1 and 2 below).

⁴⁶ S/PRST/2000/25 and S/PRST/2002/2.

1. Resolutions containing references to the Economic and Social Council

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Relevant provisions</i>
1308 (2000)	The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations	The Council emphasized the important roles of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in addressing HIV/AIDS; (<i>preambular para. 3</i>) The Security Council recalled the 28 February 2000 special meeting of the Economic and Social Council, held in partnership with the President of the Security Council, on the development aspects of the HIV/AIDS pandemic (<i>preambular para. 2</i>)
1366 (2001)	Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts	The Security Council expressed its intention to consider cases of potential conflict brought to its attention by any Member State, or by a State not a Member of the United Nations or by the General Assembly or on the basis of information furnished by the Economic and Social Council (<i>para. 6</i>)

2. Presidential statements containing references to the Economic and Social Council

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Relevant provisions</i>
S/PRST/2000/8	The question concerning Haiti	The Security Council recognized the success of cooperative efforts in bringing about the mandate for the new mission in Haiti and noted with satisfaction the contributions made by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in that regard (<i>para. 5</i>)
S/PRST/2000/25	Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts	The Security Council highlighted the importance of strengthening its cooperation with the Economic and Social Council, in accordance with Article 65 of the Charter of the United Nations, in the area of the prevention of armed conflicts, including in addressing the economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems that are often the root causes of conflicts (<i>para. 9</i>)
S/PRST/2001/5	Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach	To enhance further the effectiveness of the United Nations in addressing conflicts at all stages, from prevention to settlement to post-conflict peacebuilding, the Council reiterated its willingness to consider ways to improve its cooperation with other United Nations bodies and organs directly concerned by peacebuilding, in particular the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, which have a primary role in that field (<i>para. 15</i>)

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Relevant provisions</i>
S/PRST/2001/16	The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations	The Council recalled its resolution 1308 (2000) of 17 July 2000, in which the Council, bearing in mind its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and emphasizing the important roles of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in addressing the social and economic factors that lead to the spread of HIV/AIDS, inter alia, recognized that the HIV/AIDS pandemic is also exacerbated by conditions of violence and instability, and stressed that the HIV/AIDS pandemic, if unchecked, may pose a risk to stability and security (<i>para. 2</i>)
S/PRST/2002/2	The situation in Africa	The Council welcomed the participation of the Economic and Social Council in its public meeting on the situation in Africa, held on 29 January 2002. It reaffirmed the importance of strengthening its cooperation, through greater interaction, with the Economic and Social Council, in accordance with Article 65 of the Charter, in the area of the prevention of armed conflicts, including in addressing the economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems (<i>para. 13</i>) The Council recognized the need for adequate measures to prevent and resolve conflicts in Africa, and would consider the setting up of an Ad Hoc Working Group to monitor the Council's recommendations and enhance coordination with the Economic and Social Council (<i>para. 17</i>)
S/PRST/2003/8	The situation in Guinea-Bissau	The Council called on the Government of Guinea-Bissau to endorse fully the partnership approach defined by the Ad Hoc Advisory Group of the Economic and Social Council on Guinea-Bissau (<i>para. 3</i>)
S/PRST/2003/30	The situation in Burundi	The Council welcomed the recent mission of the Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Burundi of the Economic and Social Council (<i>para. 5</i>)

B. Constitutional discussion arising in connection with the Economic and Social Council

Note

The issue of relations between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council arose frequently in Security Council debates, particularly in the context of post-conflict peacebuilding in Africa.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Similar discussions also took place in the Economic and Social Council, including, for example, during its substantive session of 2002, a discussion of the item

During debates of the Council, emphasis was placed on the interrelation between peace and development and on the need for coordination of efforts by the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and other

entitled "Strengthening further the Economic and Social Council, building on its recent achievements, to help it fulfil the role ascribed to it in the Charter of the United Nations as contained in the United Nations Millennium Declaration". During that discussion several speakers confirmed the need for the Economic and Social Council to deepen its cooperation and coordination with the Security Council. For details, see E/2002/SR.18, E/2002/SR.19, E/2002/SR.21, E/2002/SR.22 and E/2002/SR.23.

United Nations organs involved in conflict management. At its 4465th meeting, held on 31 January 2002 in connection with the situation in Africa, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council⁴⁸ which marked the beginning of a new phase in cooperation between the two bodies on issues before the Security Council pertaining to Africa. In the statement, the Security Council reaffirmed the importance of strengthening its cooperation with the Economic and Social Council in the prevention of armed conflicts on the continent, including addressing economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems, and stated that it would consider the setting up of an ad hoc working group to, inter alia, enhance coordination with the Economic and Social Council. Several case studies are highlighted below, each addressing a different matter before the Security Council, with a view to outlining the evolving relationship between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. The case studies analysed are as follows: the impact of HIV/AIDS on peace and security in Africa (case 5); HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations (case 6); the role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts (case 7); the situation in Africa (case 8); the situation in Guinea-Bissau (case 9); the situation in Burundi (case 10);

⁴⁸ S/PRST/2002/2.

Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach (case 11); and food aid in the context of conflict settlement: Afghanistan and other crisis areas (case 12).

During the period under review, the interaction between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council considerably increased in other ways. For the first time, the President of the Economic and Social Council was invited to brief the Security Council at a Council meeting.⁴⁹ Subsequently, the Council extended numerous invitations to the representatives of the Economic and Social Council to attend Security Council meetings (see table below).⁵⁰

⁴⁹ S/PV.4460.

⁵⁰ Following the 4460th meeting of the Security Council, the President of the Economic and Social Council was also invited to participate in the meetings of the Security Council Working Group on Africa (S/PV.4673, p. 11). In addition, in April 2001, the President of the Security Council proposed a joint meeting of the Security Council and Economic and Social Council to consider coordination on conflict management. The proposed joint meeting, which was in fact never convened, was retrospectively mentioned by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 4334th meeting of the Security Council (S/PV.4334, p. 10).

<i>Person invited</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
Mr. Ivan Šimonovič, President of the Economic and Social Council	The situation in Africa	4460	29 January 2002
		4538	22 May 2002
		4577	18 July 2002
	Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security	4630	22 October 2002
Mr. Gert Rosenthal, President of the Economic and Social Council	Women and peace and security	4635	28 October 2002
	Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month	4748	30 April 2003
	The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4860	18 November 2003
Mr. Dumisani Kumalo, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Guinea- Bissau	The situation in Burundi	4876	4 December 2003
	The situation in Guinea-Bissau	4776	19 June 2003

In addition, there were several instances in which a member of the Security Council was invited to participate in a meeting of the Economic and Social Council or one of its subsidiary organs.⁵¹

During the period under review, there were two occasions when the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council collaborated in their missions to the field. At the invitation of the President of the Economic and Social Council, the Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on Africa joined the Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau of the Economic and Social Council during its visit to Guinea-Bissau from 9 to 16 November 2002.⁵² On 27 and 28 June 2003, the Security Council mission to West Africa visited Guinea-Bissau jointly with a mission of the Ad Hoc Advisory Group.⁵³ The mission was mentioned in the presidential statement of 19 June 2003.⁵⁴

Case 5 The impact of HIV/AIDS on peace and security in Africa

At its 4087th meeting, held on 10 January 2000, the Security Council considered the impact of HIV/AIDS on peace and security in Africa. Following that meeting, in a letter dated 31 January 2000⁵⁵ addressed to the President of the Economic and Social Council, the President of the Security Council informed the former of the Security Council's 10 January meeting and conveyed the "Council's desire

to explore the possibility of further cooperative action with the Economic and Social Council".

On 28 February 2000, in response to the Council's letter, the Economic and Social Council held a meeting⁵⁶ to discuss the main development issues and concerns considered at the Security Council meeting on the impact of HIV/AIDS on peace and security in Africa.⁵⁷ At that meeting, the President of the Security Council for the month of February addressed the Economic and Social Council, asserting that the "greater coordination and systematic exchanges of information between the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council, within their respective spheres of competence, would help in the development of a common agenda and policy priorities for combating HIV/AIDS in Africa".⁵⁸ The President of the Security Council for the month of January, who also attended the meeting, stated that the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council should both ensure that all agencies of the United Nations system reassessed their capacity to incorporate HIV/AIDS control into their mandate.⁵⁹

During the meeting, speakers expressed differing views on the competence of the Security Council to address the HIV/AIDS issue. Some speakers supported a more active collaborative approach by the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.⁶⁰ Others stressed that the Economic and Social Council had the mandate to be the forum for multilateral discussion and coordination on this issue,⁶¹ while two Member States emphasized that the place for the discussion to continue was in the General Assembly.⁶²

At its 4172nd meeting, held on 17 July 2000, the Security Council adopted resolution 1308 (2000). By that resolution, emphasizing the important role of the Economic and Social Council in addressing HIV/AIDS and recalling the 28 February 2000 special meeting of

⁵¹ For example, the Security Council Presidents for January and February 2000 attended a meeting of the Economic and Social Council, held to discuss the main development issues and concerns considered at the Security Council meeting on the impact of HIV/AIDS on peace and security in Africa (see E/2000/SR.4); the Security Council President addressed the substantive session of the Economic and Social Council on HIV/AIDS to represent the views of the Security Council on that issue (E/2002/SR.11); and the President of the Security Council participated in the commemoration by the Economic and Social Council of the tenth anniversary of the General Peace Agreement for Mozambique (E/2002/SR.43).

⁵² E/2003/8.

⁵³ The composition and terms of reference of the Ad Hoc Advisory Group mission are set out in the annex to the report of the mission (S/2003/688, annex, part B).

⁵⁴ S/PRST/2003/8.

⁵⁵ S/2000/76.

⁵⁶ E/2000/SR.4.

⁵⁷ S/PV.4087 and S/PV.4087 (Resumption 1).

⁵⁸ E/2000/SR.4, p. 2.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 2 (President of the Security Council for February); p. 3 (President of the Security Council for January); p. 4 (Executive Director of Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS); and p. 5 (Italy).

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 2 (President of the Economic and Social Council); p. 5 (Costa Rica); p. 5 (India); and p. 8. (Brazil).

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 5 (Cuba); and p. 7 (Ukraine).

the Economic and Social Council, held in partnership with the President of the Security Council, on the development aspects of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, the Council expressed keen interest in additional discussion among relevant United Nations bodies in order to make progress, inter alia, on the question of access to treatment and care, and on prevention.

On 3 July 2002, the President of the Security Council was invited to make a statement at the high-level segment of the Economic and Social Council substantive session on HIV/AIDS.⁶³ In his remarks, the President recalled that during the Security Council's discussion on HIV/AIDS in January 2000, its members had concurred that the Security Council should regularly share information and views with the Economic and Social Council in this regard. He also noted that the Secretary-General, in his 2002 report on prevention of armed conflict, had recognized the need for the two Councils to work more closely on conflict issues and HIV/AIDS.⁶⁴

Case 6 HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations

At its 4259th meeting, held on 19 January 2001, the Security Council considered the issue of HIV/AIDS in the context of international peacekeeping operations. Differences in opinion concerning the competence of the Council to address the issue of HIV/AIDS were expressed. One member of the Council emphasized that the issue of AIDS could be addressed only in an integrated framework and in a holistic and comprehensive manner, and that the efforts of the Security Council should serve as a complement to the activities of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, the United Nations funds and programmes, the specialized agencies and the Bretton Woods institutions.⁶⁵ Another speaker stated that the competence of the Security Council in this area was severely limited and that it was for the General Assembly to study and coordinate efforts to combat the epidemic and for the Economic and Social Council to assess and deal with the social and developmental effects of the disease.⁶⁶

⁶³ E/2002/SR.11.

⁶⁴ E/2002/SR.11, p. 3.

⁶⁵ S/PV.4259, p. 21 (Jamaica).

⁶⁶ S/PV.4259 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Costa Rica).

At the 4339th meeting of the Security Council, held on 28 June 2001 in connection with the same item, the President of the Security Council made a statement on behalf of the Council.⁶⁷ In that statement, the Council recalled its resolution 1308 (2000),⁶⁸ by which the Council, bearing in mind its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and emphasizing the important roles of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in addressing the social and economic factors that lead to the spread of HIV/AIDS, inter alia, recognized that the HIV/AIDS pandemic was also exacerbated by conditions of violence and instability, and therefore stressed that the HIV/AIDS pandemic, if unchecked, could pose a risk to stability and security. The Security Council expressed its intention to contribute, within its competence, to the attainment of the relevant objectives in the declaration adopted at the twenty-sixth special session of the General Assembly in carrying out the Council's work, and in particular, its follow-up to resolution 1308 (2000).

Case 7 Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts

At its 4174th meeting, held on 20 July 2000, the Security Council debated its role in the prevention of armed conflict. In his opening statement, the Secretary-General stated that, in his opinion, the provisions in the Charter relating to conflict prevention had been underutilized and suggested that the Council could work more closely with other principal organs of the United Nations and obtain useful information and other assistance from the Economic and Social Council, as envisaged in Article 65 of the Charter.⁶⁹ At the close of the meeting, the President issued a statement⁷⁰ on behalf of the Council, which highlighted the importance of strengthening the Security Council's "cooperation with the Economic and Social Council, in accordance with Article 65 of the Charter of the United Nations, in the area of the prevention of armed conflicts, including in addressing the economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems which are often the root causes of conflicts".

⁶⁷ S/PRST/2001/16.

⁶⁸ See case 5 in the present chapter.

⁶⁹ S/PV.4174, p. 3.

⁷⁰ S/PRST/2000/25.

In his report on the prevention of armed conflict,⁷¹ the Secretary-General noted that the Economic and Social Council had started to work more closely with the Security Council.⁷² He stated that a new phase in the relationship between the two organs had begun in 1998, when the Security Council had invited the Economic and Social Council to contribute to designing a long-term programme of support for Haiti. He recalled that the Council had requested the involvement of the Economic and Social Council in February 2000, when the Council proposed that the Economic and Social Council convene a meeting to discuss the impact of HIV/AIDS on peace and security in Africa. The Secretary-General also proposed a more active involvement of the Economic and Social Council in the prevention of armed conflict. Its future contribution could take place either on its own initiative or as requested by other principal organs of the United Nations. In addition, he stated that the more active involvement of the Economic and Social Council could be beneficial when the Security Council sets up regional initiatives in the prevention of armed conflict.

At its 4334th meeting, held on 21 June 2001, the Council discussed the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General on the prevention of armed conflict. In presenting the report to the Security Council, the Deputy Secretary-General stated once again that the report called on the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council to play a more active role in conflict prevention and to enhance their interaction with the Security Council in that field.⁷³ In the ensuing debate, several speakers stressed the need for greater interaction on conflict prevention between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council and extended their support for the measures taken by the two organs to improve coordination.⁷⁴

At its 4360th meeting, held on 30 August 2001, the Council adopted resolution 1366 (2001), by which it undertook to keep situations of potential conflict under close review as part of a conflict-prevention

strategy and expressed its intention to consider cases of potential conflict brought to its attention on the basis, *inter alia*, of information furnished by the Economic and Social Council. It also supported the development of a system-wide coordinated and mutually supportive approach to the prevention of armed conflict and looked forward to further consideration of the report of the Secretary-General on the prevention of armed conflict by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

Case 8 **The situation in Africa**

At the 4460th meeting of the Security Council, held on 29 January 2002, the President of the Economic and Social Council stated that he hoped that the meeting taking place would help lay the foundation for greater cooperation between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations. He also hoped that the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council could work together more effectively within the purview of the mandates set for each body by the Charter. Although underlining the independence of the two bodies, he called for an effective collaboration between them with a view to ensuring that all the United Nations actors in the field work in a complementary fashion. Finally, he expressed his intention to continue discussions with the members of the Economic and Social Council on ways to enhance cooperation with the Security Council.⁷⁵ During the ensuing debate, several speakers stressed the need for greater cooperation and dialogue between the two Councils to promote a more integrated approach to peacebuilding.⁷⁶

At the 4465th meeting of the Security Council, held on 31 January 2002, the President of the Security Council made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁷⁷ stating that the Council welcomed the participation of the Economic and Social Council in its public meeting on the situation in Africa held on 29 January 2002. It reaffirmed the importance of strengthening its

⁷¹ S/2001/574.

⁷² See S/2001/574 and Corr.1, paras. 40-44.

⁷³ S/PV.4334, p. 3.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6 (Colombia); pp. 9-11 (United Kingdom); and pp. 24-26 (Mauritius); S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-4 (Sweden, on behalf of the European Union); pp. 5-7 (Argentina); pp. 7-9 (Costa Rica); pp. 15-16 (Brazil); and pp. 24-26 (Belarus).

⁷⁵ S/PV.4460, pp. 34-35.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 12 (Ireland); p. 21 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); and p. 34 (South Africa); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Colombia); pp. 5-6 (Russian Federation); p. 11 (Singapore); p. 18 (Mauritius); and p. 30 (Cuba); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 2), p. 5 (Jamaica).

⁷⁷ S/PRST/2002/2.

cooperation, through greater interaction, with the Economic and Social Council, in accordance with Article 65 of the Charter of the United Nations, in the area of the prevention of armed conflicts, including in addressing the economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems. The President also stated that the Council would consider the setting up of an ad hoc Working Group to monitor the recommendations contained in the presidential statement and to enhance coordination with the Economic and Social Council. Pursuant to the above-mentioned presidential statement, the Security Council established the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa, for which the mandate included, inter alia, proposing recommendations on the enhancement of cooperation between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.⁷⁸

At the 4538th meeting of the Security Council, held on 22 May 2002, the Chairman of the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa recalled that the mandate of the Working Group included enhancing cooperation between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.⁷⁹ During the debate, several speakers made general and concrete suggestions for collaboration between the two Councils and their subsidiary organs, including the possibility of holding periodic meetings between the Presidents of the two Councils, convening joint meetings between the two Councils and scheduling a series of joint seminars or retreats.⁸⁰ In his statement, the President of the Economic and Social Council noted that the Economic and Social Council had functions mandated by the Charter that were at the heart of peacebuilding. He argued that the Economic and Social Council's oversight role in certain matters, such as humanitarian assistance, reconstruction and development, could enable it to promote better

⁷⁸ The terms of reference of the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa are included in a note by the President (S/2002/207).

⁷⁹ S/PV.4538, p. 4.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8 (Permanent Observer of the Organization of African Unity); p. 12 (Benin); p. 15 (Egypt); pp. 16-17 (Algeria); p. 23 (Bangladesh); p. 27 (Australia); p. 28 (Spain); pp. 31-32 (India); and pp. 33-34 (Japan); S/PV.4538 (Resumption 1), pp. 3-5 (Gambia); p. 6 (Tunisia); pp. 8-9 (Ireland); p. 12 (Nepal); pp. 15-16 (United Kingdom); p. 20 (Morocco); p. 25 (Bahrain); p. 34 (Mali); pp. 36-37 (Mozambique); pp. 41-42 (Costa Rica); and p. 47 (Mauritius). See also the President's concluding remarks, pp. 47-49.

integration between policy and operational dimensions, thus complementing the work of the General Assembly and the Security Council.⁸¹

At the 4577th meeting of the Security Council, held on 18 July 2002, the President of the Economic and Social Council noted that that body had recently established an Ad hoc Advisory Group on African Countries Emerging from Conflict⁸² and would be establishing additional ad hoc groups dealing with individual countries or regions. He envisaged that the ad hoc groups of both Councils would work closely together.⁸³

During the 4673rd meeting of the Security Council, held on 18 December 2002, speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa, the representative of Mauritius briefed the Council. He stated that the Working Group's most significant achievement had been the promotion of close cooperation between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, which was illustrated by the joint activities of the two Councils and their subsidiary organs. He also acknowledged that there was a growing recognition that the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council should cooperate and coordinate their activities for lasting solutions to conflicts.⁸⁴

At its 4748th meeting, held on 30 April 2003, the Security Council had a wrap-up discussion of its work for the month of April, focusing in particular on conflicts in Africa, including Security Council missions and United Nations mechanisms to promote peace and security. During the debate, the President of the Economic and Social Council welcomed the increased cooperation between the Security Council and Economic and Social Council in addressing post-conflict situations. He expressed the hope that such cooperation would be repeated in the future and suggested that a potential area of cooperation between the Councils would be to deepen reciprocal support between themselves and the Bretton Woods institutions.⁸⁵

⁸¹ S/PV.4538, p. 6.

⁸² See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Supplement No. 1 (E/2002/99)*, resolution 2002/1. See also the report of the Secretary-General on the establishment of an ad hoc advisory group on African countries emerging from conflict (E/2002/12 and Corr.1).

⁸³ S/PV.4577, p. 19.

⁸⁴ S/PV.4673, p. 11.

⁸⁵ S/PV.4748, p. 6.

Case 9**The situation in Guinea-Bissau**

By resolution 2002/304 of 25 October 2002, the Economic and Social Council established an Ad hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau. In that same resolution, the Economic and Social Council specified that the Advisory Group would invite the Chairperson of the Security Council's Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa to participate in its work.

At the 4673rd meeting of the Security Council, held on 18 December 2002, the Chairman of the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa briefed the Council. Recognizing that the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council should cooperate and coordinate better, he emphasized as a noteworthy development the active participation of the President of the Economic and Social Council in the meetings of the Working Group, and the participation of the Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on Africa in the Economic and Social Council's Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau. In his view, the Working Group could provide the vital link for the continuation of such cooperation between the Councils, and he recommended that the approach taken with respect to Guinea-Bissau could be applied to many other countries emerging from conflict. He also noted that he had participated in the joint Security Council-Economic and Social Council mission to Guinea-Bissau and stated that such joint activity illustrated the close cooperation that had been established between the two Councils.⁸⁶

In a letter dated 5 February 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁸⁷ the President of the Economic and Social Council brought to the attention of the Security Council the report of the Ad hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau and praised the Chairman of the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa for his active participation in the work of the Advisory Group. In addition, he invited the new Chairman to remain actively involved in the Group during 2003 and stated that he looked forward to increased interaction between the two bodies in the coming months, thereby

contributing to a comprehensive response by the United Nations to the situation in the country.⁸⁸

In a statement made at the 4766th meeting of the Security Council on 30 May 2003, the Under Secretary-General and Special Advisor on Africa suggested that the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council consider holding periodically joint meetings as a way of mobilizing international support for Africa in the areas of conflict prevention and resolution, for which the Council had a mandate, and of post-conflict economic rehabilitation, reconstruction and development, for which the Economic and Social Council had a unique responsibility.⁸⁹ In the debate that followed, the representatives of the United Kingdom and Spain expressed support for the comments made by the Special Advisor on Africa.⁹⁰

At the 4776th meeting of the Security Council, held on 19 June 2003, the Chairman of the Ad hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau of the Economic and Social Council noted that the forthcoming joint visit to Guinea-Bissau by the Security Council mission to West Africa and the Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau would provide an opportunity to convey a collective message of the need to strengthen the confidence between that country and its international partners.⁹¹

At the 4785th meeting of the Security Council, held on 9 July 2003 in connection with the Security Council mission to West Africa (26 June -5 July 2003), the heads of the Security Council mission to West Africa and Guinea-Bissau, respectively, recalled that the mission had visited Guinea-Bissau jointly with a mission of the Economic and Social Council Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau and welcomed such cooperation between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. They reaffirmed the observation contained in the mission's report that "the existing cooperation between the Security Council and

⁸⁶ S/PV.4673, pp. 10-12.

⁸⁷ S/2003/176.

⁸⁸ In a press statement (SC/7677) made by the President of the Security Council on 5 March 2003 in relation to the situation in Guinea-Bissau, the members of the Council fully endorsed the approach taken by the Ad hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau of the Economic and Social Council.

⁸⁹ S/PV.4766, p. 4.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4766 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Spain).

⁹¹ S/PV.4776, p. 4. The joint mission visited West Africa from 25 June to 5 July 2003.

the Economic and Social Council should be further strengthened to produce a coordinated and effective United Nations response at the intergovernmental level to the need for effective action on issues of peace and security and of sustainable development in Africa".⁹² The head of the mission to West Africa noted that it was "right and good" to have "angles" of the Economic and Social Council integrated with the mission's message, highlighting the link between economic and social issues and peace and security.⁹³ The head of the mission to Guinea-Bissau noted that cooperation gave delegates of both bodies an opportunity to observe jointly the problems of Guinea-Bissau, exchange points of view and enhance coordination, which in this case had led to a true "strategic partnership" between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. He further added that the two bodies, while remaining within their respective mandates, were complementary in their vision and provided a broad horizon for cooperation, especially in Africa.⁹⁴

In a statement made by the President on behalf of the Council on 25 July 2003,⁹⁵ the Council endorsed the recommendations made in the report of the Security Council mission to West Africa in connection with Guinea-Bissau,⁹⁶ including the one recommending that the Council continue collaborative initiatives with the Economic and Social Council in the area of peacebuilding in post-conflict countries.⁹⁷

Case 10 The situation in Burundi

On 17 July 2003, the Economic and Social Council established an Ad hoc Advisory Group on Burundi.⁹⁸ In a letter dated 25 August 2003, from the President of the Economic and Social Council addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁹ the President noted that the newly established body would start its work shortly and would invite the Chairman of the Security Council Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Resolution and Prevention in Africa

to participate in its work. In that context, the President praised the cooperation between the two Councils, particularly the collaboration between the Working Group and the Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau.

At its 4876th meeting, held on 4 December 2003, in connection with the situation in Burundi, the Security Council heard a briefing by the President of the Economic and Social Council. He noted that, in providing assistance to Burundi, both the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council needed to coordinate those areas which fell within their respective competencies. In that connection, he stated that the Council could help to ensure that the African Union peacekeeping mission remained in Burundi and/or was replaced by United Nations peacekeepers, while the Economic and Social Council could provide support for the transition between rehabilitation and reconstruction as well as for long-term development. He added that support for Burundi with regard to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants, as well as humanitarian assistance to help in the resettlement of refugees and internally displaced persons, was an area of responsibility which fell "somewhere in between".¹⁰⁰

Case 11 Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach

At its 4272nd meeting, held on 5 February 2001, the Security Council considered the item "Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach". During the debate, several speakers emphasized the need for consultations and coordination between the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, with two Member States urging joint Security Council and Economic and Social Council meetings and greater recourse to Article 65 of the Charter.¹⁰¹

At its 4278th meeting, held on 20 February 2001, in a statement made by the President on behalf of the Council,¹⁰² the Council underlined the fact that successful peacebuilding was predicated on an effective and unambiguous division of labour among all the international partners, including the United

⁹² S/2003/688, para. 77.

⁹³ S/PV.4785, p. 4.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁹⁵ S/PRST/2003/12.

⁹⁶ S/2003/688.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, para. 24.

⁹⁸ See resolution 2003/16. In a statement to the press issued on 14 August 2003, the members of the Security Council welcomed the resolution.

⁹⁹ S/2003/836.

¹⁰⁰ S/PV.4876, p. 5.

¹⁰¹ S/PV.4272, p. 29 (Mauritius); S/PV.4272 (Resumption 1), p. 26 (Malaysia).

¹⁰² S/PRST/2001/5.

Nations system, and reiterated its willingness to consider ways to improve its cooperation with other United Nations bodies and organs directly concerned by peacebuilding, particularly the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, which had a primary role in that field. With a view to avoiding any gap between peacekeeping and peacebuilding, the Security Council expressed its determination, where appropriate, to consult at various stages of any peacekeeping operation that includes peacebuilding elements and in particular when the operation was being established, with the State concerned and with relevant actors who were primarily responsible for coordinating and implementing aspects of peacebuilding activities, including the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. Although the statement made no explicit reference to Article 65 of the Charter, the Council stressed the importance of its being kept regularly informed of the progress achieved, as well as of difficulties encountered, in peacebuilding in countries where a peacekeeping operation had been mandated by the Security Council.

Case 12
Food aid in the context of conflict settlement:
Afghanistan and other crisis areas

At the 4507th meeting of the Security Council, held on 4 April 2002 in connection with the item entitled “Food aid in the context of conflicts: Afghanistan and other crisis areas”, the Executive Director of the World Food Programme was invited to brief the Council. Following his statement, the representatives of the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation stressed the need for enhanced cooperation between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council on humanitarian issues such as food aid in the context of conflict settlement.¹⁰³ According to the representative of the United Kingdom, both organs should work towards a closer and more comprehensive understanding of conflict issues in order to deal with them more effectively.¹⁰⁴ The representative of the Russian Federation, similarly, stated that the need to improve cooperation between the two organs on those issues was becoming increasingly obvious, taking into account their prerogatives and the principles of interaction enshrined in the Charter.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ S/PV.4507, pp. 10-11 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4507 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Russian Federation).

¹⁰⁴ S/PV.4507, pp. 10-11.

¹⁰⁵ S/PV.4507 (Resumption 1), p. 8.

Part III

Relations with the Trusteeship Council

This part concerns the relationship between the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council in relation to those trust territories designated as “a strategic area or areas”, under Articles 77 and 82 of the Charter. Article 83, paragraph 1, provides that “all functions of the United Nations” relating to strategic areas — “including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreement and of their alteration or amendment” — are to be exercised by the Security Council. Article 83, paragraph 2, further provides that the Security Council shall avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council to perform those functions of the United Nations under the trusteeship system relating to political, economic, social and educational matters in the strategic areas”. Those supervisory functions are specified in Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter.

The Trusteeship Council completed its mandate under the Charter by way of resolution 956 (1994) of 10 November 1994. During the period under review, although remaining in force, the Trusteeship Council was inactive and did not carry on any activity.

Part IV

Relations with the International Court of Justice

Note

Part IV concerns the relationship between the Security Council and the International Court of Justice. Section A deals with the election of the members of the Court, which requires that action be taken by the Security Council in conjunction with the General Assembly, but with both organs proceeding independently. During the period under review, three rounds of elections took place (cases 13, 14 and 15). Section B covers the discussion which took place in the Security Council regarding the respective roles of the Council and the Court.

A. Practice in relation to the election of members of the International Court of Justice

Note

The procedure for the election of members of the International Court of Justice is set out in Articles 4, 8 and 10 to 14 of the Statute of the Court; rules 150 and 151 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly; and rules 40 and 61 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council.

In two of the three instances (cases 13 and 14), the Security Council began the procedure to fill a vacancy by fixing the date of the election, in accordance with Article 14 of the Court's Statute and the Council's practice, through the adoption of a resolution.¹⁰⁶ In the remaining case (case 15), relating to the election to fill regular vacancies, the Council informally set the date of the election. The Security Council and the General Assembly then proceeded independently with the elections.¹⁰⁷ At the relevant Security Council meetings, the President of the Council drew attention to a memorandum by the Secretary-General¹⁰⁸ describing the composition of the Court and setting out the procedure to be followed in the conduct of the election. He reminded the Council

that Article 10, paragraph 1 of the Court's Statute provides that, "Those candidates who obtain an absolute majority of votes in the General Assembly and in the Security Council shall be considered as elected", adding that the required majority in the Security Council was, therefore, eight votes. He explained further that the voting would proceed by secret ballot.

Case 13

At its 4107th meeting, on 2 March 2000, the Council met to elect a member of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with the decision contained in resolution 1278 (1999), to fill a vacancy in the Court caused by the resignation of one of its members. On the first ballot, one candidate obtained the required majority of votes in the Council. The President stated that he would communicate the result of the vote to the President of the General Assembly, and requested the Council to remain in session until the results of the voting in the Assembly had been received. Subsequently, he announced to the members of the Council that he had received a letter from the President of the Assembly informing the Council that the same candidate had received the required majority in the Assembly at its 90th plenary meeting. The candidate in question was therefore elected a member of the Court. As the new member was elected to replace a member whose term of office had not expired, he was elected to the remainder of his predecessor's term of office, expiring on 5 February 2006.

Case 14

At its 4345th meeting, on 5 July 2001, the Council, in accordance with Article 14 of the Statute of the Court, considered a draft resolution¹⁰⁹ establishing a date for the election to fill a vacancy that had occurred in the International Court of Justice as the result of the resignation of one of the members of the Court. By resolution 1361 (2001), the Council decided that the election would take place on 12 October 2001.

At its 4389th meeting, on 12 October 2001, in accordance with the decision contained in resolution 1361 (2001), the Council proceeded to the election of

¹⁰⁶ See resolutions 1278 (1999) and 1361 (2001).

¹⁰⁷ For the verbatim records of the relevant Security Council meetings, see S/PV.4107, S/PV.4389 and S/PV.4629.

¹⁰⁸ See S/2000/105, S/2001/881 and S/2002/925.

¹⁰⁹ S/2001/663.

one member of the International Court of Justice to fill the seat that had become vacant as a result of the resignation of one of the members of the Court. On the first ballot, one candidate obtained the required majority. The President stated that he would communicate the result of the vote to the President of the General Assembly and requested the Council to remain in session until the results of the voting in the Assembly had been obtained. Subsequently, he announced that he had received a letter from the President of the Assembly informing the Council that the same candidate had received the required majority in the Assembly at its 24th plenary meeting. The candidate in question was therefore elected a member of the Court. As the new member was elected to replace a member whose term of office had not expired, he was elected to the remainder of his predecessor's term of office, expiring on 5 February 2006.

Case 15

At its 4629th meeting, on 21 October 2002, the Council proceeded with the election of five members of the International Court of Justice, to fill the seats which would become vacant on 6 February 2003. At the outset, the President of the Council presented the list of candidates¹¹⁰ nominated by regional groups. He drew the attention of the Council to the fact that two candidates had decided to withdraw their candidatures and, therefore, their names did not appear on the ballot papers. On the first ballot, five candidates obtained the required majority of votes in the Council. The President stated that he would communicate the result of the vote to the President of the General Assembly and requested the Council to remain in session until the results of the voting in the Assembly had been obtained. Subsequently, he announced that he had received a letter from the President of the Assembly informing the Council that the same five candidates had received the required majority in the Assembly at its 35th plenary meeting. The candidates in question were therefore elected members of the Court for a term of office of nine years, beginning on 6 February 2006.

¹¹⁰ S/2002/926.

B. Consideration of the relationship between the Security Council and the Court

Article 94 of the Charter of the United Nations

1. *Each Member of the United Nations undertakes to comply with the decision of the International Court of Justice in any case to which it is a party.*

2. *If any party to a case fails to perform the obligations incumbent upon it under a judgment rendered by the Court, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council, which may, if it deems necessary, make recommendations or decide upon measures to be taken to give effect to the judgment.*

Article 96

1. *The General Assembly or the Security Council may request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question.*

2. *Other organs of the United Nations and specialized agencies, which may at any time be so authorized by the General Assembly, may also request advisory opinions of the Court on legal questions arising within the scope of their activities.*

Article 41 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice

1. *The Court shall have the power to indicate, if it considers that circumstances so require, any provisional measures which ought to be taken to preserve the respective rights of either party.*

2. *Pending the final decision, notice of the measures suggested shall forthwith be given to the parties and to the Security Council.*

Note

At the 4212th meeting of the Security Council, held on 31 October 2000, the President of the International Court of Justice briefed the Security Council for the first time in the Council's history.¹¹¹ Subsequently, the President of the Court briefed the Council in October 2001¹¹² and October 2002.¹¹³ All three briefings took

¹¹¹ S/PV.4212.

¹¹² S/PV.4398.

place in private under the item entitled “Briefing by Judge Gilbert Guillaume, President of the International Court of Justice”. No such briefing took place in 2003.¹¹⁴

During the period under review, there was one case concerning the application of Article 94 of the Charter (case 16) and another case concerning the application of Article 41 of the Statute of the Court (case 17).

Case 16

In a letter dated 22 January 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹¹⁵ the representative of Honduras informed the Council that El Salvador had failed to execute the International Court of Justice’s judgment of 11 September 1992, whereby it settled the land, island and maritime frontier dispute between Honduras and El Salvador. Honduras asserted that the failure of El Salvador to execute the judgment posed a challenge to the authority, validity and binding nature of the decisions of the Court. As a consequence, Honduras asked the Security Council, pursuant to Article 94 (2) of the Charter, to intervene and assist in securing the execution of and faithful compliance with the Court’s judgment.¹¹⁶

Subsequently, in a letter dated 17 September 2002, addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹¹⁷ Honduras informed the Council that Honduras and El Salvador had agreed, on 16 September 2002, to start the process of demarcation of the common boundary as defined in the decision of the Court of September 1992.¹¹⁸

Case 17

On 19 June 2000, the Democratic Republic of the Congo instituted proceedings against Uganda before the International Court of Justice in respect of a dispute concerning “acts of armed aggression perpetrated by

Uganda on the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity” (*Armed activities on the territory of the Congo: Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Uganda*).¹¹⁹ By its application, the Democratic Republic of the Congo sought “to secure the cessation of the acts of aggression directed against it”, which constituted “a serious threat to peace and security in central Africa in general and in the Great Lakes region in particular”. On the same day, as a matter of urgency, it also filed a request for provisional measures on the grounds that despite “promises and declarations of principle”, Uganda had “pursued its policy of aggression, brutal armed attacks and acts of oppression and looting”.¹²⁰

At the public hearings held at the Court on 26 and 28 June 2000, Uganda asked the Court to reject the application since the subject matter of the request for interim measures was essentially the same as the matters addressed by Security Council resolution 1304 of 16 June 2000, which was adopted in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter and was therefore binding.¹²¹ Disputing Uganda’s argument, the Democratic Republic of the Congo pointed out that in line with the Security Council resolution, in which the Council demanded that Uganda withdraw all its forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo without delay, it was requesting the Court to indicate the withdrawal of Ugandan forces, not as a political measure with a view to the maintenance of international peace and security, but as a judicial measure. Referring to the Court’s jurisprudence, it argued that the parallel powers of the Security Council and of the Court were not “any bar to the exercise by the latter of its jurisdiction”.¹²²

On 7 July 2000, the Court determined that the circumstances required it to indicate provisional measures, as provided in Article 41 of the Statute of the Court. In view of the Council’s determination in resolution 1304 (2000) that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to constitute a threat to international peace and security in

¹¹³ S/PV.4636.

¹¹⁴ At the Council’s 4753rd meeting, on 13 May 2003, in connection with the item entitled “The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes”, Mr. Nabil Elaraby, Judge, International Court of Justice, spoke before the Council but only in his personal capacity (S/PV.4753, pp. 7-9).

¹¹⁵ S/2002/108.

¹¹⁶ See also S/2002/251, S/2002/1102, S/2002/1194, S/2003/306, S/2003/430 and S/2003/561.

¹¹⁷ S/2002/1088.

¹¹⁸ See also S/2003/430.

¹¹⁹ S/2000/654, annex, para. 1.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, paras. 6 and 11.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, para. 27.

¹²² *Ibid.*, para. 23.

the region and the information at its own disposal, the Court was of the opinion that indication of provisional measures was required to prevent aggravation or extension of the dispute. By provision (2) of the order rendered by the Court on the request for the indication of provisional measures, the Court held that both parties must take all measures necessary to comply with all their obligations under international law, and with Security Council resolution 1304 (2000).¹²³

By a letter dated 1 July 2000 addressed to the Secretary-General,¹²⁴ the Registrar of the Court requested that the text of the order of the Court be transmitted to the Council, in accordance with Article 41, paragraph 2, of the Statute.

¹²³ Ibid., para 47.

¹²⁴ Ibid., pp. 1-2.

In declarations appended to the order, two judges commented on the granting of the provisional measures.¹²⁵ One of the judges held that the Court was not in a position to grant provisional measures since the Charter provided for the settlement, through the Council, of disputes raising issues from armed aggression and threats to international peace, as had already been the case. Another judge, however, held that while recognizing Security Council resolution 1304 (2000), the Court, as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, juridically assessed the issues and cast its order in accordance with Article 94 of the Charter. The order, indicating provisional measures, enjoined both parties to take all measures necessary to preserve the peace as well as preserve the rights of the parties.

¹²⁵ Ibid., pp. 16-18.

Part V Relations with the Secretariat

Article 98

The Secretary-General shall act in that capacity¹²⁶ in all meetings of the General Assembly, of the Security Council, of the Economic and Social Council, and of the Trusteeship Council, and shall perform such other functions as are entrusted to him by these organs

Article 99

The Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security.

Note

This part is concerned with the functions other than those of an administrative nature entrusted to the Secretary-General by the Security Council under Article 98 of the Charter¹²⁷ (section A) and with the

¹²⁶ Article 97 of the Charter stipulates that the Secretary-General shall be the chief administrative officer of the Organization.

¹²⁷ The functions and powers of the Secretary-General in regard to the meetings of the Security Council, conferred

Secretary-General's power of initiative under Article 99 (section B).

A. Functions other than those of an administrative nature entrusted to the Secretary-General by the Security Council

Note

Section A deals with the functions entrusted to the Secretary-General by the Security Council with respect to international peace and security. His functions in that regard continued to expand during the period under review, as the activities of the Security Council continued to expand and diversify. In addition to carrying on his responsibilities in the area of peaceful settlement of disputes (political/diplomatic functions) and peacekeeping (security functions), the Secretary-General was entrusted with the implementation of sanctions regimes (legal functions).

under Article 98, are delineated in rules 21 to 26 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure (see also chap. I, part IV, of the present Supplement).

The practice described below is illustrative and does not purport to be comprehensive.¹²⁸

Measures to ascertain the facts

In a number of instances, the Secretary-General was asked to investigate the facts of a particular situation or his efforts to do so were endorsed:

(a) *In relation to the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo*, the Council requested the Secretary-General to increase the number of personnel in the human rights component of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) to assist and enhance, in accordance with its current mandate, the capacity of the Congolese parties to investigate all the serious violations of international humanitarian law and human rights perpetrated on the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo since the beginning of the conflict in August 1998. It also requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, to make recommendations to the Council on other ways to help the transitional government in the Democratic Republic of the Congo address the issue of impunity;¹²⁹

(b) *In relation to the item entitled “Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security”*, the Council, recalling the statements by its President of 30 November 1999¹³⁰ and 20 July 2000¹³¹ on the prevention of armed conflicts, welcomed in that context the intention of the Secretary-General to send fact-finding missions to areas of tension more frequently;¹³²

(c) *In relation to the item entitled “Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts”*, the Council supported the enhancement of the role of the Secretary-General in conflict prevention, including by increased use of United Nations interdisciplinary fact-finding and confidence-building missions to regions of tension, by developing regional prevention

strategies with regional partners and appropriate United Nations organs and agencies, and by improving the capacity and the resource base for preventive action in the Secretariat;¹³³

(d) *With regard to the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo*, the Council invited the Secretary-General to report further on the events in the region of Uvira;¹³⁴

(e) *In connection with the situation in Côte d’Ivoire*, after expressing its deepest concern at reports of mass killings and grave violations of human rights in that country, the Council welcomed the decision by the Secretary-General to request that the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights gather precise information about violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in Côte d’Ivoire, including through the dispatch of a fact-finding mission to that country.¹³⁵

Good offices

The Secretary-General was often requested to exercise or continue to exercise his “good offices” function. His independent political role in preventing or mediating conflicts between or within States, or his role in that regard was endorsed:

(a) *In relation to the item entitled “Women and peace and security”*, at the 4402nd meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council¹³⁶ on the anniversary of the adoption of resolution 1325 (2000) on women and peace and security, by which it urged the Secretary-General to appoint women as Special Representatives and Special Envoys to pursue good offices on his behalf in accordance with his strategic plan of action;¹³⁷

(b) *In relation to the situation in Cyprus*, the Council commended the “extraordinary” effort made by the Secretary-General and his Special Adviser to address the situation in Cyprus, in pursuance of his good offices mission and within the framework of resolution 1250 (1999).¹³⁸ The Council also commended the Secretary-General’s initiative of

¹²⁸ For details of these and other instances in which the Security Council entrusted functions to the Secretary-General, see the case studies in chapter VIII and chapter X of the present Supplement.

¹²⁹ Resolution 1468 (2003).

¹³⁰ S/PRST/1999/34.

¹³¹ S/PRST/2000/25.

¹³² Resolution 1327 (2000).

¹³³ Resolution 1366 (2001).

¹³⁴ S/PRST/2002/27.

¹³⁵ S/PRST/2002/42.

¹³⁶ S/PRST/2001/31.

¹³⁷ A/49/587.

¹³⁸ Resolution 1475 (2003).

presenting the parties with a comprehensive settlement plan, stressed its full support for the Secretary-General's mission of good offices as entrusted to him in resolution 1250 (1999), and asked him to continue to make available his good offices for Cyprus, as he had suggested in his report of 1 April 2003;¹³⁹

(c) *With regard to the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo*, the Council welcomed the efforts and good offices of the Republic of South Africa, in its capacity as chair of the African Union, and of the Secretary-General, to help the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda to reach an agreement to tackle the problem of the armed groups and to take forward the withdrawal of Rwandan troops, in the context of the full withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in accordance with the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement signed on 10 July 1999 and relevant Council resolutions.¹⁴⁰ In a subsequent statement¹⁴¹ issued by the President on behalf of the Council, the Council encouraged all local actors, including the parties to the conflict as well as civil society and the religious organizations, to engage in talks in order to end the hostilities and agree on a basis for peaceful coexistence in the region during the transitional period in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In that regard, the Council encouraged the Secretary-General to consider using his good offices to promote and facilitate such talks, with MONUC providing support where applicable;

(d) *In connection with the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia*, the Council repeatedly reiterated its strong support for the role of the Secretary-General in helping to implement the Algiers Agreements, including through his own good offices, and for the efforts of his Special Representative;¹⁴²

(e) *In connection with the situation in Afghanistan*, the Council endorsed the establishment of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA), in accordance with the mandate and structure contained in the report of the Secretary-General.¹⁴³ The core mandate of the mission included,

inter alia, the promotion of national reconciliation through the good offices of the Secretary-General's Special Representative;¹⁴⁴

Joint efforts to promote a political settlement

In several instances during the period under review, the Secretary-General was asked to undertake diplomatic efforts in conjunction with regional arrangements or other actors in order to achieve a political settlement.¹⁴⁵

(a) *In relation with the situation in Angola*, the Council requested the Secretary-General to provide appropriate support, in coordination with the Government of Angola, in the preparation of elections, including through the work of the United Nations technical assistance mission;¹⁴⁶

(b) *With regard to the Inter-Agency Mission to West Africa*, the Council welcomed the establishment of the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for West Africa to ensure, inter alia, the strengthening of harmonization and coordination of the activities of the United Nations system in an integrated regional perspective and to the development of a fruitful partnership with the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), other subregional organizations and international and national actors, including civil society;¹⁴⁷

(c) *In connection with the situation in Georgia*, the Council welcomed the efforts by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to enhance contacts at all levels between the Georgian and Abkhaz sides, and supported the appeal by the Secretary-General to both sides to make more active use of the Coordinating Council machinery, and actively to consider the paper prepared by the Special Representative concerning the implementation of the agreed confidence-building measures;¹⁴⁸

(d) *In relation with the situation in Afghanistan*, the Council supported the efforts of the Personal

¹³⁹ S/2003/398.

¹⁴⁰ S/PRST/2002/22.

¹⁴¹ S/PRST/2002/27.

¹⁴² S/PRST/2001/4; and S/PRST/2001/14; and resolution 1344 (2001), 1369 (2001), 1398 (2002), and 1430 (2002).

¹⁴³ S/2002/278.

¹⁴⁴ Resolution 1401 (2002).

¹⁴⁵ See chapter XII of the Supplement for a more comprehensive list of instances of cooperation between the United Nations and regional arrangements in order to achieve a pacific settlement of a dispute and the role of the Secretary-General in those instances.

¹⁴⁶ S/PRST/2001/24.

¹⁴⁷ S/PRST/2001/38.

¹⁴⁸ S/PRST/2000/16.

Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan to advance a peace process through political negotiations between the Afghan parties aimed at the establishment of a broad-based, multi-ethnic, and fully representative government, and called for the warring factions to cooperate fully with those efforts to conclude a ceasefire and begin discussions leading to a political settlement, by moving forward promptly in the process of dialogue;¹⁴⁹

Peacekeeping and implementation of peace agreements

In addition to carrying out responsibilities with regard to ongoing missions,¹⁵⁰ the Secretary-General took on additional functions in relation to four new peacekeeping operations¹⁵¹ established during the period from 2000 to 2003. Most of the new missions were multifunctional, with political, humanitarian, social and economic components. They were given the task of helping to regroup and demobilize combatants, destroy weapons, coordinate humanitarian assistance, monitor human rights and organize elections. The Secretary-General had the responsibility for executive direction and command of those peacekeeping operations, including their establishment, deployment and withdrawal, and the implementation of their mandates.

Support to international tribunals

During the period under review, the Secretary-General was mainly requested to make practical arrangements for the election of ad litem judges for the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda, respectively.¹⁵²

On 30 November 2000, pursuant to the letter from the Secretary-General to the Council and the annexed letters from the Presidents of the Tribunals, the Council adopted resolution 1329 (2000) to enable the Tribunals to expedite the conclusion of their work. By that resolution, the Council decided to amend the

Statute and to enlarge the membership of the Appeals Chambers of the Tribunals. In that connection, the Council requested the Secretary-General to make practical arrangements for the election of 27 ad litem judges in accordance with Article 13 ter of the Statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, and for the timely provision to the Tribunals of personnel and facilities, in particular, for the ad litem judges and the Appeals Chambers and related offices of the Prosecutor. The Council further requested the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council closely informed of progress in that regard and to submit, as soon as possible, a report containing an assessment and proposals regarding the date ending the temporal jurisdiction of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

By resolution 1431 (2002), the Council decided to amend the Statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda and to establish a pool of 18 ad litem judges. It therefore requested the Secretary-General to make practical arrangements for the election of 18 ad litem judges in accordance with Article 12 ter of the Statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda and for the timely provision to the International Tribunal for Rwanda of personnel and facilities, in particular, for the ad litem judges and related offices of the Prosecutor. The Secretary-General was further requested to keep the Security Council closely informed of progress in that regard.

Implementation of sanctions regimes

During the period under review, the Security Council established four sanctions regimes.¹⁵³ In addition to providing all necessary assistance to the sanctions committees established to monitor implementation of the sanctions, the Secretary-General was also requested to strengthen collaboration between the United Nations and regional and international organizations, including Interpol, in monitoring or

¹⁴⁹ Resolution 1333 (2000).

¹⁵⁰ For additional details see chapter V of the present *Supplement*.

¹⁵¹ United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE); United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL); UNAMA; United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISSET). For an overview of newly established peacekeeping missions, see chapter V.

¹⁵² For additional details, see chapter V.

¹⁵³ The new sanctions committees established by the Security Council during the period under consideration were the following: Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2003) concerning Liberia; Committee established pursuant to resolution 1521 (2003) concerning Liberia; Committee established pursuant to resolution 1298 (2000) concerning the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia; and Committee established pursuant to resolution 1518 (2003). For further details, see chapter V of the present *Supplement*.

enforcing the implementation of the measures in relation to Angola;¹⁵⁴ to develop an information package and media campaign designed to educate the public at large on the measures contained in the relevant Security Council resolutions concerning Angola;¹⁵⁵ to work actively through technical assistance and cooperation with the Transitional National Government, local authorities and traditional civil and religious leaders to enhance the administrative and judicial capacities throughout Somalia to contribute to the monitoring and enforcement of the arms embargo;¹⁵⁶ and to submit a report to the Council on the possible humanitarian or socio-economic impact of the measures imposed against Liberia.¹⁵⁷ In a number of instances, the Secretary-General was also requested to establish monitoring mechanisms and panels of experts to assist in the implementation of the sanctions regimes.¹⁵⁸

B. Matters brought to the attention of the Security Council by the Secretary-General

Article 99

The Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security.

At its 4360th meeting, held on 30 August 2001, the Security Council adopted resolution 1366 (2001) on the role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflict, in which it twice invoked Article 99. In the preamble, the Council recognized the importance of enhancing the role of the Secretary-General in the prevention of armed conflict in accordance with

Article 99. Furthermore, expressing its willingness to consider promptly early warning and prevention cases brought to it by the Secretary-General, the Council encouraged him to convey to it his assessment of potential threats to international peace and security, in accordance with Article 99.¹⁵⁹

During the period under review, the Secretary-General did not expressly invoke Article 99. However, he drew the attention of the Security Council to situations, already on the Council's agenda, that were deteriorating, and requested the Council to consider taking appropriate action.¹⁶⁰ In addition, the Secretary-General exercised the implicit rights conferred upon him under Article 99¹⁶¹ by initiating, for example, a good offices mission in respect of the situation in the

¹⁵⁹ Resolution 1366 (2001), para. 5.

¹⁶⁰ Thus, for example, in his letter dated 28 June 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/678), the Secretary-General brought to the attention of members of the Security Council the ceasefire agreement signed by the Liberian parties in Accra on 17 June 2003 under the stewardship of ECOWAS and sought a "prompt endorsement of a United Nations role in support of the implementation of that agreement as reflecting the Council's commitment to promote the peaceful resolution of the Liberian conflict". He further encouraged the Council to "take action to give practical effect to that commitment, in the light of the most recent grave deterioration in the situation", by authorizing the deployment to Liberia, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, of a highly trained and well-equipped multinational force, under the lead of a Member State, to prevent a major humanitarian tragedy and to stabilize the situation in that country.

¹⁶¹ With respect to Article 99, the *Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs* states in Supplement No. 8 (1989-1994), volume VI, that "the implicit powers of the Secretary-General in the spirit of Article 99 have been more liberally construed to include the right to initiate fact-finding missions, investigative commissions and the offer of good offices or mediation". See also the report of the Secretary-General dated 17 June 1992 entitled "An Agenda for peace: preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, and peacekeeping" (S/24111, paras. 23-27) and the statement by the President of the Security Council of 30 November 1992 (S/24872). For information concerning the implementation of Article 99 of the Charter, see chapter X of this Supplement.

¹⁵⁴ Resolution 1295 (2000), para. 29.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 30.

¹⁵⁶ Resolution 1407 (2002), para. 7.

¹⁵⁷ Resolution 1478 (2003), para. 19.

¹⁵⁸ See, for example, the Panel of Experts established by resolution 1521 (2003) to monitor the sanctions regime against Liberia. By that resolution, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish, within one month from the date of its adoption, in consultation with the Committee, for a period of five months, a Panel of Experts consisting of up to five members, with the range of expertise necessary to fulfil the Panel's mandate described in paragraph 22 of the resolution. For further details, see chapter V of the Supplement.

Middle East (Israel and Lebanon),¹⁶² by sending a fact-finding mission to investigate events concerning the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question,¹⁶³ and by sending reconnaissance and liaison teams in respect of the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶² S/2000/294, S/2000/322 and S/PRST/2000/13.

¹⁶³ By resolution 1405 (2002), the Security Council welcomed the initiative of the Secretary-General to develop accurate information regarding recent events in the Jenin refugee camp through a fact-finding team and requested him to keep the Council informed.

¹⁶⁴ In a presidential statement of 7 July 2000 (S/PRST/2000/676), the Council endorsed the Secretary-General's decision to dispatch reconnaissance and liaison teams in the region.

In 2001, by resolution 1379 (2001), the Security Council requested the Secretary-General to attach to his report on children and armed conflict a list of parties to armed conflict that recruited or used children in situations that were on the Council's agenda or that might be brought to the attention of the Council in accordance with Article 99. Accordingly, in his report of 10 November 2003, the Secretary-General included in the list other parties to armed conflict that recruited or used children in armed conflicts.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁵ See S/2003/1053 and Corr.1 and Corr.2, annexes.

Part VI

Relations with the Military Staff Committee

Article 47

1. *There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament.*

2. *The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any Member of the United Nations not permanently represented on the Committee shall be invited by the Committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities requires the participation of that Member in its work.*

3. *The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. Questions relating to the command of such forces shall be worked out subsequently.*

4. *The Military Staff Committee, with the authorization of the Security Council and after consultation with appropriate regional agencies, may establish regional sub-committees.*

Note

The Military Staff Committee, established pursuant to Article 47 of the Charter, is composed of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members or their representatives. During the period under review, the Military Staff Committee continued to meet regularly under its draft rules of procedure and remained prepared to carry out the functions assigned to it under Article 47. The need to revitalize and make full use of the capacity of the Military Staff Committee was discussed by Council's members during the discussions on the following items (cases 18 to 21): (a) Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security; (b) No exit without strategy; (c) Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries; and (d) Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council.

Case 18

Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security

At the Council's 4220th meeting, held on 13 November 2000 in connection with the item entitled "Ensuring an effective role of the Council in the maintenance of international peace and security", the Council adopted resolution 1327 (2000). In annex IV of the resolution, the Council undertook "to consider

the possibility of using the Military Staff Committee as one of the means of enhancing the United Nations peacekeeping capacity". In the ensuing discussion, the Russian Federation commented that, following the resolution on the Brahimi report,¹⁶⁶ the Council had entered the equally important stage of implementing agreed decisions. He believed that the approach of using the Military Staff Committee as one of the means of enhancing United Nations peacekeeping capacity would maintain balance in the distribution of responsibilities between Member States and the United Nations Secretariat.¹⁶⁷

At the 4288th meeting, the Council continued its consideration of the item. During the debate, the representative of the Russian Federation recalled that in resolution 1327 (2000), a decision was made to consider the question of how best to utilize the Military Staff Committee. He commented that there was a need "not to leave all of this on paper or simply within the sphere of conversation", but to see what in fact could really be done.¹⁶⁸

Case 19 **No exit without strategy**

At the Security Council's 4223rd meeting, held on 15 November 2000 in connection with the agenda item "No exit without strategy", the representative of China noted that, in order for peacekeeping operations to conclude successfully, the United Nations rapid deployment capacity should be developed, the effectiveness of the planning enhanced and the technical and financial resources of operations ensured. In that connection, he highlighted the importance of strengthening relevant Secretariat units, including the possibility of making full use of the capacity of the Military Staff Committee as "an important source for military expertise both for preparing for the possible deployment of an operation and for wrapping one up".¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁶ A/55/305-S/2000/809.

¹⁶⁷ S/PV.4220, p. 9.

¹⁶⁸ S/PV.4288 (Resumption 1), p. 13.

¹⁶⁹ S/PV.4223, p. 15.

Case 20 **Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries**

At its 4326th meeting, held on 13 June 2001 in connection with the item entitled "Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries", the Security Council adopted resolution 1353 (2001), by which it undertook to consider the possibility of using the Military Staff Committee as one of the means of enhancing United Nations peacekeeping operations.¹⁷⁰ At its 4257th meeting, held on 16 January 2001 on the same item, the representative of India, in advancing his views on the relationship between the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries, reminded the Council that Article 47 (2) of the Charter stipulated that the Military Staff Committee could include officers from any Member State, when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities required the participation of that Member in its work. He also invited the Council to revive the Military Staff Committee and use it as a forum for consultations with troop-contributing countries on purely military aspects.¹⁷¹

In his statement, the representative of the Russian Federation stated that his delegation would regard India's proposal on making more use of the Military Staff Committee, in line with resolution 1327 (2000), as an obligation to study ways of exploiting the potential of the Committee in the interest of strengthening the peacekeeping activities of the United Nations.¹⁷² The representative of Colombia also voiced his support for reviving the Military Staff Committee, with a broadened mandate that would reflect the concerns voiced by other delegations.¹⁷³ Mauritius also concurred with India's statement.¹⁷⁴

Case 21 **Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council**

At its 4343rd meeting, on 29 June 2001, the Council held a wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council during the month of June 2001. During the debate, the representative of the Russian

¹⁷⁰ Resolution 1353 (2001), annex I.C, para. 1.

¹⁷¹ S/PV.4257, pp. 8-13.

¹⁷² S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1), p. 13.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

Federation, recalling the need to follow up implementation of the Council's decisions, stated that the Military Staff Committee, as a mechanism which should be useful for the Council's work on peacekeeping, had been underutilized. He further recalled that the Council, in resolutions 1327 (2000) and 1353 (2001), had already emphasized the need for

the study of the means to make more active use of the Military Staff Committee in order to strengthen United Nations peacekeeping operations. He concluded by stating that his delegation expected the Military Staff Committee "to respond to the Council's resolutions".¹⁷⁵

¹⁷⁵ S/PV.4343 and Corr.1, p. 6.

Chapter VII

Practice relative to recommendations to the General Assembly regarding membership in the United Nations

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introductory note	255
Part I. Applications for admission to membership in the United Nations and action taken thereon by the Security Council and the General Assembly, 2000-2003	256
Note	256
A. Applications recommended by the Security Council	256
B. Discussion of the question in the Security Council	256
C. Applications pending on 1 January 2000	257
D. Applications submitted and action taken thereon by the Security Council and the General Assembly from 1 January 2000 to 31 December 2003	258
Part II. Presentation of applications	260
Part III. Referral of applications to the Committee on the Admission of New Members	260
Part IV. Procedures in the consideration of applications within the Security Council	260
Part V. Practices relating to the applicability of Article 4 of the Charter	261
Note	261

Introductory note

The present chapter considers the practice of the Security Council in its recommendations to the General Assembly concerning applications for membership in the United Nations.

Part I sets forth the applications for admission considered and the decisions taken thereon by the Security Council and the General Assembly during the period under review.

Parts II to V concern the procedures employed by the Council in the consideration of the applications. The parts entitled “Consideration of the adoption or amendment of rules 58 to 60 of the provisional rules of procedure”, “The roles of the General Assembly and the Security Council” and “Practices relating to the applicability of Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter” have been deleted in the present Supplement as no material was found for inclusion therein. A new part entitled “Practices relating to the applicability of Article 4 of the Charter” has been inserted in order to capture the full range of practice in that area.

During the period under review, the Council recommended the admission of four States to membership in the United Nations.

The issue of the membership of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), which had been pending since 1992,¹ was finally resolved when the Council unanimously recommended,² and the General Assembly decided,³ to admit that country to membership in the United Nations.⁴

In the case of the application of Tuvalu,⁵ a statement made by one Council member touched on the interpretation of Article 4 (1) of the Charter, which sets out the criteria for membership in the United Nations (see case study in part V).

¹ At its 3116th meeting, held on 19 September 1992, the Security Council adopted resolution 777 (1992), by which it considered that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) could not continue automatically the membership of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; and therefore recommended to the General Assembly that it decide that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) should apply for membership in the United Nations and that it should not participate in the work of the General Assembly. Consequently, from 1992 to 2000, representatives of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) participated in Council meetings under a special arrangement; they were invited by name, without mention of the State they represented, and without reference to an Article of the Charter or the provisional rules of procedure.

² Resolution 1326 (2000).

³ General Assembly resolution 55/12.

⁴ As from 4 February 2003, the name of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was changed to Serbia and Montenegro.

⁵ S/2000/5.

Part I

Applications for admission to membership in the United Nations and action taken thereon by the Security Council and the General Assembly, 2000-2003

Note

As in the previous Supplements to the *Repertoire*, part I contains information on the applications before the Council during the period under review and the decisions taken thereon by the Council and the General Assembly. Section A (Applications recommended by the Security Council), section B (Discussion of the question in the Security Council), section C (Applications pending on 1 January 2000) and section D (Applications submitted and action taken thereon by the Security Council and the General Assembly from 1 January 2000 to 31 December 2003) have been maintained from previous Supplements. However, the sections entitled “Applications that failed to obtain a recommendation” and “Applications pending at the end of the period under review” have been deleted in the present Supplement as no material was found for inclusion therein.

A. Applications recommended by the Security Council

In the period 1 January 2000 to 31 December 2003, the Security Council recommended the following States for admission to membership in the United Nations:

Switzerland
Timor-Leste
Tuvalu
Yugoslavia⁶

B. Discussion of the question in the Security Council

The Council held eight meetings⁷ to consider applications for admission during the four-year period from 2000 to 2003. At one of those meetings,⁸ held on 17 February 2000, a statement of position was made concerning Tuvalu’s admission to membership in the United Nations (see case study in part V).

⁶ As from 4 February 2003, the name of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was changed to Serbia and Montenegro.

⁷ See table in section D.

⁸ See S/PV.4103.

C. Applications pending on 1 January 2000

<i>Applicant</i>	<i>Date of application</i>	<i>Document</i>
Tuvalu ^a	16 November 1999	S/2005/5

^a Admitted on 5 September 2000. See table in section D.

D. Applications submitted and action taken thereon by the Security Council and the General Assembly from 1 January 2000 to 31 December 2003

<i>Applicant</i>	<i>Application and dates of submission and circulation</i>	<i>Referral to Committee;^a Council meeting and date</i>	<i>Committee meeting and date; Committee report and recommendations</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: Council meeting and date</i>	<i>Security Council resolution/presidential statement</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>General Assembly plenary meeting and date</i>	<i>General Assembly resolution</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Result of proceedings</i>
Tuvalu	S/2000/5 16.11.99 5.1.00	4093rd mtg. 28.1.00 Referred by President	102nd and 103rd meetings 28.1.00 and 31.1.2000 Draft resolution recommending admission Committee recommended that the Council have recourse to the provisions of the last paragraph of rule 60 of the provisional rules of procedure	4103rd mtg. 17.2.00	Draft resolution (S/2000/70) Adopted as resolution 1290 (2000) President made a statement (S/PRST/2000/6)	14-0-1 (China abstained)	55th session, 55/1 1st plenary meeting 5.9.00	55/1	Adopted by acclamation	Admitted
Yugoslavia ^b	S/2000/1043 27.10.00 30.10.00	4214th mtg. 31.10.00 Referred by President	104th meeting 31.10.00 Draft resolution recommending admission Committee recommended that the Council have recourse to the provisions of the last paragraph of rule 60 of the provisional rules of procedure	4215th mtg. 31.10.00	Draft resolution (S/2000/1051) Adopted as resolution 1326 (2000) President made a statement (S/PRST/2000/30)	Adopted without a vote	55th session, 55/12 48th plenary meeting 1.11.00	55/12	Adopted by acclamation	Admitted

<i>Applicant</i>	<i>Application and dates of submission and circulation</i>	<i>Referral to Committee:^a Council meeting and date</i>	<i>Committee meeting and date; Committee report and recommendations</i>	<i>Decision of the Council: Council meeting and date</i>	<i>Security Council resolution/presidential statement</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>General Assembly plenary meeting and date</i>	<i>General Assembly resolution</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Result of proceedings</i>
Timor-Leste	S/2002/558 20.5.02 20.5.02	4540th mtg. 22.5.02 Referred by President	105th meeting 23.5.02 Draft resolution recommending admission	4542nd mtg. 23.5.02	Draft resolution (S/2002/566) Adopted as resolution 1414 (2002) President made a statement (S/PRST/2002/15)	Adopted without a vote	57th session, 20th plenary meeting 27.9.02	57/3	Adopted by acclamation	Admitted
Switzerland	S/2002/801 20.6.2002 24.7.02	4584th mtg. 24.7.02 Referred by President	106th meeting 24.7.02 Draft resolution recommending admission	4585th mtg. 24.7.02	Draft resolution (S/2002/825) Adopted as resolution 1426 (2002) President made a statement (S/PRST/2002/23)	Adopted without a vote	57th session, 1st plenary meeting 10.09.02	57/1	Adopted by acclamation	Admitted

^a Committee on the Admission of New Members.

^b As from 4 February 2003, the name of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was changed to Serbia and Montenegro.

Part II Presentation of applications

Material concerning the presentation of applications — that is, the submission of applications to the Secretary-General, their immediate communication to representatives on the Security Council pursuant to rule 59 and their subsequent inclusion in the provisional agenda of the Council — may be found in the table in part I, section D. The application of Tuvalu, submitted on 6 November 1999, was circulated by the Secretary-General on 5 January 2000 and included in the agenda of the Council on 17 February 2000.

Part III Referral of applications to the Committee on the Admission of New Members

During the period under review, all applications were referred by the President of the Security Council to the Committee on the Admission of New Members. There were no proposals to waive the application of rule 59 of the provisional rules of procedure.⁹ On two occasions,¹⁰ upon the recommendation of the Committee on the Admission of New Members, the Council waived the time limits set forth in paragraph 4 of rule 60, in accordance with paragraph 5 of that same rule.¹¹

Part IV Procedures in the consideration of applications within the Security Council

During the period under review, the practice of deciding upon applications in the chronological order of their receipt was observed. The Council decided upon all applications separately. In all but one instance, the Council adopted the draft resolutions submitted by the Committee on the Admission of New Members without

⁹ Rule 59 provides, inter alia, that “unless the Security Council decides otherwise, the application shall be referred by the President to a committee of the Security Council upon which each member of the Security Council shall be represented”.

¹⁰ See table in part I, section D. In the case of Tuvalu, though the Council waived the time limits set forth in the fourth paragraph of rule 60 in order to present its recommendation to the General Assembly at the Assembly’s fifty-fourth session, the matter was eventually considered at the Assembly’s fifty-fifth session.

¹¹ The fourth and fifth paragraphs of rule 60 read as follows:

“In order to ensure the consideration of its recommendation at the next session of the General Assembly following the receipt of an application, the Security Council shall make its recommendation not less than twenty-five days in advance of a regular session of the General Assembly, nor less than four days in advance of a special session.

“In special circumstances, the Security Council may decide to make a recommendation to the General Assembly concerning an application for membership subsequent to the expiration of the time limits set forth in the preceding paragraph”.

a debate and a vote, “in accordance with the understanding reached in prior consultations among members of the Council”. Following the adoption of the resolution, the President of the Council made a statement on behalf of the members of the Council. In the case of Tuvalu, the draft resolution submitted by the Committee was put to a vote and adopted with one abstention (China). Prior to the vote the representative of China made a statement.¹²

Part V

Practices relating to the applicability of Article 4 of the Charter

Note

During the consideration of the admission of Tuvalu to membership, one Council member made a statement of position which touched upon the interpretation of Article 4 (1).¹³

Case

Admission of Tuvalu

By a letter dated 16 November 1999 from the Prime Minister of Tuvalu addressed to the Secretary-General, Tuvalu submitted an application for admission to membership in the United Nations, which was circulated by the Secretary-General in a note dated 5 January 2000.¹⁴

The Security Council considered the application at its 4093rd meeting, held on 28 January 2000 and referred the application, in accordance with rule 59, to the Committee on the Admission of New Members. The Committee, in paragraph 4 of its report, dated 31 January 2000,¹⁵ recommended to the Council the adoption of a draft resolution on the application of Tuvalu for admission to membership in the United Nations. Paragraph 5 of the same report, however, stated that China was unable to associate itself with the recommendation of the Committee and that it would expound its position at the formal meeting of the Council.

At its 4103rd meeting, on 17 February 2000, the Council considered the report of the Committee concerning the admission of Tuvalu and decided to proceed to the vote¹⁶ on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 4 of the report. Speaking before the vote, the representative of China asserted that his delegation attached great importance to Tuvalu’s desire to join the United Nations and had seriously considered its application. He underscored that, as a State Member of the United

¹² See S/PV.4103, p. 2, and the case study in part V of the present chapter.

¹³ The text of Article 4 (1) reads as follows: “Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations”.

¹⁴ S/2000/5.

¹⁵ S/2000/70.

¹⁶ See table in part I, section D, for details of the voting.

Nations, a country should truly fulfil the obligations contained in the Charter and strictly abide by the resolutions of the General Assembly. This, he said, was a very important basis to judge whether an applicant country had met the standards for becoming a Member of the United Nations. In considering Tuvalu's membership, his delegation believed that the most important issue was the upholding of the principles and purposes of the Charter and the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) on "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations".¹⁷ Proceeding from that principled position, the Chinese delegation could not support the Security Council recommendation to the General Assembly that Tuvalu be accepted as a new Member State. However, bearing in mind the long-term interests of the peoples of China and Tuvalu, and also taking into consideration various requests, including those of the South Pacific countries, his delegation would not block the recommendation. He expressed the hope that Tuvalu would strictly abide by the Charter of the United Nations and implement General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI). In the ensuing vote, China abstained.

Tuvalu was admitted to membership in the United Nations on 5 September 2000 pursuant to the recommendation¹⁸ of the Security Council and the decision¹⁹ of the General Assembly.

¹⁷ By resolution 2758 (XXVI) of 25 October 1971, the General Assembly decided "to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations, and to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the place which they unlawfully occup[ied] at the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it".

¹⁸ Resolution 1290 (2000).

¹⁹ General Assembly resolution 55/1.

Chapter VIII

Consideration of questions under the responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introductory note	268
Africa	
1. The situation concerning Western Sahara	270
2. The situation in Liberia	275
3. The situation in Somalia	285
4. The situation in Angola	296
5. The situation concerning Rwanda	319
6. The situation in Burundi	322
7. Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America	332
8. The situation in Sierra Leone	335
9. The situation in the Great Lakes region	356
10. The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	361
11. The situation in the Central African Republic	412
12. The situation in Africa	418
13. The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	428
14. The situation in Guinea-Bissau	437
15. The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone	443
16. Security Council resolution 1054 (1996) of 26 April 1996	448
17. Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council	449
18. Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security	451
19. Letter dated 29 November 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	453
20. The situation in Côte d'Ivoire	454
21. Letter dated 2 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	462
22. Central African Region	463
Americas	
23. The question concerning Haiti	466
Asia	
24. The situation in Timor-Leste	467

25. The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border	509
26. The situation in Afghanistan	511
27. Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.	534
28. Letter dated 10 November 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Solomon Islands to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.	539
Europe	
29. The situation in Cyprus.	540
30. Items relating to the situation in the former Yugoslavia	543
A. The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.	543
B. The situation in Croatia	560
C. Items relating to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.	562
D. Items relating to Kosovo	565
E. Briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans	588
31. The situation in Georgia.	591
Middle East	
32. The situation in the Middle East	600
A. United Nations Disengagement Observer Force	600
B. United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and developments in the Israel-Lebanon sector	601
33. The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	605
34. Items relating to Iraq.	635
A. The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	635
B. Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq	688
35. Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	690
Thematic issues	
36. Items relating to the International Tribunals.	692

A.	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	
	International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994	692
B.	International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	701
C.	International Tribunal for the prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994	704
37.	Items relating to the maintenance of international peace and security	707
A.	The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security.	707
B.	Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peacebuilding	708
C.	Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council	711
D.	The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations.	714
E.	Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa.	720
38.	Children and armed conflict.	725
39.	Items relating to terrorism	735
A.	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts	735
B.	High-level meeting of the Security Council on the anniversary of 11 September 2001: acts of international terrorism.	763
C.	High-level meeting of the Security Council: combating terrorism.	763
40.	Promoting peace and security: humanitarian assistance to refugees in Africa.	765
41.	Protection of civilians in armed conflict.	767
42.	Items relating to small arms	782
A.	Small arms.	782
B.	Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa.	787
43.	Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts.	790

44. Protection of United Nations personnel, associated personnel and humanitarian personnel in conflict zones	793
45. General issues relating to sanctions	795
46. Women and peace and security	800
47. Items relating to peacekeeping.	806
A. No exit without strategy.	806
B. Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries.	808
C. Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations	811
D. United Nations peacekeeping	812
E. The importance of mine action for peacekeeping operations	815
48. Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach	817
49. Nobel Peace Prize	820
50. Items relating to food and security	821
A. Food aid in the context of conflict settlement: Afghanistan and other crisis areas	821
B. Africa's food crisis as a threat to peace and security.	822
51. Kimberley Process Certification Scheme	825
52. The Security Council and regional organizations: facing the new challenges to international peace and security	825
53. The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes	827
54. Security Council mission	829
55. Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role.	835
56. Briefings	838

Introductory note

Chapter VIII of the *Repertoire* focuses on the substance of each of the questions included in the agenda of the Security Council that relate to its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Examining the entire chain of proceedings of the Council on each agenda item gives an overall sense of their political context.¹ The range of items covers broadly those that may be deemed to fall under Chapters VI and VII of the Charter.

The overview of the proceedings of the Council provided in chapter VIII of the *Repertoire* constitutes a framework within which the procedural developments recorded in chapters I to VII and the legal and constitutional discussions recorded in chapters X to XII may be considered. Chapter VIII also examines the substantive aspects of the Council's practice that are not covered in other chapters of the *Repertoire*.

The agenda items are grouped by region, for ease of reference, with an additional category of thematic issues. Within each region, items are listed in the order in which they were first included in the list of items of which the Council is seized.

Generally, individual sections cover all proceedings relating to a specific item. In exceptional cases, in order to improve the coherence of the text, related items have been grouped together under the heading "Items relating to..."

The material included in chapter VIII is drawn from the formal meetings of the Council, and includes summaries of the statements made in the Council and of all Council documents, including reports and letters, that were referred to during the meetings.² The chapter also includes summaries of all of the decisions that were adopted at those formal Council meetings.³

Each section is organized around the decisions taken by the Council on a specific item. All of the meetings leading to a decision are included under the heading for that decision. Meetings that do not lead to a decision are grouped together under the heading "Deliberations".

When the Council includes a new item in its agenda, the section covering its first consideration bears the heading "Initial proceedings".

Some meetings have been grouped together, and an overview of all developments at those meetings is provided. In some of these cases, similar resolutions, generally renewing the mandate of a subsidiary body and adopted without debate, have also been grouped together; a brief overview of their main provisions is provided.

Meetings with countries contributing troops to a peacekeeping mission are dealt with under the item that covers that mission.

¹ The *Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council* covers formal meetings and documents of the Security Council. Some of the questions considered in this chapter were also discussed in informal consultations among the members of the Council.

² Other documents relating to a specific item but not mentioned at a formal meeting of the Council are listed in the annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly.

³ The summaries are based on those contained in the *Index to Proceedings of the Security Council*.

Information on formal meetings held in private is given in a footnote to the subsequent open meeting.

Unless otherwise noted, representatives of States Members of the United Nations who were invited to participate in the Council's proceedings were invited under rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, and all other speakers were invited under rule 39.⁴

Unless otherwise indicated, draft resolutions were prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

⁴ See chapter III for more information.

Africa

1. The situation concerning Western Sahara

**Decision of 29 February 2000 (4106th meeting):
resolution 1292 (2000)**

At its 4106th meeting,¹ on 29 February 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 17 February 2000 on the situation concerning Western Sahara.² In his report, the Secretary-General commented on the implementation of the settlement plan; the situation of the prisoners of war and the repatriation of refugees; and the implementation of the cross-border confidence-building measures. On the issue of the implementation of the settlement plan, he noted that his Special Representative had pursued consultations with the parties in order to seek ways of moving the process forward, in particular with respect to the new round of appeals received by the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO). He stated that the Frente Polisario was concerned over the delays resulting from the large number of appeals and maintained that, under the settlement plan, only the people counted in the 1974 Spanish census of the territory should take part in the referendum. The authorities of Morocco, on the contrary, had reiterated the right of every applicant to appeal by presenting witnesses who could provide new information to support his or her inclusion in the voter list. The authorities of Morocco had, further, questioned the impartiality of the members of the Identification Commission and had warned that the referendum would not be held if any person originating from the Sahara were denied the right to participate. These substantial differences, which were still unresolved, had delayed the preparatory work of MINURSO. The

Secretary-General suggested that the two parties considered that the composition of the electorate body would predetermine the outcome of the referendum. As a way to put the peace process back on track, he informed the Council that he had appointed a Personal Envoy, who had later informed him that neither party had indicated willingness to pursue any political solution other than implementing the settlement plan. Thus, he had arranged direct talks between the parties, which had resulted in a number of agreements that, nonetheless, had not been successful in preventing further interruptions. The Secretary-General pointed out that each time the United Nations proposed a technical solution to bridge the parties' differing interpretation of a given provision of the settlement plan, a new difficulty, requiring yet another round of protracted consultations, arose. Furthermore, he expressed concern over the fact that no enforcement mechanism was envisioned in the settlement plan to enforce the results of the referendum.

At the meeting, the President (Argentina) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 24 February 2000 from Morocco, submitting its observations and conclusions on the implementation of the settlement plan in Western Sahara, the progress of the identification process and, in particular, the prospects for the implementation of the appeals procedure.³

The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁴ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1292 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of MINURSO until 31 May 2000;

Supported the intention of the Secretary-General to ask his Personal Envoy to consult the parties and, taking into account existing and potential obstacles, to explore ways and means to achieve an early, durable and agreed resolution of their dispute;

¹ During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held a number of meetings in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara, pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B. The meetings were held on 21 November 2001 (4426th), 25 February 2002 (4477th), 24 April 2002 (4520th), 24 July 2002 (4587th), 22 January 2003 (4690th), 28 May 2003 (4763rd) and 23 October 2003 (4847th).

² S/2000/131, submitted pursuant to resolution 1282 (1999).

³ S/2000/148.

⁴ S/2000/149.

Requested the Secretary-General to provide an assessment of the situation before the end of the current mandate.

Decision of 31 May 2000 (4149th meeting): resolution 1301 (2000)

At its 4149th meeting, on 31 May 2000, at which statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, China, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mali, Namibia, the Netherlands and the United States, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 22 May 2000 on the situation concerning Western Sahara.⁵

In his report, the Secretary-General detailed, inter alia, the efforts of his Personal Envoy to implement the settlement plan and the Houston agreements. He stated that the discussions had been inconclusive. Further meetings had been proposed, and his Personal Envoy had called on the parties to attend with concrete solutions, or else be prepared to consider other options to the dispute over Western Sahara.

At the meeting, the representative of Namibia stated that while, he fully supported the recommendation of the Secretary-General to extend the mandate of MINURSO, the report of the Secretary-General contained observations that had serious political implications of concern to his delegation. He stressed that he could not endorse observations that sought to diverge from the implementation of the settlement plan and would, thus, vote against the draft resolution before the Council. He further reiterated that the settlement plan remained the only viable mechanism by which to achieve a lasting solution to the question of Western Sahara.⁶

The representative of Jamaica argued that the draft resolution was not appropriate, because it implied that there were doubts within the Council as to whether the settlement plan was implementable, despite the fact that the report had not concretely assessed this. He also noted that the phrase in paragraph one that said “and explore all ways and means to achieve an early, durable and agreed resolution to their dispute over Western Sahara”, could be interpreted as a clear signal to the parties to the dispute that the settlement plan might be jettisoned without the benefit of full compliance with

the mandate given to the Personal Envoy of the Secretary-General. He stressed that the Council should hear an assessment from the Personal Envoy on whether the plan was implementable before adopting the resolution, and if it did not it would not “be following its own mandated procedure”. He maintained that the draft resolution should be purely technical, and that any political aspects should have been dealt with in a separate resolution.⁷

The representative of Mali stated that his delegation would have wished the draft resolution to be a presidential text reflecting the unanimous support of the Council for the efforts of the Personal Envoy. However, in the absence of consensus on the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, his delegation would abstain.⁸

The representative of the Netherlands suggested that the draft resolution did not adequately reflect the continued commitment to the settlement plan that had been expressed by most delegations during consultations. He noted that while in the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution⁹ the Council did reiterate its full support for the ongoing efforts to implement the settlement plan, the abrupt way that it subsequently noted that “fundamental differences needed to be resolved” produced a “disingenuous overtone” which did not “do justice” to the importance that the Council had attached to the settlement plan. Nonetheless, his delegation would vote for the draft resolution in order not to restrict any option for the Personal Envoy to tackle his mandate.¹⁰

The representative of China stated that the extension of the mandate of MINURSO would help assist the parties concerned in finding an appropriate solution to existing problems, and expressed that the

⁷ Ibid., pp. 2-3.

⁸ Ibid., p. 3.

⁹ The fifth preambular paragraph reads: “*Reiterating its full support* for the continued efforts exerted by the United Nations Mission for a Referendum in Western Sahara to implement the settlement plan and agreements adopted by the parties to hold a free, fair and impartial referendum for the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara, noting that fundamental differences between the parties over the interpretation of the main provisions remain to be resolved” (resolution 1301 (2000)).

¹⁰ S/PV.4149, p. 2.

⁵ S/2000/461, submitted pursuant to resolution 1292 (2000).

⁶ S/PV.4149, p. 2.

views of the parties should be carefully heeded so as to prevent new problems from arising.¹¹

The representative of Malaysia noted that his delegation would have preferred adopting a technical resolution to extend the mandate, while discussion continued on a text that would better reflect the commitment to the settlement plan.¹² On the other hand, the representative of Argentina highlighted his efforts to reach an agreement. He reaffirmed his support to the settlement plan and considered that other alternatives could only be considered once all the possibilities for its implementation had been exhausted.¹³ The representative of the United States stressed that the resolution could not have dealt only with the length of the mandate of MINURSO because divorcing that from the reasoning behind it would have made no sense. He indicated his support for every effort to overcome the difficulties and promote the implementation of the settlement plan, but stressed that ignoring the realities would not fix them. Thus the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy needed to be granted full leeway and authority to work with the parties as they deemed necessary, as it had been previously done in 1997 and 2000.¹⁴

At the same meeting, the President (China) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States;¹⁵ it was put to the vote and adopted, by 12 votes to 1 (Namibia), with 2 abstentions (Jamaica and Mali), as resolution 1301 (2000), by which the Council, inter alia:

Decided to extend the mandate of MINURSO until 31 July 2000, with the expectation that the parties would offer the Secretary-General's Personal Envoy specific and concrete proposals that could be agreed to in order to resolve the multiple problems relating to the implementation of the settlement plan and explore all ways and means to achieve an early, durable and agreed resolution to their dispute over Western Sahara;

Requested the Secretary-General to provide an assessment of the situation before the end of the current mandate.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 2 and 4-5.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

¹⁵ S/2000/500.

Decisions of 25 July 2000 to 27 April 2001: resolutions 1309 (2000), 1324 (2000), 1342 (2001) and 1349 (2001)

At its 4175th, 4211th, 4284th and 4315th meetings,¹⁶ the Council adopted resolutions, unanimously and without debate, by which it extended the mandate of MINURSO for periods of two to four months,¹⁷ and supported the continuation of the efforts made by the Secretary-General's Personal Envoy, on the basis of the recommendations contained in the reports of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara.¹⁸

In his reports, the Secretary-General provided information about the efforts of his Personal Envoy to move the Settlement Plan forward; the situation of the prisoners of war, political detainees and the unaccounted-for persons; the implementation of the confidence-building measures; and the security situation in the region. Regarding the efforts to move the settlement plan forward, he took note of meetings that had been held between the parties and his Personal Envoy. He noted that both parties had identified the areas they considered to be the most difficult, namely the appeals process, the repatriation of refugees, and the people who had reached voting age after December 1993 but had not been included in the identification process. However, neither party had submitted specific proposals on how to resolve the multiple problems of the settlement plan. As his Personal Envoy had explained, neither party had shown any disposition to depart from the "winner-takes-all" mentality. Moreover, he claimed that the meetings had actually moved things backwards, as the differences between the parties had deepened. However, new meetings were being pursued, aimed at arriving to a political solution,

¹⁶ Held on 25 July 2000, 30 October 2000, 27 February 2001 and 27 April 2001, respectively. During this period, the Council also held one meeting in private to hear a briefing by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of Morocco (4210th meeting, held on 26 October 2000).

¹⁷ By resolution 1309 (2000) the mandate was extended by four months, by resolutions 1324 (2000) and 1342 (2001) by two months, and by resolution 1349 (2001) by three months.

¹⁸ S/2000/683 submitted pursuant to resolution 1301 (2000); S/2000/1029, submitted pursuant to resolution 1309 (2000); S/2001/148, submitted pursuant to resolution 1324 (2000); and S/2001/398, submitted pursuant to resolution 1342 (2001).

which could either be a negotiated agreement for full integration with Morocco; a negotiated agreement for full independence; a negotiated agreement for something in between; or a negotiated agreement that would permit a successful implementation of the settlement plan. Finally, the Secretary-General's Personal Envoy stated that further meetings of the parties could not succeed unless the Government of Morocco, as the administrative Power of Western Sahara, was prepared to offer or support some devolution of governmental authority for all inhabitants and former inhabitants of the territory.

Over the course of its meetings, the attention of the Council was drawn to letters from Morocco and Algeria, explaining their positions and making some recommendations.¹⁹

**Decisions of 29 June 2001 to 30 May 2003:
resolutions 1359 (2001), 1380 (2001), 1394
(2002), 1406 (2002), 1429 (2002), 1463 (2003),
1469 (2003) and 1485 (2003)**

During this period, the Council held eight meetings,²⁰ at each of which it adopted a resolution,²¹ unanimously and without debate, by which it extended the mandate of MINURSO for periods of two to six months; supported the continuation of the efforts made by the Secretary-General's Personal Envoy; and encouraged the parties to follow the discussions, on the basis of the recommendations contained in the reports and letters of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara.²²

In his reports and letters, the Secretary-General informed the Council, *inter alia*, about the efforts of his Personal Envoy to reach a solution to the conflict; the situation regarding security and violence in the region; the implementation of confidence-building measures; and the release of prisoners of war and political

detainees. Regarding the efforts of his Personal Envoy, the Secretary-General explained that he had presented a draft "framework agreement on the status of Western Sahara" to the parties and other relevant authorities, in which was proposed the integration of Western Sahara in Morocco while giving the population of Western Sahara some level of autonomy; that the status of Western Sahara would be submitted to a referendum within five years, and that the voters would be people who had been full-time residents of Western Sahara for the preceding one year. Thus, according to the Secretary-General, the settlement plan would not be abandoned, but it would be put on hold. However, he asserted that both Algeria and the Frente Polisario had rejected this proposal, since they believed that anything other than independence could not be considered or discussed; therefore, they presented a proposal aimed at overcoming the obstacles preventing the implementation of the settlement plan. Still, the Secretary-General recalled the difficulties in implementing the settlement plan, namely the inability of the United Nations to implement any measure unless both parties had agreed to cooperate with it, as well as the difficulties in determining the people eligible to take part in the referendum given, *inter alia*, the nomadic and tribal characteristics of the Saharan population. He also informed the Council that his Personal Envoy had observed that Algeria and the Frente Polisario would be prepared to discuss a division of the territory as a political solution to the dispute over Western Sahara, but that the Government of Morocco was unwilling to discuss such an approach. Given these differences, the Secretary-General deemed that there was no real chance that the parties would ultimately voluntarily agree to that approach to solve their dispute over Western Sahara. As a way to overcome this deadlock, the Secretary-General suggested four options that could be considered by the Council: (1) the United Nations could resume trying to implement the settlement plan without requiring the concurrence of both parties before action could be taken; (2) the Personal Envoy could revise the draft framework agreement, considering the concerns expressed by both parties, but without seeking their concurrence, and submit it to the Council, which would submit it to the parties on a non-negotiable basis; (3) he could explore discussions with the parties for a possible division of the territory; but if the parties were unwilling or unable to agree before a deadline, he would present a proposal to the Council which the

¹⁹ S/2000/699 and S/2000/155.

²⁰ 4342nd meeting, held on 29 June 2001, 4427th meeting, held on 27 November 2001; 4480th meeting, held on 27 February 2002; 4523rd meeting, held on 30 April 2002; 4594th meeting, held on 30 July 2002; 4698th meeting, held on 30 January 2003; 4725th meeting, held on 25 March 2003; and 4765th meeting, held on 30 May 2003.

²¹ The draft of resolution 1406 (2002) was submitted by the United States.

²² S/2001/613, S/2001/1067, S/2002/178, S/2002/467, S/2003/59, S/2003/341 and S/2003/565 and Corr.1.

Council would submit, to the parties on a non-negotiable basis; and (4) the Council could terminate MINURSO and acknowledge that the United Nations was not going to solve the problem without requiring that one or both parties do something that they did not wish to do voluntarily. The Secretary-General emphasized that, regardless of the option that the Council would choose, it would be important that the Council did not support any changes that would require the concurrence of the parties. Given the difficulty of choosing an option that would impose a solution on the parties instead of seeking an agreement, the Personal Envoy had also undertaken a new effort to present a proposal to the parties and neighbouring countries entitled "Peace plan for the self-determination for the people of Western Sahara", which combined elements of the settlement plan and framework agreement. It envisaged a period of transition when there would be a division of responsibilities between the parties before holding a referendum, but it did not require the consent of both parties at each and every step of its implementation. However, both the parties had made objections to the plan and the Secretary-General warned the Council that they might be asked by one or both parties to support a negotiation of the peace plan. Nonetheless, he recommended that the Council should endorse the plan as proposed and ask the parties to accept it, particularly if the Council was not willing to choose from one of the four other options he had proposed.

Over the course of its meetings, the attention of the Council was drawn to letters from the representative of Algeria, Namibia and Morocco.²³

²³ In those letters Algeria, inter alia, questioned the impartiality of the United Nations Secretariat towards the settlement plan, and called upon the Council to reaffirm its commitment to it. It also expressed its opposition to the second option presented by the Secretary-General for amending the draft framework agreement, which had been considered in a draft resolution initiated by three permanent members of the Council; however, since that draft resolution was later amended by creating a new option that included elements of the first option (settlement plan) and second option (framework agreement), Algeria indicated its support for it (S/2001/623, S/2002/782, S/2002/807 and S/2002/835). Meanwhile, Namibia transmitted a memorandum by the Frente Polisario, where the group referred to the draft framework agreement's inconsistency (S/2002/749). Morocco, on the other hand,

**Decision of 31 July 2003 (4801st meeting):
resolution 1495 (2003)**

At its 4801st meeting, on 31 July 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 23 May 2003 on the situation concerning Western Sahara.²⁴

Statements were made by most members of the Council,²⁵ expressing, inter alia, their satisfaction at the unanimous adoption of the resolution and emphasizing that the resolution was not imposing a solution on the parties, but would prompt a resumption of discussions. Some of the representatives stressed that they fully supported the peace plan for the self-determination of Western Sahara, which would facilitate the early solution of the conflict on the basis of agreement between the parties. A number of representatives also maintained that the principle of self-determination was an essential element of a just resolution of the issue.²⁶

The President (Spain) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by the United States;²⁷ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1495 (2003), by which the Council, inter alia:

Continued to support strongly the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy and similarly supported their peace plan for self-determination of the people of Western Sahara as an optimum political solution on the basis of agreement between the two parties;

Called upon the parties to work with the United Nations and with each other towards acceptance and implementation of the peace plan; and decided to extend the mandate of MINURSO until 31 October 2003.

**Decision of 28 October 2003 (4850th meeting):
resolution 1513 (2003)**

At its 4850th meeting, on 28 October 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 16 October 2003 on the

continued to support the draft framework agreement and rejected the new draft resolution because it considered the two options to be irreconcilable (S/2002/758, S/2002/823 and S/2002/832).

²⁴ S/2003/565 and Corr.1, introduced at the 4765th meeting on 30 May 2003.

²⁵ The representative of the United Kingdom did not make a statement.

²⁶ S/PV.4801, p. 3 (Pakistan); and p. 4 (Mexico, Angola).

²⁷ S/2003/777.

situation concerning Western Sahara.²⁸ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the Frente Polisario had officially accepted the peace plan as presented to it, while Morocco, on the other side, had not relinquished its position, but had requested more time to reflect and consult before giving its final response. He also noted that progress had also been made towards the implementation of confidence-building measures, such as the resumption of telephone and mail services and the exchange of family visits

²⁸ S/2003/1016, submitted pursuant to resolution 1495 (2003).

between the Tindouf refugee camps and Western Sahara.

At the same meeting, the President (United States) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;²⁹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1513 (2003), by which the Council, inter alia, decided to extend the mandate of MINURSO until 31 January 2004 and to remain seized of the matter.

²⁹ S/2003/1034.

2. The situation in Liberia

Decision of 7 March 2001 (4287th meeting): resolution 1343 (2001)

At the 4287th meeting,¹ on 7 March 2001, the President (Ukraine) drew the attention of the Security Council to a draft resolution,² which “flowed from previous discussions of the Council, including the meeting with an Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) ministerial delegation on 12 February 2001” and to several other documents.³

At the meeting, the draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1343

¹ During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held one meeting in private with the potential troop and civilian police-contributing countries to the proposed United Nations peacekeeping operation in Liberia, pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B (4825th meeting, held on 15 September 2003).

² S/2001/188.

³ Letter dated 23 February 2001 from the Government of Sierra Leone, transmitting a statement concerning the question of sanctions against Liberia (S/2001/166); letter dated 27 February 2001 from the Government of Sierra Leone, concerning the expulsion from Liberia of four telecommunications operators (two each from Sierra Leone and Guinea) by airport authorities (S/2001/176); letter dated 23 February 2001 from the Government of Liberia, transmitting a statement by the President of Liberia on alleged remarks attributed to the Army Chief of Staff of Guinea threatening to take the Guinean conflict deep into Liberia (S/2001/167); and letter dated 26 February 2001 from the Government of Guinea, concerning the development of the draft resolution on sanctions against Liberia (S/2001/173).

(2001), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, inter alia:

Decided to terminate the prohibitions imposed by paragraph 8 of resolution 788 (1992) and to dissolve the ECOWAS Committee of Five on Liberia established under resolution 985 (1995);

Demanded that the Government of Liberia immediately cease its support for the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) in Sierra Leone and for other armed rebel groups in the region;

Demanded that all States in the region take action to prevent armed individuals and groups from using their territory to prepare and commit attacks on neighbouring countries and refrain from any action that might contribute to further destabilization of the situation on the borders between Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone;

Decided to establish, in accordance with rule 28 of its provisional rules of procedure, a Committee of the Security Council, consisting of all the members of the Council;

Requested the Secretary-General to establish, within one month from the date of adoption of the resolution, in consultation with the Committee, a Panel of Experts for a period of six months consisting of no more than five members, drawing, as much as possible and as appropriate, on the expertise of the members of the Panel of Experts established pursuant to resolution 1306 (2000).

Decision of 27 February 2002 (4481st meeting): resolution 1395 (2002)

At its 4405th meeting, on 5 November 2001, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 26 October 2001 from the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia addressed to the President of the

Security Council, transmitting the report of the Panel of Experts.⁴ In its report, the Panel of Experts stated that, after six months of its mandate, there were “significant signs of improvement” in the three Mano River Union countries despite the proliferation of the use of non-State actors in those conflicts. They also affirmed that the public commitments of the Government of Liberia to comply with the embargo notwithstanding, “a steady flow of new weapons continue[d] to enter into the country”. They recommended, *inter alia*, the lifting of the grounding order imposed by resolution 1343 (2001) and the reopening of the aircraft register in coordination with the International Civil Aviation Organization; the extension of the arms embargo; a regular and accurate publication of official annual rough diamond import/export statistics; and the updating of the travel ban list.

At the meeting, the President (Jamaica) drew the attention of the Council to the report of the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraph 13 (b) of resolution 1343 (2001)⁵ and to other documents.⁶ The Council then heard briefings by the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001), the Chairman of the Panel of Experts on Liberia and the Director of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs of the Secretariat, following which all Council members made statements, as well as the representatives of Belgium,⁷ Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone.⁸

⁴ S/2001/1015.

⁵ On the efforts being made by the authorities of Liberia to reform their civil aviation administration with the assistance of the International Civil Aviation Organization (S/2001/965).

⁶ Letter dated 31 October 2001 from the representative of Liberia to the Secretary-General, transmitting a statement by the President of Liberia concerning the regime of sanctions imposed under resolution 1343 (2001), renewing his call for lifting of the sanctions (S/2001/1035); and letter dated 2 November 2001 from the representative of Singapore, demanding that the Panel of Experts present copies of all relevant documentation about payments for weapons deliveries from the account of Borneo Jaya Pte. Ltd. to the company San Air, referred to in its report (S/2001/1043).

⁷ On behalf of the European Union and Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey.

⁸ The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Liberia represented his country at this meeting.

The Chairman of the Committee remarked that the report of the Panel of Experts on Liberia and the report of the Secretary-General on the humanitarian impact of possible sanctions on Liberia⁹ had been considered at two meetings of the Committee, on 22 and 25 October 2001.¹⁰

The Chairman of the Panel of Experts remarked that some countries had volunteered information and that several international organizations¹¹ had supplied useful cooperation and assistance. He declared that the Panel had cooperated with the authorities to obtain details on certain activities taking place within their jurisdiction. He highlighted the Panel’s work of tracing and reconstructing “the entire sequence of events, starting from the origin of weapons to their end destination, using documentary evidence and the direct eyewitness accounts of the persons involved”. He also declared that the Panel had been able to identify the most important networks supplying Liberia and RUF, and to give an analysis of the key players in those networks. He affirmed that the Panel had remained cognizant of the humanitarian situation before and after the imposition of the sanctions on Liberia. He added that the work of the Panel had led to visible changes in the behaviour of the trafficking networks.¹²

The Director of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs informed Council members about the report of the Secretary-General that provided a preliminary assessment of the potential impact on the people of Liberia of possible follow-up sanctions by the Council,¹³ and expressed the belief that the rather fragile humanitarian situation in Liberia could worsen

⁹ S/2001/939. The Secretary-General observed that “any restrictions imposed” on the economy of Liberia would probably have negative impacts on employment, social services and government revenues and that these factors and their implications would particularly affect “the most vulnerable of Liberia’s population”. Therefore, he recommended that, if the Council decided to establish additional sanctions, it might wish to consider establishing a mechanism to regularly review their impact on the humanitarian and economic situation of Liberia.

¹⁰ S/PV.4405, pp. 2-3.

¹¹ *Inter alia*, the International Criminal Police Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization, and the International Maritime Organization.

¹² S/PV.4405, pp. 3-5 and 31.

¹³ S/2001/939, submitted pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001).

if further sanctions were not accompanied by an increase in the response of donors. He recommended that the Council establish mechanisms to regularly monitor the humanitarian and economic situation in Liberia if the Council imposed additional sanctions.¹⁴

The majority of the speakers expressed support for the continuation of the sanctions on Liberia imposed by the Council to achieve peace in Sierra Leone and the region; for the renewal of the mandate of the Panel of Experts, and for its recommendations, including extending the arms embargo to cover non-State actors in the three countries, Sierra Leone, Liberia and Guinea; the creation of a certification system on raw diamonds; and an updated travel ban list. Several speakers maintained that the measures needed to be targeted, calibrated and the negative humanitarian consequences minimized. A number of representatives suggested that the Panel's recommendation on extending the sanctions regime needed to be studied by the Council. A number of speakers expressed concern about the propaganda of the Government of Liberia against the United Nations actions. Several representatives demanded full compliance by all States with the sanctions. Most of the speakers expressed concern about the civilian population of Liberia, and encouraged donors and non-governmental organizations to resume their humanitarian aid. Most of the representatives welcomed the efforts of the ECOWAS to improve relations between the Government of Liberia and its neighbours and to achieve a greater effectiveness of embargoes on weapons.

Several representatives recommended establishing a permanent mechanism within the United Nations system to conduct comprehensive monitoring of all sanctions, or otherwise enhancing the internal monitoring capability of the United Nations.¹⁵

The representative of Mali added that ECOWAS had sent two missions from its Mediation and Security Council to Liberia in order to verify that measures had been taken by the authorities of Liberia to meet the demands of the international community. He welcomed the major efforts recently made by the Government of Liberia to improve its relations with Guinea and Sierra Leone. He added that it was essential to continue to

develop a true partnership between ECOWAS and the Security Council, thereby promoting a regional approach to conflict settlement, for they believed that "sanctions alone [could not] restore peace in West Africa".¹⁶

The representative of Mauritius expressed concern about the continued relationship between the Government of Liberia and RUF in Sierra Leone. He, therefore, insisted that the Government of Liberia needed to "play a more determining role in ridding the entire region of West Africa of rebellious activities" as well as to uphold the principles of accountability and good governance. He added that it was most unfortunate that at a time when Liberia was showing poor prospects for sustained economic development, "the leadership of the country [was] exploiting avenues for self-enrichment".¹⁷

The representative of Bangladesh noted the lack of attention in the report of the need to have regulatory frameworks addressing the arms producing and exporting countries, which would look into the supply side of the problem as well.¹⁸

The representative of France suggested investigating whether a direct relationship existed between the yield of exports of tropical wood and the arming of the RUF rebels in Sierra Leone, before the Council considered any measures to restrict timber exports, which supported so many people in Liberia. He also suggested the creation of a small investigatory team in the field that would work with the Panel of Experts and help the authorities of Liberia implement the measures set forth in resolution 1343 (2001).¹⁹

The representative of China expressed concern that "the existing Council sanctions measures still ha[d] loopholes" that were allowing serious violations.²⁰

The representative of Tunisia questioned "the validity and viability" of what were called targeted sanctions or smart sanctions, whose application "in the case of Liberia ha[d] shown their flaws". He supported maintaining dialogue with Liberia as an active party in finding a solution to the crisis afflicting the Mano River Union countries. He recommended that the

¹⁴ S/PV.4405, pp. 5-6 and 32.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 7 (Ukraine); p. 11 (Mali); p. 19 (Singapore); and p. 25 (Jamaica).

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 10-11.

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 11-13.

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 13-14.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 14-15.

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 15-16.

Council needed to refrain from action on the Panel of Experts' various recommendations until it had proceeded with an evaluation of the implementation of existing sanctions.²¹

The representative of Singapore declared that the lack of follow-up on the information contained in various sanctions panels' reports, such as the Sierra Leone Panel report, damaged the credibility of the United Nations sanctions themselves. He pointed out that a permanent monitoring mechanism in the Secretariat could also assist States in their implementation of the sanctions and that there needed to be better coordination within the United Nations system. He regretted that the report of the Working Group on sanctions had yet to be issued. On the question of the impact of sanctions, he maintained that the humanitarian situation and the sanctions needed to be considered as separate issues, declaring that there were indications that "the Government of Liberia's own corrupt practices have strongly discouraged international aid donors".²²

The representative of the Russian Federation stressed that the illegal activities by individual persons and corporations that were circumventing resolution 1343 (2001) needed to be very carefully investigated by the national law enforcement authorities of the relevant countries.²³

The representative of the United States maintained that the hardships faced by the people of Liberia had not started with the imposition of sanctions, but had resulted from years of war and the policies of the Government that had resulted in a decline in international assistance. His delegation believed that "continued targeted sanctions against the Taylor Government promote[d] progress" on alleviating the suffering of the people in Liberia and Sierra Leone "by encouraging an end to destructive policies in the region". He also questioned the reason why more non-governmental organizations were not involved in attempting to alleviate the suffering of the people of Liberia and why the United Nations Children's Fund and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations were not doing more to help.²⁴

The representative of Liberia expressed his pleasure to see the report's publication, so that his Government would not be "repeatedly confronted with selective leaks and speculation via the Internet and in the print media". He expressed the belief that the Panel had merely sought to vindicate itself with respect to the inherent flaws of the original report, which had contributed to the imposition of sanctions on Liberia. He affirmed that the Government of Liberia was in compliance with resolution 1343 (2001) and regretted that all the actions and steps taken by the Government in compliance were "unfortunately relegated to meaningless comments made in passing". He pointed out that the Mano River Union countries had held and continued high-level discussions generally aimed at enhancing peace, security and stability within their territories. He maintained that the international community and the Security Council had ignored Liberia's security concerns relating to the attacks in Lofa County, even though it could have a long-term impact on the subregion. He called for the removal of sanctions in order to let Liberia defend its territory and sovereignty, as was the inherent right of every Member of that Organization under its constitution and Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. He affirmed that resolution 1343 (2001) was having a punitive effect and that there was a clear correlation between the imposition of sanctions and the decline of living standards. His Government was also concerned about the "apparent inequity" with which the sanctions were being administered, remarking that there had been no condemnation of the attacks committed by non-State actors along the Mano River frontier and their sponsors. He stressed that when "double standards are used in the dispositions of international disputes, efforts to achieve genuine peace are undermined".²⁵

The representative of Belgium maintained that the international community could not allow its efforts and the considerable resources that it had invested in peace in Sierra Leone to "continue to be sabotaged by manoeuvrings at the regional level". He supported the creation of a mechanism responsible for regularly reviewing the humanitarian and economic impact of sanctions imposed on Liberia if the Security Council adopted additional sanctions.²⁶

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-18.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 18-20.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-28.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.

The representative of Guinea expressed concern over the many “flagrant” violations of resolution 1343 (2001). He believed that the current calm along the Guinean borders and the significant progress made in Sierra Leone had come because of the sanctions imposed on Liberia, as well as the fact that the Guinean armed forces had regained control of the situation on the ground and had been able to contain and push back rebel troop attacks. He pointed out that those positive events supporting the international community’s efforts to restore peace and security had been possible due to the “clear-sightedness” of the Mano River Women Peace Network.²⁷

The representative of Sierra Leone affirmed that the measures imposed by the Council on Liberia were “preferable to launching a multinational military action against Liberia”.²⁸

At the 4481st meeting, on 27 February 2002, the President (Mexico) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;²⁹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1395 (2002), by which the Council, inter alia:

Decided, in the meanwhile, to re-establish the Panel of Experts appointed pursuant to paragraph 19 of resolution 1343 (2001) for a further period of five weeks commencing no later than 11 March 2002;

Requested the Panel of Experts to conduct a follow-up assessment mission to Liberia and neighbouring States, in order to investigate and compile a brief independent audit of the Government of Liberia’s compliance with paragraph 2 and of any violations of paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of resolution 1343 (2001) and to report to the Council through the Committee established by paragraph 14 of resolution 1343 (2001) no later than 8 April 2002 with the Panel’s observations and recommendations in relation to the tasks set out herein;

Requested the Secretary-General, upon the adoption of the resolution and acting in consultation with the Committee established by paragraph 14 of resolution 1343 (2001), to appoint no more than five experts, drawing as much as possible and as appropriate on the expertise of the members of the Panel of Experts appointed pursuant to paragraph 19 of resolution 1343 (2001), and further requested the Secretary-General to make the necessary financial arrangements to support the work of the Panel.

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 29-30.

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 30-31.

²⁹ S/2002/206.

**Decision of 6 May 2002 (4526th meeting):
resolution 1408 (2002)**

At its 4526th meeting, on 6 May 2002, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 19 April 2002 from the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) addressed to the President of the Security Council,³⁰ transmitting the report of the Panel of Experts appointed pursuant to resolution 1395 (2002), paragraph 4. In its report, the Panel of Experts observed that since its last report the war in Liberia’s Lofa County had spread towards Monrovia and a state of emergency had been declared in February 2002. The Panel pointed out that they had found credible evidence that Liberia had kept violating the arms embargo and that the numerous special units deployed by the Government were carrying new weaponry and ammunition. It recommended, inter alia, the continuity of the arms embargo; the expansion of the ECOWAS moratorium relating to small arms; and the creation of a credible certification scheme for rough diamonds.

The Council also included in its agenda the third report of the Secretary-General pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001).³¹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that a summit meeting of the Heads of State of the Mano River Union countries had taken place in Rabat on 27 February 2002 under the auspices of the King of Morocco as well as several other meetings at the technical and ministerial levels in order to find a lasting solution to the crisis in the region. He added that a pre-reconciliation conference had been held in Abuja in March 2002, under the auspices of ECOWAS, in preparation for a full-fledged national reconciliation conference in Monrovia in July 2002.

At the meeting, the President (Singapore) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;³² it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1408 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, inter alia:

Decided that the Government of Liberia has not complied fully with the demands in paragraphs 2 (a-d) of resolution 1343 (2001);

³⁰ S/2002/470.

³¹ S/2002/494.

³² S/2002/514.

Decided that the measures imposed by paragraphs 5 to 7 of resolution 1343 (2001) shall remain in force for a further period of 12 months;

Decided that the measures referred to in paragraph 5 shall be terminated immediately in the Council;

Determined that the Government of Liberia has complied with the demands referred to in paragraph 1;

Requested the Secretary-General to submit a report to the Council by 21 October 2002 and thereafter at six-monthly intervals from that date on whether Liberia has complied with the demands referred to in paragraph 1;

Requested the Secretary-General to establish, within three months from the date of adoption of this resolution, in consultation with the Committee, for a period of three months, a Panel of Experts consisting of no more than five members to conduct a follow-up assessment mission to Liberia and neighbouring States, in order to investigate and compile a report on the Government of Liberia's compliance with the demands referred to in paragraph 1;

Decided to conduct reviews of the measures referred to in paragraph 5 before 7 November 2002, and every six months thereafter.

**Decision of 13 December 2002 (4665th meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4665th meeting, on 13 December 2002, the President (Colombia) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³³ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Expressed its strong support for the ECOWAS moratorium on small arms and light weapons in the region;

Encouraged the African Union and ECOWAS member States actively to promote the full implementation of existing security arrangements as well as further initiatives designed to support such arrangements among the countries of the Mano River Union;

Urged the Government of Liberia and the combatants, particularly the rebel group Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD), to provide unrestricted access to United Nations humanitarian agencies and non-governmental organizations to areas where refugees need to be assisted and human rights protected;

Urged all humanitarian organizations and donor countries to continue to provide humanitarian relief to the refugees and internally displaced persons;

Requested the Secretary-General to monitor the situation in Liberia and to keep the Council informed of developments to fulfil the objectives described herein.

³³ S/PRST/2002/36.

**Decision of 28 January 2003 (4693rd meeting):
resolution 1458 (2003)**

At the 4693rd meeting, on 28 January 2003, the President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;³⁴ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1458 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to re-establish the Panel of Experts appointed pursuant to paragraph 16 of resolution 1408 (2002) for a further period of three months commencing no later than 10 February 2003;

Requested the Panel of Experts to conduct a follow-up assessment mission to Liberia and neighbouring States, in order to investigate and compile a report on the Government of Liberia's compliance with the demands referred to in paragraph 2 of resolution 1343 (2001), and of any violations of the measures referred to in paragraph 5 of resolution 1408 (2002);

Requested the Panel of Experts, as far as possible, to bring any relevant information collected in the course of its investigations conducted in accordance with its mandate to the attention of the States concerned for prompt and thorough investigation and corrective action, and to allow them the right of reply.

**Decision of 6 May 2003 (4751st meeting):
resolution 1478 (2003)**

At its 4751st meeting, on 6 May 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 24 April 2003 from the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) addressed to the President of the Security Council,³⁵ transmitting the report of the Panel of Experts appointed pursuant to paragraph 4 of resolution 1458 (2003). In its report, the Panel of Experts observed that the conflict of Liberia was "once more no longer isolated" and its refugees and armed fighters had spilled over into its neighbouring countries, and that Liberia was violating the arms embargo, as was Guinea by supporting LURD. It recommended, *inter alia*, that the moratorium on the importation, exportation and manufacturing of small arms in West Africa needed to be broadened and become an information exchange mechanism for all types of weapons procured by ECOWAS members as well as the establishment of an international mechanism for harmonizing and verifying all end-user certificates for weapons.

³⁴ S/2003/98.

³⁵ S/2003/498.

At the meeting, the President (Pakistan) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;³⁶ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1478 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, inter alia:

Decided that the Government of Liberia had not complied fully with the demands in resolution 1343 (2001);

Decided that the measures imposed by paragraphs 5 to 7 of resolution 1343 (2001) would remain in force for a further period of 12 months and be terminated immediately if the Council determined that the Government of Liberia had complied with the demands referred to in paragraph 1;

Decided that all States should take the necessary measures to prevent, for a period of ten months, the import into their territories of all round logs and timber products originating in Liberia;

Decided to consider by 7 September 2003 how best to minimize any humanitarian or socio-economic impact of the measures imposed;

Requested the Secretary-General to establish, within one month from the date of adoption of the resolution, in consultation with the Committee, for a period of five months, a Panel of Experts consisting of up to six members to conduct a follow-up assessment mission to Liberia and neighbouring States and to investigate whether any revenues of the Government of Liberia are used in violation of this resolution;

Decided that all States should take the necessary measures to prevent entry into or transit through their territories of any individuals, including from LURD or other armed rebel groups;

Decided to conduct reviews of the measures referred to in paragraphs 10 and 17 before 7 November 2003, and every six months thereafter.

**Decision of 1 August 2003 (4803rd meeting):
resolution 1497 (2003)**

At its 4803rd meeting,³⁷ on 1 August 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 29 July 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council.³⁸ In his letter, the Secretary-General recalled that ECOWAS had indicated its readiness to deploy 1,500 troops to Liberia by August 2003 to serve as a vanguard force

³⁶ S/2003/522.

³⁷ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. IV, part IV, sect. B, case 2, with regard to voluntary abstention, non-participation or absence in relation to Article 27 (3) of the Charter.

³⁸ S/2003/769.

for the multinational force that he had proposed. The deployment of the vanguard force would be the first phase of a three-phase deployment, phase two being the full multinational force and phase three being a United Nations peacekeeping operation. The priority of the vanguard force would be to stabilize the situation in Monrovia as President Taylor departed, and the phase two troops needed to arrive immediately after his departure, in order to facilitate the installation of a successor Government. The overall objective of the peacekeeping operation would be to support the implementation of the envisaged comprehensive peace agreement, leading to free elections. He requested that the Council give the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone the necessary mandate to use its resources to provide full support for the deployment and authorize a robust mandate for the envisaged United Nations peacekeeping force so that it had a credible deterrence capability.

At the meeting the President (Syrian Arab Republic) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by the United States³⁹ and to several other documents.⁴⁰

Statements were made by the representatives of Chile, China, France, Germany, Mexico and the United States. Most speakers supported the dispatch of a multinational force to Liberia and the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation. The majority of representatives expressed concern about the humanitarian and human rights situation in Liberia and emphasized the importance of the commitment of President Taylor to abandon power. Some representatives underlined the importance of the involvement and efforts of ECOWAS and called on

³⁹ S/2001/784.

⁴⁰ Letter dated 28 June 2003 from the Secretary-General, referring to the flagrant violations of the ceasefire in Liberia and requesting the Security Council to take urgent action to authorize the deployment to Liberia of a multinational force under Chapter VII of the Charter to prevent a humanitarian tragedy and stabilize the situation in the country (S/2003/678); letter dated 8 July 2003 from the Secretary-General, reporting a number of urgent initiatives taken in the light of the political situation in Liberia (S/2003/695); and letter from the President of the Security Council reporting that the Council had taken note of the information contained in the letter dated 8 July 2003 from the Secretary-General (S/2003/696).

Member States to contribute to the Multinational Force and United Nations peacekeeping mission.

The representatives of France, Germany and Mexico commented on their abstention in the vote and underlined their request for a paragraph-by-paragraph vote to the sponsor of the draft resolution. They indicated that the only reason for abstaining was their disagreement with paragraph 7 of the draft resolution,⁴¹ which limited the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court and the national jurisdiction of third countries with respect to crimes committed by members of the multinational force if that member was the national of a State not party to the Rome Statute. This would have prevented prosecutors in States that might have to exercise jurisdiction over crimes committed against their nationals abroad from investigating and prosecuting those crimes. Moreover, their disagreement with the content of paragraph 7 was also due to its disconnection with the situation in Liberia as well as its non-compliance with international law and their respective countries' domestic legislation. The representative of Mexico also highlighted that paragraph 7 of the draft resolution "would set a serious precedent" by doing away with the prerogatives of States whose legislation provided for the exercise of criminal jurisdiction in cases where crimes were committed against their nationals abroad. He expressed concern at the fact that "paragraph 7 fails to provide guarantees" for the objective of "the elimination of impunity". Finally, he maintained that his country had never agreed with "the strategy of passive containment" that had been for so long adopted towards Liberia.⁴²

The representatives of Germany and Mexico also expressed regret over the delay in adopting the resolution.⁴³ The representative of Germany added that his delegation would have liked to see one more

paragraph in the draft resolution pertaining to children and their well-being.⁴⁴ The representative of China regretted that a compromise solution with regard to paragraph 7 of the resolution could not be found by the parties concerned.⁴⁵ The representative of Chile expressed concern about the fact that, "by making exceptions", the international community might impede the "harmonious development of international law".⁴⁵

The representative of France welcomed the fact that the resolution had been adopted "so rapidly". However, he cautioned that the scope of the "jurisdictional immunity thus created" caused "a problem of consistency" at a time when the Security Council had the intention of "spearheading the movement to reject impunity in all its forms". He welcomed the commitment of the United States to Liberia "within the United Nations framework".⁴⁶

The representative of the United States expressed his country's gratification by the "swift action taken by the Security Council" in adopting the resolution. He pointed out that their sponsorship of that resolution reflected the importance that the United States placed "on finding the right and effective means to bring peace to Liberia". He added that they appreciated the willingness of many of the West African States to assist in the vital task of restoring peace to Liberia, in particular Nigeria. He stressed that his President had "directed the Secretary of Defense to position appropriate military capabilities to support the deployment of an ECOWAS force".⁴⁷

The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted by 12 votes to none, with 3 abstentions (France, Germany, Mexico), as resolution 1497 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Authorized Member States to establish a Multinational Force in Liberia to support the implementation of the 17 June 2003 ceasefire agreement; declared its readiness to establish such a follow-on United Nations stabilization force to support the transitional government and to assist in the implementation of a comprehensive peace agreement for Liberia and requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Council recommendations for the size, structure, and mandate of this force, preferably by 15 August 2003, and subsequent deployment of the United Nations force no later than 1 October 2003;

⁴¹ Paragraph 7 reads: "*Decides* that current or former officials or personnel from a contributing State which is not a party to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of that contributing State for all alleged acts or omissions arising out of or related to the Multinational Force or the United Nations stabilization force in Liberia, unless such exclusive jurisdiction has been expressly waived by that contributing State" (resolution 1497 (2003)).

⁴² S/PV.4803, pp. 2-4.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-4 (Mexico); p. 4 (Germany); and pp. 6-7 (France).

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 6.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 6-7.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

Authorized the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone to extend the necessary logistical support, for a limited period of up to 30 days, to the forward ECOWAS elements of the Multinational Force, without prejudicing the Mission's operational capability with respect to its mandate in Sierra Leone;

Decided that current or former officials or personnel from a contributing State should be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of that contributing State for all alleged acts or omissions arising out of or related to the Multinational Force or United Nations stabilization force in Liberia;

Decided that the measures imposed by paragraphs 5 (a) and 5 (b) of resolution 1343 (2001) should not apply to supplies of arms and related materiel and technical training and assistance intended solely for support of and use by the Multinational Force;

Demanded that all States in the region refrain from any action that might contribute to instability in Liberia or on the borders between Liberia, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Côte d'Ivoire.

Decision of 27 August 2003 (4815th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4815th meeting,⁴⁸ on 27 August 2003, the Council heard briefings by the Chairman of ECOWAS⁴⁹ and the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS on the situation in Liberia and the efforts of ECOWAS.⁵⁰

The Chairman of ECOWAS remarked that ECOWAS was "resolutely committed to the search for lasting peace in Liberia with a view to ensuring stability" in the entire Mano River Union area and the ECOWAS community at large. He referred to the ceasefire agreement of 17 June 2003 concluded among "the Taylor Government of Liberia", LURD and the Movement for Democracy in Liberia and to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement of 18 August 2003 (the Accra Agreement). He expressed the gratitude of the entire ECOWAS community to Nigeria, and

particularly its President, for offering political asylum to President Charles Taylor, who had left on 11 August, and for deploying a vanguard force of two battalions to Liberia. However, he expressed concern about recent measures by the Government of the United States, including the statement that the United States would pull out of direct involvement in Liberia when the United Nations peacekeeping operation began. He indicated that the Accra Agreement covered, inter alia, the cessation of hostilities; the containment, disarmament, demobilization, rehabilitation and reintegration of combatants; human rights issues; humanitarian issues; and the conduct of elections in Liberia in October 2005. He reaffirmed the determination of ECOWAS to continue to engage in Liberia after deployment of the stabilization force and to contribute troops to that force.⁵¹

The Executive Secretary of ECOWAS declared that the Council's visit to the subregion had "served as a catalyst for the Accra peace talks" and had offered the firm support of the Council to the peace process. He called for the establishment of a consultative mechanism under which there would be regular meetings between the United Nations and ECOWAS to discuss developments in Liberia. He pointed out that "conscious and deliberate efforts" needed to be directed at disarmament, demobilization and reintegration as well as to curb the proliferation of small arms and light weapons in West Africa. Finally, he spoke in favour of lifting all the sanctions currently imposed on Liberia, except the arms embargo, to further signal support for the peace process of Liberia.⁵²

At the same meeting the President (Syrian Arab Republic) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁵³ by which the Council, inter alia:

Welcomed the Comprehensive Peace Agreement reached in Accra on 18 August 2003;

Remained concerned at the continuing dire humanitarian situation of much of the population;

Urged all parties to respect fully the ceasefire and to implement fully all their commitments under the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, including through full cooperation with the

⁴⁸ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41 of the Charter; and chap. XII, part III, sect. B, with regard to encouragement or calls by the Security Council for action by regional arrangements in the pacific settlement of disputes.

⁴⁹ The Chairman of ECOWAS was the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ghana.

⁵⁰ The representatives of Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Nigeria and Senegal were invited to participate. Côte d'Ivoire, Nigeria and Guinea were represented by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs.

⁵¹ S/PV.4815, pp. 2-5.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7. See chap. XII, part III, sect. B, "The situation in Liberia", for more information on the relationship between the Security Council and ECOWAS.

⁵³ S/PRST/2003/14.

ECOWAS Mission in Liberia, the United Nations, the International Contact Group on Liberia, the African Union and the United States to establish a Joint Monitoring Committee;

Reaffirmed its readiness as stated in paragraph 2 of its resolution 1497 (2003) to establish a follow-on United Nations stabilization force to support the transitional government and to assist in the implementation of a Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Liberia.

Decision of 19 September 2003 (4830th meeting): resolution 1509 (2003)

At its 4826th meeting,⁵⁴ on 16 September 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on Liberia dated 11 September 2003.⁵⁵ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the major functions performed by the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Liberia would be transferred to the new United Nations operation in Liberia. Finally, he recommended that the Security Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, authorize the deployment of a multidimensional United Nations peacekeeping operation with a mandate as the one suggested and with adequate resources.

The Council then heard a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Liberia, who reported on the humanitarian and political crisis in Liberia and explained the role and objectives as well as the required resources for a United Nations mission. He underlined that the international community needed to make a "strong commitment" to Liberia to build on the efforts of ECOWAS. Finally, he commended the rapid deployment of the ECOWAS military mission in Liberia.⁵⁶

At its 4830th meeting, on 19 September 2003, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 11 September 2003.⁵⁶ The representative of Liberia was invited to participate in the discussion.

⁵⁴ At the 4816th meeting, held in private on 27 August 2003, members of the Council, members of the ECOWAS delegation, including the representatives of Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire, Nigeria and Senegal, and the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS had a constructive exchange of views.

⁵⁵ S/2003/875, submitted pursuant to resolution 1497 (2003).

⁵⁶ S/PV.4826, pp. 2-6.

The President (United Kingdom) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁵⁷ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1509 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, inter alia:

Decided to establish the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), the stabilization force called for in resolution 1497 (2003), for a period of 12 months, and requested the Secretary-General to transfer authority from the forces of the ECOWAS Mission in Liberia to UNMIL on 1 October 2003, and further decided that UNMIL would consist of up to 15,000 United Nations military personnel, including up to 250 military observers and 160 staff officers, and up to 1,115 civilian police officers, including formed units to assist in the maintenance of law and order throughout Liberia, and the appropriate civilian component; decided that UNMIL could have the following mandate: (a) support for implementation of the Ceasefire Agreement; (b) support for humanitarian and human rights assistance; (c) support for security reform;

Demanded that the Liberian parties cease hostilities throughout Liberia and fulfil their obligations under the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the ceasefire agreement, including cooperation in the formation of the Joint Monitoring Committee as established under the ceasefire agreement;

Demanded that all parties cease all use of child soldiers, that all parties cease all human rights violations and atrocities against the Liberia population, and stressed the need to bring to justice those responsible;

Decided that the measures imposed by paragraphs 5 (a) and 5 (b) of resolution 1343 (2001) should not apply to supplies of arms and related materiel and technical training and assistance intended solely for support of or use by UNMIL;

Decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

Decision of 22 December 2003 (4890th meeting): resolution 1521 (2003)

At its 4890th meeting, on 22 December 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 28 October 2003 from the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁵⁸ transmitting the report of the Panel of Experts appointed pursuant to paragraph 25 of resolution 1478 (2003). In its report, the Panel of Experts observed that the Transitional National Government lacked the funding to operate properly and rebuild the necessary institutions to govern and that that the arms embargo,

⁵⁷ S/2003/898.

⁵⁸ S/2003/937 and Add.1.

the travel ban and the rules of civil aviation were being violated. It recommended, *inter alia*, the continuation of all sanctions; the establishment of a process using UNMIL to monitor the main ports, airports and border crossings; and the launch of a national sensitization campaign to inform Liberians about the justification for sanctions.

At the meeting the President (Bulgaria) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁵⁹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1521 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided to terminate prohibitions imposed by paragraphs 5, 6, 7 of resolution 1343 (2001) and paragraphs 17 and 28 of

⁵⁹ S/2003/1180.

resolution 1478 (2003) and to dissolve the committee established under resolution 1343 (2001);

Decided that all States should take necessary measures to prevent the sale or supply of arms to Liberia;

Decided also that all States should take necessary measures to prevent the entry or transit through their territories of all individuals designated by the Committee who constituted a threat to the peace process in Liberia;

Decided that all States should take necessary measures to prevent direct or indirect import of all rough diamonds, all round logs and timber products from Liberia;

Decided that those measures were established for 12 months from the date of adoption of the resolution;

Decided to establish a Committee of the Security Council to monitor implementation of the measures imposed by the resolution.

3. The situation in Somalia

Decision of 29 June 2000 (4167th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4166th meeting of the Security Council, on 29 June 2000, following a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, statements were made by all Council members, the representatives of Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union¹) and Yemen, as well as the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States.

The Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs informed the Council that the Somali National Peace Conference, launched at Arta, in Djibouti, on 2 May 2000, had moved from its procedural stages to the consideration of substantial issues with the ultimate goal of drafting an interim charter and selecting the delegates for a Transitional National Assembly, which would, in turn, select the members of a Transitional National Administration for Somalia. While a large number of political leaders, government officials, Somalis from the diaspora and prominent members of civil society participated in the Conference, two “building blocks” — the self-styled “Somaliland” and

“Puntland” — remained outside the process. He emphasized that although Djibouti was acting as host and facilitator, the process was Somali-owned. The Under-Secretary-General also expressed concern about the humanitarian and security situation in Somalia and indicated that the support of the Council for the process would offer the best deterrence against obstructions from circles whose privileges and capacity to profit from disorder were threatened by a move towards peace.²

Speakers stressed the urgent need for a comprehensive and lasting solution to the crisis in Somalia and expressed support for the Djibouti peace initiative. They deplored the dire humanitarian situation, condemned the attacks on humanitarian personnel and urged all Somali factions to ensure their safety and freedom of movement. Furthermore, they expressed concern at the flow of arms to and within Somalia and called on the Security Council to endorse and support the Djibouti peace process and ensure strict implementation of the arms embargo on Somalia established by resolution 733 (1992).

The representative of Djibouti commended the exemplary efforts of the Secretary-General towards the peace process, his constant encouragement and support for the Conference and its goals. Highlighting the

¹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

² S/PV.4166, pp. 2-5.

inclusive and transparent nature of the consultations, he reiterated that the current process was not designed to undermine in any way the existing administrative regions that had achieved a measure of relative peace and stability. On the contrary, those administrative units would be key components of any national framework. The ultimate objectives of the entire process were peace, government, legitimacy and reconstruction. He further noted that there was an economic dimension to the refusal of some parties to be part of the peace process. The Conference, in which great progress had been made in discussing a wide range of issues, could be seen as an innovative approach to the question of conflict-resolution and nation-building.³

The representative of Tunisia declared that the sanctions Committee on Somalia, in which he served as Chairman, would take steps to ensure compliance with the arms embargo, an approach which should not be perceived as punitive. He further announced the Committee's intention to send a mission to the region in order to secure the broadest participation by the parties concerned, an announcement which was welcomed by the representative of Canada.⁴

The Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States stated that the Council should reactivate the sanctions Committee in order to put in place the mechanisms necessary to halt the arms trade within and to Somalia and to strengthen the embargo. He further called on the Council to, inter alia, confirm respect for the unity and territorial integrity of Somaliland and refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of Somalia.⁵

The representative of the Netherlands cautioned that while his Government subscribed to the doctrine put forth by the Organization of African Unity⁶ regarding the sanctity of borders, it also considered inviolate borders to be desirable only if they enclosed a country where fundamental humanitarian rights were respected. Otherwise, those borders could become an instrument of coercion⁷. The representatives of Ukraine

and Egypt stressed the need to preserve the unity and independence of Somalia.⁸

The representative of China strongly urged the leaders of the main Somali factions who had stayed away from the Conference to manifest the necessary political courage and wisdom to take part in the peace process.⁹ The representative of the United States declared that any effort to rebuild Somalia had to be an all-inclusive process that enjoyed the support of existing regional entities and that was based on a legitimate process that derived from Somali civil society and rejected the predatory violence of the warlords.¹⁰

The representatives of Ethiopia and Yemen expressed concern at the regional impact of the events in Somalia, especially through the influx of refugees.¹¹ The representative of Malaysia maintained that a peaceful resolution of the Somali question would have a far-reaching stabilizing effect in the Horn of Africa.¹²

At the 4167th meeting, on 29 June 2000, the President (France) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹³ by which the Council, inter alia:

Expressed its deep concern at the ongoing abuse of human rights and grave deterioration of the humanitarian situation in Somalia, which had led to death, displacement and the outbreak of diseases among the civilian population, particularly children and other vulnerable groups;

Strongly condemned attacks by armed groups on innocent civilians and all humanitarian personnel; strongly urged the Somali factions to respect international humanitarian and human rights law, to ensure the safety and freedom of movement of all humanitarian personnel and to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian relief to all those in need;

Strongly urged representatives of all social and political forces of Somali society to participate actively and in a constructive spirit in the work of the Somali National Peace and Reconciliation Conference in Djibouti.

**Decision of 11 January 2001 (4255th meeting):
statement by the President**

On 19 December 2000, the Secretary-General submitted a report on the situation in Somalia,¹⁴ in

³ Ibid., pp. 5-8.

⁴ Ibid., p. 11 (Canada); and pp. 19-20 (Tunisia).

⁵ Ibid., pp. 23-26.

⁶ On 8 July 2002, the Organization of African Unity ceased to exist and was replaced by the African Union.

⁷ S/PV.4166, p. 14.

⁸ Ibid., p. 16 (Ukraine); and p. 22 (Egypt).

⁹ Ibid., p. 15.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 17.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 22 (Yemen); and pp. 26-27 (Ethiopia).

¹² Ibid., p. 10.

¹³ S/PRST/2000/22.

which he observed that the Djibouti peace process was intended to have a broader base and greater legitimacy than previous peacemaking efforts, which constituted a major asset for the Transitional National Government as it moved to the next stage of the process. Located in Mogadishu, the Transitional National Government had begun the process of establishing itself on Somali soil and expanding the areas under its influence. It had three years, until 2003, in which to prepare for the installation of permanent governance arrangements. During that period, basic political, economic and development challenges would have to be addressed by the new authorities, who would also have to complete the task of creating a government of unity and reconciliation and prepare for democratic elections. The Secretary-General noted that the absence of some Somali politicians and leaders from the Djibouti process had posed two immediate challenges for the new authorities: how to incorporate into the peace process those who were opposed to it and to its outcome, some of whom were heavily armed; and how to work out relations with the authorities in “Somaliland” and “Puntland” without jeopardizing the relative peace and stability in those two regions. In the light of the request made by the President of Djibouti at the Council’s closed meeting on 14 September 2000 for the Council to give serious consideration to a United Nations post-conflict peacebuilding mission in Somalia, the Secretary-General suggested that the Council might wish to consider what action might be appropriate to enhance the success of the Djibouti peace process by consolidating its achievements. He announced that he stood ready to prepare a proposal for a peacebuilding mission for Somalia. Expected to be based inside Somalia as soon as the security situation permitted, the mission’s key function would be to assist in the completion of the peace process.

At its 4255th meeting¹⁵, on 11 January 2001, the Council included the above-mentioned report of the

¹⁴ S/2000/1211, submitted pursuant to the presidential statement of 27 May 1999 (S/PRST/1999/16).

¹⁵ At its 4196th meeting, held in private on 14 September 2000, the Council heard a briefing by the President of Djibouti, during which, among other things, he requested the Council to give serious consideration to a United Nations post-conflict peace-building mission in Somalia. Members of the Council made comments and posed questions in connection with the briefing. At its 4254th meeting, held in private on 11 January 2001, the Council was briefed by the Prime Minister of the Transitional

Secretary-General in its agenda.¹⁴ The President (Singapore) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁶ by which the Council, inter alia:

Welcomed the efforts of the Transitional National Government to promote reconciliation within Somalia;

Strongly urged all political groups in the country to engage in peaceful and constructive dialogue with the Transitional National Government in order to promote national reconciliation and facilitate the democratic elections scheduled for 2003 as called for in the Transitional National Charter;

Underlined the massive challenges facing Somalia with respect to reconstruction and development, and the immediate need for urgent assistance, particularly in the areas of demobilization (with special attention to measures to combat HIV/AIDS and other communicable diseases), disarmament and rehabilitation of basic infrastructure;

Strongly condemned the illegal supply of weapons to recipients in Somalia; reiterated its call upon all States, the United Nations and other international organizations and entities to report to the Committee established pursuant to resolution 751 (1992) information on possible violations of the arms embargo;

Welcomed the Secretary-General’s intention to put in place a trust fund for peacebuilding in Somalia;

Invited the Secretary-General to prepare a proposal for a peacebuilding mission for Somalia which should, with specific attention to the security situation in the country, outline possible ways to advance the peace process further.

**Decision of 19 June 2001 (4332nd meeting):
resolution 1356 (2001)**

At the 4332nd meeting, on 19 June 2001, the President (Bangladesh) drew attention to a draft resolution;¹⁷ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1356 (2001), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, inter alia:

Reiterated to all States their obligation to comply with measures imposed pursuant to resolution 733 (1992);

Decided that those measures should not apply to protective clothing temporarily exported to Somalia by United Nations personnel, media, humanitarian and development workers for their own use;

National Government of Somalia. Members of the Council made comments and posed questions in connection with the briefing.

¹⁶ S/PRST/2001/1.

¹⁷ S/2001/589.

Decided that those measures should not apply to non-lethal military equipment intended solely for humanitarian or protective use;

Requested the Committee to decide upon such requests for exemption.

**Decision of 31 October 2001 (4401st meeting):
statement by the President**

In his report on the situation in Somalia dated 11 October 2001,¹⁸ the Secretary-General observed that the conclusion of the Djibouti peace process in Arta was an important milestone in the search for peace and reconciliation in Somalia. In his view, the Arta process remained the most viable option for lasting peace in Somalia. He recalled that the Transitional National Government had inherited none of the formal institutions of a modern State on the basis of which a national authority could be said to have control over a territory. He further noted that in recent weeks the authority of the “Presidents” of both “Somaliland” and “Puntland” had been challenged, which had led to uncertainty regarding the political stability of those regions. He stressed that while the search for a national solution continued, much more attention could be paid to local political settlements. The process of rebuilding national institutions should go forward alongside strong and impartial efforts at local reconciliation. He expressed his intention to consult all concerned on the feasibility of setting up a Committee of Friends of Somalia to focus on ways and means of drawing attention to Somalia’s needs in the area of national reconciliation. Referring to the Council’s request for a proposal for a peacebuilding mission for Somalia, the Secretary-General reported that a security assessment of Mogadishu undertaken late in February 2001 had concluded that the security situation did not make it possible to deploy a peacebuilding office in the country. The security situation had not improved, the seaport and airport remained closed and there was no single authority in the country that could assure security and unimpeded access to the United Nations even in Mogadishu. Under those circumstances, he could not recommend the deployment of a post-conflict peacebuilding mission in Somalia. When the security situation improved enough to allow for the establishment of such a mission, he would submit a detailed proposal to the Council.

¹⁸ S/2001/963, submitted pursuant to the presidential statement of 27 May 1999 (S/PRST/1999/16).

At its 4392nd meeting, on 19 October 2001, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.¹⁸ The Council was briefed by the Representative of the Secretary-General for Somalia and statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Belgium (on behalf of the European Union¹⁹), Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria, Qatar, Somalia,²⁰ the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen, as well as the Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

The Representative of the Secretary-General observed that during the 10 years that had passed since the collapse of the Siad Barre regime, Somalia had been without any national institutions of any description. As a result, the main focus of loyalty and source of identity for many Somalis remained the clan. He stressed that the task in Somalia was not so much that of negotiating ceasefires, but helping the Somalis to devise institutions which commanded the allegiance of the population over and above the clan. In his view, the crucial question was to find a role for all clans within the future structure of Somalia. He indicated that another problem was the proliferation of initiatives to assist Somalia.²¹

The representative of Somalia enumerated the principles upon which the process of national reconciliation was built, which included that the outcome of the Arta peace process would continue to be the basis for the pursuit of Somali reconciliation; the process would continue to be a Somali one; and the engagement of those who were outside the Arta peace process through sustained dialogue and negotiations was a crucial component of the national reconciliation endeavour. In the light of those principles, the Somali Government had succeeded in bringing on board two out of the five factions based in Mogadishu which had not supported the Arta Conference, while intensive negotiations were going on with the remaining factions and with the northern administrative entities of “Somaliland” and “Puntland”. He noted with regret that the Secretary-General’s report did not recommend the establishment of a peacebuilding mission in Somalia. In his view, the failure to create such a mission would

¹⁹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁰ Somalia was represented by its Prime Minister.

²¹ S/PV.4392, pp. 2-3.

further contribute to the vicious circle of inadequate security and the perpetuation of the benign neglect to which his country had been subjected over a decade. Considering that the establishment of the peacebuilding mission was imperative and critical at that moment, he proposed the dispatch of a high-level inter-agency United Nations mission to Somalia, with a mandate to critically examine the work of the security office in Nairobi and to re-evaluate, in an objective manner, the security situation in Mogadishu and the whole Somalia. He further welcomed the creation of a Committee of Friends of Somalia.²²

The majority of the speakers expressed support for the work of the Transitional National Government and believed that the Arta peace process presented the most viable option for lasting peace in Somalia. Speakers also gave general support for the idea of the establishment of a Committee of Friends. Many speakers further noted their concern about the grave humanitarian situation in Somalia and underlined the need for the international community to provide assistance to the Somali people. A number of speakers pointed out that the recent escalation of conflict in Somalia was intrinsically linked to the spread of small arms in the area and demanded the respect of the arms embargo on Somalia imposed by resolution 733 (1992).

The representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States agreed with the conclusion of the Secretary-General that security conditions in Somalia precluded the establishment of a peacebuilding mission at the time.²³ The representative of Norway condemned the recent attacks on a police station in Mogadishu and noted that, nevertheless, there seemed to have been improvements in the security situation in Somalia recently and stressed that peacebuilding should not be held hostage to deliberate actions by a small subset of Somalis to prevent the country from returning to normalcy and the rehabilitation of its governing structure.²⁴ Against that background, he joined a number of other speakers in asking the Secretary-General to carry out a comprehensive inter-agency security assessment in Somalia.²⁵

While acknowledging the reasons that had led the Secretary-General not to recommend the establishment of a post-conflict peacebuilding mission in Somalia, the representative of Egypt stressed that the United Nations could not wait until perfect conditions prevailed before deploying such a mission, especially since such a logic would only create a vicious cycle in which any real hopes of providing peace and security to the Somali people would evaporate.²⁶ Similarly, the representative of Tunisia believed that maintaining the status quo in Somalia was not an option, and the Secretary-General's recommendations were not sufficient to advance a solution to the crisis in that country. He stated that it was the time to define the roles of various external actors and, in particular, the role of the Security Council in the Somali problem.²⁷ The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya suggested that a peacebuilding mission could be permanently deployed in Somalia in order to "lay the egg of peace". In his view, calling upon the Transitional National Government to establish peace, then having the Security Council guarantee the peace, would be acting like those who would "place the cart before the horse".²⁸

A number of representatives urged the Council to dispatch a fact-finding mission to Somalia to ascertain the situation on the ground and report on progress towards the restoration of peace.²⁹

At its 4401st meeting, on 31 October 2001, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 11 October 2001.³⁰ The President (Ireland) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³¹ by which the Council:

Reiterated its support for the outcome of the Arta peace conference, the establishment of the Transitional National Assembly and the Transitional National Government;

Called on all parties to refrain from actions that undermined the Arta peace process; and emphasized that, while the search for a national solution continued, unwavering

(Djibouti); S/PV.4392 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Belgium on behalf of the European Union).

²⁶ S/PV.4392, p. 27.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 12.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 29.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 29 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); S/PV.4392 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Nigeria); p. 7 (Yemen); p. 11 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 12 (Qatar).

³⁰ S/2001/963.

³¹ S/PRST/2001/30.

²² Ibid., pp. 3-6.

²³ Ibid., pp. 13-14 (United Kingdom); and p. 15 (United States).

²⁴ Ibid., p. 17.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 8 (France); p. 9 (Singapore); p. 11 (Russian Federation); p. 15 (Colombia); p. 17 (Norway); p. 18 (Mauritius); p. 20 (Jamaica); p. 23 (Ireland); and p. 25

attention must be paid to achieving local political settlements as well;

Expressed its support for the Transitional National Government's ongoing efforts to enhance security in the Mogadishu area and to make operational the National Commission for Reconciliation and Property Settlement, which should be independent, as foreseen in the Transitional National Charter;

Called on all States and other actors to comply scrupulously with the arms embargo established by resolution 733 (1992); strongly condemned the attack on 13 October 2001 on a police station in Mogadishu and the attack on 27 March 2001 on the compound of Médecins sans Frontières in Mogadishu and the subsequent abduction of international personnel, and demanded that those responsible must be brought to justice;

Expressed concern about the humanitarian situation in Somalia, in particular in southern areas, and in the Bay, Bakool, Gedo and Hiran regions due to the expected food insecurity and lack of rainfall;

Requested the Secretary-General to take steps as outlined in support of the peace process in Somalia.

**Decision of 28 March 2002 (4502nd meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4487th meeting,³² on 11 March 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 21 February 2002.³³ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, inter alia, that although the Security Council had stated that the Arta peace process was the most viable basis for peace, the peace process was incomplete and there was a divergence of views among the States members of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) regarding national reconciliation in Somalia. However, the decision taken at the ninth IGAD summit refocused attention on national reconciliation in Somalia and reached an encouraging understanding regarding specific steps to be taken by the IGAD countries concerned. The IGAD decision on Somalia was significant also because it acknowledged that consensus among Somalia's neighbours was essential in order to support a way forward in search of a more broad-based transitional arrangement for the country.

³² At the 4486th meeting, held in private on 11 March 2002, members of the Council and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Transitional National Government of Somalia had a constructive discussion.

³³ S/2002/189, submitted pursuant to the presidential statement of 31 October 2001 (S/PRST/2001/30).

He urged the IGAD member countries and other States in the region to contribute constructively to peace efforts and announced that the United Nations would also do all that was possible to achieve progress in the peace process, including through the deployment of a post-conflict peacebuilding mission, once security conditions permitted. Based on the general support expressed to the proposal to establish a Committee of Friends of Somalia, he intended to establish such a Committee in Nairobi and New York. He further reported that the inter-agency security assessment had confirmed that the security situation in Mogadishu did not allow for a long-term United Nations presence. Under those circumstances, a comprehensive peacebuilding programme could not yet be launched in Somalia. He stressed that greater unity of purpose of Somalia's friends and neighbours was needed and that only Somalia's leaders could decide to end the conflict.

At the meeting, statements were made by all Council members and by the representatives of Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Somalia³⁴ and Spain (on behalf of the European Union³⁵).

Most speakers welcomed the IGAD proposal to hold a peace and reconciliation conference, expressed support for the Arta process and the Transitional National Government, welcomed the Secretary-General's intention to set up the Committee of Friends, and shared the Secretary-General's view that only Somalia's leaders could end the conflict. They further voiced concern about the humanitarian situation and called on the Somali factions to ensure the freedom of movement, as well as the safety and security of humanitarian personnel. Speakers also expressed concern about the proliferation of small arms in Somalia and the violations of the arms embargo established pursuant to resolution 733 (1992). While calling for the reinforcement of the embargo, they commented on the social and humanitarian impact of blocking assets belonging to the Al-Barakaat companies. Taking into account the "very grave" consequences of the freeze on the assets of Al-Barakaat, the representative of France insisted that

³⁴ Somalia was represented by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Transitional National Government.

³⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

the formula of a controlled lifting of the freeze, proposed by the Somali authorities, should be welcomed.³⁶

The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya held that the international community must stand “shoulder to shoulder” with the Transitional National Government, as there was “no alternative”. The Council could not remain neutral, since neutrality only strengthened the hand of the warlords or sent them an indirect message that the Council did not really care and that they could continue their warring activities in the country.³⁷

On the security situation, most speakers expressed support for the Secretary-General’s view that the security situation in Mogadishu did not allow for a long-term United Nations presence, as had been confirmed by the inter-agency security assessment, and that under those circumstances a post-conflict peacebuilding programme could not be launched in Somalia. In contrast, a number of representatives expressed the view that the United Nations should not be held hostage by the activities of the warlords.³⁸ Echoed by several speakers, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic expressed the view that there was an imperative need to formulate specific recommendations that would enable the United Nations to provide greater assistance, as proposed by the Council in its presidential statement of 31 October 2001.³⁹

The representative of France, while favouring a peacebuilding mission in Somalia as soon as the security conditions allowed, underlined that the security situation in Mogadishu, in particular, needed to be regularly assessed in the hope that the United Nations could return, especially to the capital.⁴⁰ The representative of Jordan called on the Council to dispatch a fact-finding mission to Somalia to assess the situation there and re-examine the situation on the ground.⁴¹

Regarding the security situation, the representative of Somalia held that a multiple-track approach would be the most appropriate way forward, providing the Transitional National Government with the necessary resources and tools to enhance security in Mogadishu and other areas in Somalia; ensure the strict enforcement of the sanctions regime regarding the illegal influx of weapons and arms; sustain a continuous contribution to the campaign against terrorism; and sustain support for the IGAD-sponsored peace process, sending a very strong signal to the warlords that their failure to contribute positively to the peace process would result in punitive measures taken against them.⁴²

On efforts to combat terrorism, the representatives of Ireland and Spain, the latter speaking on behalf of the European Union, welcomed the establishment of a counter-terrorism task force by the Transitional National Government.⁴³ The representative of Colombia recalled that the Transitional National Government had asked the international community for assistance so that it could create the infrastructure necessary for ensuring full compliance with resolution 1373 (2001).⁴⁴

At its 4502nd meeting, on 28 March 2002, in which the representative of Somalia was invited to participate, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 21 February 2002.⁴⁵ The President (Norway) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁴⁶ by which the Council, inter alia:

Reiterated its support for the Arta peace process; urged the Transitional National Government, local authorities and traditional leaders in Somalia to make every effort to complete the peace and reconciliation process through dialogue, with the view to establish an all-inclusive government in Somalia; and strongly supported the decisions by the ninth IGAD Summit and by the IGAD Foreign Ministers Committee on 14 February 2002 to convene a National Reconciliation Conference for Somalia in Nairobi in April 2002;

Encouraged the Secretary-General, through his Special Adviser and the United Nations Political Office for Somalia, to support actively the IGAD initiative;

³⁶ S/PV.4487, p. 8.

³⁷ S/PV.4487 (Resumption 1), pp. 8-9.

³⁸ S/PV.4487, pp. 4-6 (Syrian Arab Republic); and pp. 8-10 (Mauritius); S/PV.4487 (Resumption 1), pp. 4-5 (Egypt); and pp. 8-9 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).

³⁹ S/PV.4487, pp. 4-6 (Syrian Arab Republic); pp. 8-10 (Mauritius); and pp. 11-12 (Ireland); S/PV.4487 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-4 (Spain on behalf of the European Union).

⁴⁰ S/PV.4487, p. 8.

⁴¹ S/PV.4487 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

⁴³ S/PV.4487, p. 12 (Ireland); S/PV.4487 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Spain on behalf of the European Union).

⁴⁴ S/PV.4487, pp. 6-7.

⁴⁵ S/2002/189.

⁴⁶ S/PRST/2002/8.

Noted with serious concern the continued flow of weapons and ammunition supplies to Somalia;

Emphasized the necessity for further efforts against international terrorism in accordance with resolution 1373 (2001) of 28 September 2001;

Expressed concern about the humanitarian situation in Somalia and called on Member States to respond urgently and generously to the United Nations Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeal for 2002;

Requested the Secretary-General to establish without further delay a trust fund for peacebuilding in Somalia;

Endorsed a working mission to the region consisting of members of the Council and Secretariat staff; endorsed the establishment of the Somalia Contact Group to operate in Nairobi and New York; and welcomed the appointment of Winston A. Tubman as the Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Political Office for Somalia.

**Decision of 3 May 2002 (4524th meeting):
resolution 1407 (2002)**

At the 4524th meeting, on 3 May 2002, in which the representative of Somalia was invited to participate, the President (Singapore) drew attention to a draft resolution;⁴⁷ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1407 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Requested the Secretary-General to establish, within one month from the date of adoption of the resolution, in preparation for a Panel of Experts, a team of experts consisting of two members for a period of 30 days, to provide the Committee with an action plan detailing the resources and expertise that the Panel of Experts would require to be able to generate independent information on violations and for improving the enforcement of the weapon and military equipment embargo established by paragraph 5 of resolution 733 (1992); requested the Chairman of the Committee to forward the report of the team of experts, within two weeks of its reception, to the Security Council for its consideration; urged all other individuals and entities contacted by the Chairman of the Committee or the team of experts to cooperate fully by providing relevant information and facilitating their investigations, including political and traditional leaders, members of civil society and the business community, financial institutions and intermediaries, other brokering agencies, civil aviation companies and authorities, non-governmental organizations, intergovernmental organizations and international law enforcement cooperation bodies;

⁴⁷ S/2002/507.

Called upon all States, in particular those in the region, to provide the Committee with all available information on violations of the arms embargo; and decided to remain seized of the matter.

**Decision of 22 July 2002 (4580th meeting):
resolution 1425 (2002)**

At its 4580th meeting,⁴⁸ on 22 July 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 27 June 2002.⁴⁹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that, despite the efforts of the Government of Kenya in coordinating the IGAD initiative to convene the national reconciliation conference for Somalia, the conference was not held in April as anticipated. Consequently, the IGAD peace process was at an impasse because of differences on how to proceed on national reconciliation. He stressed that the environment of apparent suspicion, both among regional countries and inside Somalia, needed to be defused. He hoped that the Somalia Contact Group would prove to be a useful forum for the exchange of information and coordination of peacemaking efforts among external actors. He also deplored the escalation of violence in recent months, particularly in Mogadishu and Gedo and indicated that the security and humanitarian situations remained problematic.

At the meeting, the President (United Kingdom) drew attention to a draft resolution;⁵⁰ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1425 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Requested the Secretary-General to establish, within one month from the date of adoption of the resolution, in consultation with the Committee established pursuant to resolution 751 (1992); a Panel of Experts consisting of three members to be based in Nairobi for a period of six months, in order to generate independent information on violations of the arms embargo and as a step towards giving effect to and strengthening the embargo;

Urged all other individuals and entities contacted by the Panel of Experts to cooperate fully by providing relevant

⁴⁸ At its 4565th meeting, held in private on 3 July 2002, the Council was briefed by the Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Political Office for Somalia.

⁴⁹ S/2002/709, submitted pursuant to the presidential statements of 31 October 2001 and 28 March 2002 (S/PRST/2001/30 and S/PRST/2002/8, respectively).

⁵⁰ S/2002/799.

information and facilitating its investigations, including political and traditional leaders, members of the civil society and the business community, financial institutions and intermediaries, other brokering agencies, civil aviation companies and authorities, non-governmental organizations, intergovernmental organizations and international law enforcement cooperation bodies;

Requested the Panel of Experts to submit a final report at the end of its mandated period to the Security Council, through the Committee, for its consideration; requested the Secretary-General, in his next report due on 31 October 2002, to include updates on the activities undertaken to coordinate ongoing peacebuilding initiatives and to provide for their incremental expansion; the technical assistance and cooperation provided to enhance the administrative and judicial capacities throughout Somalia; and the reporting by States to the Committee on measures they have in place to ensure the full and effective implementation of the arms embargo, in accordance with resolution 1407 (2002); and decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

Decision of 12 December 2002 (4663rd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4663rd meeting, on 12 December 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 25 October 2002.⁵¹ In his report, the Secretary-General welcomed the opening of the Somali National Reconciliation Conference at Eldoret, Kenya, on 15 October 2002. He noted that the international community had to continue working with the IGAD countries and responsible Somali leaders to keep the peace process on track, and stressed that only Somali leaders could decide to end the conflict. He indicated that one area of critical concern was the proliferation of arms and highlighted the need to disarm armed men, many of whom were youths, and to reintegrate them as useful members of their communities. In that connection, he called on the international community, in particular the IGAD countries, and all Somalis to cooperate with and help the Panel of Experts on the arms embargo, which had begun its work in Nairobi. He further noted that aid workers continued to face an unacceptable level of insecurity and urged concerted international action to put an end to the impunity with which armed groups continued to harass humanitarian and development agencies. The United Nations was still ready to deploy

⁵¹ S/2002/1201, submitted pursuant to the presidential statement of 31 October 2001 (S/PRST/2001/30) and resolution 1425 (2002).

a post-conflict peacebuilding mission as soon as security conditions permitted.

At the same meeting, in which the representative of Somalia was invited to participate, the President (Colombia) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁵² by which, the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its commitment to a comprehensive and lasting settlement of the situation in Somalia;

Welcomed the Eldoret Declaration as an important step towards the ending the violence and suffering of the Somali people; and welcomed the Joint Declaration issued by involved parties in Mogadishu on 2 December 2002;

Encouraged Member States urgently to provide further contributions in support of the Somali National Reconciliation Process;

Condemned recent attacks on humanitarian personnel and civilians in Somalia; and expressed serious concern regarding the situation of displaced persons in Somalia;

Called on all Member States, entities and individuals to respect fully the arms embargo established by resolution 733 (1992);

Requested the Secretary-General to continue preparatory activities on the ground for a post-conflict peacebuilding mission in Somalia once security conditions permitted.

Decision of 12 March 2003 (4718th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4718th meeting, on 12 March 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 26 February 2003.⁵³ In his report, the Secretary-General stressed that the international community continued to support the Somali national reconciliation process launched under the auspices of IGAD and led by Kenya. He noted that the first phase of the process had ended with the signing of the Eldoret Declaration on 27 October 2002, by which the participants pledged, among other things, to cease hostilities and guarantee the security of all humanitarian and development personnel and installations. He further commended the IGAD frontline States for their decision to set up a mechanism to monitor compliance with the Eldoret Declaration, noting that hostilities in Somalia were motivated by individual rivalries and criminal activities

⁵² S/PRST/2002/35.

⁵³ S/2003/231, submitted pursuant to the presidential statement of 31 October 2001 (S/PRST/2001/30) and resolution 1425 (2002).

rather than wider issues. In a positive development, he observed that Somali leaders in Mogadishu had committed themselves, early in December 2002, to ceasing hostilities and reopening the Mogadishu seaport and airport. Since then, however, serious hostilities had occurred involving the militias and supporters of some of the very leaders who had signed the Eldoret Declaration and December agreements. As a result, assistance delivery continued to be seriously affected, despite the fact that chronic food insecurity had resulted in unacceptably high malnutrition rates, which had become endemic in parts of Somalia. On the other hand, in some more stable areas, community-based peacebuilding activities had evolved, which presented windows of opportunity to build on the peace that had been achieved. Failure to do so, however, could result in renewed conflict.

At the same meeting, the President (Guinea) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁵⁴ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reiterated its firm support for the Somali National Reconciliation Process;

Demanded that the Somali parties abide by and implement the Eldoret Declaration;

Called on the IGAD Technical Committee to continue its active role in promoting the Process;

Urged all parties involved to participate fully in the six reconciliation committees;

Expressed concern regarding the humanitarian situation in Somalia and urged the Somali leaders to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance;

Requested the Secretary-General to continue preparatory activities on the ground for a post-conflict peacebuilding mission in Somalia once security condition permitted;

Reiterated its commitment to assist the Somali parties and support the IGAD mediation.

**Decision of 8 April 2003 (4737th meeting):
resolution 1474 (2003)**

At the 4737th meeting, on 8 April 2003, in which the representative of Somalia was invited to participate, the President (Mexico) drew attention to a draft resolution;⁵⁵ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1474 (2003), by which the

Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided to re-establish a Panel of Experts for a period of six months commencing no later than three weeks from the date of the adoption of the resolution, to be based in Nairobi;

Requested the Secretary-General to appoint up to four experts, including the Chairman;

Further requested the Secretary-General to ensure that the Panel of Experts comprised, and had access to, sufficient expertise in the areas of armament and financing thereof, civil aviation, maritime transport, and regional affairs;

Requested all Somali and regional parties as well as government officials and other actors contacted outside the region to cooperate fully with the Panel of Experts;

Requested the Panel of Experts to provide a mid-term briefing to the Council;

Decided to send a mission of the Committee, led by the Chairman of the Committee, to the region;

Called again upon all States, in particular those in the region, to provide the Committee with all available information on violations of the arms embargo; called upon regional organizations, in particular the African Union and the League of Arab States, as well as States that had the resources, to assist Somali parties and the States in the region in their efforts to fully implement the arms embargo.

**Decision of 11 November 2003 (4856th
meeting): statement by the President**

On 13 October 2003, the Secretary-General submitted a report on the situation in Somalia,⁵⁶ by which he observed, *inter alia*, that the Somali national reconciliation process under the auspices of IGAD had devoted almost a year of sustained effort to trying to arrive at a durable and inclusive solution to the conflict in Somalia, including through the Kenya-facilitated Somali National Reconciliation Conference in Mbagathi. Notwithstanding the progress made at the Mbagathi Conference, further advances had been slow owing to differences on the issue of federalism and on the relationship of the future transitional government with existing regional and local authorities, in particular “Somaliland”. The situation had been complicated by the expiration on 26 August 2003 of the mandate of the Transitional National Government. He observed that key Member States, in the region as well as outside it, should monitor and support the

⁵⁴ S/PRST/2003/2.

⁵⁵ S/2003/408.

⁵⁶ S/2003/987, submitted pursuant to the presidential statement of 31 October 2001 (S/PRST/2001/30).

efforts of Somali leaders and the IGAD Technical Committee in helping to ensure that the Mbagathi Conference culminated in an inclusive and comprehensive agreement. In that context, he welcomed the African Union's commitment to deploy a military observer mission to Somalia to monitor the cessation of hostilities. He further indicated that conflict and violence continued and the activities of United Nations agencies and partners had been curtailed due to insecurity prevailing in many parts of the country. Humanitarian and development workers in Somalia were calling upon the international community to hold the Somali leaders accountable for the welfare of their people and for the legitimacy of the leaders to be judged accordingly. In that context, he welcomed the decision of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 751 (1992) to visit the region to strengthen the arms embargo. He noted that the United Nations Political Office for Somalia and the United Nations country team were actively developing a peacebuilding plan to be implemented in Somalia once a definitive agreement was reached at the Conference.

At its 4856th meeting, on 11 November 2003, in which the representative of Somalia was invited to participate, the Council included the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General in its agenda.⁵⁶ The President (Angola) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁵⁷ by which the Council, inter alia:

Reiterated its firm support for the Somali National Reconciliation Process;

Urged all Somali leaders to participate in the meeting of leaders in Kenya in November 2003;

Called on the international community to continue its efforts to support IGAD;

Called on the donor countries to contribute to the Process, the Trust Fund and the Inter-Agency Appeal for Somalia;

Expressed serious concern regarding the humanitarian situation in Somalia and called on the Somali leaders to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance and to assure the safety of all international and national aid workers;

⁵⁷ S/PRST/2003/19.

Reiterated that the comprehensive peacebuilding programme would be important to post-conflict Somalia.

Decision of 16 December 2003 (4885th meeting): resolution 1519 (2003)

At its 4885th meeting, on 16 December 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 4 November 2003 from the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 751 (1992) to the President of the Council, transmitting the report of the Panel of Experts on Somalia.⁵⁸ The Panel of Experts recommended, inter alia, the continuation of the arms embargo and the establishment of a more systematic monitoring mechanism, which would improve the effectiveness of the embargo. The Panel also advocated an improvement in the cooperation between international, regional and subregional organizations, Member States and non-State actors involved in enforcing the embargo and made recommendations aimed at stemming the flow of arms and addressing the issue of piracy and terrorism against ships.

At the meeting, the President (Bulgaria) drew attention to a draft resolution;⁵⁹ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1519 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, inter alia:

Stressed the obligation of all States and other actors to comply fully with resolutions 733 (1992) and 1356 (2001);

Requested the Secretary-General to establish a monitoring group composed of four experts for a period of six months commencing as soon as possible from the date of the adoption of the resolution, to be based in Nairobi, with a mandate which should focus on the ongoing arms embargo violations;

Called upon all States in the region and regional organizations to establish focal points to enhance cooperation with the Monitoring Group and to facilitate information exchange;

Called on neighbouring States to report to the Committee quarterly on their efforts to implement the arms embargo.

⁵⁸ S/2003/1035; the report was transmitted pursuant to paragraph 7 of resolution 1474 (2003).

⁵⁹ S/2003/1177.

4. The situation in Angola

Deliberations of 18 January 2000 (4090th meeting)

At the 4090th meeting, on 18 January 2000, the President (United States) drew the attention of the Security Council to the report of the Secretary-General dated 14 January 2000 on the United Nations Office in Angola.¹ In the report, the Secretary-General provided an update on the political, military, humanitarian, human rights and socio-economic developments in Angola. Regarding the political and military aspects, he stated that the situation had seen a major change following the successful military campaign undertaken by the Government, resulting in the re-establishment of State authority in the vast territory previously occupied by the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA), as well as the improvement of the security conditions in the north-eastern region of the country. He added that the Government did not consider the head of the group, Jonas Savimbi, a credible partner for dialogue due to his record of not implementing previous agreements, although they still considered the Lusaka Protocol² as a valid basis for the peace process. The humanitarian and human rights aspects were some of the major challenges, according to the Secretary-General; adding that there had been reports of abuses but, since the United Nations did not have access to most parts of Angola, little information was available. Regarding the socio-economic aspects of the conflict, he informed Council members about the deterioration of all key economic indicators, which was exacerbated by the fact that different United Nations programmes and agencies had had to scale down its operational activities because of the conflict. Finally, he concluded that the conflict risked spilling over to the neighbouring countries, that UNITA bore the primary responsibility for the state of affairs, and that only a political solution could help to restore durable peace and security in Angola.

At the meeting, the Council heard briefings by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs and the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola, following which statements were made by

¹ S/2000/23, submitted pursuant to paragraph 7 of resolution 1268 (1999).

² S/1994/1441, annex.

most members of the Council and the representative of Angola.³

In his statement, the Under-Secretary-General recalled the origins of the current situation in Angola. He made reference to the withdrawal of the Cuban forces in 1988 which the United Nations had been asked to monitor; the first democratic election in the country in 1992, which had been rejected by UNITA resulting in resumption of the civil war; the comprehensive peace treaty, the Lusaka Protocol, that had been signed in November 1994, again followed by the failure of UNITA to demobilize its forces, the resumption of fighting and the termination of the United Nations Observer Mission in Angola the previous February. He pointed out, *inter alia*, that the Government had considered the Lusaka accord as still valid, while UNITA (after some major military setbacks) had claimed to be ready to resume the peace process. He also made reference to the issues of the humanitarian crisis and the lack of security, as well as the need to improve the human rights situation in the country. He commented that the new United Nations Office in Angola would continue to assist the Government and civic organizations in the areas of capacity-building, humanitarian assistance and the promotion of human rights.⁴

In his briefing, the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) (Canada) presented a report on his visit to Angola from 8 to 16 January 2000. He explained that the three objectives of the visit were to consult with the Government of Angola on developments regarding the application worldwide of sanctions against UNITA; to visit the areas and see the military equipment captured from UNITA; and to meet with UNITA people who had defected from UNITA or been captured in recent fighting. He had been able to gather testimonies about

³ The Russian Federation spoke on behalf of the troika of observer States of the Angolan peace process (Portugal, United States, Russian Federation). The representatives of the United States and Canada did not make statements at the meeting, but the representative of the United States submitted a statement for the public record. Angola was represented by its Vice-Minister for External Relations. The representatives of France, the Netherlands, Ukraine and the United Kingdom aligned themselves with the statement of the troika.

⁴ S/PV.4090, pp. 3-4.

the violations and violators of the United Nations sanctions, as well as the conditions in which UNITA was operating, including its financial, military and infrastructure positions. He concluded that the sanctions were having a real impact on the capacity of UNITA to pursue its military objectives, including by impairing UNITA's ability to transport the weapons system and fuel it needed. He then showed a video of his trip, including excerpts from the interviews.⁵

The representative of Angola expressed, *inter alia*, his concern over the fact that, despite the existence of several resolutions that imposed sanctions against UNITA, many countries and organizations were determined to continue to break them, while his Government remained committed to a democratic and reconciled Angola through the Lusaka Protocol.⁶

Most representatives reiterated that UNITA had the primary responsibility for the continuation of the conflict; that a political solution and, particularly, the Lusaka Protocol remained the foundation for achieving peace in Angola. They expressed concern over the humanitarian situation and underlined that the repercussions of the conflict on the security in the region had to be tackled. Finally, they emphasized that the sanctions against UNITA should be supported.

The representative of the United Kingdom added that the Government of Angola itself had some responsibility and some things it needed to do better. He also stated that his government was looking forward to the report of the expert panel, which it hoped would contain firm recommendations on strengthening the sanctions, as he hoped that the international community would be able to name and shame individuals, companies and, if necessary, Governments, involved in sanctions-busting.⁷

The representative of Namibia stated that the actions of UNITA had "threatened the very foundation of the existence of the Republic of Angola, its unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Government of Angola had no other option but to apply the necessary decisive military force against the rebel movement UNITA in order to defend its people and territory."⁸

The representative of the Netherlands noted that what was needed was a recognition that, despite Mr. Savimbi's lamentable role, UNITA as such continued to be a factor in Angolan society, entirely in accordance with the original intention of the Lusaka Protocol. He underlined that all parties now needed to work for an all-inclusive solution through dialogue.⁹

Deliberations of 15 March 2000 (4113th meeting)

At its 4113th meeting, on 15 March 2000, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 10 March 2000 from the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹⁰ transmitting the final report of the Panel of Experts established pursuant to resolution 1237 (1993) to investigate violations of Security Council sanctions against UNITA. The Panel informed Council members about the way UNITA had acquired and maintained its arms and military equipment, including through diamond sales, and the way UNITA handled its relations abroad. It also referred to the people and countries that allegedly supported those activities since 1993, *inter alia*, South African individuals, who had provided military equipment, facilitated transactions, and provided non-military equipment for UNITA; the former Zaire (Democratic Republic of the Congo), whose territory had been used to facilitate the passage of arms and military equipment; Burkina Faso, which had been used as a transit point for arms originating in Eastern Europe and other military equipment for UNITA; Congo-Brazzaville and its Government, where UNITA had moved military equipment following the signature of the Lusaka Protocol; Rwanda, which had been cooperating with UNITA in different military operations and in contacts with arms brokers; Togo, whose territory was being used to facilitate the passage of arms and military equipment; Ukrainian nationals, who supported the flights bringing in arms and other military materiel for UNITA; Bulgaria, which was the source of origin for the majority of the arms purchased by UNITA and where some UNITA personnel had been trained; Zambia, where contacts at the highest level had been made by Savimbi in order to facilitate fuel procurement operations and whose border had been used to smuggle fuel; Namibia, whose territory had

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-10.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

¹⁰ S/2000/203.

been used to smuggle significant quantities of diamonds belonging to UNITA; Uganda, whose territory had been used to refuel aircrafts from Eastern Europe on route to Andulo; Belgium, where illegal diamonds had been sold in its major diamond market (Antwerp); and Côte d'Ivoire, where protected diamond deals had taken place. The Panel made a number of recommendations to control the violations of the sanctions and to improve the control of arms and fuel supply, as well as the diamond trade, the financial activities and the links abroad of UNITA.

At the meeting, the President (Bangladesh) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a letter from Uganda, transmitting the record of a meeting of the Panel of Experts established by resolution 1237 (1999) and representatives of the Government of Uganda concerning alleged violations by Uganda of sanctions imposed against UNITA.¹¹ The Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993), following which statements were made by most members of the Council,¹² as well as the representatives of Angola, Burkina Faso, Togo, Rwanda, South Africa, Bulgaria, Zambia, Morocco, Belarus, Belgium and Uganda.

In his statement, the Chairman of the Committee referred to the report of the Panel of Experts and stressed that Security Council sanctions against UNITA had not worked well, although they were beginning to be taken more seriously and were starting to become effective. He went over in detail the main recommendations of the report, and he stressed that now that the sanctions were beginning to have real impact that they should not make the mistake of letting up the pressure on UNITA.¹³

During the debate, numerous speakers welcomed the report and its recommendations, and considered that the document had shown that, in spite of the fact that the sanctions regime was already bearing, there were still many flaws and the Council needed to

consider the desirability of strengthening the sanctions, particularly in the areas of diamond sales, arms purchases and foreign travel, as well as establishing more effective monitoring mechanisms for sanctions regimes. A number of representatives noted the links between different crises in Africa, which required the Council to deal with them in a comprehensive. A number also noted the links being the illegal exploitation of resources and the continuation of conflicts.

The representative of the United Kingdom noted that the report highlighted the porous and haphazard nature of the enforcement of sanctions against UNITA, in addition to exposing the hypocrisy of those countries, and sometimes leaders, that condemned UNITA while some of their citizens and companies supplied Jonas Savimbi with the arms, munitions, fuel and assistance without which "25 years of murderous activities would have ended long ago". Regarding the reference made in the report to African government ministers and public officials, arms dealers from Eastern Europe, and air companies and fuel suppliers, he described them as "merchants of death". He called upon all the Governments of the world to act against them, and the Security Council to take decisive action by, *inter alia*, implementing the report's key recommendations in a series of mandatory United Nations resolutions. The private sector had a major role to play too, he acknowledged, as well as the Government of Angola, which needed to ensure full transparency and accountability.¹⁴

The representative of Malaysia regarded the report to be in depth and comprehensive, as well as bold and candid. He stressed that all the people and countries named in the report should have the right to respond to the allegations and to clarify their own roles in the alleged sanctions-busting activities, but if these explanations were not plausible and could not be borne out by facts, the Security Council would have to take appropriate actions.¹⁵

The representative of the Netherlands noted that exchange of information and transparency in relations to arms trafficking was essential, and in this respect the role for regional organizations was particularly important. He concluded that the most important thing was to make sure that the Panel exercise would get the

¹¹ S/2000/200.

¹² The United States spoke on behalf of the troika of observer States of the Angolan peace process. The representatives of Bangladesh, Canada, Portugal, the Russian Federation and the United States did not make statements. The United Kingdom was represented by its Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs.

¹³ S/PV.4113, pp. 2-7.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-14.

best possible follow-up to avoid a return to business as usual and to the culture of impunity.¹⁶

The representative of Jamaica noted that the Panel's existence and presence had already had the important effect of stimulating Governments and others to focus on what each of them could do to improve the implementation and enforcement of sanctions and to curtail existing violations. She commented that the report left no doubt that there had been serious violations of the sanctions regimes by individuals, companies and Government officials, who shared the responsibility for the conflict and, with UNITA, were equally culpable; that the Governments of the countries whose nationals were engaged in the sanctions-busting had an obligation to investigate and take actions against those who were responsible.¹⁷

The representative of Namibia considered it imperative that the Council applied sanctions to those leaders and Governments that had sustained UNITA's political and war machinery, in violation of Council resolutions. She concurred with the evidentiary standard employed by the Panel, but regarded that important links might have been omitted and, thus, ongoing investigations would help during the monitoring process.¹⁸

The representative of China underlined that the sanctions against UNITA were far from being effective; thus, he appealed to all countries to genuinely abide by the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, by putting an end to the supply of arms or any other forms of support to UNITA and by taking other effective measures to prevent violations by their own nationals. The signal sent by the report was that measures had to be taken to strengthen the sanctions regime, even though it was itself just a tool to create the necessary conditions for a final political solution to the conflict.¹⁹

The representative of Angola pointed out that the rearming of the military wing of UNITA had only been possible because of the connivance of some Governments, political individuals and businessmen in violating the sanctions, thus becoming co-perpetrators of crimes against humanity and interfering in the internal affairs of other States. He fully supported the recommendations contained in the report and he trusted

that they would be included in the upcoming resolution on Angola. Additionally, he stressed that in view of the irrefutable evidence contained in the report, the Council had to consider taking measures against those implicated.²⁰

The representative of South Africa stated that they would be studying the report with great care, and looked forward to receiving more evidence on the allegations in the report. However, he acknowledged that some South African citizens had been involved in efforts to undermine sanctions, and they would take firm action against those involved.²¹

The representative of Morocco referred to the mention in the report of money placed by the representative of UNITA in Morocco. He explained that those funds were completely exhausted before the imposition of the sanctions and that the representative of UNITA had left Morocco a long time ago.²²

The representative of France expressed a number of concerns over the report; inter alia, that some dates were imprecise; that there was lack of clarity as to the sources of the information; that it was not clear if some of the people regarded as being linked to UNITA were on the list of the sanctions Committee; and that the report did not provide an estimate of the revenue of UNITA. He stressed that on all of those points it would be necessary to get explanations from the countries mentioned in the report. He suggested that the sanctions Committee could question the Chairman of the Panel in greater detail and also receive communications from States cited in the report, and then transmit its own conclusions to the Council. Finally, he noted some of the recommendations were general in nature, and should be dealt with in the competent forum. Others related to new sanctions on third States, which could result in numerous problems and went beyond the framework of sanctions against UNITA.²³

The representative of Tunisia drew the attention of the Council to the sensitivity of some of the information, conclusions and recommendations of the report. He said that he would have preferred the report to avoid citing certain parties, at least at that stage, so as to first be certain of its absolute veracity. It would

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 16-17.

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 17-18.

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 18-21.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 21-22.

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 23-25.

²¹ S/PV.4113 (Resumption 1), pp. 8-10.

²² Ibid., pp. 10-11.

²³ S/PV.4113, pp. 10-12.

have been better to have proceeded by first engaging the attention of the States and parties concerned before making suggestions or deciding on appropriate steps, which would have given the necessary credibility to the investigations of the sanctions Committee.²⁴

The representative of Burkina Faso objected to the conclusions of the report and particularly to those that accused their head of state by name. He complained about a number of aspects of the report and the way it was prepared. First, he stated that his delegation had not received it early enough in order to study it and respond and that there had been broad coverage in the media before its official publication. Commenting on the substance of the report, he maintained that the mission of the Panel of Experts to Burkina Faso was “quite clearly botched” and that it had given a false impression that the authorities of Burkina Faso had not wanted to cooperate. He went on to argue that it was difficult to consider the work done by the Panel as particularly meticulous, as the thrust of the report was based on allegations made by UNITA defectors, “whose judgement, necessarily coloured by rancour and perhaps by the spirit of vengeance, cannot help but be biased and partial”. Noting that the report seemed to be built on allusions rather than on certainties, he added that most facts lacked dates, concordance and consistency and that it did not comply with the rigorous scientific requirements of an investigation based on rigorous, fair and reliable foundation. Finally, he opined that it left a sense of a certain degree of partiality, based on the presumption of the guilt of some countries and leaders and of the innocence of others.²⁵

The representative of Togo also criticized some aspects of the report, particularly the “flimsy and selective” nature of the accusations, based on declarations made by deserters and defectors from UNITA; and the working methods followed, which he considered to be just compiling rumours, hearsay and gossip and the “absolute lack of rigour in the approach”. He strenuously denied that Togo had violated existing sanctions, noting that the lack of dates given for the supposed meetings made it impossible to tell whether they happened before or after sanctions had been imposed. He also commented that while Togo had hosted the family of Mr. Savimbi, including his

children, they were not on the list drawn up by the sanctions Committee, and if they were added they would be immediately expelled. He complained that leaks had been cunningly orchestrated to make the report available to the media and there was an impression of collusion between the interests of a country that had an official mandate and the implementation of sanctions against UNITA.²⁶

The representative of Rwanda stressed that the allegations about the cooperation of Rwanda with UNITA had no foundation and were merely hearsay from quarters that distorted facts for reasons known only to themselves. He complained about the fact that the information and explanations given by Rwanda to the Panel had not been mentioned. He denied that there had been any cooperation or contacts with UNITA, and challenged the Panel to produce concrete evidence of the “unfounded and uncalled-for allegations”.²⁷

The representative of Bulgaria expressed the frustration of his Government with the violation of the established procedure requiring all countries concerned to be acquainted first with the report, before it was given to the mass media. He highlighted that the report did not, and could not, contain concrete evidence linking Bulgaria with any violation of resolution 864 (1993) or of the internationally recognized standards and norms of arms control regimes. He referred to some of the accusations related to arms transactions, explained the facts surrounding them, and rejected the accusations.²⁸

The representative of Belgium regretted the omission of some important information from the report, as well as the inclusion of some unfounded references. He recalled the efforts of its Government to control the diamonds trade which, he said, were not fully reflected in the report, even though that information had been conveyed in due time. He denied the accusation that a large number of diamond dealers in Antwerp operated in a so-called “grey” market, and considered that the complex problem of identifying the origin of diamonds was insufficiently elaborated and clearly underestimated in the report.²⁹

The representative of Uganda welcomed the report but regretted that, in spite of extensive

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 22-23.

²⁵ S/PV.4113 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-4.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 4-7.

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 8-10.

²⁹ Ibid., pp. 11-13.

discussions which the Panel of Experts held with Ugandan officials the previous month, all the information that was exchanged and provided was ignored. He stressed that Uganda had never supplied arms to UNITA, either directly or indirectly and that Uganda had neither imported nor re-exported diamonds, and rejected all the other allegations dealing with contacts between UNITA and Uganda. He added that while the Government of Uganda was cooperating with the Mouvement de libération du Congo of Jean-Pierre Bemba, it was not the policy of the Government of Uganda to dictate whom its partners cooperated with. Therefore, the Government of Uganda could not be responsible for the arms which the rebel groups have in their possession.³⁰

Finally, the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) rejected any suggestion that Canada was somehow biased in its administration of Security Council sanctions, or that any Canadian participated in the leaking, of any documents to the press relating to the Panel's report. He noted that the Panel had used a higher standard for the rules of evidence than would apply in a court of law in most countries in a bribery case; faced with convincing evidence of high-level complicity; the Panel had no option but to report it. He stressed that the Panel took into consideration the dates when the different sanctions had been in effect and they were reflected in the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Panel. In addition, he pointed out that countries and Governments more specifically accused of sanctions-busting had been consulted in advance.³¹

**Decision of 13 April 2000 (4126th meeting):
resolution 1294 (2000)**

At its 4126th meeting, on 13 April 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Office in Angola dated 11 April 2000.³² In his report, the Secretary-General stated that, after the issuance of the report of the Panel of Experts regarding the violations of the sanctions, a number of Governments and corporations had announced that they would be taking measures in compliance with the sanctions, while

UNITA had dismissed the allegations contained in the report arguing that they were based on statements by defectors. He also explained the latest developments in the military situation, and the human rights and humanitarian situations. He stressed that, although the Government had continued to be effective in further reducing the conventional war capacity of UNITA, while the humanitarian, the security and the socio-economic situation had deteriorated. The war still risked spilling over into the neighbouring countries, which remained a major cause of concern. The Government had also announced plans to re-establish political and military stability, as well as to step up efforts to institute monetary stability, further economic development and carry out programmes for the provision of humanitarian assistance and social services to the civilian population. He encouraged the international community to support the Government in its efforts to provide basic services to the areas formerly occupied by UNITA.

At the same meeting, to which the representative of Angola was invited, the President (Canada) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;³³ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1294 (2000), by which the Council, inter alia:

Endorsed the decision contained in paragraph 51 of the report of the Secretary-General of 11 April 2000 (S/2000/304) to extend the mandate of the United Nations Office in Angola for a period of six months until 15 October 2000;

Requested the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to implement the tasks of the office as outlined in resolution 1268 (1999);

Requested the Secretary-General to provide every three months a report on developments in Angola, including his recommendations about additional measures the Council might consider to promote the peace process in Angola.

**Decision of 18 April 2000 (4129th meeting):
resolution 1295 (2000)**

At its 4129th meeting, on 18 April 2000, the Council again included in its agenda the letter dated 10 March 2000 from the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993).³⁴ Statements were made by the Chairman of the Committee and the members of the Council, including

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 13-15.

³¹ Ibid., pp. 15-17.

³² S/2000/304 and Corr.1, submitted pursuant to para. 7 of resolution 1268 (1999).

³³ S/2000/307.

³⁴ S/2000/203, transmitting the final report of the Panel of Experts.

the representative of Portugal on behalf of the European Union,³⁵ as well as the representatives of Angola, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Gabon, Mozambique, New Zealand, Portugal, Rwanda, Spain, Togo, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

At the same meeting, the President (Canada) drew the attention of the Council to letters from the representatives of Belgium, Burkina Faso, Gabon, Portugal, Rwanda, Togo and Uganda, as well as a note verbale from Bulgaria.³⁶ By those communications, those countries, *inter alia*, commented on the report of the Panel of Experts established pursuant to resolution 1237 (1999); expressed concerns over some of the information provided; requested detailed verification of some of the facts contained in it; provided clarifications on points that touched on their respective countries; or informed the Council of follow-up activities being taken by their Governments in response to the report.

In his statement, the Chairman explained that the fact that the draft resolution did not name names or take action against alleged sanctions-busters did not exonerate any State but, instead, provided the opportunity to answer the allegations, end sanctions violations, and bring their actions into conformity with the clearly articulated will of the international community. Moreover, he stated, the draft resolution before the Council made clear the Council's willingness to adopt measures if necessary.³⁷

Most of the speakers welcomed the report, underlined the importance of the draft resolution, and reiterated that the responsibility for the continuation of the conflict lied within the leadership of UNITA. They added that the draft resolution would contribute to improving the effectiveness of control over the sanctions against UNITA by establishing machinery for monitoring sanctions, as well as close off the channels used by the leadership of that organization to preserve their ability to continue the war.

The representative of the United Kingdom stressed that the new resolution would require a new level of cooperation among Member States, and between Governments and the private sector; besides technical expertise and political will. In addition, as he remarked, this would place a particular burden on States neighbouring Angola.³⁸

The representative of France welcomed the fact that, barely a month after the report was issued, the Council would adopt a draft resolution taking on board more than three quarters of the recommendations. These were directed first and foremost to Member States, but also to international and regional organizations, enterprises, professional organizations and experts. Highlighting the constructive approach of the resolution, he underlined that it did not appear that the creation of new sanctions against countries that had allegedly violated the old sanctions would provide a real solution, and the exponential growth in the number of existing sanctions regimes would likely create management problems at the very moment when the Council was already having enough trouble enforcing the nine embargoes in place.³⁹

The representative of the Netherlands explained that the draft resolution would put in place a new monitoring mechanism that would be effective as long as it was allowed to collect, analyse and submit information independently.⁴⁰

The representative of Argentina remarked that the submission of the report had already had an impact in mobilizing States mentioned in the report and creating awareness within the international community.⁴¹

The representative of Malaysia considered the draft resolution to be a very important one, particularly with regards to the trade of arms and diamonds. However, he stated that his delegation would have preferred the inclusion in the draft resolution of language regarding exploring the lawful seizure of the rough diamonds in question as well as any collateral assets used in the transport of such goods and would also express support for a call on States to make dealing in illegal rough diamonds a criminal offence. He added that, while he supported the draft resolution, he wanted to reiterate that any further steps or

³⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³⁶ S/2000/225 (Gabon), S/2000/228 (Belgium), S/2000/230 (Portugal), S/2000/240, 267 and 315 (Bulgaria), S/2000/249 (Burkina Faso), S/2000/252 (Uganda), S/2000/256 and 326 (Togo) and S/2000/283 (Rwanda).

³⁷ S/PV.4129, pp. 2-3.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

measures to be meted out to sanctions-busters should be considered very carefully and should be weighed against the seriousness of an alleged breach and that the Council should act only when it had conclusive evidence of breaches.⁴²

The representative of Jamaica stressed that those who aided and abetted UNITA in violating sanctions were equally culpable for the humanitarian tragedy in Angola.⁴³

The representative of Ukraine stressed that a differentiation could be made between groups of countries bearing special responsibility for specific areas, and that the Council should attempt to make very distinct recommendations to those States.⁴⁴

The representative of Canada observed that, while the Panel's work underscored the complexity of imposing and enforcing targeted sanctions, if successful, the measures could serve as a template for focused actions against belligerents in other conflicts. Additionally, he mentioned how the Panel's efforts had highlighted the reality and the impact of the new war economies, since "in a growing number of conflict situations, economic agendas coexist with political and military goals in the perpetuation of violence and the victimization of people"; the large and growing importance of non-State actors in conflicts; and the reality that, while the Council's decisions reflected the will of the international community, their implementation depended on the action of individual members.⁴⁵

The representative of Angola stated that it found it difficult to understand the reason why, despite the evidence that the sanctions were being violated, the United Nations had only recently decided to investigate the extent of these violations and identify the main perpetrators. Regarding the report, he considered that the overwhelming support it had received from the international community had dispelled any doubt as to its objectivity and transparency. Finally, he stressed that the action of the Council should include prohibition of the use of the territory of any State to carry out political activities or propaganda campaigns and the bringing to justice of all individuals or

companies whose practices were in conflict with Security Council resolutions on Angola.⁴⁶

The representative of Burkina Faso reiterated the repudiation and rejection by his Government to the conclusions of the report that had named Burkina Faso and its President. However, he provided information on the measures taken by his Government in order to follow up on the implementation of the sanctions.⁴⁷

The representative of Belgium recalled the numerous measures taken by his Government in order to ensure the application of the sanctions, particularly in the area of diamonds trade, which, he regretted, had not been mentioned in the report.⁴⁸

The representative of Bulgaria reiterated the serious doubts that his Government and other delegations had raised about the working methods and credibility of sources used by the Panel, as well as its objectivity and ability to substantiate its findings by concrete evidence. In spite of this, he claimed that his Government had given serious consideration to the Panel's report. He also pointed out the lessons learned from the Panel's report, which should be taken into account in the activities of the new monitoring mechanism: its work should combine transparency with confidentiality, using only trustworthy and verified information from reliable sources; it should pursue its mandate in close cooperation and consultation with the Governments concerned; and the established procedure should be strictly observed so as not to allow a "linkage" to the media.⁴⁹

The representative of Gabon regretted some actions from the Panel of Experts who, according to the speaker, had failed to provide evidence on its accusations against the Gabon, had not replied to its communication, and had not even visited the country.⁵⁰

The representative of Togo decried the fact that the report had been released first to the media, "the frivolous and entirely unprofessional method followed by the Experts, as well as the lack of consistency of the allegations raised against Togo". He pointed out that his delegation hoped that the observations and comments made during the examination of the report

⁴² Ibid., pp. 10-11.

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 12-13.

⁴⁴ S/PV.4129 (Resumption 1), pp. 3-4.

⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 4-6.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 6.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 7.

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 9-11.

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 11-12.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 16.

would be taken into consideration, particularly those regarding the working methods followed by the Panel of Experts. He also underscored the steps taken by its Government in order to follow up and monitor the implementation of the sanctions against UNITA.⁵¹

The representative of Zimbabwe stressed that the report correctly identified greed, and not grievance, as the rationale for the declared war of UNITA; “furthermore, in the process of establishing the symbiotic nature of the relations of UNITA with Rwanda and Uganda and their surrogates in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the report also situates the pursuit of economic goals by UNITA, Rwanda, Uganda, the Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie and the Mouvement de libération du Congo as the motivation for what we all along regarded as being senseless civil war”. He added that, as long as Rwanda continued to occupy Congolese territory, UNITA would have a lifeline, since that territory provided the conduit for its arms and diamonds trade.⁵²

The representative of Rwanda reiterated his comments about the report and claimed that the allegations were false. He pointed out the investigations made by his Government, and expressed that his delegation had no problem with the establishment of a new team of experts, even though he wished to see a team that was more independent, more representative and professionally unquestionable.⁵³

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁵⁴ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1295 (2000), by which the Council, inter alia:

Requested the Secretary-General to establish a monitoring mechanism composed of up to five experts, for a period of six months from its effective entry into operation, to collect additional relevant information and investigate relevant leads relating to any allegations of violations of the measures contained in resolutions 864 (1993), 1127 (1997) and 1173 (1998);

Further undertook to consider, by 18 November 2000, the application of additional measures against UNITA under Article 41 of the Charter of the United Nations;

Encouraged all States to exercise all due diligence, in order to prevent the diversion or trans-shipment of weapons to

unauthorized end-users or unauthorized destinations where such diversion or trans-shipment risked resulting in the violation of the measures contained in resolution 864 (1993);

Encouraged the convening of a conference of experts to devise a regime for curbing the illegal supply of petroleum and petroleum products into UNITA-controlled areas;

Called upon the Government of Angola to implement additional internal controls and inspection procedures with respect to the distribution of petroleum and petroleum products for the purpose of enhancing the effectiveness of the measures contained in resolution 864 (1993);

Called upon States that have issued passports to UNITA officials and adult members of their families designated by the Committee pursuant to resolution 1127 (1997) to cancel those passports in conformity with paragraph 4 (b) of that resolution and to report to the Committee on the status of their efforts in this regard;

Further urged all States, including those geographically close to Angola, to take immediate steps to enforce, strengthen or enact legislation making it a criminal offence under domestic law for their nationals or other individuals operating on their territory to violate the measures imposed by the Council against UNITA.

Deliberations of 27 July 2000 (4178th meeting)

At its 4178th meeting, on 27 July 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Office in Angola dated 12 July 2000.⁵⁵ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that, in relation to the political developments, the absence of dialogue had continued to create an unstable political and military situation, despite the efforts of the Government to consolidate its authority throughout the country. UNITA had continued its guerrilla activities, while there had been an influx of refugees into neighbouring countries. Additionally, the conflict had increased tensions between Angola and Zambia. Efforts to promote a dialogue for peace continued, mainly by the Angolan opposition political parties, the Chairman of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the Angolan Church. Regarding the military situation, he said that the Government forces had continued to be effective in further reducing the conventional war capacity of UNITA, and the observance of human rights by the police had improved, even though the hostilities had had a negative impact on law and order throughout the

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 19-21.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

⁵⁴ S/2000/323.

⁵⁵ S/2000/678, submitted pursuant to para. 3 of resolution 1294 (2000).

country. On the subject of human rights, he highlighted that although the overall situation remained grave, there were indications that the Government was prepared to recognize the existence of abuses and to develop regular procedures to redress them with the support of the international community and Angolan civil society. Likewise, the humanitarian situation remained precarious, particularly in relation to food distribution and the situation of the displaced population, with important initiatives being carried out by the World Food Programme. In the same line, the socio-economic situation had been affected by the conflict, and thus the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank, inter alia, had carried out work in order to assist the Government in poverty reduction strategies and initiative to tackle the macroeconomic instability.

Statements were made by the members of the Council, including the United States on behalf of the troika of observer States of the Angolan peace process, Portugal, the United States and the Russian Federation;⁵⁶ and France on behalf of the European Union,⁵⁷ as well as the representatives of Angola, Brazil, Japan, Lesotho, Mozambique and Norway.⁵⁸ The Council also heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa.

In his statement, the Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa referred to the main concerns in Angola, mainly the situation of refugees, displaced persons and the problem of landmines. On the economic aspect, he stressed that, even though the Government had made commendable efforts to improve its management and performance, these efforts tended to be offset by the continuation of hostilities. Finally, with respect to democratization, he mentioned the announcement made by the Government regarding its intention to hold national elections. He stated that, in the effort to make Angola a prosperous country again, it was necessary to help bring the war to an end,

for which it had to be acknowledged that military force in itself was not sufficient. Finally, he held that the Secretary-General, the Secretariat, United Nations agencies and the international community should redouble their efforts, first to tighten the sanctions against UNITA; second, to complement those of the Government of Angola to respond more fully to the needs of the large percentage of Angolans; and third, to support civil society, the Government and all those who were promoting a political settlement of the conflict in Angola.⁵⁹

Most representatives agreed that the primary responsibility for the humanitarian situation in Angola lay with UNITA and noted the efforts of the Government to consolidate its authority throughout the territory. They observed that there were signs that the efforts of the international community to put pressure on UNITA were beginning to have the desired effect. However, they expressed concerns over the political, security, economic and humanitarian situation in Angola, which risked spilling over into neighbouring countries. They emphasized that military force was not the way forward, but that only a political solution under the Lusaka Protocol could contribute to the restoration of lasting peace and security in Angola; and that the consistent implementation and enhancement of the effectiveness of the sanctions against UNITA was an important element of international efforts to end the conflict in Angola. A number of representatives stressed that the responsibility for the breakdown in the Lusaka Protocol rested primarily with UNITA leader Jonas Savimbi.

The representative of Angola stated that the measures taken by his Government to create a climate of relative tranquillity in a large proportion of the country. However, a definitive end had not yet been put to the war, as small pockets of UNITA resistance still existed to carry out terrorist activities. He stressed that the lasting solution to Angola's problem still lay in the complete implementation of the Lusaka Protocol. He also recalled the efforts of his Government, together with several United Nations agencies and programmes, to address the issues of poverty, displaced population, access and security, as well as humanitarian assistance and services.⁶⁰

⁵⁶ The representatives of Ukraine and the Russian Federation aligned themselves with the statement of the troika of observer States of the Angolan peace process.

⁵⁷ The representatives of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom aligned themselves with the statement of the European Union, as did Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey.

⁵⁸ Angola was represented by its Minister for Social Affairs.

⁵⁹ S/PV.4178, pp. 2-5.

⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 5-7.

The representative of the United States stressed that it was necessary to establish dialogue between all sectors of society in Angola under the principles of the Lusaka Protocol, and Mr. Savimbi's participation could only be considered after he had taken irreversible steps to implement the Protocol.⁶¹

**Decision of 23 January 2001 (4263rd meeting):
resolution 1336 (2001)**

At its 4263rd meeting, on 23 January 2001, the Council included in its agenda a note by the President of the Security Council.⁶² In his note, the President of the Security Council enclosed a letter dated 21 December 2000 from the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993), transmitting the final report of the Monitoring Mechanism on Sanctions against UNITA established by resolution 1295 (2000).

In its report, the mechanism informed the Council about the issues related to the import and export of military equipment and arms; petroleum and petroleum products; UNITA representation and travel abroad; the role of transportation; and diamond trading and financial assets. It provided updates on what actions had been taken by a number of countries in improving enforcement of the sanctions, as well as what areas had not seen improvement.

At the meeting, the President (Singapore) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁶³ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1336 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of the monitoring mechanism as set out in resolution 1295 (2000) for a period of three months;

Requested the Secretary-General, upon adoption of this resolution and acting in consultation with the Committee, to reappoint up to five of the experts appointed by him pursuant to resolution 1295 (2000) to serve on the monitoring mechanism, and further requested the Secretary-General to make the necessary financial arrangements to support the work of the monitoring mechanism.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁶² S/2000/1225 and Corr.1 and 2.

⁶³ S/2001/69.

**Deliberations of 22 February 2001
(4283rd meeting)**

At its 4283rd meeting, on 22 February 2001, the Council again included in its agenda the note by the President of the Security Council transmitting the report of the Monitoring Mechanism.⁶⁴ Statements were made by most members of the Council, including Portugal on behalf of the troika of observer States and Sweden on behalf of the European Union,⁶⁵ as well as the representatives of Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Mozambique, Namibia, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo and Zimbabwe. The Council also heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993).

In his briefing, the Chairman remarked that the Mechanism had employed only the strictest evidentiary standards in its investigations, besides allowing the right to reply to all those against whom allegations concerning sanctions violations had been made. He explained that the work of the Mechanism had focused on four main areas, mainly arms and military equipment; representation, travel and residence outside Angola; the role of transport in the violation of the sanctions; and diamond trading and financial assets. Based on this, the Mechanism had made a series of recommendations. One important aspect of the work of the Mechanism was that, according to the Chairman, there was clear evidence of the involvement of the same people, as well as the same organizations and corporations, in at least two of the major conflicts in Africa. He also pointed out that the sanctions regime, in spite of its problems, was working, but he expressed concern over the fact that the United Nations lacked, at that moment, the necessary permanent capacity for following up the findings of the reports of the Panel of Experts and the Monitoring Mechanism.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ S/2000/1225 and Corr.1 and 2.

⁶⁵ The representatives of the Russian Federation and the United States aligned themselves with the statement of the troika. The representatives of France, Ireland, Romania and the United Kingdom aligned themselves with the statement of the European Union, as did Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey. The representative of Ireland did not make a statement.

⁶⁶ S/PV.4283, pp. 3-4.

Most representatives welcomed the report, particularly its methodology, its respect to the right of response, and its attempt to describe problems linked to organized crime networks comprehensively and in all their complexity. They stressed the need for continued sanctions and for improved implementation of the sanctions regime. Some of them highlighted the fact that the actors violating the sanctions were, to a large extent, the same as in the conflict of Sierra Leone, which showed that the situations could not be seen in isolation. They also welcomed the recommendations, specifically the establishment of a system for the certification of diamonds from Angola and the concept of a global certification scheme for rough diamonds; the development of a continuous system of sanctions monitoring; the updating of the list of UNITA leaders and their family members to whom States should refuse entry in their territory; the establishment of effective controls by arms-exporting countries on their exports to conflict areas; and that national standards should be developed to impose sanctions on aircraft operators and pilots linked to the illicit transport of arms.

The representative of France, echoed by the representative of Colombia, stressed that imposing secondary sanctions against countries that were believed to have violated sanctions was the wrong response to a genuine problem, stressing that rather than doling out punishment, States, regional organizations and other actors involved should be assisted in order to implement the measures and to ensure compliance. He added that sanctions, in order to remain relevant and credible and retain their political force, should be used in a limited manner, for cases where there was a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace or an act of aggression. Finally, he put forward two proposals: to launch a plan to create a permanent mechanism for monitoring sanctions and illicit traffic in valuable raw materials involved in conflicts: and to ask States to undertake inquiries, as well as administrative and judicial measures, against the activities of “merchants of war”.⁶⁷

The representative of Colombia commented that the suggestion made by the Mechanism regarding the possibility of imposing sanctions on Governments that violated the sanctions would run the risk of proliferating such measures, operating selectively and

politicizing the sanctions regime. On the technical knowledge required to improve the monitoring of sanctions against UNITA and, more specifically, the need to commission an investigation of the financial assets of UNITA, he expressed concern over the fact that such a study would run the risk of leading the Council to gradually depend on outside bodies to monitor the sanctions regime; and that it might reduce State’s responsibility to carry out its own financial investigations and apply penal or administrative sanctions.⁶⁸

The representative of Mali considered that secondary sanctions against States that violated measures adopted against UNITA should be imposed once other recourses and means had been exhausted.⁶⁹ The representative of Norway, on the topic of secondary sanctions, maintained that caution would be exerted since these could only be imposed pursuant to Chapter VII on the grounds that non-compliance with the sanctions regime constituted a threat to international peace and security.⁷⁰

The representative of Mozambique particularly welcomed the Mechanism’s recommendation by which the Security Council should consider applying sanctions against Governments violating the sanctions.⁷¹ The representatives of Mauritius and Argentina commented that the Council should go beyond the “naming and shaming” system to impose appropriate sanctions or other specific measures against those found guilty of complicity in sanctions-busting.⁷²

The representative of Canada highlighted the quality of the work “despite the often frustrating disregard for their work by the apparently paralyzed United Nations bureaucracy”, and stressed that the findings of the Monitoring Mechanism were entirely consistent with of the report of the Panel of Experts on Angola. The purpose of sanctions enforcement monitoring was not to punish, he reminded, but rather to ensure that the sanctions were being applied, that behaviour was being changed and that loopholes were being closed; in that respect it was of particular concern that one Member State was cited by both

⁶⁸ Ibid., pp. 10-12.

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 14.

⁷⁰ Ibid., pp. 14-15.

⁷¹ Ibid., pp. 38 and 39.

⁷² Ibid., pp. 19-20 (Mauritius); and p. 31 (Argentina).

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 6.

monitoring bodies, as well as by the Panel of Experts on Sierra Leone. He mention that, in this context, the imposition of secondary sanctions was an entirely appropriate option to consider, even though there were also other options, like requiring States deemed to be in violations of the sanctions to report regularly to the Council on steps taken to comply with them.⁷³

The representative of Burkina Faso emphasized the close cooperation his country had provided to the Panel of Experts and the concrete measures taken by his Government. However, he stressed that the suggestion that certain UNITA officials were still in Burkina Faso, remained “in the realm of hypothesis”. He then recalled other measures by his Government to comply with the sanctions against UNITA, and stated that instead of continuing to accuse certain Member States, the Security Council should organize better monitoring of the traffic of diamonds, arms and related materials. Thus, he argued that even though he was not against extending the mandate of the Monitoring Mechanism, other investigations were pointless as long as a permanent international mechanism that could guarantee continuous monitoring for follow-up of sanctions was not set up.⁷⁴

The representative of Togo underlined the actions taken by his Government and questioned some aspects of the report related to Togo, mainly in the points of the representation abroad of UNITA and diamond trade. He emphasized that it was through substantive dialogue and seeking ongoing cooperation with all States that the United Nations would be able to achieve effective implementation of the sanctions imposed by the Council.⁷⁵

The representative of Rwanda commented on the references to Rwanda in the report, asserting that there was only one tangible and verifiable fact, and the rest were partially or fully speculative. He added some specific critiques, such as the reference to the use of the territory of Angola to withdraw troops which, he explained, had been done with the permission of the authorities of Angola. In spite of this, he accepted, supported and endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of the report, and reaffirmed the commitment of Rwanda vis-à-vis the implementation of the sanctions. In particular, he stated that his

Government had taken the decision not to cooperate with anyone believed or found to be a friend of UNITA.⁷⁶

The representative of Angola remarked that sanctions against UNITA had proved to be a fundamental tool to persuade the members of that organization to abandon war, while his Government continued on the path of political and economic reform. He also expressed concern over the involvement of the networks of organized crime operating in direct support of rebels in Angola, stressing that the sanctions should be strengthened and measures against countries that facilitated propaganda in favour of UNITA should be considered. Specifically, he asserted that the Council should contemplate secondary measures against countries or entities that continued to violate the sanctions. He referred to the statement given by the representative of Rwanda, and denied that it was true that there had been any consultation between their two Governments at the time of the transit of the troops of Rwanda through the territory of Angola.⁷⁷

**Decision of 19 April 2001 (4311th meeting):
resolution 1348 (2001)**

At its 4311th meeting, on 19 April 2001, the Council included in its agenda a note by the President of the Security Council, transmitting an addendum to the final report of the Monitoring Mechanism on Sanctions against UNITA.⁷⁸

In the addendum to the final report, the Mechanism informed Council members that the situation along the border of Angola with Namibia and Zambia remained militarized and unstable; thus, those countries had reached a tripartite agreement aimed at preventing the illegal circulation of people and goods, as well as illegal diamonds, ivory and arms. The Government of Angola had reported that there had been a positive response to the amnesty law of 2000, with many UNITA combatants reportedly taking advantage of the offer. However, the Mechanism noted that UNITA very probably still had vast quantities of arms hidden in the ground all over Angola, enough for it to pursue guerrilla warfare for a long time, a

⁷³ Ibid., pp. 23-26.

⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 22-23.

⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 32-34.

⁷⁶ Ibid., pp. 42-43.

⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 21, 22 and 43.

⁷⁸ S/2001/363; the addendum was submitted in accordance with resolution 1336 (2001).

situation that indicated the need to strengthen the implementation of the sanctions. The report then provided updates on the main issues of arms brokering companies, UNITA representation and travel abroad, the diamond trade and other issues related to sanctions. Regarding the issue of arms brokering companies, the mechanism concluded that the *modus operandi* used by those companies had introduced an element of diversion in order to make it difficult to establish a direct link between suppliers and UNITA. Therefore, it considered that there was an urgent need to tighten the regulations governing the activities and operations of arms-brokering companies, as well as to establish an international register of the dubious companies involved in sanctions-busting. On the subject of diamond trading, the mechanism pointed out that illicit diamonds from Angola were reaching diamond markets regardless of the certificate of origin system, making the tracing of UNITA smuggling more problematic, although some measures had been taken. Many countries had not passed national laws enacting the implementation of resolution 1173 (1998), while others claimed that existing national laws were sufficient for this purpose. Nevertheless, the Mechanism considered that this was patently not the case, although the problem might be more related to local controls than to the laws themselves. Furthermore, for those countries which both enacted laws and strengthened diamond-trading controls, illicit diamonds were still reaching the market due to the clear and major weaknesses in systems for controlling diamond trading. In spite of these difficulties, the Mechanism maintained that the sanctions had driven UNITA diamond trading deeper underground, had made UNITA seek new routes for diamond trading, and had brought about reform of official Angolan diamond trading structures, producing a novel approach to resolving problems on the ground, which should be considered as an option for application in other African diamond mining countries. Finally, the mechanism stated that the United Nations sanctions had provided the impetus for worldwide controls on diamonds — the certificate of origin scheme.

At the same meeting, the representative of Ireland made a statement, during which he read out revisions to the text of the draft resolution before the Council.⁷⁹

⁷⁹ S/PV.4311, p. 2.

The President (United Kingdom) drew the attention of the Council to the draft resolution;⁸⁰ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1348 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of the monitoring mechanism for a further period of six months, ending on 19 October 2001;

Requested the monitoring mechanism to report periodically to the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993), and to provide a supplementary report by 19 October 2001;

Requested the Secretary-General, upon adoption of the resolution and acting in consultation with the Committee, to appoint up to five experts to serve on the monitoring mechanism, and to make the necessary financial arrangements to support the work of the monitoring mechanism;

Requested the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) to submit the supplementary report to the Council by 19 October 2001.

Decision of 20 September 2001 (4377th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4377th meeting,⁸¹ on 20 September 2001, the President (France) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁸² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Stated that it remained concerned at the continuing conflict in Angola;

Condemned in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks by UNITA forces on the civilian population of Angola;

Stated that it was determined to keep sanctions in place until it was convinced that the conditions set out in its relevant resolutions were met;

Reiterated its call upon all States to implement strictly the sanctions regime against UNITA and urged them to strengthen, where appropriate, their internal legislation related to application of sanctions measures imposed by the Council;

Supported the intention of the Government of Angola to hold elections as a part of the ongoing democratization process in Angola in conformity with the universally accepted democratic principles and standards;

Stressed the need to create the necessary conditions for elections to be free and fair;

⁸⁰ S/2001/379; presidential text proposed by Ireland.

⁸¹ At its 4376th meeting, held in private on 20 September 2001, the Council held a constructive discussion on the item entitled "The situation in Angola", with the participation of the Minister of the Interior of Angola.

⁸² S/PRST/2001/24.

Expressed its serious concern about the plight of the Angolan population, particularly the internally displaced persons and, in order to alleviate its suffering, called again upon all parties concerned to facilitate the delivery of emergency relief assistance.

**Decision of 19 October 2001 (4393rd meeting):
resolution 1374 (2001)**

At its 4393rd meeting, on 19 October 2001, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 12 October 2001 from the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁸³ transmitting the supplementary report of the Monitoring Mechanism on Sanctions against UNITA, in which the Mechanism, *inter alia*, referred to the military actions undertaken by UNITA, stating that the organization had increased its terrorist attacks on innocent civilians, even though deliveries of arms and ammunition had drastically decreased. Notwithstanding this achievement, cross-border supplies still reached UNITA from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and there were repeated allegations that that country remained a major transit country for UNITA diamonds. Regarding the issue of UNITA diamonds, the Mechanism established that resolution 1173 (1998) continued to be violated. It expressed concern over the fact that, to that date, not a single parcel of illicit gems from Angola had been intercepted anywhere, even though the primary responsibility for intercepting diamonds mined in defiance of the embargo lied with States. The Mechanism suggested general measures to improve the effectiveness of the sanctions, like the establishment of a permanent capability of the Security Council to ensure ongoing monitoring of targeted sanctions and illicit trafficking in high-value commodities in armed conflicts.

At the meeting, the President (Ireland) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁸⁴ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1374 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of the monitoring mechanism for a further period of six months, ending on 19 April 2002;

Requested the monitoring mechanism to report periodically to the Committee established pursuant to resolution

⁸³ S/2001/966; the report was submitted in accordance with para. 6 of resolution 1348 (2001).

⁸⁴ S/2001/985.

864 (1993), and to provide an additional report by 19 April 2002;

Requested the Secretary-General to appoint four experts to serve on the monitoring mechanism and to make the necessary financial arrangements to support the work of the monitoring mechanism;

Requested the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) to submit the additional report to the Council by 19 April 2002.

**Deliberations of 15 November 2001
(4418th meeting)**

At the 4418th meeting, on 15 November 2001, statements were made by most members of the Council, including the Russian Federation on behalf of the troika of observer States and Belgium on behalf of the European Union,⁸⁵ as well as the representatives of Angola, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Cape Verde, Malawi, Namibia and Zimbabwe. The Council also heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser of the Secretary-General on Africa.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa updated the Council on the situation, noting that continued guerrilla attacks by UNITA and counteroffensives by Government troops continued to aggravate the already dire humanitarian situation in Angola. On the status of the peace process, he stated that the Government of Angola had recently reaffirmed its commitment to the Lusaka Protocol, while UNITA requested the Church to continue its search for peace and national reconciliation, and reiterated its interpretation of the Lusaka Protocol, even though he underlined that many of the specific proposals emanating from the communications of UNITA appeared to lie outside the framework of that Protocol. He also called attention to the situation along the Angola-Zambia border area, which remained unstable.⁸⁶

Most representatives held UNITA and Jonas Savimbi primarily responsible for the failure to implement the Lusaka Protocol and the continued fighting in Angola; reaffirmed that the Lusaka Protocol

⁸⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement. The representative of the United States did not make a statement. Angola was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

⁸⁶ S/PV.4418, pp. 2-3.

remained the only viable basis for a lasting peaceful political settlement of the conflict; and considered that there was no military solution to the conflict. Likewise, most representatives supported the measures taken by the Government of Angola regarding elections, an amnesty law, the creation of a peace fund, and the efforts of the civil society and the churches to alleviate humanitarian situation and facilitate national reconciliation. They also stated that the sanctions regime should be maintained, that efforts should be made to improve its effectiveness, and the recommendations made in the Monitoring Mechanism report should be urgently considered by the Council.

The representative of Angola informed Council members of the recent efforts made by his Government to restore peace and stability to Angola through, inter alia, engaging in dialogue with civil society and churches, as well as forceful measures to disarm UNITA and extend Government authority throughout Angola. He also noted the effectiveness of sanctions, but regretted that some Member States were not fully complying with the sanctions resolutions, highlighting that the obligations resulting from the Security Council resolutions prevailed over any other obligation to which the Member States might be subject by virtue of any treaty or international agreement.⁸⁷

The representative of Ireland suggested that the Government of Angola should remain open to the possibility that UNITA could change course, in spite of which he maintained that the obligation and responsibility to take a new course lay entirely in the hands of UNITA.⁸⁸ However, the representative of Ukraine underlined that the resumption of dialogue with UNITA should not mean a renegotiation of the Lusaka Protocol.⁸⁹

The representative of Singapore stressed that it was necessary to look at how they could combine the pressure of sanctions with other approaches to bring about national reconciliation and peace in Angola. He considered that the most important reconciliation that had to take place was that between the two major antagonists, who had not engaged in direct dialogue.⁹⁰

The representative of Malawi said that he shared the growing disillusionment with the apparent

inadequacy so far of any measures by the Security Council to rein in UNITA. He stated that UNITA's attacks against unarmed civilian population were also proof that the sanctions regime against UNITA at that time was seriously ineffectual. There was still a need, he added, for an urgent shift towards criminalization of the atrocities of UNITA, within the context of the existing international legal regime for crimes against humanity.⁹¹ Similarly, the representative of Mauritius deemed that it was time for the Council to declare the head of UNITA, Mr. Savimbi, a war criminal. He also stated that he did not share the view that resolution 1127 (1997) was incompatible with some regional treaties and called on the concerned countries to take the necessary steps to ensure its effective implementation.⁹²

The representatives of Namibia and Zimbabwe expressed support for a further strengthening of sanctions, particularly through measures in the telecommunications area, since UNITA conducted its propaganda using electronic technology.⁹³ The representative of Canada stated that his country was encouraged by the fact that more Member States were providing assistance to the Mechanism. In particular, he encouraged the States that hosted bank accounts, residential property and business of the high authorities of UNITA to cooperate with the Mechanism and freeze their assets.⁹⁴

Decision of 15 November 2001 (4419th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4419th meeting, on 15 November 2001, the President (Jamaica) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁹⁵ by which the Council, inter alia:

Remained deeply concerned about the ongoing conflict in Angola;

Held Mr. Jonas Savimbi and the armed faction of UNITA primarily responsible for the failure to implement the Lusaka Protocol;

Reaffirmed that the Lusaka Protocol remained the only viable basis for a political settlement of the conflict in Angola; reiterated its call on Member States to comply fully with the implementation of the sanctions regime against UNITA;

⁸⁷ Ibid., pp. 4-5.

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 6.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 9.

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 19.

⁹¹ Ibid., p. 21.

⁹² Ibid., p. 12.

⁹³ Ibid., pp. 22-24 (Namibia); and pp. 28-30 (Zimbabwe).

⁹⁴ Ibid., pp. 27-28.

⁹⁵ S/PRST/2001/36.

Supported the Government of Angola in its efforts to implement the Lusaka Protocol including through the Fund for Peace and National Reconciliation;

Supported the intention of the Government to hold free and fair elections when appropriate conditions were in place.

**Deliberations of 21 December 2001
(4444th meeting)**

At its 4444th meeting, on 21 December 2001, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa, following which statements were made by all members of the Council.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa informed the Council on his visit to Angola where he met with, inter alia, the Government, political parties, and national and international non-governmental organizations, on ways to accelerate the peace process in Angola within the framework of the Lusaka Protocol, as well as to improve the humanitarian situation. He asserted that progress was being made on all fronts, and reiterated that following the fundamentals of United Nations policy in Angola, there could be no military solution to the conflict. He underlined that sanctions against UNITA were an important instrument for bringing pressure on them to embrace the political process. He also reiterated that support for the participation of the civil society in the peace process was essential and that the Government should be encouraged to implement programmes of political and economic reforms. He commented, in particular, on the progress towards the national elections and the humanitarian situation. Regarding the peace process, he informed the Council that there was a convergence of opinion among the people consulted that the United Nations should play a more proactive role in the peace process. He also noted the belief of the Government that the military capacity of UNITA had been almost totally destroyed, even though it was still capable of conducting attacks of terror. In the meantime, UNITA parliamentarians reiterated the organization's commitment to peace within the Lusaka Protocol, which, they believed, should be implemented with the necessary adjustments in accordance with the 12-point peace plan that UNITA had communicated to the United Nations. They had also emphasized that the final decision in this matter still lay with UNITA leadership headed by Mr. Savimbi. Finally, on the topic of the collection and destruction of weapons, he reported to the Council that

the Government had indicated that the United Nations should assume responsibility for this task, but he noted that this would require an adjustment to the mandate and capacity of the United Nations Office in Angola.⁹⁶

Most representatives expressed satisfaction over the strengthening of relations between the United Nations and the Government of Angola, and the invitation to the United Nations to become more involved in the peace process, as well as the growing participation of the civil society in the peace process and the efforts of the Government in relation to the humanitarian assistance of the population. However, on the last issue, most of the representatives expressed that the overall humanitarian situation was still a concern. Speakers also commented that the peace process could not progress unless there was real dialogue between the parties, under the Lusaka Protocol and United Nations resolutions.

The representative of the United States maintained that UNITA lacked the political will to begin a serious political dialogue. Until that will was shown, the Council should focus on the steps that the United Nations could take to improve the lives of the people in Angola.⁹⁷

**Deliberations of 13 February 2002
(4472nd meeting)**

At the 4472nd meeting, on 13 February 2002, most members of the Council made statements, as did the representative of Angola and the representative of Portugal on behalf of the troika of observer States of the Angolan peace process. The Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, and the Humanitarian Coordinator for Angola.⁹⁸

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General gave the Council an account of the humanitarian situation in Angola which, he said, had its roots in the war and remained among the worst in the world in relation, inter alia, to the situation of children and displaced population. Moreover, UNITA had continued activities that destabilized large parts of the countryside and

⁹⁶ S/PV.4444, pp. 2-5.

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 15.

⁹⁸ The representatives of China, the Russian Federation and the United States did not make statements. Angola was represented by its Vice-Minister for External Relations.

disrupted normal economic and social activities. He explained that humanitarian coverage was limited by a number of factors, including insecurity, mine infestation, poor infrastructure, lack of capacity, and lack of funding. However, he noted, the Government of Angola had taken several steps to increase its involvement in the provision of humanitarian assistance; was the leading country in incorporating the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement; and had increased its cooperation with the humanitarian community. Finally, he remarked that the real solution to the humanitarian crisis in Angola was the end of the war.⁹⁹

Most representatives expressed concern over the humanitarian situation in Angola, particularly since the situation had deteriorated during 2001. They emphasized that the responsibility for this rested with UNITA, and that the situation required the concentrated attention of both the international community and the Government of Angola. However, they acknowledged the important efforts carried out by the Government.

The representative of Angola recognized the seriousness of the humanitarian situation in the country, and outlined the points the Government believed were essential for the achievement of peace, namely the unilateral and unconditional cessation of hostilities by UNITA and its complete disarmament; the resolution of the internal problems of UNITA by the group itself; the complete implementation of the Lusaka Protocol and the holding of general elections. Noting that UNITA had failed to respond to the calls of the Government for a resolution to the conflict by means of dialogue, he stressed that the Government had been forced to implement its peace agenda, which provided for political, economic, social and military actions. Turning to the humanitarian situation in the country, he focused the attention of the Council on the major constraints facing the Government and its partners, while also outlining the measures taken by the Government to improve the quality and quantity of humanitarian assistance throughout the country.¹⁰⁰

The representative of Norway stressed that it was necessary that the Government elaborated an agreed

monitoring mechanism for the implementation of priority actions set out by the Government.¹⁰¹

The representative of Colombia pointed out that the tools available to the Security Council to respond to the humanitarian situation in Angola (in the medium and long term) were to focus attention on the situation with urgency; to continue supporting the initiatives of the Secretary-General and the Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa aimed at facilitating a solution to the armed conflict; and to continue supporting the international sanctions regime against UNITA until its fighting capability had been curbed and eliminated.¹⁰²

The representative of Portugal stated that the Government of Angola could do more to help its own citizens who were displaced, and encouraged it to take a more active stance in the provision of direct assistance and to fully cooperate in the efforts of the international community to alleviate the suffering of those who were not receiving the necessary assistance.¹⁰³

**Decision of 28 March 2002 (4499th meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4499th meeting, on 28 March 2002, the President (Norway) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁰⁴ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Urged UNITA to recognize the historic nature of this opportunity to end the conflict with dignity, to give a clear, positive response to the Government's offer of peace, to implement fully the Lusaka Protocol, including by disavowing the use of arms and demilitarizing completely, and to re-enter political life to pursue its ideals as an important contributor to the process of national reconciliation towards a fully democratic Angola;

Recognized the positive initiatives of the Government of Angola in this process;

Also recognized the vital role to be played by a peaceful UNITA and stressed the importance of the role of other political parties and civil society;

Called on the Government of Angola to ensure further the transparency and credibility of the peace process;

Stressed the active role that the United Nations was expected to play in the implementation of the Lusaka Protocol;

⁹⁹ S/PV.4472, pp. 2-4.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹⁰⁴ S/PRST/2002/7.

Declared its support for the full implementation of the Lusaka Protocol, and its willingness to work with all parties in this endeavour, and stressed the importance of the re-commencement of the Joint Commission as soon as UNITA was ready to name its members;

Underlined that the legitimacy of the peace process depended upon a genuine role for, and full participation of, political parties and civil society without interference.

**Decision of 18 April 2002 (4514th meeting):
resolution 1404 (2002)**

At the 4514th meeting, on 18 April 2002, the President (Russian Federation) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁰⁵ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1404 (2002), by which the Council, inter alia:

Decided to extend the mandate of the monitoring mechanism for a further period of six months, ending on 19 October 2002;

Requested the monitoring mechanism to provide the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) within 30 days of the adoption of the resolution with a detailed action plan for its future work, in particular, but not exclusively, on the financial measures and on the measures concerning the trade in diamonds and the trade in arms against UNITA;

Requested the monitoring mechanism to report periodically to the Committee and to provide a further additional report to the Committee by 15 October 2002;

Requested the Secretary-General, upon adoption of the resolution and acting in consultation with the Committee, to appoint four experts to serve on the monitoring mechanism, and further requested the Secretary-General to make the necessary financial arrangements to support the work of the monitoring mechanism;

Requested the Chairman of the Committee to submit the additional report to the Council by 19 October 2002;

Decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

Deliberations of 23 April 2002 (4517th meeting)

At its 4517th meeting, on 23 April 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser for Special Assignments in Africa and a statement made by the representative of Angola.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General referred to meetings he had in Luanda with, inter alia, members of the Government of Angola, including the

President, as well as political parties and civil society. He informed the members of the Council about the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding in Luanda, which formally brought a halt to the hostilities in Angola: it detailed the responsibilities of the armed forces of Angola and those of UNITA for the observation of a ceasefire, for quartering UNITA soldiers and their families, and for the collection and destruction of weapons. In addition, it granted a blanket amnesty for all crimes committed during the conflict. He had pledged the support of the United Nations in the entire peace process, according to his statement, even though in signing the Memorandum of Understanding on behalf of the United Nations as witness, he had expressed a reservation concerning the non-recognition by the United Nations of any general amnesty that included genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. That had created some apprehension in UNITA, some people in the armed forces of Angola, and some segments of civil society who felt that the position might undermine the peace process by negating the provision of the amnesty law. Concerning the stability of the peace agreement, he asserted that the people with whom he had had consultations believed that the chances of returning to war in Angola were very negligible, given the military debility of UNITA; the effectiveness of United Nations sanctions, which had been recognized by the Secretary-General of UNITA; the war fatigue on both sides of the conflict and in the general population; the adherence of all UNITA regional military commanders to the Memorandum of Understanding; and the physical presence in Luanda of UNITA senior military officers. However, the irreversibility of the peace process, would depend on a number of elements, such as the adequate quartering of UNITA soldiers; the attention to the humanitarian needs of their families; the promotion of national reconciliation and national reconstruction; the emergence of UNITA as a united political party and as a credible interlocutor in the peace process and democratization in Angola. Regarding the role of the United Nations within the peace process, which was organized in two phases (the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding, and the Lusaka Protocol), the organization was expected to participate in the first one as observer, to provide technical assistance in the quartering areas, to assist the armed forces of Angola in managing these areas, and to provide humanitarian assistance to the families of UNITA military forces and to the internally displaced persons. The Government had agreed in principle that the mandate of the United Nations Office in Angola

¹⁰⁵ S/2002/437.

needed adjustment in order to allow it to support the peace plan. On the issue of sanctions, he declared that there was an apparent consensus within the country that, while the suspension of the travel ban on UNITA officials would be in order, it was premature at that point to talk about the lifting of other sanctions. The Government of Angola accepted in principle the lifting of the travel ban against UNITA officials, but had expressed the view that great caution was needed in implementing it and that, in this regard, a case-by-case approach was to be preferred.¹⁰⁶

The representative of Angola informed Council members that, at that moment, there had been no violations of the ceasefire. He elaborated on the different phases of the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding, the first of which comprised the quartering, disarmament, integration and demobilizations of UNITA combatants and their families. In phase two, the joint commissions to oversee the implementation of the Lusaka Protocol would be reinstated, enabling the process of national reconciliation and leading to national elections.¹⁰⁷

**Decision of 17 May 2002 (4536th meeting):
resolution 1412 (2002)**

At the 4536th meeting, on 17 May 2002, the President (Singapore) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 26 April 2002 from the representatives of Portugal, the Russian Federation and the United States transmitting a joint statement of the observer countries of the Angolan peace process.¹⁰⁸ By the statement, the troika praised the courage of all parties for reaching the ceasefire agreement, and welcomed the intention of the Government to provide conditions which would permit UNITA to resolve its problems, internally and freely.

At the same meeting the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁰⁹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1412 (2002), by which the Council, inter alia:

Decided that the measures imposed by paragraphs 4 (a) and 6 (b) of Council resolution 1127 (1997) were suspended for 90 days;

¹⁰⁶ S/PV.4517, pp. 2-5.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

¹⁰⁸ S/2002/535.

¹⁰⁹ S/2002/546, submitted by Portugal, the Russian Federation and the United States.

Decided that prior to the end of that period the Council would decide whether to extend the suspension of those measures, taking into account all available information on the continuing progress of national reconciliation in Angola.

Deliberations of 17 July 2002 (4575th meeting)

At its 4575th meeting, on 17 July 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator on the humanitarian situation in Angola. Most members of the Council, as well as the representative of Angola, made statements.¹¹⁰

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General stated that the Government of Angola, as well as the United Nations and its partners, had a unique opportunity to create a new partnership to address humanitarian needs, reconstruction and development issues. He also commented that the Government was working hard to make the agreement set out in the Memorandum of Understanding hold. He made a call to the humanitarian community which, would have to continue with massive lifesaving interventions for the short term because, even though there had been improvements in humanitarian access to many locations in the interior, the humanitarian situation in many parts of the country continued to be dire. In this respect, he also mentioned that there were a number of steps the Government could take on its own to facilitate the ongoing humanitarian activities, adding that improving coordination with the Government was a problem that needed to be addressed.¹¹¹

Most representatives commended the Government of Angola for having taken positive steps to meet the humanitarian needs of the country; however, they underlined that more had to be done, particularly in the issues of mine clearance and attention to the displaced population. The speakers emphasized that special support was needed from the international community.

The representative of Angola referred to the issue of burden sharing, which had been raised by Council members who had noted the large oil revenues that Angola had. He recalled that that the Government of Angola had increased the share of the budget allocated for spending on social programmes during the past two

¹¹⁰ The representatives of Guinea, the Russian Federation and Singapore did not make statements.

¹¹¹ S/PV.4575, pp. 2-5.

years, even though he acknowledged that that trend should be reinforced.¹¹²

**Decision of 15 August 2002 (4603rd meeting):
resolution 1432 (2002)**

At the 4603rd meeting,¹¹³ on 15 August 2002, the President (United States) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹¹⁴ it was then to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1432 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to suspend the measures imposed by paragraphs 4 (a) and (b) of resolution 1127 (1997) for an additional period of 90 days from the date of adoption of the resolution, with a view to encouraging further the peace process and national reconciliation in Angola;

Decided that, prior to the end of the period, the Security Council might consider reviewing the measures referred to in paragraph 1, taking into account all available information, including from the Government of Angola, on the implementation of the peace accords;

Decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

**Decision of 15 August 2002 (4604th meeting):
resolution 1433 (2002)**

At its 4604th meeting, on 15 August 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on Angola dated 26 July 2002.¹¹⁵ In his report, the Secretary-General provided an overview of the developments leading to the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding. He recalled that in December 2002 the Government of Angola had asked the United Nations to resume its role as mediator and to re-establish contact with UNITA in support of efforts to find a political settlement to the conflict. Contacts with UNITA leaders outside the country had resulted in expressions of commitment to the Lusaka Protocol. Then, on 22 February, Jonas Savimbi was killed in combat, and the Angolan armed forces quickly established contacts with their counterparts in UNITA with a view to achieving a cessation of hostilities. The

first official contact between commanders of UNITA and the Angolan armed forces had taken place on 15 March 2002 and on 4 April they had signed a Memorandum of Understanding on the cessation of hostilities. He explained that the Memorandum of Understanding was intended to replace the Lusaka Protocol with regard to its military aspects, while the Joint Military Commission was reinstated as the main body supervising the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding, supported by a Technical Group composed of members of the Angolan armed forces and UNITA forces, as well as observers from the United Nations and the troika. The second phase of the peace process would include the re-establishment of the Joint Commission, to be chaired by the United Nations, in order to implement the outstanding political issues in the Lusaka Protocol. He also informed the Council that, since the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding, fighting had stopped in the entire country and no violations of the ceasefire had been reported, and numerous members of UNITA military personnel and their families had arrived in quartering areas. The Secretary-General underlined the challenges for the consolidation of peace in Angola, in its political-security aspects and with regard to human rights, protection and rehabilitation of children, and humanitarian affairs. As for the role of the United Nations in supporting the consolidation of peace, the promotion of national reconciliation and a transition to normalcy in Angola, he said that the Organization would enhance its presence and step up its operations throughout the country in a comprehensive manner by phases: the initial focus would be on the continuing delivery of urgently needed humanitarian assistance throughout the country, and the long-term aim would be to assist the process of reconciliation and economic recovery through peacebuilding. To implement this plan, a new mission would need to be established to succeed the United Nations Office in Angola with an expanded mandate that would include liaising with the parties through the Joint Military Commission and the Technical Group, providing advice on the quartering, demobilization and reintegration process, if requested by the Government, chairing the Joint Commission, assisting in the development of strategies to consolidate peace and providing assistance for the building of institutions in support of the rule of law and to assist in the promotion of human rights.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

¹¹³ At its 4595th meeting, held in private on 7 August 2002, the Council heard briefings by the Vice-Minister for External Relations of Angola and the Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser for Special Assignments in Africa.

¹¹⁴ S/2002/934.

¹¹⁵ S/2002/834, submitted pursuant to resolution 1294 (2000).

At the same meeting, the President (United States) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹¹⁶ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1433 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Authorized the establishment of, as a follow-on mission to the United Nations Office in Angola, the United Nations Mission in Angola for a period of six months until 15 February 2003, to pursue the objectives and perform the tasks recommended by the Secretary-General in his report and reflected in paragraph 3 of the resolution, and expressed its intention, in determining whether to extend, adjust or curtail the mission, to take into account the recommendations of the Secretary-General based on his Special Representative's assessment of progress in completing the Lusaka Protocol;

Endorsed the staffing of the Mission as appropriate and as recommended by the Secretary-General in his report, including the recommendation for a Child Protection Adviser, with the following mandate: to assist the parties in concluding the Lusaka Protocol; to assist the Government of Angola in undertaking tasks;

Requested the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council when his Special Representative confirmed that the Joint Commission had determined that all remaining tasks under the Lusaka Protocols had been completed; and decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

Decision of 18 October 2002 (4628th meeting): resolution 1439 (2002)

At the 4628th meeting, on 18 October 2002, the President (Cameroon) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a letter dated 14 October 2002 from the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993),¹¹⁷ transmitting the additional report of the Monitoring Mechanism on Sanctions against UNITA.

In its report, the Monitoring Mechanism stated that the pattern of widespread and flagrant violations had changed given that a number of individuals, as well as industry and government officials who aided and abetted UNITA, were no longer active. In spite of these improvements, and even though the military wing of UNITA had turned over huge quantities of weapons to the Government during the demilitarization process, considerable amounts of arms remained unaccounted for. On top of this, UNITA was still believed to be in possession of stashes of illicit diamonds that had been

neither located nor accounted for, and a significant number of UNITA members who played vital roles in the illicit procurement of arms, smuggling of diamonds and propaganda had not yet explicitly indicated their intention to join the peace process. The report of the Mechanism also included a brief summary of the data on arms surrendered by UNITA during the demobilization. From this information, it concluded that during the past two years there had been a clear disruption in the ability of UNITA to purchase weapons and it had experienced severe shortages of supplies. Nonetheless, the Mechanism considered that the problem of cross-border illicit circulation of firearms between the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Namibia and Zambia constituted a threat, and therefore post-conflict programmes should include specific measures aimed at properly dealing with that phenomenon. Regarding the diamond component of the sanctions regime, the Mechanism, *inter alia*, asserted that the lack of transparency in any centre, except Belgium, and the legal requirements of commercial confidentiality in diamond centres had made the task of gathering evidence, and substantiating the often detailed information available, "close to impossible". On the remaining capacity of UNITA to violate the diamond embargo, the Mechanism indicated that UNITA had continued to mine until the effective end of the war in 2002 and that there was evidence that suggested that its troops had carried out mining-related activities.

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria, France, Ireland, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States;¹¹⁸ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1439 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of the monitoring mechanism for a further period of two months, ending on 19 December 2002, subject to review by the Council;

Requested the monitoring mechanism to provide the Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) within 10 days of the date of adoption of the resolution with an action plan for its future work;

Requested the Secretary-General, upon adoption of the resolution and acting in consultation with the Committee to appoint two experts to serve on the monitoring mechanism, and further requested the Secretary-General to make the necessary

¹¹⁶ S/2002/936.

¹¹⁷ S/2002/1119; the report was submitted pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 1404 (2002).

¹¹⁸ S/2002/1168.

financial arrangements to support the work of the monitoring mechanism;

Decided that the provisions of paragraph 4 (a) and 4 (b) of resolution 1127 (1997) should cease to have effect from 00:01 Eastern Standard Time on 14 November 2002, following the expiration of the suspension of the measures as set out in paragraph 1 of resolution 1432 (2002);

Decided to review, with a view to the possible lifting of, all the measures in resolutions 864 (1993), 1127 (1997) and 1173 (1998) by 19 November 2002, including from the Government of Angola and all other parties involved, on the implementation of the peace accords.

**Decision of 9 December 2002 (4657th meeting):
resolution 1448 (2002)**

At the 4657th meeting, on 9 December 2002, the President (Colombia) drew the attention of the Council to the draft resolution;¹¹⁹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1448 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided that the measures imposed by Council resolutions 864 (1993), 1127 (1997) and 1173 (1998) should cease to have effect from the date of adoption of the resolution;

Decided further to dissolve the Committee established by paragraph 22 of resolution 864 (1993) with immediate effect;

Decided to request that the Secretary-General close the United Nations Trust Fund established by resolution 1237 (1999) and to make the necessary arrangements to reimburse Member States that had provided voluntary contributions.

**Deliberations of 17 December 2002
(4671st meeting)**

At its 4671st meeting, on 17 December 2002, the Council included in its agenda the interim report of the Secretary-General dated 12 December 2002 on the United Nations Mission in Angola.¹²⁰ The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Angola and Head of the Mission briefed the Council.

In his interim report, the Secretary-General informed Council members of the latest developments in Angola since the end of the armed conflict, including the signing of the Memorandum of Commitment, the efforts of UNITA to unite and transform itself into a political party, and the completion of the work of the Joint Commission. In conclusion, the Secretary-General stated that, after 27 years of war, there were at last real prospects for lasting peace in Angola. The challenges were still considerable, however, and the support of the United Nations and the international community needed to be accompanied by the strong will of the Government of Angola to establish transparent and accountable governmental institutions across the board. He underlined that, while significant progress had been made on the political track, the major remaining challenges were in the humanitarian and development sectors.

In his briefing, the Special Representative indicated that it had successfully initiated activities in nearly all the areas mandated to it. In the effort to establish the United Nations Mission in Angola as an integrated and coordinated mission, numerous initiatives were promoted, which had provided an integrated strategy for United Nations activities in Angola. On the issue of the sanctions, he reported that the decision taken by the Council to lift them had been welcomed by both UNITA and the Government. Regarding the humanitarian situation, on the other hand, he asserted that it remained extremely difficult, with a need to concentrate on the process of resettlement of ex-combatants and their families, as well as internally displaced persons and refugees from neighbouring countries. However, some progress had been made and since 2002 the humanitarian operation had doubled in size.¹²¹

¹²¹ S/PV.4671, pp. 2-5.

¹¹⁹ S/2002/1331.

¹²⁰ S/2002/1353, submitted pursuant to resolution 1433 (2002).

5. The situation concerning Rwanda

Deliberations of 14 April 2000 (4127th meeting)

At its 4127th meeting, on 14 April 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda a letter dated 15 December 1999 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹ transmitting a report of the Secretary-General dated 15 December 1999 on the Independent Inquiry into the actions of the United Nations during the 1994 genocide in Rwanda. The report examined the circumstances surrounding the failure of the international community to prevent the systematic slaughter of some 800,000 people in Rwanda in 1994 by examining the events leading up to the genocide and the actions taken by the United Nations and other major actors. The Independent Inquiry found that the response of the United Nations before and during the 1994 genocide had failed in a number of fundamental respects and that “responsibility for the failings lay with a number of different actors, in particular, the Secretary-General, the Secretariat, the Security Council, the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR) and the broader membership of the United Nations”. The “overriding failure” in the response was “a lack of resources and a lack of will to take on the commitment which would have been necessary to prevent or to stop the genocide”. In particular UNAMIR, the main component of the United Nations presence in Rwanda had not been “planned, dimensioned, deployed or instructed in a way which provided for a proactive and assertive role in dealing with a peace process in serious trouble”. The report recommended, inter alia, initiating an action plan to prevent genocide involving the whole United Nations system; increasing the capacity of peacekeeping operations; improving the early warning capacity; and ensuring an effective flow of information within the United Nations and particularly to the Security Council.

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Independent Inquiry, followed by statements by the representatives of Argentina, Bangladesh, China, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mali, Namibia, the United Kingdom, the Russian Federation, Tunisia and Ukraine.

In his briefing, the Chairman of the Independent Inquiry reported that the Council had had the power to

prevent the tragedy in Rwanda, and could act to ensure such a tragedy did not happen again. He stressed that the overriding failure of the United Nations in Rwanda was due to the lack of political will by Member States to act in the face of crises, which affected the response of the Secretariat, the decision-making by the Security Council and the difficulties in getting troops for the UNAMIR. He stated that one of the aspects of the United Nations role during the genocide, which had caused most bitterness in Rwanda, was the fact that a few weeks after the start of the genocide, the Council decided to reduce the strength of UNAMIR. He maintained that the Rwandan tragedy had impacted on the belief in the capacity of the United Nations to fulfil the purposes for which it was founded. He stressed that, in future, the Council needed to give missions the mandate they needed, mobilize the necessary troops and resources, and accept its responsibility irrespective of where problems occurred. The Secretary-General needed to tell the Council what the real needs on the ground were; how many troops and what mandate was needed; how tough the task was; and the Council needed to ensure that short-term financial constraint did not prevent effective action. He stated that there was a hope that the panel that had been appointed to follow up on the Rwanda and Srebrenica reports would help in identifying these lessons. He maintained that the best way to honour the victims of the Rwandan tragedy was through a firm commitment never to turn away from civilians victimized by armed conflict again. Improving the protection of civilians was a key task for the United Nations, he noted. Therefore, there could be no neutrality in the face of the threat of genocide or massive violations of human rights and peacekeepers and the United Nations needed to act in these cases. He added that the presence of a United Nations mission, whether or not its mandate included protection of civilians, would create an expectation among civilians that they would be protected. He hoped that the report would improve the relations between Rwanda and the United Nations and that its recommendations would be taken on board in future discussion on the role of the United Nations in conflict situations.²

Most speakers welcomed the report of the Independent Inquiry into United Nations actions during

¹ S/1999/1257.

² S/PV.4127, pp. 2-4.

the 1994 Rwanda genocide and expressed regret about “the failure of the United Nations in Rwanda”. They emphasized the need to learn the lessons from Rwanda and to ensure that “the United Nations responded to prevent genocide in the future”. Several speakers noted that responsibility for the failures in Rwanda needed to be shared by both the United Nations and the great majority of Member States that were not willing to send troops or materiel to Rwanda. Several speakers stressed the need to provide appropriate mandate and resources to peacekeeping missions, as well as “to have better communication between the Council and the field”.

At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands maintained that there were a number of lessons to be learned from the report. Firstly, a peace process should not be treated as something of a higher order than the populations of the countries concerned. Secondly, one should not clutch at a peace process that had ceased to be relevant; if a peace process was dead, it was the conflict that demanded attention. Thirdly, more attention should be paid to non-governmental organizations, since they had a wealth of up-to-date information from the ground. Fourthly, evenhandedness was not a virtue when genocide was going on. He concluded that everything needed to be done “to prevent future catastrophes of the type that took place in Srebrenica and Rwanda”.³

The representative of the United States stated that the report made clear that in Rwanda, as in Bosnia and Somalia, the international system had failed and that these collective failures had “nearly brought the United Nations system down”. He maintained that the atrocities carried out by a small group of “murderers intent on promoting hate to preserve power” had been political acts and those who had perpetrated them needed to be held responsible. Furthermore, the international community also needed to be held responsible for not acting against the violence. He stressed that the prevention of another round of violence, genocidal or otherwise, in central Africa was one of the core elements of United States policy in the Great Lakes, and one of the United Nations’ greatest challenges. The legacy of “genocide and ethnic cleansing” in Rwanda, Burundi and the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was a tragic reality that needed to be addressed. He maintained that

³ Ibid., pp. 5-6.

the discussion should galvanize support for the United Nations sanctions against the ex-Rwandese Armed Forces and Interahamwe. Nevertheless, he stressed that it could not be said that the solution to problems in Rwanda lay exclusively in actions within the Democratic Republic of the Congo, but neither could it be said that problems in Rwanda could be solved without addressing the presence of the genocidal militias in a neighbouring State.⁴

The representative of Mali stressed that the political will to act, and in particular to prevent acts of genocide or massive violations of human rights, needed to be clear and not be subject to double standards. He also stressed the importance of enhancing the early warning capacity of the United Nations, particularly its capacity to analyse information and react effectively to it.⁵

The representative of the United Kingdom noted the need for the Council to have accurate timely and unfiltered information, but also stressed that the Council and the United Nations membership needed to demonstrate the political will to act on that information to tackle complex humanitarian emergencies.⁶

The representative of Argentina maintained that United Nations peacekeeping operations could not remain indifferent in the face of any deliberate attempt to carry out serious attack on the civil population. A “false idea of impartiality” could not be allowed to prevail when genocide or crimes against humanity were being committed. He also stressed the need to strengthen standards for the protection of human rights and international law and the need to establish an appropriate national and international machinery to fight impunity.⁷

The representative of the Russian Federation, noting that the capacity of the Security Council was not unlimited, argued that the Council needed to attempt, on one hand, to ensure that peacekeepers provided maximum protection for innocent civilians and, on the other, to avoid “creating illusions that [were] not backed up by the real capacities of United Nations personnel”.⁸

⁴ Ibid., pp. 8-10.

⁵ Ibid., p. 10.

⁶ Ibid., p. 12.

⁷ Ibid., p. 13.

⁸ Ibid., p. 14.

The representative of Malaysia commented that many questions that should have been addressed by the Independent Inquiry were kept in abeyance. Such questions revolved around the identity of perpetrators and possible accomplices in the attack that had claimed the lives of the Heads of State of Rwanda and Burundi, and which had served as a catalyst for the genocide. He also noted that the report was based on evidence collected from only one side of the conflict, that of the Rwandese Patriotic Front and its collaborators. He suggested that similar interviews with other personalities in exile could have been useful. He also suggested that it would have been useful for the Independent Inquiry to have included in its recommendations the setting up of a more comprehensive and detailed commission of inquiry on the genocide.⁹

The representative of France stressed that the United Nations had failed in its mission during the genocide and it could no longer be inactive or impotent in the face of such tragedies. He stated that in the face of the genocide, and the delays and difficulties in strengthening UNAMIR, France had established Operation Turquoise to assist the people who were under threat, with the support of the troops of African countries and with the authorization of the Security Council. He commented that his delegation felt that the criticism of Operation Turquoise was “unjustified”. He noted that while the report of the Independent Inquiry reflected some of this criticism, it also gave credit to the Operation for saving lives when few other initiatives were being taken. Moving to the lessons that needed to be learned, he noted that after the failure to deal with the Rwandan genocide, the United Nations had not been able to face up to subsequent crises, and he stressed that United Nations action with respect to the Great Lakes region as a whole needed to be more sustained. On the work of the Council, he recommended that the decisions of the Council in setting up new operations be better prepared. Information provided by the Secretariat needed to be supplemented by other data, particularly historical data, so that the Council could better understand the situation. He also stressed the need to improve the follow-up of the United Nations missions. Once

⁹ Ibid., p. 15.

missions had been deployed, implementation of their mandate had not been always followed up carefully enough, so there was a need for greater regularity and a need to refocus the work of the Council on crisis situations and United Nations operations. He suggested spending more time considering those situations and less time on the “thematic subjects”.¹⁰

The representative of Jamaica stated that future peacekeeping missions needed to be designed with allowances for rapidly changing circumstances, or at the minimum it had to be possible to have reinforcements deployed quickly. He stressed that the practice of deploying the minimum number of troops on the basis of political or financial expediency took no account of the many variables that troops might be presented with in the field, and the Council could not continue to send troops without the necessary room to maneuver when faced with unforeseen circumstances. He also suggested that a mechanism needed to be designed to allow force commanders the necessary flexibility to determine the best course of action and rapidly communicate decisions to the Council.¹¹

The representative of Canada maintained that in the most exceptional situations the protection of civilians required the will in the Council “to intervene with force if necessary”. While military intervention was called for only in the most severe cases, he stressed that the price of inaction had been too high, and the Council needed to have a framework for action if the need arose.¹²

The representative of Rwanda stated that the report clearly showed that the world had failed Rwanda but the Government and people of Rwanda were grateful to those who had put their hands on their hearts and apologized on behalf of their peoples and their Governments for failing Rwanda. He maintained that the victims of the genocide in Rwanda were still suffering cruelly from physical, psychological and post-trauma hardships, and the best efforts of the Government were not enough to address them. He concluded that the report clearly challenged the conscience of the international community and evoked the responsibility of the parties to the 1948 Genocide Convention.¹³

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 17-19.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 22.

¹² Ibid., pp. 23-25.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 25-26.

6. The situation in Burundi

Decision of 19 January 2000 (4091st meeting): resolution 1286 (2000)

At its 4091st meeting, on 19 January 2000, the Security Council heard briefings by the Secretary-General and the Facilitator of the Burundi peace process, and the former President of South Africa, Nelson Mandela, following which all Council members and the representative of Burundi made statements.

The Secretary-General congratulated the President (United States) on his success in focusing world attention on Africa and its problems. He underlined that of all the many crises and conflicts confronting Africa, perhaps none was more urgent than the one in Burundi, and in no other country was it so easy to imagine a repetition of ethnic killing on a genocidal scale. He remembered the efforts made by the former President of the United Republic of Tanzania, Mwalimu Julius Nyerere, to push the peace process forward and welcomed the involvement of Nelson Mandela to revive it. He informed Council members about the progress achieved in the commissions in Arusha and through consultations in Dar es Salaam. Yet serious disagreements remained on some key issues, including the future composition of the army, the electoral system and the transitions period, while other issues, such as guarantees for the minority community and the question of reconciliation versus impunity, had yet to be seriously addressed. He underlined the unstable and volatile regional context and the growing number of Burundian refugees, which had reached 500,000 and was still growing. He stated that more than 800,000 people, 12 per cent of the country's population, were internally displaced, many of them as a result of a deliberate Government policy of forcibly relocating civilians in circumstances that could not be justified under international humanitarian law. Since September 2008, 300,000 people had been herded into camps where he asserted they had been deprived of the most elementary means of subsistence. He affirmed that they were on the verge of another humanitarian catastrophe, for which the world would undoubtedly hold the Government of Burundi responsible and urged its authorities to abandon the inhumane and illegal camps policy altogether and to allow independent humanitarian agencies full access to them as well as to ensure the safety of humanitarian workers. He warned that the Burundian parties'

"willingness to sacrifice the lives of their fellow citizens on the altar of their political ambitions" amounted to a "betrayal" of other Africans striving to promote their continent's recovery. He encouraged all parties in the conflict to seek a political solution, which he hoped would be supported by the diplomatic and economic assistance of the international community.¹

The Facilitator of the Burundi peace process briefed Council members in detail about the progress of the Arusha process, especially the achievements of the four committees for the negotiations, and about their visit to Arusha. He emphasized that the responsibility to reach an agreement rested squarely with the leaders of the Burundi people. He advocated for an inclusive process and appealed to all belligerents to respect the international humanitarian efforts in Burundi. He observed that one of the most important issues impacting upon the situation in Burundi and the negotiation process was that of violence. He, therefore, stressed that the international community should seek to send a clear message to the Government of Burundi that, in spite of the manner in which they had come to power, they and the Burundi army had a particular responsibility to defend and protect the entire civilian population, and not just part of it. He called for the international community's support on financial, humanitarian and political assistance. Finally, he pointed out the impact of regional developments in the Great Lakes region on developments in Burundi.²

The majority of the speakers welcomed the appointment of the Facilitator, and recognized the contribution of former President Nyerere to the peace in Burundi. A few representatives commended the presidency for highlighting the Burundi situation as a part of the Council's focus on Africa. Most of the representatives emphasized the necessity of a political solution through collective participation in the Arusha process. A number of representatives expressed concern about the attacks against the civilian population and United Nations personnel as well as humanitarian conditions. Several speakers expressed the view that the economic situation was the main cause of the current turbulence and called for humanitarian, economic and development assistance.

¹ S/PV.4091, pp. 2-3.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6.

Most representatives stressed the requirement of dealing with the problems of the Great Lakes region as a whole, specifically with the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

A few representatives supported the proposal of France to convene an international conference on the Great Lakes region under the joint auspices of the Organization of African Unity (OAU)³ and the United Nations.⁴

Some representatives condemned the policy of *regroupment* and called for the dismantling of the camps and for free access to them in the meantime by humanitarian workers and human rights observers.⁵ The representative of the United Kingdom pointed out that the Government of Burundi had not been listening to the international community and had not been putting the people of Burundi first. He added that the draft resolution before the Council did not, in the end, mention the regroupment camps, but his Government, like the Secretary-General, condemned those camps.⁶ The representative of Netherlands affirmed that his delegation did not consider the involuntary resettlement or regroupment of rural populations an acceptable way to address the security situation in Burundi, but did believe that Burundi had the right to be safeguarded from cross-border attacks by armed insurgents.⁷ The representative of the Russian Federation expressed his delegation's concern over the continuing practice of forced displacement of civilians into camps under military guard.⁸ The representative of Malaysia noted the explanation given by the Government of Burundi that the regrouping of the population was not forced and was a response to real concerns for their safety and well-being and hoped that such measures were only temporary in nature and would be terminated as soon as possible so that the people could return to their homes in safety.⁹

The representative of Burundi informed Council members that no national catastrophe in terms of widespread massacres was really imminent. He rejected allegations that regroupment camps were part of an ethnic cleansing system or that they involved human rights violations and stated that the only goal of those operations had been to ensure security. He affirmed that they would be able to close some of the camps within two weeks and that camps were accessible and open to all monitors and humanitarian personnel. He asserted that the rebellion was not only internal and that it had taken root in neighbouring and even distant countries as far away as southern Africa. He cautioned that the needlessly prolonged and extreme economic pressure on his country due to the embargo on international cooperation threatened to lead to an explosion. Finally, he added that the situation was extremely urgent and called for resuming cooperation immediately.¹⁰

At the same meeting, the President (United States) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹¹ it was adopted unanimously as resolution 1286 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Warmly endorsed and strongly supported the designation by the eighth Arusha Regional Summit on 1 December 1999 of Nelson Mandela as the new Facilitator of the Arusha peace process;

Reiterated its strong support for the renewed Arusha peace process;

Endorsed efforts by the Secretary-General to enhance the role of the United Nations in Burundi and in particular the continued work of his Special Representative for the Great Lakes region; and expressed appreciation for international donor support;

Condemned continuing violence perpetrated by all parties, and in particular by those non-State actors who refused to participate in the Arusha peace process;

Condemned attacks against civilians in Burundi;

Strongly condemned the murder of UNICEF and World Food Programme personnel and Burundian civilians in Rutana province in October 1999;

Called for the immediate, full, safe and unhindered access of humanitarian workers and human rights observers to all regroupment camps, and called for internees to have access to their livelihoods outside these camps;

³ On 8 July 2002, the Organization of African Unity ceased to exist and was replaced by the African Union.

⁴ S/PV.4091, p. 9 (Argentina); p. 10 (France); and p. 11 (China).

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Canada); p. 9 (Argentina); p. 10 (France); p. 11 (United Kingdom); p. 13 (Namibia); and p. 16 (United States).

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

¹¹ S/2000/29.

Called for donors to provide humanitarian and human rights assistance to Burundi and to resume substantial economic and development assistance with due regard to security conditions.

Decision of 29 September 2000 (4201st meeting): statement by the President

At the 4201st meeting, on 29 September 2000, the representative of Burundi was invited to participate in the discussion.¹² The Council heard briefings by the Secretary-General and the Facilitator of the Burundi peace process.

The Secretary-General observed that the signing of the Arusha agreement on 28 August, followed by the agreement on 20 September in Nairobi on the participation of the remaining three parties, was a very important milestone in Burundi's long and painful road to peace. He believed that the Arusha agreement addressed the root causes of the conflict, such as exclusion and genocide, as well as the tragic consequences of the war, including the plight of hundreds of thousands of refugees and internally displaced people.¹³

The Facilitator of the Burundi peace process welcomed the "serious and direct interest" of the international community in the quest for peace in Burundi and the involvement of a range of Heads of State and Government in the Burundi peace process. He explained the methodology and procedure of the peace process; the political agreement signed in Arusha; and remaining matters relating to details and implementation. He observed that one of the most encouraging developments was the agreement between the leaders of the two major political rallies in the country to work together to resolve problems among themselves. He affirmed that the process then continued with a major focus on engaging the combatant rebel forces in direct talks with the political leadership. But he noted that he had stressed to the leaders of rebel forces that there could not be any justification for continuing violent attacks on the civilian population when a political agreement had been reached and a way had been opened for them to bring their concerns to the negotiating table. Regarding the regroupment camps, he noted that while the armed forces were saying that they had not been dismantled,

¹² Namibia was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

¹³ S/PV.4201, p. 2.

the representative of the Secretary-General and the representative of OAU had assured him that they had been. He noted that some of the inmates were refusing to leave the camps because of the security situation inside the country. He also mentioned that he was moving his office to Bujumbura, but said that the security situation did not yet allow for the returned of exiled Burundian leaders. He concluded that the international community should be mobilized to assist massively in the reconstruction and development of the economy and society of Burundi.¹⁴

At the meeting, the President (Mali) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁵ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the signature on 28 August 2000 of the Arusha Peace Accord, as well as the signatures added to that Accord at a regional summit held on 20 September 2000 in Nairobi, commended those Burundian parties, including the Government of Burundi, which had demonstrated their commitment to continued negotiations; reiterated its call, in resolution 1286 (2000) of 19 January 2000, on all parties that remained outside the peace process to cease hostilities and to participate fully in that process; and supported the call of the Facilitator to the rebel groups to clarify their positions by 20 October 2000;

Condemned all attacks on civilian populations;

Remained deeply concerned at the continuing levels of violence in Burundi, in particular that perpetrated by rebel groups, despite the call made to them for direct negotiations with the Burundian Government to secure a lasting ceasefire agreement;

Noted the holding of a meeting of donor countries in Brussels on 15 September 2000; welcomed the call made at that meeting for progressive resumption of assistance to Burundi, including through development aid, to alleviate its urgent humanitarian and economic problems as it made progress in its internal peace negotiations; and also welcomed the plan to hold a donor conference in Paris in due course.

Decision of 2 March 2001 (4285th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4285th meeting,¹⁶ on 2 March 2001, the representative of Burundi was invited to participate in the discussion. The President (Ukraine) made a

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-6.

¹⁵ S/PRST/2000/29.

¹⁶ At its 4202nd meeting, held in private on 29 September 2000, the Council had a useful exchange of views with the Facilitator of the Burundi peace process.

statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁷ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Condemned the recent attacks by armed groups in Burundi and called for the immediate cessation of those attacks;

Expressed its strong disapproval of all acts aimed at undermining the peace process in Burundi;

Condemned the deliberate targeting of civilians and reiterated its call on all concerned to join the peace process; and stressed the importance of providing urgent humanitarian assistance to civilians displaced by the hostilities;

Reaffirmed its full support to the continuing efforts of the Facilitator, the Regional Peace Initiative and the Implementation Monitoring Committee to bring peace to Burundi.

Decision of 29 June 2001 (4341st meeting): statement by the President

At the 4341st meeting,¹⁸ on 29 June 2001, the representative of Burundi was invited to participate in the discussion. The President (Bangladesh) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Strongly emphasized to the parties to the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement of 28 August 2000 the need to implement all the immediately applicable provisions of the Agreement, including the provisions for the establishment of new institutions;

Expressed grave concern at continuing human rights abuses and violations of humanitarian law, and stressed the need for all parties to ensure respect for human rights and humanitarian law;

Urged the belligerents to commit themselves immediately to the protection of civilians, in particular their life, physical integrity and the means necessary for their survival;

Also reiterated its call for safe and unhindered access for the delivery of humanitarian aid to all people in need.

¹⁷ S/PRST/2001/6.

¹⁸ At the 4297th meeting, held in private on 16 March 2001, the members of the Council and the representative of Burundi had a constructive discussion; at its 4338th meeting, held in private on 27 June 2001, the Council heard a statement by the second Vice-President of Burundi.

¹⁹ S/PRST/2001/17.

Decision of 26 September 2001 (4383rd meeting): statement by the President

At the 4383rd meeting,²⁰ on 26 September 2001, the representative of Burundi was invited to participate in the discussion. The President (France) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²¹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its strong support for the facilitation of former President Nelson Mandela;

Called on all parties to cooperate fully with the Implementation Monitoring Committee; strongly supported the installation on 1 November 2001 of the Transitional Government in Burundi;

Called on the Burundian parties to reach agreement on the establishment of a special protection unit of providing personal security for politicians returning from exile;

Concerned by the increase of violence, recalled the urgent need to bring about a negotiated settlement;

Called on all States to cease all forms of support to the Forces nationales de Libération (FNL) and the Front pour la défense de la démocratie (FDD);

Called upon the donor community to increase their humanitarian assistance to Burundi.

Decision of 29 October 2001 (4399th meeting): resolution 1375 (2001)

At the 4399th meeting, on 29 October 2001, the President (Ireland) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution²² and two letters,²³ and a statement

²⁰ At the 4378th meeting, held in private on 20 September 2001, the members of the Council heard briefings and had a constructive interactive discussion with the representative of the Facilitator of the Burundi peace process and the representative of the Facilitator in the Implementation Monitoring Committee.

²¹ S/PRST/2001/26.

²² S/2001/1016.

²³ Letter dated 15 October 2001 from the representative of Belgium addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting a statement by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union concerning the Great Lakes region (S/2001/979); and letter dated 25 October 2001 from the representative of South Africa addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitting a letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs on South Africa's intention to deploy security personnel to Burundi and a letter from the President of Burundi requesting South Africa to make available protection for the political leaders returning from exile (S/2001/1013).

was made by the representative of the United Kingdom.

The representative of the United Kingdom thanked the representatives of Mauritius and Jamaica for putting the draft resolution forward as the original sponsors. He also congratulated the Government of South Africa on taking the initiative on the protection force and on their commitment to it. However, he emphasized that the Council was not endorsing the protection force itself or giving it a United Nations mandate.²⁴

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted unanimously as resolution 1375 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its strong support for the installation on 1 November 2001 of the Transitional Government in Burundi;

Called on FNL and FDD to cease immediately all hostilities, enter into negotiations and join the peace process, and called on all the States of the region to fully support the process;

Endorsed the efforts of the Government of South Africa and other Member States to support the implementation of the Arusha Agreement, and strongly supported in this regard the establishment of an interim multinational security presence in Burundi, at the request of its Government, to protect returning political leaders and train an all-Burundian protection force;

Requested the Government of Burundi to keep the Council informed of progress to establish an all-Burundian protection force;

Urged the international community, with the installation of the Transitional Government, to provide additional assistance, including by honouring fully the pledges made by donors during the Paris Conference of December 2000.

Deliberations of 8 November 2001 (4406th meeting)

At the 4406th meeting, on 8 November 2001, the President (Jamaica) invited the representatives of Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia, as well as the Permanent Observer for the Organization of African Unity to participate in the discussion.²⁵ The Council heard

²⁴ S/PV.4399, p. 2.

²⁵ The Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of Burundi, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of the Democratic Republic of

briefings by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes region and Chairman of the Implementation Monitoring Committee, and the Deputy Prime Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda and Chairman of the Regional Peace Initiative on Burundi, following which the President of the Security Council made a statement.

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes region stated that, on 1 November 2001, the Transitional Government of National Unity had been inaugurated in Burundi, which had been witnessed by several African leaders and representatives of international organizations,²⁶ and expressed the belief that the inauguration constituted a significant step in the implementation of the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement. He detailed, *inter alia*, the adoption of a transitional constitution; the arrival of the first group of the special protection unit; the return of a number of political leaders from exile to participate in the new Government; and the priorities of the Transitional Government. He commended the initiative of former President Nyerere, as well as Nelson Mandela, who had completed his task as Facilitator. He warned that so long as violence persisted the peace process would remain "fragile". He encouraged the two armed groups FDD and FNL, to put down their arms and join their compatriots in the search for durable peace in Burundi without delay. Finally, he suggested that the international community could bring a peace dividend by resuming in a significant way its socioeconomic development cooperation and enhancing its humanitarian assistance qualitatively and quantitatively. He suggested that the Council might wish to consider, *inter alia*, calling on the two armed groups to engage the new Government in serious negotiations; expressing its support for the

the Congo, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ghana, the Special Envoy of the President of Rwanda, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of the United Republic of Tanzania, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia represented their countries at this meeting.

²⁶ Including the Presidents of Malawi, Nigeria, Rwanda, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia as well as the Facilitator of the Burundi peace process, the Deputy Presidents of South Africa and Uganda, the Secretary General of the Organization of African Unity, representatives of the United Nations and the European Union and representatives of other African States at the ministerial level.

regional special protection unit; and calling on all the signatory parties to cooperate fully with the Implementation Monitoring Committee in the discharge of its mandate under the Arusha Agreement.²⁷

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda and Chairman of the Regional Peace Initiative on Burundi saluted the Council for its partnership with the Great Lakes Regional Initiative in the search for a permanent solution to the conflict in Burundi. He informed Council members about, inter alia, the inauguration of the Transitional Government, and that the position of the region was that the negotiations between the Transitional Government and the armed opposition, facilitated by the President of Gabon and the Deputy President of South Africa, would continue. He asked for support and encouragement from the Council in the formation of a new national army, Parliament and other institutions of the transition as well as to bring their influence to bear on the armed groups. He emphasized that the link between the conflicts in Burundi and in the Democratic Republic of the Congo had hitherto been a complicating factor in the search for peace in the Great Lakes region, but that there was an opportunity for it to become a positive force. He noted the decision of the regional leaders to deploy a regional force in Burundi, composed of troops from South Africa, Nigeria, Ghana and Senegal. Nevertheless, he insisted that it was “extremely important” that a ceasefire was urgently put in place in Burundi in order to allow for the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping force under Chapter VII of the Charter and the involvement of the armed groups — FDD and FNL — in the power-sharing arrangement. He called on the Security Council to send a strong message that it was prepared to commit an adequate United Nations peacekeeping force as soon a ceasefire was in place.²⁸

The President of the Security Council recognized the idea of the Ambassador of France to convene a dialogue with the members of the Regional Peace Initiative on Burundi. She paid special tribute to the Facilitator, the regional leaders and the Burundian parties for their “efforts in making the Transitional Government a reality”. She reiterated the call of the Security Council to the armed groups to cooperate with

the Transitional Government and expressed the Council’s support for the regional special protection force. She warned about the deteriorating humanitarian and human rights situation in the country and stated that the Council stood ready to assist in that regard.²⁹

Decision of 8 November 2001 (4408th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4408th meeting,³⁰ on 8 November 2001, the President (Jamaica) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³¹ by which the Council, inter alia:

Condemned the recent attacks by FDD and FNL on civilians, and was gravely concerned that the frequency of such attacks had increased;

Stated that the installation of a broad-based government in accordance with an internationally supported peace process made armed rebellion an unacceptable means of political expression;

Reiterated its call for an immediate suspension of hostilities in Burundi and for the armed groups to enter into negotiations to reach a definitive ceasefire, which was the priority issue;

Called on the international community to increase its humanitarian assistance, as well as to assist in Burundi’s economic recovery and development through, inter alia, honouring the pledges made at the Paris donors’ conference.

Decision of 15 November 2001 (4417th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4417th meeting,³² on 8 November 2001, the representative of Burundi was invited to participate in the discussion. The President (Jamaica) drew the attention of the Council to the interim report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Burundi.³³ In his report, the Secretary-General highlighted the urgent

²⁹ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

³⁰ At the 4407th meeting, held in private on 8 November 2001, the members of the Council and the members of the Regional Peace Initiative on Burundi, as well as the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes region and Chairman of the Implementation Monitoring Committee and the Permanent Observer of the Organization of African Unity had a constructive discussion.

³¹ S/PRST/2001/33.

³² At the 4416th meeting, held in private on 15 November 2001, the members of the Council heard a briefing by the Facilitator of the Burundi peace process, and had a useful exchange of views with him.

³³ S/2001/1076.

²⁷ S/PV.4406, pp. 2-4.

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 4-6.

need to cease hostilities to allow the full implementation of the Arusha Agreement, reiterated his call upon the armed groups to negotiate a cessation of hostilities, and invited donors to assist the country in its humanitarian, development and reconstruction efforts.

At the meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁴ by the Council, *inter alia*:

Expressed its deep gratitude to Madiba Nelson Mandela for his dedicated service and commitment towards political reconciliation in Burundi;

Also acknowledged his contribution as Facilitator of the Burundi peace process;

Expressed its appreciation to Madiba and the South African Government for initiating the deployment of the first elements of the multinational security presence to protect political leaders of the Transitional Government;

Expressed its concern about the recent increase in violence and reiterated its call on all Burundians to reject violence and support the Regional Peace Initiative and the Transitional Government.

Deliberations of 5 February 2002 (4467th meeting)

At its 4467th meeting, on 5 February 2002, the Council heard a statement by the President of Burundi. The President affirmed that his country had opted for peace through dialogue due to its conviction that any other way would lead the country to an impasse. He noted, *inter alia*, the improvement of the political climate in Burundi; the return of political leaders from exile; the upcoming transfer of power at the Head of State level; and the future local, legislative and presidential elections. He pointed out that the negotiation and signing of a ceasefire was crucial to speeding up and concluding the needed reform process. He emphasized that the Security Council had the means to make the Burundian rebels renounce violence. He also asserted that if diplomatic means did not succeed, all other means needed to be used to prevent the rebels from taking the peace process hostage. He called on other countries in the subregion to halt those who sought to destabilize the country. He expressed the belief that peace in the Great Lakes region would come when every country of the region lived in peace. He concluded by expressing concern about the economy of Burundi and hoping that the

³⁴ S/PRST/2001/35.

pledges made in Geneva would be redeemed without further delay by donors.³⁵

Decision of 7 February 2002 (4471st meeting): statement by the President

At the 4471st meeting,³⁶ on 7 February 2002, the President (Mexico) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁷ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Paid tribute to the signatories to the Arusha Agreement, and the transitional President, Pierre Buyoya, in particular, for their efforts to advance the peace process;

Reaffirmed that continued fighting against the legitimate transitional government set up pursuant to an inclusive peace agreement was totally unjustifiable and unacceptable, and threatened the implementation of the peace process;

Called on the rebel groups immediately to lay down arms in the interest of all Burundians and recalled that only a negotiated solution would finally end the fighting;

Welcomed the steps taken by the Governments of Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo to normalize their relations;

Stressed the important role of the international community in that regard and called on donor countries to honour as soon as possible the pledges which they made at the Paris (December 2000) and Geneva (December 2001) donor round tables, as well as on the United Nations system as a whole to support the Transitional Government for the reconstruction of the country.

Deliberations of 4 December 2002 (4655th meeting)

At the 4655th meeting,³⁸ on 4 December 2002, the representative of Burundi was invited to participate in the discussion. The Council heard a briefing by the Deputy President of South Africa and statements were made by the representatives of Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Colombia, France, Guinea, Ireland, Mauritius, Norway, Singapore, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Kingdom and the United States.

³⁵ S/PV.4467, pp. 2-4.

³⁶ At the 4468th meeting, held in private on 5 February 2002, the members of the Council and the President of Burundi had a constructive discussion.

³⁷ S/PRST/2002/3.

³⁸ At the 4609th meeting, held in private on 17 September 2002, the members of the Council and the Minister for External Relations and Cooperation of Burundi had a constructive discussion.

The Deputy President of South Africa noted that in the two years since the mediation in Burundi had begun, the two armed groups, CNDD-FDD³⁹ and Palipehutu-FNL⁴⁰ had split because of infighting, resulting in four armed movements, with the same names but different leaders. He emphasized that the message of the Security Council delegation in South Africa to the armed groups directing them to enter into negotiations “immediately and without conditions” had eliminated the wrong impression that the international community supported their reluctance to negotiate a ceasefire. He underlined that the Transitional Government had signed ceasefire agreements with CNDD-FDD of Pierre Nkurunziza, CNDD-FDD of Jean-Bosco Ndayikengurukiye and Palipehutu-FNL of Alain Mugabarabona. He remarked that the nineteenth summit of Heads of State on Burundi had directed the other Palipehutu-FNL to enter into negotiations immediately and conclude a ceasefire agreement or face robust sanctions. Recalling the “stringent precepts of the United Nations”, including the difficulties of deploying peacekeeping forces where there was not a total ceasefire, he underlined that, given the nature of the conflict, there would never be a straightforward and classical ceasefire agreement. However, his Government believed that the support of such a unique situation was possible under Chapter VIII of the Charter, which supported the establishment of regional initiatives for the resolution of conflicts, as well as Chapter VI, which provided for the use of regional initiatives for the resolution of disputes without the active and direct involvement of, but with the full support of, the United Nations. He maintained that the African mission and other structures to be set up would require the support of the United Nations apparatus to ensure success.⁴¹

The majority of the speakers welcomed the ceasefire agreement and paid tribute to the Burundian negotiators, to the heads of State of the region, in particular the Deputy President of South Africa, as well as the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. Most of the speakers maintained that the ceasefire needed to become universal, and that FNL needed to join the peace process. Some speakers appealed to the

international community to provide ongoing assistance to Burundi in the implementation of the agreements. Several representatives encouraged the transitional authorities to work with their neighbours, especially with the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and supported an international conference in the Great Lakes region.

The representative of France stated that the Council would have to reflect on the support that it could provide to a possible African force or to whatever formula that the Secretary-General could recommend in support of the peace process, once all the parties had agreed to a ceasefire in Burundi.⁴²

The representative of Colombia noted the possibility of imposing international sanctions on FNL, while the representative of the United States expressed support for the call by the President of Uganda for regionally imposed sanctions.⁴³

**Decision of 18 December 2002 (4675th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4675th meeting, on 18 December 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Burundi.⁴⁴ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the full implementation of the Arusha Agreement would only be possible if a ceasefire agreement was reached. A ceasefire that did not include all armed parties and political movements would be dangerous and needed to be avoided. Moreover the issue of reform of the security sector needed to be addressed by the parties in the context of the ceasefire negotiations. He commended the efforts to this end by Deputy President of South Africa, the Governments of Gabon and the United Republic of Tanzania and to the Regional Peace Initiative. He noted that once a comprehensive ceasefire agreement had been reached, he intended to provide to the Security Council an analysis of the situation and recommendations on the future course of action, including planning for a possible expanded involvement of the United Nations in Burundi.

At the meeting, the representative of Burundi was invited to participate in the discussion, and the

³⁹ Consiel national pour la défense de la démocratie — Front pour la défense de la démocratie.

⁴⁰ Parti pour la libération du peuple hutu — Forces nationales de libération.

⁴¹ S/PV.4655, pp. 2-5.

⁴² Ibid., p. 6.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 10 (United States); and p. 11 (Colombia).

⁴⁴ S/2002/1259.

President (Colombia) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁴⁵ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the signing of the ceasefire agreement between the Transitional Government of Burundi and the CNDD-FDD in Arusha on 2 December 2002;

Supported the decision of the nineteenth Heads of State summit of the Regional Initiative to direct Palipehutu-FNL to enter into negotiation immediately and conclude a ceasefire agreement by 30 December 2002 or face the consequences;

Strongly urged FNL, under the leadership of Agathon Rwasa, to put an end immediately to the hostilities, sign a ceasefire agreement and commit themselves to political negotiations;

Welcomed the success of the donor round table organized in Geneva on 27 and 28 November 2002, and called on donors to respond urgently to the significant progress made recently and to disburse fully the contributions promised so far;

Strongly condemned all massacres and other acts of violence against civilians in Burundi;

Expressed serious concern about the deteriorating humanitarian situation in Burundi.

**Decision of 2 May 2003 (4749th meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4749th meeting, on 2 May 2003, the representative of Burundi was invited to participate in the discussion, and the President (Pakistan) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁴⁶ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Congratulated the Burundian parties on the peaceful transition of power in accordance with the 2000 Arusha Agreement; condemned the attacks of 17 and 25 April on Bujumbura and other cities by the forces of CNDD-FDD;

Reiterated its demand that FNL (Rwasa) lay down its arms and immediately enter into ceasefire with the Government of Burundi without preconditions;

Expressed support for the speedy deployment of the African Mission in Burundi;

Urged donors to support the economy in Burundi;

Urged the Burundian parties to take serious, meaningful steps to address human rights and accountability issues; and reaffirmed the vital importance of the Burundian parties themselves taking ownership of the process to address the devastating impact of impunity;

Requested the Secretary-General to continue to support the peace process in Burundi.

**Deliberations of 4 December 2003
(4876th meeting)**

At the 4876th meeting,⁴⁷ on 4 December 2003, the representative of Burundi was invited to participate in the discussion. The Council heard briefings by the Deputy President of South Africa and the President of the Economic and Social Council, following which all Council members made statements.

The Deputy President of South Africa informed the Council that he had received a mandate from the Great Lakes Regional Peace Initiative on Burundi to report to the Security Council again and to request urgent direct assistance for the Burundi peace process. He detailed the tremendous progress in Burundi, *inter alia*, the establishment of the African mission in March 2003 and an inclusive Transitional Government; reduced levels of violence; the “proficient” presidential alternation from President Buyoya of the Tutsi political family to President Ndayizeye of the Hutu political family in line with the Arusha Agreement of 2000; and the conclusion of outstanding negotiations and the implementation of various agreements. He believed that the establishment of the African mission had been in line with Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations and that reference was also made to such initiatives in Chapter VI. The African mission was headed by a Special Representative of the African Union in Burundi, assisted by three deputies from South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uganda, and integrated a military component with contingents from Mozambique, Ethiopia, and South Africa, with military observers from Burkina Faso, Gabon, Mali, Togo and Tunisia. The objectives of the mission were to oversee the implementation of the ceasefire agreements and to work to achieve conditions that were favourable for the establishment of a United Nations peacekeeping mission. He maintained that the mission was widely regarded as a shining example and model of African solutions to continental security challenges. He also told Council members about the signing of the two Pretoria Protocols of 8 October and 2 November 2003, and the comprehensive ceasefire

⁴⁵ S/PRST/2002/40.

⁴⁶ S/PRST/2003/4.

⁴⁷ At the 4832nd meeting, held in private on 22 September 2003, the members of the Council, the President of Burundi and the Chairperson of the Commission of the African Union had a constructive exchange of views.

agreement signed in Dar es Salaam on 16 November 2003, which had been a consolidation of all agreements between CNDD-FDD of Mr. Nkurunziza and the Transitional Government. As a result, Burundi had completed the first two thirds of the transition period, at the end of which a democratically elected legislature and executive would be in place to replace transitional institutions. He remarked that the November Summit had issued an ultimatum to FNL to join the peace process. He pointed out that conditions were now conducive for the United Nations to express its support and solidarity by taking over the African mission in Burundi, re-hatting the existing military contingent and deploying a United Nations peacekeeping operation. The other, more immediate, relief measures were to provide material, logistical and financial support to enable it to continue its work.⁴⁸

The President of the Economic and Social Council observed that part of the needed international assistance clearly fell within the purview of the Security Council, such as ensuring that the African Union mission peacekeepers either stayed in place or were replaced by United Nations peacekeepers, or a combination of both. He also recognized that supporting the transition between rehabilitation and reconstruction as well as longer-term development clearly fell within the mandate of the Economic and Social Council, with a third part, including support for demobilization, disarmament and reintegration falling somewhere in between. In any case, peace was a prerequisite for reconstruction and development, so the immediate challenge was to avoid any slippage back into conflict. Finally, he opined that the United Nations could advocate for a solid partnership between the international community and Burundians.⁴⁹

The majority of the speakers commended the efforts by the South African authorities, the Heads of State of Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania as well as of many other actors of the Great Lakes Regional Peace Initiative and the African Union, particularly praised the regional nature of various efforts, and welcomed the agreements of 2 and 8 November. Most of the representatives regretted the failure of the Nairobi negotiations between the Transitional Government and FNL and urged the parties to cease hostilities and enter into negotiations.

⁴⁸ S/PV.4876, pp. 2-5.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

Several representatives expressed concern about the economic, social and humanitarian situation in the country, as well as the results to date of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process. A few speakers referred to the regional dimension of the conflict in the countries of the Great Lakes region.⁵⁰

Some speakers advocated further logistical and financial support to the African mission⁵¹ or stated that they would examine the possibility of contributing to peacekeeping efforts in Burundi.⁵²

The representatives of Angola, Cameroon, France, Guinea and the United Kingdom spoke in favour of the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation in Burundi.⁵³ The representative of France pointed out that the international community needed to take over from and consolidate regional efforts, and ensure an element of coherence in United Nations actions.⁵⁴ The representative of Angola called the attention of the Council to the need to apply the same standards to Burundi as it had in Liberia, in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and as it would in Côte d'Ivoire.⁵⁵

The representative of China highlighted that the United Nations needed to enhance its coordination and cooperation with the African Union and its support to the African Union's mission in Burundi through joint efforts.⁵⁶

The representative of Germany suggested that if FNL failed to enter into negotiations within a three-month period, the Council might wish to consider coercive measures against those FNL leaders unwilling to cooperate, as well as a weapons embargo against FNL.⁵⁷

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Angola); p. 10 (Germany); and p. 12 (Russian Federation).

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Pakistan); p. 8 (China); p. 11 (United States, Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 15 (Bulgaria).

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Pakistan); p. 8 (China); p. 11 (United States); p. 12 (Russian Federation); and p. 14 (Chile).

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (France); pp. 6-7 (Angola); pp. 8-9 (United Kingdom); pp. 12-13 (Guinea); and pp. 13-14 (Cameroon).

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

Decision of 22 December 2003 (4891st meeting): statement by the President

At its 4891st meeting, on 22 December 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Burundi.⁵⁸

In his report, the Secretary-General underlined that the transfer of power at the level of the Head of State and intensive ceasefire negotiations in 2003 had created a new hope for a democratic and peaceful Burundi. The transitional institutions were working well and the people of Burundi were adjusting themselves to the new situation. He reiterated his call on Palipehutu-FNL to “immediately and without conditions” begin ceasefire negotiations with the Transitional Government. He expressed concern about the living conditions of the people of Burundi and called on the donor community to provide “all-round assistance” and support to the African Mission in Burundi. Finally, he indicated that the preparation and

⁵⁸ S/2003/1146.

conduct of the elections would need to be undertaken in the coming year.

At the meeting, the President (Bulgaria) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁵⁹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its full support for the peace process of the Arusha Agreement for Peace and Reconciliation for Burundi, called on all the Burundian parties to implement their commitments and assured them of its determination to support their efforts in this direction;

Welcomed the progress recently made by the Burundian parties, in particular by the signing, in Pretoria, of the protocols of 8 October and 2 November 2003 and by the conclusion, on 16 November 2003 in Dar es Salaam, of the Global Ceasefire Agreement between the Transitional Government and CNDD-FDD of Mr. Nkurunziza;

Condemned all acts of violence as well as violations of human rights and international humanitarian law, and reaffirmed its determination to support Burundian efforts to prevent such acts, based on the rule of law, in order to put an end to impunity.

⁵⁹ S/PRST/2003/30.

7. Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America

Decision of 12 September 2003 (4820th meeting): resolution 1506 (2003)

By a letter dated 15 August 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya informed the Council that the remaining issues relating to the fulfilment of all Security Council resolutions resulting from the Lockerbie incident had been resolved. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had facilitated the bringing to justice of the two suspects charged with the bombing of Pan Am flight 103 and accepted responsibility for the actions of its officials; had cooperated with the Scottish investigating authorities; and had arranged for the payment of appropriate compensation. His Government had also repeatedly condemned all acts of terrorism. He then called on the Security Council to immediately lift the measures set forth in its resolutions 748 (1992) and 883 (1993).¹

¹ S/2003/818.

By a letter dated 15 August 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States referred to the letter dated 15 August 2003 from Libyan Arab Jamahiriya related to bombing of Pan Am flight 103 and reported that the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States were prepared to allow the lifting of the measures set forth in resolutions 748 (1992) and 883 (1993) once the necessary sums referred to in the Libyan letter had been transferred to the agreed escrow account.²

At its 4820th meeting, convened on 9 September 2003, the Security Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned letters. The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya was invited to participate in the meeting. The President (United Kingdom) stated that, as a result of painstaking negotiations, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had accepted its responsibility for the bombing of Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie and had

² S/2003/819.

agreed to pay compensation to the relatives of the victims, to cooperate with any further Lockerbie investigation and to renounce terrorism. He stated that these agreements were all substantial gains, which opened the possibility of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya moving back into the international community and of the lifting sanctions. However, he also stated that the Council members were conscious of two factors: that the Council needed to act unanimously; and that there were legitimate concerns pertaining to the Libya Arab Jamahiriya which still needed resolution. As a result of a discussion on the issues among the Council members, the President invoked rule 33 of the provisional rule of the procedures and proposed the adjournment of the meeting. The procedural motion was then put to the vote and was carried unanimously.

On 12 September 2003, the meeting was reconvened, and statements were made by the representatives of Bulgaria, France, Germany, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Kingdom and the United States. The President (United Kingdom) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria and the United Kingdom;³ it was put to the vote and adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (France, United States) as resolution 1506 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to lift, with immediate effect, the measures set forth in paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of its resolution 748 (1992) and paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of its resolution 883 (1993);

Decided further to dissolve the Committee established by paragraph 9 of resolution 748 (1992);

Decided also that it had concluded its consideration of the item entitled "Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America" and removed the item from the list of matters of which the Council was seized.

The representative of the United States stated that the sanctions had been suspended in 1999 after the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had fulfilled one demand by transferring the two Libyan suspects for trial and that the country had subsequently addressed the remaining United Nations requirements related to the bombing of Pan Am flight 103. In recognition of these steps, his country had not opposed the formal lifting of the sanctions on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. However, he emphasized that this decision must not be misconstrued

by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya or by the world community as United States acceptance that the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had rehabilitated itself. He also stated that the United States continued to be concerned about other aspects of Libyan behaviour, including its poor human rights record; its rejection of democratic norms and standards, its irresponsible behaviour in Africa; its history of involvement in terrorism; and its pursuit of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. He stated that the United States would intensify its efforts to end the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya's threatening actions. This included keeping United States bilateral sanctions on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. He stated that the United States could not guarantee that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would take the required steps and it would not want the United States' vote on the resolution lifting sanctions to be misconstrued as a decision now to modify United States bilateral measures. He stated that for this reason, and because of the concerns he had stated, his country had abstained in the voting on this resolution.⁴

The representative of France stated that the agreement reached on the previous day between the representatives of the families of UTA flight 772 and the Qaddafi Foundation had allowed France not to oppose the lifting of sanctions against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The lifting of sanctions against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya was an important phase in the process of reintegrating that country into the international community. He stressed that this normalization, which France encouraged, presumed that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would continue to make the necessary gestures beyond the requirements for the lifting of sanctions. He also stressed that France would be vigilant in ensuring that the agreement reached between the families of the victims of the bombing of the UTA flight and the Qaddafi Foundation was rapidly implemented. He stated that this was the substance of the position according to which France had abstained in the voting on the resolution just adopted by the Security Council. He emphasized that France also intended to be vigilant with respect to all aspects involving human rights and combating terrorism.⁵

⁴ S/PV.4820 (Part II), p. 3.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

³ S/2003/824.

The representative of the United Kingdom emphasized that the arrangements for the trial and appeal were made in accordance with the Security Council resolution. He appreciated that the Council had placed sanctions on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya until certain requirements were met, sanctions being the only means of actually delivering justice. He stated that his country would pursue those responsible for terrorism. He stressed that his country hoped the resolution would bring some comfort to the relatives and friends of the victims of the bombing of Pan Am flight 103 and that the agreement was the result of patient diplomacy over many years.⁶

Speakers expressed their sympathy with the families of the victims of the bombings of Pan Am flight 103 and UTA flight 772 and the terrorist attack on the La Belle discotheque in Berlin. They also agreed that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had fully met with the conditions for the lifting of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council. A number of speakers called on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for further commitment to the implementation of the agreements, including, *inter alia*, cooperating in anti-terrorism and paying the compensation to the relatives of the victims of the relevant terrorist attacks.

The representatives of France, Germany, and the United Kingdom welcomed that the representatives of the families of the bombings of UTA flight 772 and the Qaddafi Foundation had reached agreement on the compensation for the relatives of the victims. They also urged the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to reach an appropriate settlement with the representatives of victims and their families of the bombing in Berlin.⁷

The representative of Spain stated that the lifting of the sanctions not only ended the alienation of a country like the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya from the international community, but it also reflected recognition of an improvement in the relations of that country with the international community. For Spain, which was committed to anti-terrorism, the act of proclaiming the renunciation of terrorism as an instrument of political action was a source of great satisfaction.⁸

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (France, Germany); and p. 6 (United Kingdom).

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

The representative of Bulgaria emphasized its close and important relationship with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. He also stated that Bulgaria had always maintained that once a country under sanctions fulfilled the conditions imposed on it by the Council, the sanctions must be lifted.⁹

However, the representatives of the Russian Federation, Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic regretted that the Security Council had been delayed in resolving the question of lifting the sanctions.¹⁰ The representatives of Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic expressed happiness that the long-standing suffering of the fraternal Libyan people under the weight of those sanctions was now coming to an end.¹¹ The representative of Pakistan stressed that, while his country understood the French position, given the humanitarian aspects of the issue of the compensation for the families of the bombing of UTA flight 772, adjudication of issues such as compensation rested with other relevant organs, in the light to the provisions of the Charter. He also stressed that if that approach had been followed the delay in the final lifting of the sanctions and a strain on the Council could have been avoided.¹² The representative of the Russian Federation stated that, as a result of the delay in resolving the question of lifting the sanctions, the political image of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had been undermined, despite the suspension of action related to the sanction measures by the Council in 1998. He emphasized that restrictive measures under Chapter VII of the Charter must immediately cease once all Security Council requirements had been met.¹³ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic emphasized that his country believed that the Council did not have to impose sanctions that would adversely impact the civilian population and that exposed people to suffering under collective sanctions that were unacceptable under international law and the Charter.¹⁴

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (Bulgaria, Pakistan); and p. 5 (Russian Federation and Syrian Arab Republic).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (Pakistan); and p. 5 (Syrian Arab Republic).

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (Bulgaria, Pakistan); and p. 5 (Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic).

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

8. The situation in Sierra Leone

Decision of 7 February 2000 (4099th meeting): resolution 1289 (2000)

At its 4098th meeting,¹ on 7 February 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda a letter dated 23 December 1999 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council² and the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) dated 11 January 2000.³

By the above-mentioned letter, in view of the impending withdrawal of troops from the Monitoring Group of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in Sierra Leone, the Secretary-General recommended that the Council authorize the expansion of UNAMSIL up to 10,000 military personnel and broaden its mandate with more robust rules of engagement in order to enable it to assume the functions currently performed by the Monitoring Group (ECOMOG).

In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the peace established in Sierra Leone, despite some progress, remained very fragile. In order to enable UNAMSIL to assume many of the functions assigned to ECOMOG, he recommended that the Security Council authorize, as soon as possible, the expansion of UNAMSIL to up to 11,100 military personnel and a broadening of its mandate. He noted that the expansion of UNAMSIL would be indispensable for making progress towards priorities identified in the peace process — maintaining the necessary security conditions for the implementation of the Lomé Agreement, in particular the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme, the extension of State administration throughout the

provinces and, in due course, the holding of elections in Sierra Leone.

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, following which statements were made by the representatives of Bangladesh, Mali, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General reported that the situation in Sierra Leone had remained relatively stable, notwithstanding a number of serious incidents and updated the Council on the deployment and expansion of UNAMSIL, in view of the withdrawal of ECOMOG troops from the country. Concluding his briefing, he underlined the importance for regional leaders and Security Council members to continue to engage with the parties to ensure they fulfill their commitments under the Lomé Agreement and cooperate fully with UNAMSIL. Following a number of questions regarding the deployment of UNAMSIL, the Under-Secretary-General reported about some difficulties concerning the operational capacity of the Mission and updated the Council on the stage of negotiations with a number of countries interested in contributing to the expanded Mission.⁴

At its 4099th meeting,⁵ on 7 February 2000, the Council included in its agenda the documents considered at the 4098th meeting.⁶ The President (Argentina) also drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 17 January 2000 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Sierra Leone,⁷ endorsing the recommendations of the Secretary-General contained in his report dated 11 January 2000.

Some Council members,⁸ as well as the representative of Sierra Leone, made statements. In their statements, speakers supported the expansion and the broadened mandate of UNAMSIL, recognized the contribution of ECOMOG, and underlined the importance of the full implementation of the Lomé

¹ During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held a number of meetings in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL), pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B. The meetings were held on 13 September 2001 (4371st), 20 March 2002 (4496th), 18 September 2002 (4610th), 20 March 2003 (4724th) and 16 September 2003 (4827th).

² S/1999/1285.

³ S/2000/13 and Add.1, submitted pursuant to resolution 1270 (1999).

⁴ S/PV.4098, pp. 2-4.

⁵ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part IV, sect. B, with regard to Article 42 of the Charter.

⁶ S/1999/1285 and S/2000/13 and Add.1.

⁷ S/2000/31.

⁸ Canada, China, Ukraine, the United Kingdom and the United States.

Agreement. The representative of Sierra Leone welcomed the fact that the revised mandate and additional responsibilities of UNAMSIL were fully backed by Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.⁹ By contrast, the representative of the United Kingdom underlined that UNAMSIL was not a Chapter VII peace enforcement mission, although in formulating the mandate of the Mission it was recognized that the task required a robust and serious stance against possible threats.¹⁰

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹¹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1289 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided that the military component of UNAMSIL should be expanded to a maximum of 11,100 military personnel, including the 260 military observers already deployed;

Decided further that the mandate of UNAMSIL, as revised, should be extended for a period of six months from the date of the adoption of the resolution;

Authorized the increases in the civil affairs, civilian police, administrative and technical personnel of UNAMSIL proposed by the Secretary-General in his report of 11 January 2000;

Welcomed the intention of the Secretary-General to establish within UNAMSIL a landmine action office responsible for mine action activities; reiterated the importance of the safety, security and freedom of movement of United Nations and associated personnel;

Reiterated its request to the Government of Sierra Leone to conclude a status-of-forces agreement with the Secretary-General within 30 days of the adoption of this resolution;

Welcomed the contributions made to the multi-donor trust fund;

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, decided further that the mandate of UNAMSIL should be revised to include the following additional tasks:

(a) To provide security at key locations and Government buildings, in particular in Freetown, important intersections and major airports, including Lungi airport;

(b) To facilitate the free flow of people, goods and humanitarian assistance along specified thoroughfares;

(c) To provide security in and at all sites of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme;

(d) To coordinate with and assist, in common areas of deployment, the Sierra Leone law enforcement authorities in the discharge of their responsibilities;

(e) To guard weapons, ammunition and other military equipment collected from ex-combatants and to assist in their subsequent disposal or destruction;

Authorized UNAMSIL to take the necessary action to fulfil the additional tasks set out above.

Deliberations of 13 March 2000 (4111th meeting)

On 7 March 2000, the Secretary-General submitted a report on UNAMSIL,¹² in which he observed that one of the main priorities for UNAMSIL remained the speedy establishment of a credible peacekeeping presence throughout the country to create the necessary climate of confidence and security conditions for the implementation of various aspects of the peace process. At the same time, the Secretary-General expressed concern about the often negative and confusing approach taken by the leader of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), Mr. Foday Sankoh, to key elements of the peace process and the role entrusted to the United Nations and UNAMSIL. He condemned as unacceptable the continuing ceasefire violations perpetrated against civilians and peacekeepers as well as the persistent obstruction of UNAMSIL patrols and deployments. In the face of considerable difficulties, the Secretary-General reported that UNAMSIL made impressive progress in deploying to many locations in Sierra Leone, including areas where previously no ECOMOG peacekeepers had been deployed. He therefore hoped that the continuing expansion of UNAMSIL would help to instill confidence and accelerate the process of disarmament, which progressed quite slowly, as well as the delivery of humanitarian assistance. Also, the Secretary-General outlined the main steps ahead in the peace process in Sierra Leone that could be grouped under four specific areas: first, the early disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of all ex-combatants; secondly, the extension of State authority, including law enforcement, throughout the country; thirdly, national reconciliation and democratization; and, fourthly, the improvement of Sierra Leone's capacity to ensure its own security. The Secretary-General observed that the progress towards these objectives would require full

⁹ S/PV.4099, p. 3.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹¹ S/2000/34.

¹² S/2000/186, submitted pursuant to resolution 1289 (2000).

and sustained commitment by the Government of Sierra Leone, RUF and other Sierra Leonean parties, as well as on the part of the international community. Finally, the Secretary-General expressed his gratitude to the efforts of the ECOWAS Chairman as well as of the other leaders of the region in supporting the peace process in Sierra Leone.

At its 4111th meeting, on 13 March 2000, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.¹² At the meeting, at which statements were made by most members of the Council and the representative of Sierra Leone,¹³ the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General noted that during the reporting period there had been some progress in furthering the peace process in Sierra Leone, but in many areas the process had remained slow, in particular with regard to the disarmament process in the northern and eastern parts of the country, where groups of rebels continued to interfere with humanitarian activities and with UNAMSIL patrols and to harass the civilian population in such areas. He reiterated the appeal of the Secretary-General for the parties to stop the ceasefire violations perpetrated against the civilians and the peacekeepers as well as the persistent obstructions of UNAMSIL patrols and deployment. Finally, he recalled the main steps that according to the Secretary-General should be taken in the peace process, underscoring also the importance of a sustained commitment by all the parties concerned, as well as the need for significant material and financial resources.¹⁴

In the course of the debate, members of the Council endorsed the report of the Secretary-General and generally concurred with his assessment of the situation as well as with the four main steps in the peace process. The representative of the United Kingdom noted that his recent visit to Sierra Leone bore out the main conclusions in the Secretary-General's analysis and recommended that the President make a statement to the media which, among other things, made it clear that the Council endorsed the conclusions of the Secretary-General's report.¹⁵ Some speakers welcomed the continued presence of ECOMOG to maintain the fragile situation and prevent

a security vacuum and, in this regard, applauded the decision of the Government of Nigeria to suspend the withdrawal of the Nigerian ECOMOG troops.¹⁶ The representative of Malaysia stated that it was imperative for UNAMSIL to respond in a "more assertive manner", in accordance with the robust rules of engagement provided for under the limited Chapter VII mandate of the Mission.¹⁷ Similarly, the representative of Argentina noted that, since UNAMSIL was facing a hostile environment, Chapter VII of the Charter and the rules of engagement should be applied very rigorously.¹⁸

On the basis of the preceding discussion, the President outlined six elements he intended to include in his statement to the media: (1) members of the Security Council endorsed, in general, the conclusions of the Secretary-General's report; (2) Council members placed great weight on the early implementation of all aspects of the Lomé Peace Agreement and commended the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Oluyemi Adeniji, and of UNAMSIL to this end; (3) Council members expressed their disappointment at the slow progress being made in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process in particular; (4) Council members called upon all signatories to the Lomé Agreement, and in particular upon Chairman Sankoh and RUF, to reaffirm and demonstrate their concrete commitment to the Lomé peace process by allowing the extension of State authority throughout Sierra Leone, in full cooperation with UNAMSIL and with the United Nations team as a whole, and by instructing the RUF membership to disarm and to surrender all weapons, including their heavy weapons, mines and anti-aircraft equipment; (5) Council members urged Member States strictly to enforce the travel ban imposed by the Council and to remind concerned Sierra Leone leaders of their obligation to obtain exemptions before travelling abroad, without exception; and lastly (6) Council members welcomed the upcoming donor conference in London on 27 March and urged Members to participate and contribute generously to the peace process and development efforts in Sierra Leone.¹⁹

¹³ The representative of France did not make a statement.

¹⁴ S/PV.4111, pp. 2-5.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 5-7.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 8 (Netherlands); and p. 11 (Jamaica); and S/PV.4111 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Canada).

¹⁷ S/PV.4111, p. 7.

¹⁸ S/PV.4111 (Resumption 1), p. 4.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 12.

**Decision of 4 May 2000 (4134th meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4134th meeting, on 4 May 2000, in which the representative of Sierra Leone was invited to participate, the President (China) drew the attention of the Council to two letters dated 2 and 4 May 2000 from the representative of Sierra Leone, transmitting, respectively, a press release related to incidents of violence against international peacekeepers in Sierra Leone²⁰ and a resolution adopted by the Parliament of Sierra Leone following the mounting attacks on UNAMSIL forces.²¹

At the meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,²² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Demanded that RUF release immediately and unharmed all detained United Nations and other international personnel and cooperate in establishing the whereabouts of those unaccounted for; held Foday Sankoh, as leader of RUF, to be responsible for these actions;

Commended the forces of UNAMSIL and the Force Commander for the courage, resolve and sacrifice they had shown in attempting to bring the situation under control.

Deliberations of 11 May 2000 (4139th meeting)

The 4139th meeting of the Council²³ was held on 11 May 2000 in response to the requests contained in a letter dated 10 May 2000 from the representative of Eritrea, on behalf of the Group of African States,²⁴ and letters dated 11 May 2000 from the representatives of Mali and Namibia.²⁵ The letters were included in the agenda of the meeting.

The Council heard a briefing by the Secretary-General, following which statements were made by all Council members²⁶ and the representatives of Algeria (on behalf of the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity), Djibouti, India, Japan, Jordan, Norway,

Pakistan, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union²⁷) and Sierra Leone.²⁸

In opening the meeting, the President (China) emphasized the urgency and the importance of the matter before the Council, and observed that since the deterioration of the situation in Sierra Leone the Council had held numerous consultations and heard regular briefings from the Secretariat. The Council was then briefed by the Secretary-General who described the detention of several hundreds of UNAMSIL peacekeepers by RUF as “deplorable and unacceptable”. He therefore reminded the RUF leader, Foday Sankoh, of his responsibility for the action of forces under his command, and demanded that the detainees be immediately and unconditionally released. Observing that UNAMSIL was configured as a peacekeeping force and that it was neither designed nor equipped to be an enforcement operation, the Secretary-General stated that, in the light of the new situation, it was necessary to consolidate and reinforce the United Nations troops so that they could defend themselves and their mandates effectively and help stabilize the situation. Since after the deployment of additional troops to Sierra Leone the military component of UNAMSIL would exceed the maximum authorized by the Council in resolution 1289 (2000), the Secretary-General hoped that, under the circumstances, the Council would be willing to set a new and more generous limit. Emphasizing the logistical difficulties of such reinforcement, he commended the Member States that were willing to assist, including the offer by ECOWAS to send additional troops. Noting that West African leaders, among others, had called for a revision of the UNAMSIL mandate to give it a clear enforcement role, the Secretary-General stated that he was not necessarily opposed to that but specified that, whatever mandate was decided, the first priority for the Council should be to ensure that there was the capacity to carry out the tasks outlined in the mandate. With reference to the offer of troops by ECOWAS, the Secretary-General underlined that it was contingent on financial and logistical support from other Member States. Although recognizing that a degree of regional and subregional specializations in handling security issues was quite

²⁰ S/2000/373.

²¹ S/2000/380.

²² S/PRST/2000/14.

²³ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part IV, sect. B, with regard to Article 42 of the Charter; part V, sect. B, with regard to Article 43; and part V, sect. D, with regard to Article 44.

²⁴ S/2000/408.

²⁵ S/2000/409 and S/2000/410.

²⁶ The representative of Mali made a statement in his capacity as coordinator of the States of ECOMOG.

²⁷ The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁸ The representative of Mozambique was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

natural and healthy, he observed that the United Nations and the Council could not be released from their overall responsibility. In his view, the best way to provide UNAMSIL with the combat capability it needed was to cooperate to reactivate the peace process and to form with the new troops a nucleus of a rapid reaction force. He therefore called on the Council to back words with deeds, and mandates with the resources to make them work.²⁹

During the course of the debate, speakers were unanimous in their condemnation of the actions of RUF and its leadership, requesting that the detained peacekeepers be released immediately and without preconditions. The majority of speakers expressed the view that the credibility of the United Nations was at stake; commended the Government of the United Kingdom for sending additional troops to defend the airport; and, in view of the possible repercussions of the events in Sierra Leone on peacekeeping in other parts of Africa, called for urgent action in the crisis; agreed that priority should be given to securing the release of the hostages, as well as to stabilizing the situation by quickly reinforcing UNAMSIL through the deployment of the remaining troops; welcomed the decision of the recent Summit of Heads of State of ECOWAS held in Abuja to send troops to Sierra Leone.

In connection with the mandate of UNAMSIL, several speakers, in view of the serious situation on the ground and the small numbers of UNAMSIL forces, called for a review of the Mission's mandate by adoption of a new resolution that would place UNAMSIL entirely within the context of Chapter VII of the Charter, making it a peace-enforcement mission.³⁰ The representative of China stressed that the Council should adopt appropriate measures with respect to the situation in Sierra Leone, including a review of the mandate and the adoption of measures to ensure that the mandate was fully implemented. In this regard, he expected the Secretariat to formulate recommendations.³¹ The representative of France noted that there should be true cohesiveness between the

mandate of the force and the size, which was not sufficiently the case for UNAMSIL.³²

By contrast, the representatives of the United Kingdom, Argentina, the Russian Federation, Portugal, India, Pakistan and Jordan expressed the view that the current mandate of UNAMSIL was sufficient to deal with the situation and to carry out the Mission's tasks, as it contained elements of Chapter VII of the Charter.³³ The representative of the United Kingdom agreed with the conclusion of the Secretary-General that changing the UNAMSIL mandate would not of itself change it into an effective peace enforcement mission and moving to peace enforcement would be a radical change of approach, which should be thought carefully.³⁴

Expressing his country's gratitude to the United Nations, the representative of Sierra Leone stressed that the average citizen in his country did not know the difference between Chapter VI and Chapter VII mandates. He therefore appealed to the Security Council, as the organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, to take the lead in ensuring the safety and security of the people in Sierra Leone and of the United Nations Mission deployed to give effect to the Council's mandatory decisions on Sierra Leone.³⁵

**Decision of 19 May 2000 (4145th meeting):
resolution 1299 (2000)**

At its 4145th meeting, on 19 May 2000, in which the representative of Sierra Leone was invited to participate, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 17 May 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council.³⁶ In the letter, the Secretary-General stated that, as a result of the recent attacks by RUF against UNAMSIL personnel and the resumption of hostilities, it was deemed crucial to accelerate the deployment of military units that Member States had already committed for service with UNAMSIL, as well as to further reinforce the Mission's military component, up to 13,000 military personnel. As the Council, by

²⁹ S/PV.4139, pp. 2-3.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (Algeria); p. 6 (Mali as coordinator of the ECOMOG States); p. 10 (Malaysia); p. 13 (Bangladesh); p. 14 (Namibia); p. 17 (Jamaica); p. 18 (Ukraine); and p. 20 (Tunisia).

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 19.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 15 (Argentina); p. 16 (Russian Federation); p. 22 (Portugal); p. 24 (India); p. 27 (Pakistan); and p. 28 (Jordan).

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

³⁶ S/2000/446.

resolution 1289 (2000), had authorized the Mission's strength of 11,100 military personnel, the Secretary-General noted that that number would be exceeded in the following days as the reinforcements arrived, therefore requesting the Security Council to consider taking appropriate steps to authorize the interim expansion of the United Nations force.

At the meeting, at which no statements were made, the President (China) drew the attention of the Council to two letters dated 15 May 2000 from the representative of Sierra Leone, transmitting a statement by the Government on the third meeting of the Joint Implementation Committee on the Lomé Peace Agreement³⁷ and a message broadcast to the nation by the President of Sierra Leone in which he appealed to the members of RUF to lay down their arms and release all United Nations peacekeepers being detained;³⁸ and a letter dated 9 May 2000 from the representative of Mali addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting the final communiqué of the Summit of ECOWAS Heads of State, members of the Committee on Sierra Leone of the Lomé Peace Agreement, held in Abuja on 9 May 2000.³⁹

The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁴⁰ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1299 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided that the military component of UNAMSIL should be expanded to a maximum of 13,000 military personnel, including the 260 military observers already deployed;

Expressed its appreciation to all States for the rapid reinforcement of UNAMSIL and for their additional contribution of personnel and logistical and technical assistance; and decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, decided that the restrictions set out in paragraph 2 of its resolution 1171 (1998) of 5 June 1998 did not apply to the sale or supply of arms and related materiel for the sole use in Sierra Leone of those Member States cooperating with UNAMSIL and the Government of Sierra Leone.

³⁷ S/2000/433.

³⁸ S/2000/434.

³⁹ S/2000/441.

⁴⁰ S/2000/449.

**Decision of 5 July 2000 (4168th meeting):
resolution 1306 (2000)**

On 19 May 2000, the Secretary-General submitted a report on UNAMSIL, in which he observed that the overall situation in Sierra Leone remained tense and critical. He condemned as unacceptable acts the deliberate and unprovoked attacks by RUF fighters on United Nations peacekeepers as well as the detention of large numbers of United Nations personnel.⁴¹ To this end, he demanded that the leadership of RUF release immediately and unconditionally all remaining United Nations personnel in their hands and called upon those with influence on RUF to continue to work towards this end. In addition, he also recommended that the Security Council consider a strengthening of the sanctions regime, including measures which would prevent RUF commanders from reaping the benefits of their illegal exploitation of mineral resources, in particular diamonds. In such difficult circumstances, the Secretary-General noted that active political efforts to assist the people of Sierra Leone to change the course of events in their country should be supplemented by credible military force and therefore recommended an increase of the strength of UNAMSIL up to a level of 16,500 military personnel, for the purpose of stabilizing the situation in the country. With reference to the Mission's mandate, the Secretary-General observed that he did not oppose a strong peace-enforcement mandate under Chapter VII of the Charter, as long as the United Nations was able to obtain from Member States the necessary resources to carry out the new mandate and the international community demonstrated the necessary will and resolve to sustain such a commitment. The Secretary-General added that, ultimately, a lasting resolution of the crisis could not be imposed by military force alone, but needed to be found through political means, with the Government of Sierra Leone holding a particular responsibility to actively design and implement the necessary steps towards peace in consultation with its regional and international partners, particularly the continuation of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process, together with the restructuring of Sierra Leone's armed forces.

⁴¹ S/2000/455, submitted pursuant to resolution 1289 (2000).

At its 4168th meeting,^{42,43} on 5 July 2000, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.⁴⁴ Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, China, Canada, France (on behalf of the European Union⁴⁵), Mali, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States.

Speaking before the vote, the representative of Sierra Leone, noting that the illicit export of Sierra Leonean diamonds was not only the fuel and the root cause of the conflict but also a major obstacle to a peaceful resolution of the conflict, welcomed the adoption of the resolution as a major contribution to

the search for peace and stability in Sierra Leone.⁴⁶ Several speakers agreed that the measures contained in the draft resolution were an important instrument to stop the illicit exploitation of and trade in diamonds in order to help restore peace and stability in Sierra Leone.⁴⁷

The representative of Canada, stating that the natural wealth of Sierra Leone needed to be used for the people of the country, welcomed the balanced approach of the resolution, which targeted illicit Sierra Leone diamonds through a certification regime. While recalling the responsibility of the diamond industry to be vigilant in its processes and in its practices, he added that the Council should consider taking further action to tackle the regional sources of support for RUF.⁴⁸

With reference to the time-bound nature of the sanctions regime imposed by the Council, the representative of the United States expressed reservations about the effectiveness of a time frame for the sanctions, stressing that the only viable criterion for a review of the measures was a change in the behaviour that led to the sanctions in the first place, namely the use of diamonds by RUF to fuel the conflict in Sierra Leone and the full control of the Government over its resources.⁴⁹ While the representative of the Netherlands supported the periodic review of the sanctions regime, he opposed time limits leading to an automatic discontinuation of sanctions in the absence of a resolution leading to their extension.⁵⁰

By contrast, expressing his satisfaction with the element of time-bound sanctions contained in the draft resolution, the representative of China indicated that the sanctions imposed by the Council should not be indefinite and that a periodic review of such measures should be conducted and adjustments made on the basis of circumstances.⁵¹ Similarly, the representative of the Russian Federation emphasized that it was of fundamental importance that the sanctions regime, in relation to the illegitimate export of diamonds from Sierra Leone, was limited to 18 months from the time

⁴² At its 4163rd meeting, held in private on 21 June 2000, the Council met with the delegation of the ECOWAS Mediation and Security Council Committee of Six on Sierra Leone which included the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mali (leader of the delegation), the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Ghana, Liberia, Nigeria and Togo, the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Guinea to the United Nations, and the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS. The members of the Security Council and the Ministerial Committee had a full discussion of the situation in Sierra Leone, during which they agreed on the need, in accordance with the objectives set out in the Lomé Agreement, to restore stability and normality throughout Sierra Leone, putting an end to violence and encouraging reconciliation between all parties to the conflict. Council members and the ECOWAS Committee also condemned the continued detention by RUF of United Nations peacekeepers and the denial of freedom of movement to a large number of other United Nations personnel in the east of the country, demanding the immediate and unconditional release of all United Nations personnel detained or surrounded. Members of the Security Council and the ECOWAS delegation also expressed their concern about the humanitarian situation in Sierra Leone and called upon all parties to ensure safe and unhindered access of humanitarian assistance to those in need in Sierra Leone. Finally, members of the Security Council informed the members of the ECOWAS delegation of ongoing discussion within the Council on draft resolutions concerning the strengthening of UNAMSIL, the control of diamond exports and arms imports and on the provision of justice.

⁴³ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41 of the Charter.

⁴⁴ S/2000/455.

⁴⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁴⁶ S/PV.4168, pp. 2-3.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4 (United Kingdom); pp. 4-5 (United States); p. 6 (Russian Federation); pp. 6-7 (Argentina); and p. 7 (China).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

of adoption of the draft resolution, indicating that the Council should then review the situation in Sierra Leone and, if necessary, take a decision as to whether the sanctions should be extended or adjusted.⁵²

The representative of France expressed the hope that the Council would be quick in deciding to support an increase in the troop strength of UNAMSIL as recommended by the Secretary-General and in bringing Mr. Sankoh and his associates to trial for violations of the Lomé Peace Agreement. Calling on the leadership of RUF to immediately and unconditionally respect the commitments made, he held that Mr. Sankoh could no longer be considered a partner of the peace process under any circumstances, by virtue of his personal responsibility for the recent events that had occurred in Sierra Leone.⁵³

The representative of Mali declined to support the resolution, pointing out that by calling into question one of the States of ECOWAS, namely Liberia, the resolution had faulted the growing working relationship between the Council and ECOWAS. Given that the investigation by ECOWAS into the diamond trade had not been completed, he added that the reference to Liberia was of concern to ECOWAS and noted that it might have implications for the role of ECOWAS in the peace process.⁵⁴

At the same meeting, the President (Jamaica) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution,⁵⁵ submitted by the United Kingdom; it was put to a vote and was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention (Mali), as resolution 1306 (2000), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, *inter alia*:

Decided that all States should take the necessary measures to prohibit the direct or indirect import of all rough diamonds from Sierra Leone to their territory;

Requested the Government of Sierra Leone to ensure that an effective certificate-of-origin regime for trade in diamonds was in operation in Sierra Leone;

Also requested States, relevant international organizations and other bodies in a position to do so to offer assistance to the Government of Sierra Leone to facilitate the full operation of an effective certificate-of-origin regime for Sierra Leone rough diamonds;

Decided that rough diamonds controlled by the Government of Sierra Leone through the certificate-of-origin regime should be exempt from the measures imposed in paragraph 1 of the resolution when the Committee reported to the Council;

Decided that the measures referred to in paragraph 1 are established for an initial period of 18 months, and affirmed that, at the end of this period, it would review the situation in Sierra Leone;

Requested all States to report to the Committee established by resolution 1132 (1997), within 30 days of the adoption of the present resolution, on the actions taken to implement the measures imposed by paragraph 1 of the resolution;

Requested the Committee to hold an exploratory hearing in New York no later than 31 July 2000 to assess the role of diamonds in the Sierra Leone conflict and the link between trade in Sierra Leone diamonds and trade in arms and related materiel in violation of resolution 1171 (1998);

Decided to conduct a first review on the measures imposed by paragraph 1 of the resolution no later than 15 September 2000, and further such reviews every six months after the date of adoption of the resolution;

Requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Committee, to establish a panel of experts, for an initial period of four months, consisting of no more than five members.

**Decision of 17 July 2000 (4173rd meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4173rd meeting, on 17 July 2000, the President (Jamaica) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁵⁶ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Expressed its full support for the decision taken by the Secretary-General to mount a military operation by UNAMSIL to relieve its surrounded peacekeepers and military observers at Kailahun;

Expressed its satisfaction at the successful outcome of the operation and its admiration for the professionalism, determination and robustness displayed by UNAMSIL forces involved in this difficult and dangerous operation;

Expressed its profound condolences to the family of the Indian sergeant, Krishna Kumar, who gave his life in the cause of peace; and Expressed also its sympathies to those who were wounded.

⁵⁶ S/PRST/2000/24.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

⁵⁵ S/2000/635.

**Decision of 4 August 2000 (4184th meeting):
resolution 1313 (2000)**

On 19 May 2000, the Secretary-General submitted a report on UNAMSIL.⁵⁷ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the overall situation in Sierra Leone remained tense and critical, particularly in the light of the deliberate and unprovoked attacks by RUF fighters on United Nations peacekeepers and the detention of large numbers of United Nations personnel. He demanded that the leadership of RUF take urgent steps to ensure that all remaining United Nations personnel in their hands were released immediately and unconditionally and called upon those with influence on RUF to continue to work towards this end. In addition, he called upon the Security Council to consider a strengthening of the sanctions regime, including measures which would prevent the RUF commanders from reaping the benefits of their illegal exploitation of mineral resources, in particular diamonds. Finally, he recommended an increase in the strength of UNAMSIL up to a level of 16,500 military personnel for the purpose of stabilizing the situation in Sierra Leone.

On 31 July 2000, the Secretary-General submitted another report on UNAMSIL,⁵⁸ reiterating that the situation in Sierra Leone remained dangerous and volatile, he observed that, under the present circumstances, peace and stability in the country could not be achieved through either political or military means only, but through a collective approach, concentrating efforts for a political solution based on a robust and credible military presence. He therefore recommended the extension of the mandate of UNAMSIL for another period of six months.

At its 4184th meeting, on 4 August 2000, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned reports of the Secretary-General. At the meeting, in which the representative of Sierra Leone was invited to participate, the President (Malaysia) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 24 July 2000 from the representative of Sierra Leone transmitting an address by the President of Sierra Leone announcing, inter alia, that he would soon order the establishment of a code of

conduct for the Armed Forces;⁵⁹ and a letter dated 2 August 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council informing the Council that he had appointed a panel of experts pursuant to paragraph 19 of resolution 1306 (2000) to collect information on possible violations of the measures imposed by paragraph 2 of resolution 1171 (1998) and the link between trade in diamonds and trade in arms and related materiel, and to consider the adequacy of air traffic control systems in the region.⁶⁰

The President also drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁶¹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1313 (2000), by which the Council, inter alia:

Decided to extend the mandate of UNAMSIL until 8 September 2000;

Considered that the widespread and serious violations of the Lomé Peace Agreement (S/1999/777) by RUF since early May 2000 constituted a breakdown of the prior generally permissive environment based on the Agreement and predicated on the cooperation of the parties, that until security conditions had been established allowing progress towards the peaceful resolution of the conflict in Sierra Leone there would continue to be a threat to UNAMSIL and the security of the state of Sierra Leone, and that, in order to counter that threat, the structure, capability, resources and mandate of UNAMSIL required appropriate strengthening;

Recognized that the RUF offensive against UNAMSIL since May 2000 revealed serious inherent weaknesses in the Mission's structure, command and control and resources as referred to in the report of the Secretary-General of 31 July 2000, reflecting findings of the United Nations assessment mission which visited Sierra Leone from 31 May to 8 June 2000; welcomed the recommendations made and action already taken to address these deficiencies; and requested the Secretary-General to take further urgent steps to implement these recommendations to improve the performance and capacity of the mission.

**Decision of 14 August 2000 (4186th meeting):
resolution 1315 (2000)**

At its 4186th meeting, on 14 August 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL dated 31 July 2000.⁶² At the meeting, in which the representative of Sierra

⁵⁷ S/2000/455, submitted pursuant to resolution 1289 (2000).

⁵⁸ S/2000/751, submitted pursuant to resolution 1289 (2000).

⁵⁹ S/2000/727.

⁶⁰ S/2000/756.

⁶¹ S/2000/764.

⁶² S/2000/751.

Leone was invited to participate, the President (Malaysia) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 9 August 2000 from the representative of Sierra Leone, transmitting a letter by the President of Sierra Leone requesting the Council to initiate a process to set up a special court for Sierra Leone to try those members of RUF and their accomplices responsible for committing crimes against the people of Sierra Leone and for taking United Nations peacekeepers hostage.⁶³ The President of the Council then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁶⁴ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1315 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Requested the Secretary-General to negotiate an agreement with the Government of Sierra Leone to create an independent special court consistent with the resolution;

Recommended that the subject matter jurisdiction of the special court should include notably crimes against humanity, war crimes and other serious violations of international humanitarian law, as well as crimes under relevant Sierra Leonean law committed within the territory of Sierra Leone;

Recommended further that the special court should have personal jurisdiction over persons who bore the greatest responsibility for the commission of the crimes referred to in paragraph 2, including those leaders who, in committing such crimes, had threatened the establishment of and implementation of the peace process in Sierra Leone;

Requested, in this connection, that the Secretary-General, if necessary, send a team of experts to Sierra Leone as may be required to prepare the report referred to in paragraph 6;

Requested the Secretary-General to submit a report to the Security Council on the implementation of the resolution, in particular on his consultations and negotiations with the Government of Sierra Leone concerning the establishment of the special court, including recommendations, no later than 30 days from the date of the resolution.

**Decisions of 5 and 20 September 2000
(4193rd and 4199th meetings): resolutions
1317 (2000) and 1321 (2000)**

At its 4193rd and 4199th meetings, on 5 and 20 September 2000, respectively, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL dated 24 August 2000.⁶⁵ In his report,

following the decision contained in resolution 1313 (2000) to reinforce the military component of UNAMSIL through the provision of a strengthened force reserve, the Secretary-General, after consultations with the troop-contributing countries, provided a description of the tasks that would be required of UNAMSIL in the environment prevailing in Sierra Leone, its concept of operations and the necessary resources. In order for the Mission to enhance its operational structure and overall effectiveness and to deploy progressively forward in strength to key areas in Sierra Leone, the Secretary-General recommended that the Council authorize an increase in the Mission's military strength to a level of 20,500 military personnel, including 260 military observers, to enable it to achieve the first two phases of forward deployment. The Secretary-General believed that, in the present circumstances, the Mission's priority tasks, as indicated in resolution 1313 (2000), could largely be achieved under its current mandate, based on resolutions 1270 (1999) and 1289 (2000), and robust rules of engagement, provided that the Mission received the necessary resources and support from Member States. He therefore expressed his intention to keep the security, political and humanitarian situation in Sierra Leone under close review, leaving open the option to revert again to the Council with any additional recommendations, including the possibility of further strengthening the Force and/or its mandate, should this be required to reach the international community's objectives in Sierra Leone. Finally, in view of the proposed increase in the United Nations military presence in Sierra Leone, the Secretary-General called upon Member States to support UNAMSIL, in particular those able to provide specialized support units or those that have the capacity to train, equip or provide other support to current and future UNAMSIL troops.

At those meetings, in which the representative of Sierra Leone was invited to participate, the Council adopted resolutions 1317 (2000) and 1321 (2000) extending the mandate of UNAMSIL, in total until 31 December 2000. By resolution 1321 (2000), the Council also decided to review the situation no later than 31 October.

⁶³ S/2000/786.

⁶⁴ S/2000/789.

⁶⁵ S/2000/832, submitted pursuant to resolution 1313 (2000). At its 4199th meeting, the Council also included in its agenda an addendum concerning the financial

implications of the increase in the strength of the Mission (S/2000/832/Add.1).

Decision of 3 November 2000 (4216th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4216th meeting, on 3 November 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Security Council mission to Sierra Leone dated 16 October 2000,⁶⁶ and the report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL dated 31 October 2000.⁶⁷

In its report, the Council reported on its mission to Sierra Leone from 7 to 14 October and made a number of recommendations, including for the intensification of the momentum of the peace process, aimed at an early ceasefire throughout the territory of Sierra Leone; the strengthening of UNAMSIL in terms of numbers, effectiveness and capability, as recommended by the Secretary-General in his report dated 24 August 2000, taking advantage of the offers of further troops from, inter alia, ECOWAS countries; a well-coordinated and comprehensive approach, based on credible military pressure, including a dialogue with the rebels leading to their disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, justice and reconciliation, humanitarian assistance, and the economic and social rehabilitation of Sierra Leone; the establishment of a continuous United Nations-based mechanism for overall coordination, including a process of consultation through some form of structure, between the Security Council and the Secretariat, ECOWAS, UNAMSIL troop-contributing countries and the Government of Sierra Leone.

In his report dated 31 October 2000, the Secretary-General observed that, following the decision by the Governments of India and Jordan to withdraw their contingents from the Mission, it was important to avoid any security gaps in Sierra Leone. He therefore added that in the phase of overlap between the deployment of incoming and outgoing units, a temporary increase in the short term of the Mission's troop strength over the authorized level of 13,000 military personnel was needed. Sharing the observations of the Security Council mission that the challenges in Sierra Leone required a well-coordinated and comprehensive approach, the Secretary-General noted that a key aspect of this approach was the continued provision of security by UNAMSIL in key areas of the country. In order to achieve this objective

without exposing its troops to undue risks, he therefore observed that UNAMSIL would require an increase in its authorized strength to the level of 20,500 all ranks, as recommended in his previous report. In this regard, however, he reported that, after approaching a number of Governments to ascertain their willingness to provide the necessary troops and equipment, it appeared that the offers received were barely enough to compensate for the loss of the capabilities provided by the Indian and Jordanian contingents. He therefore concluded that, unless additional troop contributors were quickly identified, it would not be possible to envisage the further strengthening of UNAMSIL well into the year 2001, with the chance of undermining the credibility of the international community's military presence in Sierra Leone. Stressing that this could have negative repercussions for Sierra Leone, he therefore appealed to Member States to urgently consider participating in UNAMSIL with troops and/or equipment, while in the meantime, the implementation of the Mission's current mandate, in particular its deployment on the ground, would be adjusted in the light of the available resources.

At the meeting, in which the representative of Sierra Leone was invited to participate, the President (Netherlands) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁶⁸ by which the Council, inter alia:

Supported efforts to strengthen the State institutions of Sierra Leone; underlined the importance of RUF relinquishing control of the diamond producing areas, full freedom of movement of UNAMSIL leading to its deployment throughout the country, and demobilization of all non-governmental forces;

Reiterated its firm intention to take action to strengthen UNAMSIL at the appropriate time, taking into account the readiness of troop-contributing countries to provide sufficient forces to this end.

Decision of 22 December 2000 (4253rd meeting): resolution 1334 (2000)

At its 4253rd meeting, on 22 December 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL dated 15 December 2000.⁶⁹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that, despite some positive developments which included the signing on 10 November of the Abuja ceasefire agreement between RUF and the Government

⁶⁶ S/2000/992.

⁶⁷ S/2000/1055, submitted pursuant to resolution 1289 (2000).

⁶⁸ S/PRST/2000/31.

⁶⁹ S/2000/1199, submitted pursuant to resolution 1289 (2000).

of Sierra Leone, the situation in the country remained precarious. Reiterating the recommendations contained in his previous reports to increase the Mission's military strength to a level of 20,500 personnel, the Secretary-General suggested in the meantime the extension of the Mission's mandate for a further period of three months, which would allow the Mission to complete its consolidation phase and to respond to the requirements of the Abuja ceasefire agreement.

At the meeting, in which the representative of Sierra Leone was invited to participate, the President (Russian Federation) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁷⁰ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1334 (2000), by which the Council, inter alia:

Expressed its continued concern at the continuing fragile situation in Sierra Leone and neighbouring States;

Recalled that the main objectives of UNAMSIL remained to assist the efforts of the Government of Sierra Leone to extend State authority, restore law and order and further stabilize the situation progressively throughout the entire country and to assist in the promotion of the political process, leading to a renewed disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme where possible, and reiterated that, to that end, the structure, capability, resources and mandate of UNAMSIL required appropriate strengthening; strongly urged all States in a position to do so seriously to consider contributing peacekeeping forces for Sierra Leone;

Decided to extend the mandate of UNAMSIL until 31 March 2001.

Deliberations of 25 January 2001 (4264th meeting)

At its 4264th meeting, on 25 January 2001, the Council included in its agenda a note by the President of the Security Council dated 20 December 2000,⁷¹ transmitting the report of the Panel of Experts established pursuant to resolution 1306 (2000) to collect information on possible violations of the measures imposed by paragraph 2 of resolution 1171 (1998) and the link between trade in diamonds and trade in arms and related materiel as well as the adequacy of air traffic control systems in the region. In the report, noting with concern that Security Council resolutions on diamonds and weapons were being broken with impunity, the Panel of Experts made a variety of specific recommendations dealing with

diamonds, weapons and the use of aircraft for sanctions-busting and the movement of illicit weapons. Many of these recommendations and the problems addressed related to the primary support given to RUF by Liberia, particularly its President, its Government and the individuals and companies associated with it. With regard to diamonds, the Panel observed that diamonds had become an important resource for RUF in sustaining and advancing its military ambitions and that, as long as no controls were in place in neighbouring countries, RUF would continue to move their diamonds out with impunity. For this reason, the Panel inter alia recommended that, in order to better regulate the flow of rough diamonds from producing countries, a global certification scheme based on the system currently adopted in Sierra Leone be set up. In the short run, and in the absence of a global system, the Panel further recommended that certification systems, similar to that adopted by Sierra Leone, be required of all diamond-exporting countries in West Africa and that a complete embargo be imposed on all diamonds from Liberia until Liberia demonstrated convincingly that it was no longer involved in the trafficking of arms to, or diamonds from, Sierra Leone. With regard to arms trafficking, the Panel found unequivocal and overwhelming evidence that Liberia had been actively supporting RUF at all levels, in providing training, weapons and related materiel, logistical support, a staging ground for attacks and a safe haven for retreat and recuperation, and for public relations activities. With regard to air traffic control, the Panel inter alia observed that regional air surveillance capacities were weak or totally inadequate in detecting, or in acting as a deterrent to the arms merchants supplying Liberia and RUF. Weak airspace surveillance in the region in general, and abusive practices with regard to aircraft registration, created a climate in which arms traffickers operated with impunity. The Panel therefore suggested that the Security Council consider ways in which air traffic control and surveillance in West Africa could be improved, with a view to curtailing the illicit movement of weapons. In addition to the foregoing, the Panel offered a number of other recommendations, including: (1) the set up of a travel ban by all United Nations Members similar to that already imposed on senior Liberian officials and diplomats by the United States until such time as Liberia's support to RUF and its breaking of other United Nations sanctions ended conclusively; (2) the set up of a temporary embargo on Liberian timber exports, until Liberia demonstrated

⁷⁰ S/2000/1224.

⁷¹ S/2000/1195.

convincingly that it was no longer involved in the trafficking of arms, or diamonds from, Sierra Leone; and (3) the creation of a capacity within the United Nations Secretariat for ongoing monitoring of Security Council sanctions and embargoes.

At the meeting, the President (Singapore) drew the attention of the Council to a note by the President of the Security Council enclosing a letter dated 21 December 2000 from the Permanent Observer of Switzerland that set out the measures that Switzerland had taken regarding the issue of conflict diamonds;⁷² letters dated 28 December 2000 and 23 January 2001, respectively, from the representative of the Gambia contesting some allegations included in the report of the Panel of Experts;⁷³ a letter dated 3 January 2001 from the representative of Liberia countering some allegations against Liberia included in the report of the Panel of Experts, requesting to be invited to the Council's discussion on the report, and informing the Council of its intention to make a proposal for the Council's consideration;⁷⁴ and a letter dated 24 January 2001 from the representative of Liberia addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting a letter from the President of Liberia.⁷⁵

Following a briefing by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone, statements were made by all members of the Council, as well as by the representatives of Belgium, Burkina Faso, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, the Gambia, Guinea, Liberia,⁷⁶ the Niger, Sierra Leone and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union⁷⁷) and the Permanent Observer of Switzerland.

In his briefing, the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) introduced the aforementioned report of the Panel of Experts. Recalling that the report offered specific and general recommendations of a procedural and systemic nature, the Chairman stressed that a comprehensive

approach was needed to address the situation in Sierra Leone that would involve actors other than the Council and urged the Council to put emphasis on follow-up action to the recommendations.⁷⁸

During the debate, many speakers welcomed and endorsed the report of the Panel of Experts, noting with concern the role of the Government of Liberia in fuelling the conflict in Sierra Leone, both by financial and military support.⁷⁹ By contrast, some delegations expressed reservations concerning the report and highlighted what they viewed as problems with the report. The representative of the Russian Federation held that some of the Panel's recommendations were too radical and went beyond the mandate of the Panel as decided by the Council. Further, he lamented that there were no recommendations on how to enhance the effectiveness of the Sierra Leone sanctions regime, including within the context of the Organization of African Unity and ECOWAS.⁸⁰ The representative of Ukraine maintained that a number of the Panel's recommendations should be looked at from the point of view of their consistency, both with the original mandate of the Panel and the work being done in other specific competent forums.⁸¹ The representative of Burkina Faso and the Permanent Observer of Switzerland also expressed concerns about the report, particularly with regard to some allegations made by the report regarding the role and involvement of their countries.⁸² Similarly, the representative of the Gambia expressed concern at the allegations contained in the report, referring to them as baseless and malicious, particularly since the Panel had not visited the Gambia.⁸³

Concerning the Panel's recommendations on diamonds, several speakers expressed support for the recommendation that a global certification scheme, based on the system adopted in Sierra Leone, should be endorsed. The representative of Sweden also supported

⁷² S/2000/1232.

⁷³ S/2001/8 and S/2001/74.

⁷⁴ S/2001/6.

⁷⁵ S/2001/78.

⁷⁶ Liberia was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

⁷⁷ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁷⁸ S/PV.4264, pp. 2-4.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6 (United Kingdom); pp. 7-8 (France); pp. 9-11 (Colombia); pp. 15-17 (United States); pp. 17-18 (Mauritius); pp. 20-21 (Norway); pp. 21-22 (Singapore); S/PV.4264 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union); and p. 5 (Guinea).

⁸⁰ S/PV.4264, pp. 12-13.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

⁸² S/PV.4264 (Resumption 1), pp. 4-5 (Switzerland); and pp. 6-7 (Burkina Faso).

⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

coordinated action in order to establish national certification schemes in the region.⁸⁴ The representative of the Russian Federation expressed doubts about the six-month period proposed in the report for establishing and introducing the certification regimes as well as on the financing of such measures. He added that his delegation found it totally unacceptable that the report attempted to raise the question of establishing an international certification system for rough diamonds, as the question was being discussed in the intergovernmental negotiation process and the Panel of Experts had not been authorized by the Council to make recommendations in favour of the position of any one party in that dialogue.⁸⁵

Concerning the Panel's recommendations on arms trafficking, particularly the flow of small arms into West Africa, a number of speakers pointed to the need for producing countries to exert better control over their weapons exports.⁸⁶ The representative of the United Kingdom, stressing the importance of thorough checks on the proposed end use of arms exports at the time of licensing.⁸⁷ The representatives of Jamaica and Sweden noted their support for the ECOWAS Moratorium on the Importation, Exportation and Manufacture of Small Arms and Light Weapons in West Africa⁸⁸ and held that it deserved support from the international community.⁸⁹ The representative of Colombia held that the Council should reinforce international measures to limit the inflow of weapons into West Africa. Arms-producing countries, he noted, should be the first to monitor transactions destined for conflict areas, areas under moratorium and those subject to a Security Council embargo.⁹⁰ The representative of Tunisia expressed support for the recommendation of Burkina Faso, endorsed by the Panel, that the Council should supervise the import of all weapons into Burkina Faso for a three-year period.⁹¹

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁸⁵ S/PV.4264, p. 13.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (United Kingdom); p. 7 (Jamaica); p. 8 (France); p. 10 (Colombia); and p. 11 (Tunisia).

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁸⁸ See S/1998/1194.

⁸⁹ S/PV.4264, p. 7 (Jamaica); and S/PV.4264 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union).

⁹⁰ S/PV.4264, p. 10.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

Concerning the Panel's recommendations on air traffic control, the representative of Colombia held that the Council must ask for a more transparent regime of ships and planes in those areas that used flags of convenience. He also held that the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) should be more active in providing countries with the necessary equipment, including the possible deployment of monitors at airports at critical points.⁹² The representative of Ireland noted that his Government would strongly welcome increased collaboration between the relevant actors and bodies such as ICAO, the World Customs Organization and INTERPOL.⁹³

With regard to the recommendation by the Panel for enhanced capacity within the United Nations Secretariat for supporting the Council and the sanctions committees on all aspects of sanctions, several delegations agreed with the proposal.⁹⁴ The representative of the United Kingdom expressed the view that this support could include action to profile arms brokers and intermediaries responsible for supplying weapons to RUF.⁹⁵ The representative of Canada held that monitoring arrangements should remain in place for the duration of each targeted sanctions regime and, moreover, urged the Council to consider putting in place a standing and integrated monitoring arrangement that would operate with reference to sanctions regimes and related issues.⁹⁶

Speakers also commented on a draft resolution before the Council, co-sponsored by the United Kingdom and the United States, which would impose, under Chapter VII of the Charter, a range of measures on Liberia designed to put effective pressure on President Taylor and his associates. The representative of the United Kingdom, presenting the draft resolution, added that such measures, which included a ban on Liberian rough diamonds, a ban on flights by Liberian registered aircraft, a new arms embargo, a selective travel ban on senior Liberian officials and a ban on the import of Liberian timber, had been carefully crafted to have minimal consequences for the people of Liberia, while making Liberian support for RUF more difficult. He recalled that the draft resolution made clear that

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (United Kingdom); p. 6 (Jamaica); pp. 10-11 (Colombia); and p. 11 (Tunisia).

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁹⁶ S/PV. 4264 (Resumption 1), pp. 3-4.

sanctions would be lifted as soon as the Council saw an end to Liberian financial and military support for RUF in Sierra Leone and armed rebel movements in other neighbouring countries.⁹⁷ Other speakers, including the representatives of the United States, France, Norway, Guinea, Ireland, Mauritius, Singapore, Sweden and Canada expressed support for the proposed measures.⁹⁸ The representative of the United States, stressing that the proposed sanctions would not adversely affect the people of Liberia, stated that the proposed measures mirrored steps that had been recommended in the report of the Panel of Experts.⁹⁹ Noting that the most urgent task was to take concrete measures to effectively curb the illegal diamond trade and the illicit flows of and trafficking in arms so as to reduce the negative effects of these two phenomena on peace in Sierra Leone, the representative of China held the view that any sanctions imposed would have to be well targeted, have a time limit and avoid all possible negative humanitarian effects.¹⁰⁰ The representative of France, echoed by the representative of Canada, stressed that sanctions should be “motivational” rather than punitive, and linked to precise criteria for lifting them.¹⁰¹ The representative of the Russian Federation held that it was essential to further analyse all factors involved and to take into account the views of ECOWAS on the matter.¹⁰²

The representative of Sierra Leone, considering the findings of the report to be credible and its recommendations far-reaching but viable, noted that his delegation agreed with the experts that based on unequivocal and overwhelming evidence, Liberia had been providing RUF with military and other types of assistance to carry out and prolong the conflict in Sierra Leone. He urged the Council to consider endorsing the recommendations of the Panel in a binding resolution under Chapter VII of the Charter and drew attention to widespread calls on the Council

to change the mandate of UNAMSIL from peacekeeping to peace enforcement.¹⁰³

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Liberia noted that his country had serious reservations on the report of the Panel of Experts and denied any connection between Liberia and the illicit trade of Sierra Leone diamonds. He defined as unfair and erroneous the Panel’s conclusion that Liberia was the primary supplier of arms received by RUF. He elaborated on various initiatives taken to address the concerns of the international community, including those of ECOWAS, with regard to the problem in Sierra Leone and noted that the Government of Liberia had decided to seek the assistance and cooperation of the United Nations in putting into place an appropriate mechanism for the control and monitoring of the diamond trade. He elaborated on his Government’s proposal in that regard.¹⁰⁴

**Decision of 30 March 2001 (4306th meeting):
resolution 1346 (2001)**

At its 4306th meeting, on 30 March 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL dated 14 March 2001.¹⁰⁵ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that while the situation in Sierra Leone had remained relatively stable since the signing of the Abuja Agreement, deep concerns remained about the continuing incursions and violence at the borders of Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone. Recalling that a key objective of the peace process in Sierra Leone remained to end, as soon as possible, the RUF rebellion, to extend the legitimate authority throughout the country, to disarm and demobilize combatants, and also to allow the rebels to pursue political objectives in a democratic process, the Secretary-General noted that the two-track approach, which had been endorsed by the Security Council, continued to offer the best chances of achieving a durable peace through a combination of a strong military deterrent and a political dialogue between the parties to the Abuja Agreement. Concluding that the forward deployment of UNAMSIL in sufficient strength was an indispensable element in that approach, he recommended that the authorized strength of the Mission be increased to

⁹⁷ S/PV.4264, pp. 5-6.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 8 (France); p. 14 (Ireland); p. 16 (United States); p. 18 (Mauritius); p. 21 (Norway, Singapore); S/PV. 4264 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union); p. 3 (Canada); and p. 5 (Guinea).

⁹⁹ S/PV.4264, p. 16.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁰¹ S/PV.4264, p. 8 (France); S/PV.4264 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Canada).

¹⁰² S/PV.4264, p.13.

¹⁰³ Ibid., pp. 22-24.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., pp. 24-29.

¹⁰⁵ S/2001/228, submitted pursuant to resolution 1289 (2000).

enable it to begin to discharge some of the tasks identified in resolution 1313 (2000) and the Mission be extended for another six months, until 30 September 2001.

At the meeting, in which the representative of Sierra Leone was invited to participate, the President (Ukraine) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁰⁶ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1346 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided that the mandate of UNAMSIL should be extended for a period of six months from the date of the adoption of the resolution;

Further decided to increase the military component of UNAMSIL to a strength of 17,500, including the 260 military observers already deployed, as recommended by the Secretary-General in paragraphs 99 and 100 of his report;

Requested the Secretary-General to inform the Council at regular intervals on progress made by UNAMSIL in the implementation of key aspects of its concept of operations, and further requested him to provide an assessment in his next report on steps taken to improve the effectiveness of UNAMSIL;

Expressed its deep concern at the reports of human rights abuses committed by RUF and others, including other military groups, against the civilian population, in particular the harassment and forced recruitment of adults and children for fighting and forced labour;

Demanded that these acts cease immediately, and requested the Secretary-General to ensure all human rights monitoring positions within UNAMSIL were filled in order to address the concerns raised in paragraphs 44 to 51 of the report of the Secretary-General;

Expressed also its deep concern that the Ceasefire Agreement between the Government of Sierra Leone and RUF signed in Abuja on 10 November 2000¹⁰⁷ had not been fully implemented, and demanded that RUF take immediate steps to fulfil its commitments under that Agreement;

Requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Council his views on how to take forward the issue of refugees and internally displaced persons, including their return;

Encouraged the efforts of ECOWAS towards a lasting and final settlement of the crisis in the Mano River Union region caused by the continued fighting in the border areas of Sierra Leone, Guinea and Liberia.

¹⁰⁶ S/2001/293.

¹⁰⁷ S/2000/1091, annex.

Deliberations of 28 June 2001 (4340th meeting)

At its 4340th meeting, on 28 June 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL dated 25 June 2001.¹⁰⁸ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that some positive developments in Sierra Leone over the past two months constituted grounds for cautious optimism, although many challenges remained and considerable efforts needed to be made to maintain the recently achieved momentum. Stressing the need for the United Nations to remain vigilant and continue its efforts to establish security throughout the country, the Secretary-General reported that UNAMSIL was continuing its forward deployment, in particular to the key diamond-producing areas in the east of the country, as well as its robust patrols to all areas, including towards the borders with Guinea and Liberia. Also, the Secretary-General noted that in the months ahead, once UNAMSIL had deployed further, the establishment of State authority and law and order in the diamond-producing areas would be a particular challenge. Observing that UNAMSIL, in particular its civilian police component, could play an enhanced role in providing training and advice to Sierra Leonean law enforcement officials, the Secretary-General reported that he intended to bring the civilian police component of UNAMSIL to its authorized strength of 60 civilian police advisers as soon as possible and to assess whether there was a need to further expand the United Nations role in that regard. Recalling that the Government had requested, through the National Electoral Commission, the support of the United Nations in the electoral process, he stated that preparations were under way, in accordance with the mandate of UNAMSIL, to provide such support. Finally, the Secretary-General reported that, in the light of the progress achieved on the ground, he was in the process of assessing what deployment pattern UNAMSIL should adopt and the overall military strength that may be required in the next phases, which would involve deployment throughout the country and, subsequently, support for the holding of free and fair elections.

At the meeting, following a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of UNAMSIL, statements were made by all

¹⁰⁸ S/2001/627, submitted pursuant to resolution 1289 (2000).

Council members, and by the representatives of Nigeria, Pakistan, Sierra Leone and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union).¹⁰⁹

Presenting the report of the Secretary-General,¹⁰⁸ the Special Representative of the Secretary-General noted that despite the fact that some provisions of the Abuja Agreement were not yet implemented, neither the Government of Sierra Leone nor RUF appeared interested in resuming generalized armed conflict. He therefore highlighted several successes, which included the disarmament of the RUF combatants in Kambia district and restoration of Government authority in the region; the removal of roadblocks throughout the country, with a consequent improved humanitarian access; and the release of political prisoners and child combatants. Among the challenges remaining, the Special Representative touched on the need for adequate funding to keep pace with the rapid advancement of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme. He also highlighted progress towards the establishment of a truth and reconciliation commission and the Special Court for Sierra Leone, and appealed for donor support for those endeavours. In stressing the increasing need to focus on political issues, he reiterated the Secretary-General's call to the leaders of the Mano River Union to start, without delay, a political dialogue, and urged the Government of Sierra Leone to assist in transitioning RUF into a political party.¹¹⁰

Speakers unanimously conveyed strong support for the ongoing peace process in Sierra Leone led by UNAMSIL; stressed the importance of free and fair elections in the reconciliation and normalization process in Sierra Leone and encouraged UNAMSIL to actively participate in electoral activities; and, underscoring the importance of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme in the peace process, called for closer cooperation between the Government of Sierra Leone, UNAMSIL and other United Nations bodies. Several members also called for the early establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the Special Court for Sierra Leone.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹ Sweden was represented by its Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The representative of Canada was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

¹¹⁰ S/PV.4340, pp. 2-6.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (China); p. 14 (Ireland); p. 16 (United States); p. 18 (Colombia); p. 19 (Mali); p. 20 (France, Jamaica); p. 27 (Nigeria); and p. 28 (Bangladesh).

Emphasizing the need to address unrest throughout the subregion, particularly the ongoing violence in neighbouring Liberia, in order to bring a comprehensive and lasting solution to the problems in Sierra Leone; speakers also expressed grave concern at the humanitarian situation in the Mano River region, noting the vast numbers of refugees and internally displaced persons, continuing human rights violations, and the current unrest along the Guinea-Liberia border; and echoed the Secretary-General's appeal to the leaders of the Mano River Union countries to enter into a political dialogue for the purpose of restoring security and stability in the subregion.

**Decision of 18 September 2001
(4374th meeting): resolution 1370 (2001)**

At its 4374th meeting, on 18 September 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL dated 7 September 2001.¹¹² In his report, the Secretary-General, *inter alia*, recommended the extension of the Mission's mandate for a further period of six months in order to complete the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme, continue to assist in the implementation of the Abuja Ceasefire Agreement and support the preparations for the forthcoming national elections.

At the meeting, in which the representative of Sierra Leone was invited to participate, the President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution¹¹³ and to a revision to be made to the text; it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1370 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided that the mandate of UNAMSIL should be extended for a period of six months from 30 September 2001;

Requested the Secretary-General to inform the Council at regular intervals on progress made by UNAMSIL in the implementation of key aspects of its concept of operations, and further requested him to provide an assessment in his next report on steps taken to improve the effectiveness of UNAMSIL;

Expressed its continued deep concern at the reports of human rights abuses committed by RUF and others armed groups against the civilian population and demanded that these acts cease immediately;

¹¹² S/2001/857 and Add.1, submitted pursuant to resolution 1346 (2001).

¹¹³ S/2001/874.

Urged RUF to step up its efforts to fulfil its commitment under the Ceasefire Agreement signed in Abuja and to ensure full liberty for the United Nations to deploy its troops throughout the country;

Requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Council his views on how to take forward the issue of refugees and internally displaced persons, including their return;

Encouraged the ongoing efforts of ECOWAS towards a lasting and final settlement of the crisis in the Mano River Union region; urged international organizations and donor countries to support generously the post-conflict activities, including humanitarian and rehabilitation requirements; and decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

**Decision of 19 December 2001
(4442nd meeting): resolution 1385 (2001)**

At the 4442nd meeting, on 19 December 2001, the President of the Security Council (Mali) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹¹⁴ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1385 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided that the measures imposed by paragraph 1 of resolution 1306 (2000) should remain in force for a new period of 11 months from 5 January 2002, except that, pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 1306 (2000), rough diamonds controlled by the Government of Sierra Leone under the certificate-of-origin regime should continue to be exempt from these measures;

Affirmed that, in addition to its six-monthly review in accordance with paragraph 15 of resolution 1306 (2000), at the end of this period it would review the situation in Sierra Leone, including the extent of the Government's authority over the diamond-producing areas, in order to decide whether to extend these measures for a further period and, if necessary, to modify them or adopt further measures.

**Decision of 16 January 2002 (4451st meeting):
resolution 1389 (2002)**

At its 4451st meeting, on 16 January 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL dated 13 December 2001.¹¹⁵ In his report, the Secretary-General, *inter alia*, outlined the United Nations role in supporting the elections and, in this connection, recommended an increase of the civilian police component of UNAMSIL to advise and support the approximately 6,500 strong

Sierra Leone police force in carrying out its election-related responsibilities.

At the meeting, in which the representative of Sierra Leone was invited to participate, the President of the Security Council (Mauritius) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹¹⁶ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1389 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided that, further to paragraph 8 (i) of resolution 1270 (1999), in order to facilitate the smooth holding of elections, UNAMSIL should undertake election-related tasks within the parameters set out in paragraphs 48 to 62 of the Secretary-General's report of 13 December 2001, within its existing mandate, capabilities and areas of deployment and in the light of conditions on the ground;

Authorized the increase in the United Nations civilian police proposed by the Secretary-General in his report of 13 December 2001, encouraged the Secretary-General to request a further increase if appropriate, and endorsed the Secretary-General's recommendation that the United Nations civilian police should perform the following tasks: (a) advise and support the Sierra Leone police in carrying out their election-related responsibilities; (b) assist the Sierra Leone police to devise and implement an electoral training programme for their personnel, focused mainly on establishing security for public events, human rights and police conduct.

**Decision of 28 March 2002 (4500th meeting):
resolution 1400 (2002)**

At its 4500th meeting, on 28 March 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL dated 14 March 2002.¹¹⁷ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the completion of the disarmament process and the deployment of UNAMSIL throughout the country created a relatively more secure environment, which provided a unique opportunity for Sierra Leone to hold free and fair elections, which he hoped could be conducted in a credible manner and in a reasonably secure and peaceful environment. Noting that the continued engagement of UNAMSIL after the elections would still be indispensable until the security forces of Sierra Leone had the capacity to take full responsibility for the country's security, he recommended that the mandate of the Mission be extended for another six months. Should the security situation in Sierra Leone

¹¹⁴ S/2001/1216.

¹¹⁵ S/2001/1195 and Add.1, submitted pursuant to resolution 1370 (2001).

¹¹⁶ S/2002/68.

¹¹⁷ S/2002/267, submitted pursuant to resolution 1370 (2001).

continue to improve after the elections, the Secretary-General added that adjustments would need to be made to the current strength, composition and deployment of UNAMSIL troops, on the basis of how the post-election situation evolved.

At the meeting, in which the representative of Sierra Leone was invited to participate, the President (Norway) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution¹¹⁸ and to an oral amendment to the text, it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1400 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided that the mandate of UNAMSIL should be extended for a period of six months from 30 March 2002;

Welcomed the military concept of operations for UNAMSIL for 2002 outlined in paragraph 10 of the Secretary-General's report of 14 March 2002, and requested the Secretary-General to inform the Council at regular intervals on progress made by UNAMSIL in the implementation of its key aspects and in the planning of its subsequent phases.

Decision of 22 May 2002 (4539th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4539th meeting, on 22 May 2002, the President of the Security Council (Singapore) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹¹⁹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the elections held in Sierra Leone on 14 May 2002;

Commended the National Electoral Commission and all those responsible for the successful management of the elections, and commended UNAMSIL for their invaluable supporting role;

Noted that the various electoral observation groups were impressed by the Sierra Leonean people's commitment to democracy and their determination to vote;

Called on all political parties and their supporters to work together to strengthen democracy and thereby assure continuing peace;

Considered the elections an important milestone on the road to peace and security in Sierra Leone and the Mano River region;

The next challenge for Sierra Leone and the international community was the further consolidation of peace extension of public services to make real the restoration of government authority throughout the country, the further enhancement of the

¹¹⁸ S/2002/321.

¹¹⁹ S/PRST/2002/14.

operational effectiveness of the security sector, and the effective reintegration of all ex-combatants;

Urged all donors to contribute generously towards providing urgently needed funds to the Special Court and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

Decision of 24 September 2002 (4615th meeting): resolution 1436 (2002)

At its 4615th meeting,¹²⁰ on 24 September 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL dated 5 September 2002.¹²¹ In his report, the Secretary-General provided a further assessment of the security situation in Sierra Leone and described the concept for the adjustment of UNAMSIL. In the light of the encouraging developments in Sierra Leone, along with the steady improvement in the security situation in the country, the Secretary-General recommended that the Council consider beginning the drawdown of UNAMSIL. The ultimate objective of the drawdown process, he observed, was to conduct a gradual, phased and deliberate transfer of responsibility for the security of Sierra Leone from UNAMSIL to the Government of Sierra Leone. Stressing that the beginning of the drawdown of UNAMSIL would take the Mission into the final phase of the United Nations peacekeeping operation in Sierra Leone, he recommended that the Security Council approve his proposal for the adjustment and drawdown of UNAMSIL and extend the mandate of the Mission for a further period of six months, in order to facilitate the commencement of the adjustment process.

At the meeting, in which the representative of Sierra Leone was invited to participate, the President of the Security Council (Bulgaria) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹²² it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1436 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

¹²⁰ At its 4570th meeting, held in private on 11 July 2002, the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations and by the representative of Mexico, in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone; a constructive discussion followed.

¹²¹ S/2002/987.

¹²² S/2002/1062.

Decided that the mandate of UNAMSIL should be extended for a period of six months from 30 September 2002;

Urged UNAMSIL to take responsibility for internal and external security, to complete phases 1 and 2 of the Secretary-General's plan, including the reduction of 4,500 troops within eight months, and requested the Secretary-General to inform the Council at regular intervals on progress made by UNAMSIL in implementing the adjustments and in the planning of subsequent phases;

Reiterated its strong support for the Special Court for Sierra Leone and welcomed the start of its operations.

**Decision of 4 December 2002 (4654th meeting):
resolution 1446 (2002)**

At the 4654th meeting, on 4 December 2002, the President of the Security Council (Colombia) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹²³ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1446 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter:

Decided that the measures imposed by paragraph 1 of resolution 1306 (2000) should remain in force for a new period of six months from 5 December 2002, except that, pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 1306 (2000), rough diamonds controlled by the Government of Sierra Leone under the Certificate of Origin regime should continue to be exempt from these measures, and affirmed that at the end of this period it would review the situation in Sierra Leone, including the extent of the Government's authority over the diamond-producing areas, in order to decide whether to extend these measures for a further period and, if necessary, to modify them or adopt further measures;

Decided also that the measures imposed by paragraph 1 of resolution 1306 (2000), as extended by paragraph 2, should be terminated immediately if the Council determined that it would be appropriate to do so; decided that the Committee established by resolution 1132 (1997) should continue its consideration of the measures referred to in paragraphs 2, 4 and 5 of resolution 1171 (1998) and present its views to the Council.

**Decision of 28 March 2003 (4729th meeting):
resolution 1470 (2003)**

At its 4729th meeting, on 28 March 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL dated 17 March 2003.¹²⁴ In his report, the Secretary-General presented detailed proposals for the gradual drawdown of the

¹²³ S/2002/1318.

¹²⁴ S/2003/321 and Corr.1, submitted pursuant to resolution 1436 (2002).

Mission guided by progress in the implementation of key security benchmarks and recommended the extension of the UNAMSIL mandate for a further period of six months.

At the meeting, in which the representative of Sierra Leone was invited to participate, the President of the Security Council (Guinea) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹²⁵ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1470 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided that the mandate of UNAMSIL should be extended for a period of six months from 30 March 2003;

Urged UNAMSIL, guided by an evaluation of the security situation and the capacity and ability of the Sierra Leonean security sector to take responsibility for internal and external security, to complete phase 2 of the Secretary-General's plan as planned and to embark on phase 3 as soon as practicable thereafter;

Requested the Secretary-General to provide the Council with detailed plans for the remainder of the drawdown once phase 3 was under way, including options for faster and slower withdrawal depending on the security situation and the capacity and ability of the Sierra Leonean security sector to take responsibility for internal and external security;

Called on States, international organizations and non-governmental organizations to continue to support the National Recovery Strategy of the Government of Sierra Leone;

Urged the Presidents of the Mano River Union member States to resume dialogue and to implement their commitments to building regional peace and security, encouraged ECOWAS and Morocco to continue their efforts towards a settlement of the crisis in the Mano River Union region, and expressed its support for the efforts of the International Contact Group on Liberia towards a resolution of the conflict in that country;

Decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

**Decision of 18 July 2003 (4789th meeting):
resolution 1492 (2003)**

At its 4789th meeting, on 18 July 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL dated 23 June 2003.¹²⁶ In his report, in addition to providing an assessment of the prevailing security situation in Sierra Leone and the progress made on the benchmarks that had guided the drawdown of UNAMSIL, the Secretary-

¹²⁵ S/2003/375.

¹²⁶ S/2003/663, submitted pursuant to resolution 1470 (2003).

General also described ongoing efforts to consolidate peace in Sierra Leone, including the activities of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the Special Court for Sierra Leone, and the efforts to facilitate national recovery. On the basis of such analysis, the Secretary-General provided three options for the remaining phases of the drawdown process and recommended that the Security Council approve “the modified status quo option”, entailing the modification of the current pace of the drawdown process, with a view to completing the withdrawal of UNAMSIL from Sierra Leone by December 2004.

At the meeting, the President of the Security Council (Spain) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹²⁷ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1492 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Approved the recommendation of the Secretary-General, in paragraph 68 of his report, that the drawdown of UNAMSIL should proceed according to the “modified status quo” option towards withdrawal by December 2004, and welcomed the intention of the Secretary-General to submit additional recommendations to the Council in early 2004 concerning a residual presence of the United Nations;

Decided to monitor closely the key benchmarks for drawdown and requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council at the end of each phase, and at regular intervals, on the progress made with respect to the benchmarks, and to make any necessary recommendations on the planning of subsequent phases of the withdrawal.

Decision of 19 September 2003 (4829th meeting): resolution 1508 (2003)

At its 4829th meeting, on 19 September 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNAMSIL dated 5 September 2003.¹²⁸ In his report, after providing an assessment of the security situation and the overall efforts to consolidate peace in Sierra Leone, the Secretary-General reported on the progress made in achieving the

key benchmarks guiding the drawdown of UNAMSIL and in the planning of subsequent phases of the withdrawal. The Secretary-General observed that the further progress achieved towards peace consolidation in Sierra Leone and the overall security environment in the country had enabled UNAMSIL to continue the progressive drawdown of its military component as approved by the Security Council and therefore recommended an extension for a further period of six months. Despite some challenges, the responsibility for national security in some parts of the country, he observed, was being shifted to the Government of Sierra Leone whose efforts aimed at augmenting the overall capacity of its national police and armed forces were encouraging.

At the meeting, in which the representative of Sierra Leone was invited to participate, the President of the Security Council (United Kingdom) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹²⁹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1508 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided that the mandate of UNAMSIL should be extended for a period of six months from 30 September 2003; urged the Government of Sierra Leone to continue to strengthen its control over, and regulation of, diamond mining, including through the High-level Steering Committee;

Noted with serious concern the precarious financial situation of the Special Court for Sierra Leone;

Expressed its strong support for the efforts of ECOWAS towards building peace in the subregion;

Welcomed the deployment of ECOWAS forces to Liberia, supported by UNAMSIL;

Reiterated its demand that armed groups in Liberia refrain from illegal incursions into Sierra Leone;

Welcomed the Secretary-General’s intention to keep the security, political, humanitarian and human rights situation in Sierra Leone under close review and to report to the Council;

Decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

¹²⁷ S/2003/713.

¹²⁸ S/2003/863, submitted pursuant to resolution 1492 (2003).

¹²⁹ S/2003/895.

9. The situation in the Great Lakes region

Deliberations of February 2001 to May 2002 (4273rd, 4323rd and 4532nd meetings)

At its 4273rd meeting, on 7 February 2001, the Security Council heard briefings by the Secretary-General and the President of Rwanda, following which statements were made by all members of the Council.

In his briefing, the Secretary-General pointed out that the Council was meeting to reaffirm its commitment to bringing peace and stability to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He highlighted the need to address the issues of governance, national dialogue, democracy, accountability and reconciliation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in the region. Furthermore, he mentioned the issue of the continued existence of predatory armed groups and he emphasized that those guilty of the worst atrocities of human rights abuses and especially those guilty of genocide should not be allowed to escape unpunished.¹

The President of Rwanda underlined the importance of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement peace process and the desire of his country to fulfil its obligation as demanded in that process. He maintained that the core issues that needed to be addressed in order for the Lusaka process to succeed were, first, the inter-Congolese dialogue; secondly, the problem of former Rwandese Armed Forces and Interahamwe and, thirdly, the withdrawal of foreign armies from the Congo. In addition, he maintained that he had no doubt that the Council would continue to play its role in finding a solution to the problems in the region.²

Most speakers called for reconciliation and a peaceful solution to the crisis. They expressed support for the Lusaka Agreement and called for all parties to adhere to it. Several speakers noted the importance of disarming and repatriating members of armed groups in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Several speakers also expressed concerns about human rights violations in the region.

The representative of the United States stated that the withdrawal of foreign forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo could not be accomplished through military means. Noting that Rwanda could not secure its long-term security interests via a policy of

military opposition to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, he called for a cooperative relationship based on common interests that would lead to the marginalization of the former Rwandese Armed Forces, Interahamwe and other armed groups. In addition, he urged the President of Rwanda “to ensure that his forces and their Congolese allies respect fully the human and civil rights of the Congolese people”.³

The representative of France opined that relaunching the Lusaka peace process and proceeding to phase II of the deployment of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) required the disengagement and withdrawal of foreign forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He stated that the presence of forces of aggression in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was unacceptable. He furthermore pointed out that there was also concern about information on large-scale plundering of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁴

The representatives of Ireland and Norway maintained that the concerns that the President of Rwanda had mentioned could not justify the extent of the Rwandan military presence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the representative of Ireland noting that the same reservation applied to the number of troops deployed by other neighbouring countries, regardless of the reasons put forward for their presence.⁵

The representative of the United Kingdom asked whether the President of Rwanda had instructed his armed forces to refrain from any exploitation of the mineral wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and raised the issue of whether he would take action to ensure that child soldiers were not recruited into military activities.⁶

At its 4323rd meeting,⁷ on 30 May 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Ireland); and pp. 11-12 (Norway).

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

⁷ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. I, part V, case 8, with regard to special cases concerning the application of rules 27-36 of the provisional rules of procedure.

¹ S/PV.4273, p. 2.

² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

Security Council mission to the Great Lakes region, 15 to 26 May 2001.⁸ The report covered the meetings of the mission with 10 Heads of State across Africa, as well as facilitators, representatives of civil society, and the leaders of several armed groups. It covered developments in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Burundi, and provided suggestions and recommendations for Council action in these areas.⁹

At the meeting, statements were made by all members of the Council, and the representatives of Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Namibia, Rwanda, South Africa and Uganda, as well as the Secretary-General. The President (United States) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 24 May 2001 from Zambia, transmitting the text of a communiqué produced at a joint meeting of the Political Committee on the Implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Security Council mission to the Great Lakes region.¹⁰

The representative of France briefed the Council on the mission and emphasized that the role of the United Nations in the Great Lakes region was helping the parties to implement their commitments by having observers on the ground. He stressed that it was not a matter of imposing peace but a matter of helping the parties to implement their own commitments. He discussed, *inter alia*, the progress made in the Lusaka peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the withdrawal of foreign forces from there, as well as the impasse in Burundi. He also observed that their mission had not simply been to observe events, but it had also contributed to bridging differences, provided for real negotiations on sensitive issues and reminded all the parties of their obligation to respect international law, human rights and international humanitarian law. Furthermore, he stated that the conference of all the States concerned by the conflict in the region needed to take place in order to deal with the matter of security between States in the region and human rights issue, especially minority rights.¹¹

In his briefing, the Secretary-General maintained that the mission's visit to the region demonstrated the importance that the United Nations attached to the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He highlighted the urgent challenges in the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. First, with regard to the humanitarian situation, there was the imperative need to provide additional resources in order to address the emerging requirements of the population. Secondly, with regard to the human rights of civilians, the question of impunity had to be addressed by investigating alleged massacres and other major violations of human rights. He maintained that "without accountability for the most severe crimes, there can be no lasting peace". Thirdly, he raised the issues of child soldiers and the precarious security situation, especially in the east of the country. He concluded that beyond the region, every member of the United Nations family had a role to play in helping to secure the peace and in improving the lives of the Congolese people.¹²

Most speakers welcomed the mission, and stressed that it provided an opportunity to achieve stability in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. They stressed that all of the signatories to the Lusaka Agreement needed to abide by their commitments under the disengagement plans. Several speakers stressed the importance of the inter-Congolese dialogue and of the decision by the Government to allow political parties to participate in it. A number of speakers stressed the importance of rejuvenating economic activity in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. A few speakers also called for an end to illegal exploitation of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Several speakers also welcomed the efforts of the Council mission to provide momentum to the peace process in Burundi, as well as the efforts of the Facilitator of the Burundi peace process, the former President of South Africa, Nelson Mandela.

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo stated that the mission had sent a strong signal and had conveyed the unanimous determination of the Council to move ahead in the peace process, put an end to the "plundering of the wealth" of his country and to take up the question of the massive violations of international humanitarian law that had been taking

⁸ S/2001/521 and Add.1.

⁹ For more information, see the studies in the present chapter on Burundi (section 6) and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (section 10).

¹⁰ S/2001/525.

¹¹ S/PV.4323, pp. 3-8.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

place since the “aggression began”. He stressed that it was time for the Council to declare that the “war of aggression” was intolerable and that the “occupying forces” needed to immediately return home. He stressed that the authorities of Burundi, Uganda, and Rwanda who were responsible for the flight of thousands of people needed to be brought to justice. Finally, he fully endorsed the idea of an international conference on peace and security in the Great Lakes region.¹³

The representative of Rwanda noted that the arrival in the field of the “most important body of the United Nations” had reinvigorated the Lusaka Peace Agreement and given its signatories a determination to see it succeed. Nevertheless, the disarmament and disengagement of the “negative forces”, which included those who had carried out the genocide in Rwanda, namely, “the Interahamwe militia and the ex-Rwandese Armed Forces, which have been welcomed with open arms on Congolese soil since the time of the Mobutu regime”, continued to be necessary. He stressed that all support provided for those forces needed to come to an end.¹⁴

The representative of Burundi expressed his satisfaction that the Council had been able to hear from the mediator and other leaders in the region about the “danger of total war” in Burundi due to a spillover from the war in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He stated that through its talks with the two rebel groups in Burundi, the Council had been able to recognize that those groups regarded the ceasefire as the lowest priority. On the role of the region, he maintained that the Council would have recognized that some were committed to helping, while others were still reluctant and kept repeating that there was no infiltration along their borders with Burundi. Some of his country’s neighbours had adopted an attitude that was contrary to the spirit of the Peace Agreement, despite the fact that they had co-sponsored it. Therefore, he called on the Council to act without delay to get assurances from those countries and armed groups that they would cooperate with the Government in settling security issues along their common border. He expressed support for the immediate imposition of sanctions on armed groups and those that supported

them as envisaged in the Arusha process and in the Lusaka process.¹⁵

The representative of Jamaica, echoed by the United Kingdom and Ireland, expressed disappointment that some delegations had used this important milestone in the peace process to be belligerent rather than to seek ways to advance the process.¹⁶

The representative of the United Kingdom observed that while all parties had stated that they would implement the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, the Council mission had also “heard nuances from all of them about where they would like to swing Lusaka their way”. He stressed that, while the parties would be tempted to seek advantage from the process, the international community would not be prepared to invest, politically and economically, in that region unless the whole region had stability. There was therefore no point in any one party pursuing its own interests at the expense of its neighbours or of the region as a whole. On Burundi, he noted he was “depressed”, and stated that none of the parties, or the Government, were really contributing as they should to the peace process.¹⁷

At its 4532nd meeting,¹⁸ on 14 May 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Security Council mission to the Great Lakes region, of 27 April to 7 May 2002.¹⁹ In its report, the mission observed that the parties to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, with the help of MONUC, continued to make slow progress in the application of the peace process and made several recommendations aimed at

¹³ Ibid., pp. 10-14.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 18.

¹⁶ S/PV.4323 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Jamaica); p. 3 (United Kingdom); and p. 12 (Ireland).

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 2-4.

¹⁸ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. I, part V, case 10, with regard to special cases concerning the application of rules 27-36 of the provisional rules of procedures.

¹⁹ S/2002/537 and S/2002/537/Add.1, which contained a non-paper entitled “International conference on peace, security, democracy and development in the Great Lakes region” submitted by the Council to its interlocutors during its mission and a communiqué issued at the conclusion of the joint meeting of the Political Committee on the Implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Council mission, held in Luanda on 2 May 2002.

facilitating the peace process, including the establishment of a buffer zone to promote the orderly withdrawal of all foreign troops. On Burundi, the mission noted that, while there had been improvements, the fighting had continued. The mission made several recommendations for strengthening the peace process.

At the same meeting, statements were made by the representatives of Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, France, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain²⁰ and the United Kingdom.

Most speakers welcomed the results of the mission and the progress of the inter-Congolese dialogue, and expressed support for the recommendations of the mission on both the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Burundi.

The representative of France, presenting the report of the Council's third mission to the region, noted the importance, *inter alia*, of the withdrawal of all foreign troops and stressed that the establishment of a transitional government of national unity in Kinshasa would not only help Rwanda deal with its security issues, but would also help MONUC to better discharge its functions. He maintained that progress had been made but the peace process remained fragile. On Burundi he stressed that first and foremost, there needed to be a cessation of hostilities. Secondly, the implementation of reforms during the transition period was indispensable, with or without a ceasefire. Lastly, he emphasized that the assistance of the international community was crucial.²¹

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo welcomed the close involvement of the Council, but stressed that the international community needed to attach greater importance to the economic reconstruction of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and that of the Great Lakes region, following the devastation of four years of a "war of aggression" against his country. He stated that consolidating the peace process could not be done without economic support, as well as bilateral and multilateral activity.²²

The representative of Rwanda welcomed the fact that the Council had focused its attention on the underlying causes that had prompted Rwanda to "intervene militarily in the Democratic Republic of the Congo by virtue of its natural right of legitimate defence under Article 51. Nonetheless, he stressed that the full implementation of the Lusaka Peace Agreement would reassure Rwanda only if "the perpetrators of the Rwandan genocide" in the Democratic Republic of the Congo no longer had support and had been disarmed and reintegrated. He also stressed that all parties of the inter-Congolese dialogue needed to be considered equal.²³

The representative of South Africa expressed concern that the Council was departing from resolution 1291 (2000) and the intent of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, because paragraph 23 of the report²⁴ could be read to mean that the three armed parties in the Congolese dialogue could reach agreement by themselves and then impose it on the unarmed groups in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He stressed that the five components of the inter-Congolese dialogue — the Government, the Mouvement de libération du Congo, the Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie-Goma, and the unarmed groups and civil society — needed to be treated equally.²⁵

The representative of Burundi stated that the achievements of the transitional Government in his country, established six months ago had been broadly positive. However, he stated that the peace process remained fragile, due to the continuation of violence and the wrenching poverty afflicting the population.²⁶

The representative of France noted that, in regard to paragraph 23 of the report, the Council was strictly following the text of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

²⁴ Paragraph 23 of the report (S/2002/537) reads, in part: "The mission trusts that, in accordance with the views expressed by its interlocutors, the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, MLC [Mouvement de libération du Congo] and RCD-Goma [Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie-Goma] will pursue their talks with a view to reaching a comprehensive and inclusive agreement in accordance with the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. Such an agreement might then be endorsed by the parties to the inter-Congolese dialogue, in the presence of the neutral facilitator, Sir Ketumile Masire."

²⁵ S/PV.4532, p. 12.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

²⁰ On behalf of the European Union and Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey.

²¹ S/PV.4532, pp. 2-5.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

However, he also stressed that the situation was in a delicate phase in which there was “risk of the crystallization of two opposing blocks of unequal size, but which could lead to the risk of a partition”. That risk had prompted the mission to stress that it was desirable to promote direct and discreet contact in order to reconcile the points of view and arrive at an inclusive agreement, which would, of course, include civil society and the political parties.²⁷

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that he was convinced that there was a real chance to move forward in resolving the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in the Great Lakes region if the inter-Congolese dialogue could be brought to a conclusion that fitted the Lusaka Agreement and the aims of resolution 1291 (2000) and following resolutions. He underlined the need to put all possible influence towards producing a real conclusion to the dialogue and not just “support with rhetoric the words that had been written in resolutions.”²⁸

**Decision of 20 November 2003
(4865th meeting): statement by the President**

At its 4865th meeting,²⁹ on 20 November 2003, the Council included in its agenda a report of the Secretary-General dated 17 November 2003 on preparations for an international conference on the Great Lakes region.³⁰ In his report, the Secretary-General, stressed that the Council’s call for an international conference on the Great Lakes region entailed the recognition of the fact that the internal problems in the region tended to spread because of the close social, economic and cultural links of the inhabitants of the entire region, which was why a regional approach was needed. The purpose of the Conference, under United Nations and African Union partnership, was to begin a process to bring together the leaders of the countries of the Great Lakes region to reach an agreement on a set of principles and launch selected programmes to help end the cycle of conflict and ensure durable peace, democracy and development in the whole region. It would also establish a regional

framework to facilitate the adoption of a stability, security and development pact. He noted that the conference was not a one-time event but a process of several stages and he urged the core countries to focus on the priorities of the conference in order to formulate concrete and feasible policies.

At the meeting, statements were made by the Secretary-General, most members of the Council,³¹ the representatives of Italy (on behalf of the European Union³²), Mozambique (on behalf of the Presidency of the African Union) and the United Republic of Tanzania, as well as the Special Envoy of the Chairperson of the African Union for the Great Lakes region and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes region.

Most speakers strongly supported the conference, agreeing that a regional approach was essential to address the crisis affecting the Great Lakes region. They expressed hope that holding the conference would help consolidate the gains that had been made in the recent peace processes in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Burundi. A number of speakers stressed that the conference would have to be judged on whether it produced concrete measures to ensure a safeguard against a future resurgence of violence, instability, and criminality. Several speakers welcomed the role of the Council in working in the region and expressed support for the various peacekeeping and other missions that were on the ground. A number of speakers also noted the need for sufficient financial support for the conference and called on donors to provide it in a timely manner.

A few speakers stressed that participation in the first round of the conference should be open to all neighbouring States and that no Governments that legitimately wished to take part should be excluded.³³

The Special Envoy of the Chairperson of the African Union for the Great Lakes region noted that although the six core countries had agreed to appoint national coordinators and to set up national preparatory

²⁷ Ibid, pp. 15-16.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 16.

²⁹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. X, part IV, with regard to the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter.

³⁰ S/2003/1099.

³¹ The representative of the United States did not make a statement.

³² Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³³ S/PV.4865, p. 15 (France); and p. 25 (Cameroon, Germany).

committees, only a few countries had submitted details. Therefore, it might not be possible to hold the regional preparatory meetings due to the lack of input from most of the core countries.³⁴

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes region noted that the role of the Security Council was of crucial importance to the conference in terms of providing political guidance in the conference process; giving essential diplomatic support; and in mobilizing the international community.³⁵

At the same meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁶ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

³⁶ S/PRST/2003/23.

Welcomed and strongly endorsed the report of the Secretary-General of 17 November 2003;

Stressed also the importance of the participation of all States concerned to ensure the success of the conference on the Great Lakes region;

Encouraged the States in the region to reach early agreement on participation in the conference;

Expressed hope that the full normalization of relations and the implementation of confidence-building measures would also help achieve stability for all countries in the region;

Appealed to the countries of the region and to the international community to provide sustained political and diplomatic support, as well as adequate technical and financial assistance.

10. The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Decision of 26 January 2000 (4092nd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4092nd meeting,^{1,2} held at a high level on 24 and 26 January 2000, the Security Council heard a briefing by the Secretary-General. Statements were made by most members of the Council,³ the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Belgium, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union⁴), Mozambique,

Rwanda, South Africa, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe, and the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity (OAU)⁵ and the Facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue.⁶

The Secretary-General stated that since the signing of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement on 10 July 1999,⁷ there had been many ceasefire violations and

Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey associated themselves with the statement.

⁵ On 8 July 2002, the Organization of African Unity ceased to exist and was replaced by the African Union.

⁶ Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mozambique, Rwanda, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe were represented by their respective presidents; Belgium by its Vice Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs; Burundi, Canada and Namibia by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs; France by its Minister Delegate for Cooperation and Francophonie; Mali by its Minister of the Armed Forces; the United Kingdom by its Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs; and the United States by its Secretary of State. The representatives of Brazil, Cape Verde, Colombia, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Israel, Japan, Lesotho, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Norway and the United Republic of Tanzania were invited to participate but did not make statements; some representatives circulated their statements (see S/2000/54).

⁷ See S/1999/815 (letter dated 23 July 1999 from the representative of Zambia to the President of the Security

¹ During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held a number of meetings in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B. The meetings were held on 18 and 22 October 2001 (4391st), 4 March 2002 (4483rd), 11 June 2002 (4550th), 19 September 2002 (4612th) and 4 June 2003 (4767th).

² For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. I, part V, case 14, with regard to special cases concerning the application of rules 27-36 of the provisional rules of procedure; chap. XI, part IV, sect. B, with regard to Article 42 of the Charter; and part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51; and chap. XII, part I, sect. B, case 4, with regard to Article 2 (4).

³ The United States circulated its statement (see S/2000/54).

⁴ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania,

that the deployment of United Nations military liaison officers had been obstructed, undermining confidence in the implementation process. He stressed that the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), if given the necessary cooperation and allowed to do its job, could help foster confidence among the parties and keep the peace process on track. Believing that the Lusaka Agreement remained the most viable blueprint for achieving a comprehensive negotiated solution, he stressed that a sustainable solution to the crisis could be found only if the root causes of the conflict were addressed. In that respect, he emphasized the importance of the inter-Congolese negotiations and welcomed the appointment of Sir Ketumile Masire as facilitator of the dialogue. The Secretary-General held that the parties themselves bore primary responsibility for adhering to commitments and creating conditions conducive to progress, whether it related to the political process, military deployments or protection for humanitarian or other United Nations personnel.⁸

The majority of speakers concurred that the Lusaka Agreement remained the most viable framework for achieving long-lasting peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and emphasized that the main responsibility for the implementation of the Agreement lay with the signatory parties. The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo lamented that the Lusaka Agreement was deadlocked and had failed to achieve its objectives. In his view, the Agreement would not be able to restore peace to the region unless it demanded a real and immediate ceasefire; a deployment of United Nations forces that would systematically replace the troops of the aggressor countries; the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the uninvited aggressor forces; and, lastly, the positioning of United Nations forces along the borders between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the aggressor countries.⁹

Deploring the ceasefire violations, a number of speakers stressed the importance of providing resources to the Joint Military Commission to enable it to assist in the disengagement of forces and the

Council, transmitting the text and annexes of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement).

⁸ S/PV.4092, pp. 5-6.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 11-12.

investigation of any ceasefire violations, as stipulated in the Lusaka Agreement.¹⁰

Most speakers agreed with the recommendation made by the Secretary-General in his report dated 17 January 2000,¹¹ to expand the mandate and deploy a second phase of MONUC and called for expeditious actions to be taken by the Security Council. The representative of Zimbabwe deplored the “lethargic manner” in which the Council had responded to the crisis and called upon the body to urgently dispatch peacekeepers.¹² The representative of Zambia expressed concern at the possibility of preconditions such as the perfect implementation of the Lusaka Agreement being imposed before peacekeepers were sent to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, pointing out that no other ceasefire agreement anywhere in the world had been subject to such a test.¹³ The Secretary-General of OAU declared that the perception that the Council had been “hesitant” in mandating the deployment of a force had served to undermine the speedy implementation of the Lusaka Agreement.¹⁴ Similarly, a few representatives urged the Council to authorize the deployment without delay of a United Nations peacekeeping operation.¹⁵ In that context, citing Article 24 of the Charter, the representative of South Africa warned that a delay by the Council in carrying out its fundamental duty could impact negatively on the situation on the ground.¹⁶ For his part, the representative of the Russian Federation indicated that the timing of the deployment of the United Nations mission should respond to the rate of progress in the peace process, and that the mission should be a large-scale peacekeeping operation. The mission would be deployed when the necessary conditions existed, such as respect for the ceasefire and assurances regarding the security of international

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 7 (Zambia); p. 17 (Zimbabwe); p. 23 (Rwanda); p. 24 (Secretary-General of OAU); and p. 30 (Namibia); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (South Africa); p. 5 (Belgium); pp. 7-8 (Algeria); p. 12 (Canada); p. 13 (United Kingdom); p. 15 (France); and p. 19 (Tunisia); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), p. 2 (Netherlands); p. 6 (Jamaica); and p. 8 (Malaysia).

¹¹ S/2000/30, submitted pursuant to resolution 1279 (1999).

¹² S/PV.4092, pp. 17-18.

¹³ Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 26.

¹⁵ S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (South Africa); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), p. 8 (Malaysia).

¹⁶ S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

personnel. In his opinion, the failure of such an operation would have extremely negative consequences for the further development of the situation in the region, and also for the authority of the United Nations and the Security Council.¹⁷ The representative of China declared that the timely deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation was an essential guarantee for resolving the conflict. He opined that the Council should accelerate its consideration of the deployment and that the peacekeeping mission should be given an appropriate mandate.¹⁸

A number of speakers advocated that the peacekeeping mission be given a Chapter VII mandate.¹⁹ According to the representative of Uganda, a Chapter VII mandate was required in order to enable the mission to effectively deal with the question of disarmament, demobilization and the protection of civilians.²⁰ In a similar vein, expressing support for the immediate creation of a robust United Nations mission, with a clear mandate and adequate resources, to assist the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement, the representative of Canada also called for the mission's mandate to include "clear and unequivocal" provisions for the protection of civilians under Chapter VII of the Charter.²¹ Several speakers stressed the need for adequate protection for the force.²² In that regard, the representative of the United Kingdom emphasized that the risks associated with peacekeeping operations must be minimized, not only to protect the United Nations personnel, but also to sustain the momentum for the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement.²³

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo argued that the presence of "occupying armies of" Rwanda, Uganda and Burundi in his country was contrary to the principles of the Charter. He declared that, together with its allies in the Southern

African Development Community (SADC), his Government was trying to ensure respect for the principle of the territorial integrity of his country. Underlining the need to halt the "illegal occupation", he questioned whether the Council was justified in relying exclusively on the Lusaka Agreement in trying to re-establish peace.²⁴ In response, the representative of Angola pointed out that his Government had been forced to intervene in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in order to contain the escalation of the war which was taking place close to its own borders.²⁵ Similarly, the representative of Uganda noted that his and other neighbouring countries of the Democratic Republic of the Congo had legitimate security concerns, as recognized in the Lusaka Agreement. Pledging his country's support for the territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, he further endorsed the withdrawal of all foreign troops from that country's territory, in accordance with a timetable to be worked out in accordance to the Lusaka Agreement by the United Nations and OAU.²⁶ The security concerns of neighbouring countries were acknowledged by a number of speakers,²⁷ while others reaffirmed the territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.²⁸

The majority of speakers stressed the importance of national dialogue and in that context expressed their support for Sir Ketumile Masire, the Facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue. Believing that an all-inclusive national political dialogue was an effective means to achieve national reconciliation, the representative of China argued that internal dialogue within the Democratic Republic of the Congo could not be achieved without a stable external environment.²⁹

Deploring the failure to organize a conference on security and development in the Great Lakes region in May 1998, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo joined other speakers in

¹⁷ S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), p. 9.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

¹⁹ S/PV.4092, p. 11 (Mozambique); p. 18 (Zimbabwe); pp. 20-21 (Uganda); and p. 30 (Namibia); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 11 (Canada); p. 14 (United Kingdom); and p. 17 (Bangladesh); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), p. 6 (Jamaica).

²⁰ S/PV.4092, p. 20.

²¹ S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 11.

²² S/PV.4092, p. 8 (Zambia); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Belgium); p. 14 (United Kingdom); and p. 20 (Argentina); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), p. 2 (Netherlands); and p. 10 (Portugal).

²³ S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 14.

²⁴ S/PV.4092, pp. 11-13.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 22 (Rwanda); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 17 (Bangladesh); and p. 20 (Argentina); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), p. 2 (Netherlands); and p. 8 (Malaysia).

²⁸ S/PV.4092, p. 16 (Zimbabwe); p. 20 (Uganda); and p. 30 (Namibia); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Mali); p. 19 (Tunisia); and p. 20 (Argentina); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), p. 2 (Netherlands); p. 3 (China); p. 5 (Jamaica); and p. 8 (Malaysia).

²⁹ S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), p. 4.

supporting the convening of such an international meeting under the joint auspices of the United Nations and OAU.³⁰

At the same meeting, the President (United States) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³¹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Expressed its appreciation to the Heads of State and other Government representatives who had participated in its meeting concerning the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo on 24 January 2000;

Expected that the progress made at the Maputo Summit of 16 January 2000 and the Harare meeting of the Political Committee of 18 January 2000 would continue at the next Political Committee Meeting and Summit of the Signatories of the Agreement;

Urged all parties to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement to build on the momentum of those meetings to create the climate necessary for the full implementation of the Agreement;

Reaffirmed the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and reiterated its call for the immediate cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of all foreign forces;

Welcomed the report of the Secretary-General and expressed its determination to support his recommendation to expand the mandate of MONUC;

Welcomed the arrival of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, expressed its support for his efforts, and urged all parties to assist and cooperate with him;

Called on all signatories of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement to provide assurances of safety, security and freedom of movement of United Nations and associated personnel;

Strongly supported the designation of the former President of Botswana, Sir Ketumile Masire, as the Facilitator of the National Dialogue, and called on Member States to provide full financial and other support to his efforts;

Expressed serious concern over the humanitarian situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and urged Member States and donor organizations to make available the necessary funds to carry on urgent humanitarian operations.

³⁰ S/PV.4092, p. 13 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Mali); p. 16 (France); p. 18 (Bangladesh); p. 19 (Tunisia); and p. 21 (Argentina); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), p. 4 (China); p. 6 (Jamaica); p. 7 (Ukraine); pp. 8-9 (Malaysia); p. 9 (Russian Federation); and p. 10 (Portugal).

³¹ S/PRST/2000/2.

Decision of 24 February 2000 (4104th meeting): resolution 1291 (2000)

At its 4104th meeting,³² on 24 February 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on MONUC dated 17 January 2000.³³ In his report, the Secretary-General drew attention to violations of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, the danger of large-scale violence among ethnic groups and the deterioration of the humanitarian situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He reaffirmed that, in order to be effective, any United Nations peacekeeping mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, whatever its mandate, would have to be large and expensive and cautioned that the deployment of MONUC would create inflated, even unrealistic, expectations. Noting that the proper implementation of the Lusaka Agreement required very close coordination and cooperation between the United Nations, the parties, the Joint Military Commission and OAU, he commended the regional initiatives undertaken in support of the peace process. Subject to agreement by the parties to taking steps to recommit themselves to the Lusaka Agreement, he recommended the expansion of MONUC. Underlining the necessity of establishing the Joint Military Commission on a permanent basis, he supported the continued efforts to integrate the Commission's activities with those of MONUC. Lastly, the Secretary-General suggested that the inter-Congolese dialogue be conducted under the neutral auspices of the Facilitator with the assistance of OAU.

At the meeting, the President (Argentina) drew the attention of Council members to a number of communications addressed to the President of the Council.³⁴

³² For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XII, part I, sect. B, case 4, with regard to Article 2, (4) of the Charter.

³³ S/2000/30, submitted pursuant to resolution 1279 (1999).

³⁴ Letters from the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, dated 28 January 2000 informing the Council of "massacres" taking place in the north-east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo which was occupied by Ugandan forces (S/2000/67); and dated 11 February 2000 transmitting a memorandum of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo on the humanitarian situation in those areas (S/2000/122); two letters from the representative of Uganda, dated 26 January 2000 forwarding a document

Statements were made by a majority of the members of the Council,³⁵ and the representatives of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Portugal (on behalf of the European Union³⁶).

Most speakers expressed their satisfaction with the draft resolution before the Council,³⁷ viewed as a critical step towards resolving the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Great Lakes region by initiating the second phase of deployment of MONUC. They also noted its timely adoption, coming one day after the conclusion of the Lusaka Summit, in which the parties to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement reaffirmed their commitment to the Agreement and approved the revised calendar for its implementation. The speakers also reaffirmed that the main responsibility for the implementation of the Agreement lay with the parties. In that connection, they underlined the need for the parties to cooperate with MONUC and to honour their commitments to provide protection and access to the Mission, and for effective cooperation and coordination between MONUC and the Joint Military Commission.

The representative of Namibia, echoed by the representatives of France and Canada, called the draft resolution a compromise, because it did not authorize the deployment of enough military personnel to adequately monitor the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement.³⁸ The main concern expressed by the representative of Canada was that the draft resolution did not match the Mission's mandate with the resources needed to guarantee its success. He further held that in order to ensure that the United Nations peacekeeping

missions had a fair chance to do their job, efforts should be made not to force configurations on them that might be politically convenient but operationally unsound.³⁹ Recalling the complexity of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the representative of the Russian Federation warned against excessive expectations from the deployment of MONUC, as it would be not only naive but also dangerous to rely on external forces to end the conflict, even if those forces were United Nations forces.⁴⁰ The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo announced that, while MONUC would receive a warm welcome in his country, his Government hoped to be consulted at all times about the way MONUC was set up and would retain the right to refuse offers coming from States it did not see as neutral.⁴¹

The representative of the United States maintained that his Government's support for phase II did not constitute prior approval for any future deployment of MONUC. If the United Nations recommended the establishment of a larger United Nations peacekeeping mission, his country would consider such recommendations on their own merits, based on the achievements and the situation in phase II. In his opinion, phase III should begin only after the parties had accomplished specific military and political objectives.⁴² The representative of the Netherlands noted that when, at a later stage, the Council would start its deliberations about phase III, the progress made by the parties would undoubtedly determine the direction of the discussion.⁴³ The representative of Tunisia expressed hope that phase II of the Mission's deployment would take place under positive conditions and acknowledged that additional and sustained efforts would be necessary to permit the launching of phase III on a solid foundation.⁴⁴ For his part, the representative of Canada hoped that phase II of deployment would pave the way to a third phase of "substantial" United Nations peacekeeping in the service of the Congolese.⁴⁵

Reaffirming the importance of firm and credible assurances for the security and freedom of movement

on conflicts in the Great Lakes region by the President of Uganda (S/2000/73), and dated 3 February 2000 by which the Government of Uganda rejected the allegations of genocide in the Democratic Republic of the Congo made by the Democratic Republic of the Congo (S/2000/89); and a note verbale dated 31 January 2000 from the Permanent Mission of South Africa to the United Nations forwarding a letter from its Minister for Foreign Affairs requesting the Council to urgently adopt the draft resolution referred to in the presidential statement of 26 January 2000 (S/2000/81).

³⁵ The representative of Malaysia did not make a statement.

³⁶ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey associated themselves with the statement.

³⁷ S/2000/143.

³⁸ S/PV.4104, p. 3 (Namibia); p. 4 (France); and p. 7 (Canada).

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

of the staff of MONUC, the representative of Argentina saluted the inclusion in the resolution of a provision empowering MONUC, within specific circumstances, to act under Chapter VII of the Charter to protect civilians under imminent threat of physical violence.⁴⁶

A number of speakers also expressed concern at the illegal exploitation of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁴⁷ A few representatives called attention to the situation in the eastern part of the country, including the possibility of a humanitarian catastrophe in the north and south Kivu areas.⁴⁸ The need to pay urgent attention to an effective disarmament, demobilization, repatriation and reintegration programme was also emphasized by a number of speakers.⁴⁹

At the meeting, the President (Argentina) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁵⁰ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1291 (2000), by which the Council, determining that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo constituted a threat to international peace and security in the region, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of MONUC until 31 August 2000;

Authorized the expansion of MONUC to consist of up to 5,537 military personnel, including up to 500 observers and requested the Secretary-General to recommend immediately any additional force requirements that might become necessary to enhance force protection;

Decided that the phased deployment of personnel referred to in paragraph 4 would be carried out as and if the Secretary-General determined that MONUC personnel would be able to deploy to their assigned locations and carry out their functions as described in paragraph 7 in conditions of adequate security and with the cooperation of the parties, and that he had received firm and credible assurances from the parties to the Ceasefire Agreement to that effect, and requested the Secretary-General to keep the Council informed in that regard;

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (Namibia); p. 4 (France); p. 5 (United Kingdom); p. 6 (Jamaica); p. 9 (Netherlands); and p. 14 (Argentina).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (Namibia); p. 4 (France); p. 5 (United Kingdom); p. 14 (Argentina); and p. 17 (Portugal on behalf of the European Union).

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (United Kingdom); p. 12 (United States); and p. 16 (Portugal).

⁵⁰ S/2000/143.

Decided that MONUC would establish, under overall authority of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, a joint structure with the Joint Military Commission that would ensure close coordination during the period of deployment of MONUC, with co-located headquarters and joint support and administrative structures;

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, with regard to paragraph 8 below, decided that the Mission might take the necessary action, in the areas of deployment of its infantry battalions and as it deemed within its capabilities, to protect United Nations and co-located Joint Military Commission personnel, facilities, installations and equipment, ensure the security and freedom of movement of its personnel, and protect civilians under imminent threat of physical violence.

**Decision of 5 May 2000 (4135th meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4135th meeting,⁵¹ on 5 May 2000, the President (China) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁵² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Expressed its grave concern at the renewed fighting between Ugandan and Rwandan forces in Kisangani, the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Demanded that those latest hostilities cease immediately and that those involved in the fighting at Kisangani reaffirm their commitment to the Lusaka process and comply with all relevant Security Council resolutions;

Considered that those hostilities were in violation of the Lusaka Agreement, the Kampala Disengagement Plan of 8 April 2000 and the ceasefire of 14 April 2000.

**Decision of 2 June 2000 (4151st meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4143rd meeting, on 17 May 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Security Council mission visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, 4 to 8 May 2000.⁵³ In its report, dated 11 May 2000, the Council mission stipulated that the ceasefire which had been inaugurated by the agreement of 8 April and begun on 14 April, though fragile, constituted an important basis for future peacemaking. It noted that the renewed

⁵¹ At the 4132nd meeting, held in private on 25 April 2000, the Council was briefed by the Facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue. Members of the Council made comments and posed questions in connection with the briefing. The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo made a statement.

⁵² S/PRST/2000/15.

⁵³ S/2000/416.

fighting between Ugandan and Rwandan troops in Kisangani on 5 May and the reported violations of the ceasefire in Equateur Province did not represent breakdowns between the parties to the conflict. Referring to the capture of Zambian peacekeepers in Sierra Leone, the mission stressed that the developments in Sierra Leone should not cloud the international community's responsibility in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and its capacity to make a real difference. The mission also recommended that the Secretary-General, before making a final decision, speak to each of the Lusaka Agreement parties, seeking their unequivocal commitment to assist the proposed deployment of phase II of MONUC, testing their commitment to the maintenance of the ceasefire and asking for their firm undertaking to support phase II on the ground in every way possible. The mission further noted that the military activity in and around Kisangani was in clear breach of the ceasefire, and underscored the mission's role in promoting the joint declaration on the demilitarization of Kisangani issued by the Governments of Uganda and Rwanda on 8 May. Reaffirming the need for the Lusaka and United Nations processes to interact effectively, the mission believed that the core structure for ceasefire monitoring, as ordained in resolution 1291 (2000), had to be MONUC and the Joint Military Commission working together from co-located headquarters. The mission advised that the Lusaka requirement for disarmament, demobilization, repatriation and reintegration should be dealt with when the Political Committee on the Implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement convened in New York in June. It further recognized the need for time and the most substantial deployment of peacekeeping forces, beyond phase II of MONUC, and stressed that work had to be done on the details, so that the parties could be confident that the whole structure of the Lusaka Agreement was being given attention. The mission also drew attention to the importance of inter-Congolese dialogue and recommended the early establishment of an expert panel to address the issue of illegal exploitation of natural resources.

At the meeting, statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, Pakistan, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union⁵⁴), Rwanda, South Africa, Swaziland,

⁵⁴ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary,

the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.⁵⁵

Introducing the report of the Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the head of the mission (United States) stated that the mission unanimously believed that Council decisions and actions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo should not be affected by the dangerous and terrible events in Sierra Leone. In his view, the deployment of MONUC in adequate conditions of security and cooperation should remain a key priority. Noting that the demilitarization of Kisangani could take place only once MONUC forces arrived in the city, he advocated their deployment ahead of the initial deployment schedule. He stressed the importance of resolving the issue of co-location of the Joint Military Commission and MONUC, the need for national dialogue, and a successful disarmament, demobilization and reintegration campaign. Finally, he observed that the link between the exploitation of natural resources and the continuation of the conflict needed to be further examined.⁵⁶

Most speakers emphasized the importance of national dialogue among the parties to the conflict and expressed their support for the Facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue and hoped that the difference over the venue of the dialogue would be reconciled.

Speakers welcomed the progress achieved by the disengagement plan of 8 April, the signing of the status-of-forces agreement, and the proposed timetable for the withdrawal of Rwandan and Ugandan troops from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and endorsed the recommendations contained in the mission's report. Concurring with the head of the mission that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo should be considered on its own merits, they called for the rapid deployment of phase II of MONUC, the implementation of the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation and reintegration programme and the resolution of the issue of co-location of the Joint Military Commission and MONUC. They also urged that all cases of violations

Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey associated themselves with the statement.

⁵⁵ The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

⁵⁶ S/PV.4143, pp. 2-6.

of humanitarian law and human rights be investigated and perpetrators brought to justice. Speakers expressed satisfaction that the Political Committee would meet in New York in June at the invitation of the President of the Council and reaffirmed the importance of withdrawal of foreign troops from the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Several speakers endorsed the mission's recommendation for the creation of a panel of experts on the illegal exploitation of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁵⁷

In connection with the future deployment of MONUC, the representative of Namibia cautioned that further delays in the Mission's deployment might be misinterpreted and taken advantage of by the enemies of the peace process.⁵⁸ The representatives of Malaysia and the Russian Federation supported the recommendation that, before the appropriate decision was taken, the Secretary-General should speak once again to each of the Lusaka parties concerning their assistance in the deployment of peacekeeping forces to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁵⁹ The representative of Algeria stated that the rapid and complete deployment of phase II of MONUC remained an absolute priority, designed to strengthen the existent ceasefire and develop confidence in the peace process.⁶⁰ In the light of the Sierra Leone experience, the representative of Bangladesh believed that two opposing considerations had to be made: first, the expediency of deployment of MONUC for maintaining peace and security and second, the imperative of security for peacekeepers and avoiding humiliation.⁶¹ The representative of Ukraine stressed that one of the most compelling tasks was to prevent the events in Sierra Leone from negatively impacting the United Nations presence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁶² The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo called on the United Nations to engage in the rapid deployment of phase II of

MONUC, recalling that President Kabila had assured the Council mission that his Government would not hinder such a deployment in any way.⁶³

The representative of Canada drew attention to what his delegation viewed as a mismatch between the mandate of MONUC and its resources, describing it as "penny-wise and pound-foolish" in the light of the recent events in Sierra Leone. In his view, MONUC lacked the capacity to achieve even the core elements of its mandate. He held that an adequate match between mandate and resources was not an option but an operational necessity.⁶⁴ Observing that by resolution 1291 (2000), acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, MONUC had been given a mandate as challenging as that of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone, the representative of Pakistan stressed that MONUC should be adequately equipped to fulfil its mandate.⁶⁵ Similarly, the representative of South Africa argued that United Nations troops had to be provided not only with an appropriate mandate that took into account the actual conditions in the area of deployment, but also had to be equipped with appropriate resources to carry out their mandate.⁶⁶ In supporting the rapid deployment of MONUC, the representatives of Jamaica and Algeria emphasized that the Mission had to be equipped to deal with any eventuality.⁶⁷

At the 4151st meeting, on 2 June 2000, the President (France) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁶⁸ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the recommendation made by its mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo to proceed with the establishment of an expert panel on the illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Requested the Secretary-General to establish that panel, for a period of six months;

Stressed that in order to implement its mandate, the expert panel might receive logistical support from MONUC and make visits to various countries in the region and if necessary, to other relevant countries;

Requested the Secretary-General to appoint the members of the panel on the basis of the candidates' professional expertise, impartiality and knowledge of the subregion.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 9 (France); p. 12 (Ukraine); pp. 14-15 (Bangladesh); p. 18 (Namibia); p. 21 (Jamaica); and p. 27 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); S/PV.4143 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Portugal); and p. 9 (Zimbabwe).

⁵⁸ S/PV.4143, p. 17.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 13 (Malaysia); and p. 15 (Russian Federation).

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

⁶⁵ S/PV.4143 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁶⁷ S/PV.4143, p. 21 (Jamaica); and p. 25 (Algeria).

⁶⁸ S/PRST/2000/20.

**Decision of 16 June 2000 (4159th meeting):
resolution 1304 (2000)**

At the 4156th meeting, on 15 June 2000, statements were made by the representatives of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United States, and by the representative of Uganda, in his capacity as Chairman of the Political Committee on the Implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement.⁶⁹

Speaking on behalf of the Council, the President (France) noted that, a year after the signing of the Lusaka Agreement, hostilities had flared up in Kisangani and had been ongoing in Equateur Province and Kivu region. In particular, the resumption of hostilities between Rwanda and Uganda in Kisangani had come as a shock to the international community. He hoped that the necessary decisions would be taken to implement the Lusaka Agreement and bring back peace to the people in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Central Africa. He noted that the cost in human lives was ever higher and expressed concern over the number of displaced persons and the need for food. Turning to the national dialogue, he deplored the lack of cooperation of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo with the Facilitator. Lastly, he pointed out that the lack of security in that country and the parties' lack of goodwill were hindering the deployment of MONUC, which ran counter to the commitment that had been undertaken. He further characterized the manifestations of hostility towards MONUC in Kinshasa as unacceptable.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ The representatives of Algeria, Angola, Rwanda, Zambia and Zimbabwe, as well as the Head of External Relations of the Mouvement de libération du Congo (MLC), the head of the delegation of the Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie-Mouvement de libération (RCD-ML) and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Democratic Republic of the Congo were invited to participate but did not make statements. Algeria was represented by the Special Envoy of the President of Algeria, who was the Chairman of OAU; Angola by its Vice-Minister for External Relations; the Democratic Republic of the Congo by its Minister of State for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation; Namibia by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and President of the General Assembly; Rwanda by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Regional Cooperation; Uganda by its Minister of State for Foreign Affairs and Regional Cooperation; and Zambia by its Minister for Presidential Affairs. Also present at the meeting was the Secretary-General.

⁷⁰ S/PV.4156, pp. 3-5.

The representative of the United States remarked that the Council mission to Africa in May had carried the weight of the United Nations to the Great Lakes region. He deplored the resumption of hostilities between Rwanda and Uganda in Kisangani, for which there was no excuse as the ceasefire of 8 May had been negotiated by the Security Council. While priority was to be given to the withdrawal of Rwandan and Ugandan forces from Kisangani as the Secretary-General had recommended, all foreign forces needed to be withdrawn and assistance to groups that had not signed the Lusaka Agreement, particularly the ex-Rwandese Armed Forces and Interahamwe, was to be stopped. He further deplored that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to refuse to engage in the inter-Congolese dialogue and to collaborate with the Facilitator, which could be regarded as an attack on the Lusaka peace process. If difficulties had arisen between any parties and the Facilitator, he suggested that they should be "ironed out".⁷¹

The representative of Uganda, speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Political Committee on the Implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, observed that, various violations notwithstanding, the Agreement had held. Those violations had occurred largely because the mechanism that the Agreement had put in place to manage the implementation process had not been fully operationalized. He observed that after the very cautious approach initially adopted by the United Nations with regard to its involvement in the implementation process, the Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo had signalled the beginning of a partnership in earnest with the Political Committee. He expected the release and exchange of prisoners to commence by the end of the week. The disengagement of forces would follow once the information given by each party had been verified by MONUC. He noted that while enormous challenges to the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement lay ahead, the challenge posed by the fighting in Kisangani between Rwandan and Ugandan forces had been resolved when the parties had been called upon by the Political Committee to end the fighting and implement the agreement for the demilitarization of Kisangani.⁷²

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-10.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo assured the Council that his Government was committed to the Lusaka Agreement. He warned, however, that no one could guarantee the outcome if foreign forces remained in the country. He stressed that the Democratic Republic of the Congo needed MONUC but, as a sovereign State, it was necessary for the Government to be notified on the movement of every United Nations aircraft. With respect to the inter-Congolese dialogue and the Facilitator, he declared that his Government had reasons to believe that the existing embodiment of the facilitation was no longer appropriate to the progress of the operation. Therefore, his Government had asked OAU to appoint another facilitator who could facilitate dialogue among all Congolese. He lastly called on the Council to speed up the peace process by, for example, linking phases II and III of the deployment of MONUC.⁷³

At the 4159th meeting,⁷⁴ on 16 June 2000, statements were made by the representatives of Tunisia and Uganda, the latter speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Political Committee.⁷⁵

The Chairman of the Political Committee reported that the Committee had met in a joint session with the Council in New York on 15 and 16 June 2000, and had reviewed the implementation of the Ceasefire Agreement; the conditions for the deployment of MONUC; disarmament, demobilization, repatriation and reintegration of armed groups; the humanitarian situation; and the inter-Congolese dialogue. Reaffirming the commitment of the parties to the Lusaka Agreement as the only viable means to finding a peaceful and sustainable solution, the Committee had briefed the Council on the measures taken to address ceasefire violations and the steps taken by Rwanda and Uganda to bring the situation in Kisangani back to normalcy, including the withdrawal of their forces from Kisangani that had commenced on 16 June. The Committee had further urged the Council to expedite

the deployment of MONUC and to provide adequate resources to the Facilitator of inter-Congolese political negotiations.⁷⁶

Noting that the deployment of MONUC was of capital importance for the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement, the representative of Tunisia announced that a Tunisian unit was ready to be deployed.⁷⁷

At the same meeting, the President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁷⁸ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1304 (2000), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, *inter alia*:

Demanded that Ugandan and Rwandan forces as well as forces of the Congolese armed opposition and other armed groups immediately and completely withdraw from Kisangani, and called on all parties to the Ceasefire Agreement to respect the demilitarization of the city and its environs;

Further demanded, that Uganda and Rwanda, which had violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, withdraw all their forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo; that each phase of withdrawal completed by Ugandan and Rwandan forces be reciprocated by the other parties in conformity with the same timetable; and that all other foreign military presence and activity in the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo be brought to an end; in that context demanded that all parties abstain from any offensive action during the process of disengagement and of withdrawal of foreign forces;

Requested the Secretary-General to keep under review arrangements for the deployment of the personnel of MONUC;

Demanded that the parties to the Ceasefire Agreement cooperate with the deployment of MONUC to the areas of operations deemed necessary by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General;

Expressed the view that the Governments of Uganda and Rwanda should make reparations for the loss of life and the property damage they had inflicted on the civilian population in Kisangani, and requested the Secretary-General to submit an assessment of the damage as a basis for such reparations;

Expressed its readiness to consider possible measures which could be imposed in accordance with its responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations in case of failure by parties to comply fully with the resolution.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁷⁴ At the 4157th and 4158th meetings, held in private on 15 June and 16 June 2000, respectively, the Council members and the members of the Political Committee on the Implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, as well as Zambia, the representative of the Chairman of OAU and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Democratic Republic of the Congo had frank and constructive discussions.

⁷⁵ Uganda was represented by its Minister of State for Foreign Affairs and Regional Cooperation.

⁷⁶ S/PV.4159, pp. 2-3.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁷⁸ S/2000/587.

Decision of 23 August 2000 (4189th meeting): resolution 1316 (2000)

At its 4189th meeting,⁷⁹ on 23 August 2000, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 14 August 2000 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Council.⁸⁰ By that letter, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the deployment of MONUC had been prevented by an adverse climate characterized by large-scale fighting in many parts of the country, severe restrictions imposed by the Government and other parties on the Mission's freedom of movement, the refusal of the Government to permit the deployment of United Nations armed troops in accordance with the decisions of the Council, and by a sustained campaign of vilification conducted against MONUC and its staff. Under those conditions, he indicated that the Lusaka peace process was undergoing an extremely challenging phase, which required substantive reevaluation not only on the part of its signatories, but also of the United Nations. He believed that the role MONUC could play under such circumstances remained unclear and requested that the Council consider an interim extension of the mandate of MONUC for one month, until 30 September 2000, in order to allow sufficient time to assess the impact of the development and formulate recommendations accordingly.

The President (Malaysia) drew attention to a draft resolution;⁸¹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1316 (2000), by which the Council, inter alia:

Decided to extend the mandate of MONUC until 15 October 2000;

Emphasized that the technical extension of the Mission's mandate was designed to allow time for further diplomatic activities in support of the Ceasefire Agreement and for Council reflection on the future mandate of MONUC and possible adjustments thereto;

Requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council by 21 September 2000 on progress in the implementation of the

⁷⁹ At the 4183rd meeting, held in private on 3 August 2000, the Council was briefed by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. Members of the Council and the Minister for Human Rights and Special Envoy of the President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo had a constructive discussion.

⁸⁰ S/2000/799.

⁸¹ S/2000/823.

Ceasefire Agreement and relevant Council resolutions and make recommendations for further Council action.

Decision of 7 September 2000 (4194th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4194th meeting, held on 7 September 2000 at the level of Heads of State and Government, in connection with the item entitled "Ensuring an effective role for the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa", the President (Mali) made a statement on behalf of the Council in connection with the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo,⁸² by which the Council, inter alia:

Called on all parties to the conflict to cease the hostilities and to fulfil their obligations under the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and the relevant resolutions of the Security Council;

Called for the accelerated withdrawal of Ugandan and Rwandan forces and of all other foreign forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Called on all the Congolese Parties to engage fully in the national dialogue process;

Deplored that the continuation of hostilities and the lack of cooperation by the parties had prevented the full deployment of MONUC;

Urged all parties, particularly the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to cooperate effectively with MONUC in order to allow its deployment.

Decision of 13 October 2000 (4207th meeting): resolution 1323 (2000)

At its 4207th meeting, on 13 October 2000, the Council included in its agenda the fourth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC, dated 21 September 2000.⁸³ In his report, the Secretary-General informed the Council that despite the efforts of regional leaders to put the peace process back on track, there had been little progress in the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement. The ceasefire had been violated consistently and progress in developing the disengagement plan adopted in Kampala on 8 April had been stalled since July, when the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo withdrew from Joint Military Commission deliberations on the subject.

⁸² S/PRST/2000/28. For a summary of the meeting, see chap. VIII, sect. 37.E.

⁸³ S/2000/888, submitted pursuant to resolution 1316 (2000).

Moreover, the rebel movements had intensified their attempts to achieve a unified front opposing the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Government had recently questioned the validity of the Lusaka Agreement and had asked for its revision. The Secretary-General further reported that prospects for the early implementation of the provisions of the Agreement had receded, owing to the refusal of one party to cooperate with the Facilitator. He further announced that Rwandan and Ugandan forces had withdrawn from Kisangani, although it was not clear whether they had redeployed in other areas. He drew attention to the deterioration of the humanitarian and human rights situation and recommended the extension of the mandate of MONUC for a period of two months, an extension which would indicate to all the parties that those months should be used to unequivocally demonstrate their will to move the peace process forward and to create conditions necessary for the deployment of phase II.

At the meeting, statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Canada, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States.⁸⁴

Noting that there had been “wholesale violations” of the ceasefire agreement, the representative of Canada pointed out that MONUC was unable to deploy its personnel to the regions of the Democratic Republic of the Congo where its presence was needed. He stressed that it was the responsibility of the Government to get the peace process moving again by finally honouring its repeated commitment to allow MONUC full freedom of movement. He also underlined that the Lusaka Agreement signatories had to realize that the Council would not consent to a process in which cooperation with MONUC or the Joint Military Commission was selective or used to legitimize gains made through armed aggression.⁸⁵ Similarly, the representative of the United Kingdom declared that, while troop-contributing countries and Council members could review the status of MONUC deployment and the concept of operations in an early meeting, the real problem was that MONUC was unable to do its job, as efforts to get the right

conditions for the Mission’s deployment had been so far unsuccessful.⁸⁶ In that connection, others also regretted the lack of guarantees of freedom of movement and security for MONUC and the serious violations of the ceasefire.⁸⁷

On the two-month extension of the mandate of MONUC, many speakers emphasized that the parties needed to utilize those months to reaffirm their commitment to and implement the Lusaka Agreement.⁸⁸ At the same time, the representative of Canada stressed that if the parties did not desist from their “destructive approach”, the Council would need to re-examine whether MONUC, in its existing form, was the most appropriate instrument for helping to stabilize the situation on the ground.⁸⁹ The representative of the United States also cautioned that if efforts to block the Mission continued, and should the parties fail to demonstrate their commitment to the peace process, there would be little choice but to review closely the utility and purpose of a continued United Nations presence, as defined in the Mission’s concept of operations.⁹⁰

At the same meeting, the President (Namibia) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁹¹ it was adopted unanimously as resolution 1323 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*, decided to extend the mandate of MONUC until 15 December 2000.

Decision of 14 December 2000 (4247th meeting): resolution 1332 (2000)

At its 4237th meeting, on 28 November 2000, at which statements were made by a majority of Council members,⁹² the Council was briefed by the Emergency Relief Coordinator *ad interim*.

In her briefing, the Emergency Relief Coordinator reported that the humanitarian situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to

⁸⁴ The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

⁸⁵ S/PV.4207, pp. 2-3.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (Argentina); and p. 5 (France, United States).

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (United Kingdom, Netherlands); p. 5 (France); and pp. 5-6 (United States).

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

⁹¹ S/2000/979.

⁹² The representative of Ukraine did not make a statement. The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

deteriorate, 33 per cent of the population being affected by the conflict and some 1.7 million likely to have died as a result of war in the eastern part of the country alone. Flagrant human rights violations prevailed throughout the country and occurred “in an atmosphere of total impunity” on both the Government and rebel sides. Of particular concern were the high numbers of internally displaced people and refugees. She indicated that humanitarian efforts were hampered by a lack of security, limited access to the affected populations and critically few resources for life-saving interventions. In that respect, she emphasized that the genuine commitment of all parties was needed to ensure full humanitarian access across the country. In spite of problems, she reported that the United Nations agencies had had a number of breakthrough operations and were successfully collaborating with MONUC and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. In closing, noting that the problems present the Democratic Republic of the Congo were interconnected with those of its neighbours, she expressed support for the Council’s efforts to find long-term solutions to address the military, political and humanitarian challenges.⁹³

Council members expressed concern at, *inter alia*, the enormity of the humanitarian crisis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the implications of further deteriorations for the region and the continent. They lamented that neither the Government nor the rebel groups had lived up to their commitments under the Lusaka Agreement, cooperated with the United Nations or ensured the security and freedom of movement of humanitarian workers. Referring to violations of human rights and humanitarian law, a number of representatives insisted that the culture of impunity should end and those guilty of such crimes be brought to justice.⁹⁴ A number of speakers agreed that the political and military situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo could not be analysed in isolation, and should be seen in the context of the Great Lakes region.⁹⁵

Several representatives stressed that the long-term solution to the humanitarian situation lay in a

political settlement.⁹⁶ The representative of the United States observed that neither the United Nations nor any Member State could impose a solution to the crisis. Such a solution, in his view, had to come only from the Congolese political leadership and be respected by all combatants, foreign and Congolese.⁹⁷ The representative of the Russian Federation held that it was important to consider the most suitable forms of United Nations assistance to the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including the establishment of conditions for the deployment of phase II of MONUC.⁹⁸

The representative of Argentina believed that the deployment of MONUC under reasonable security conditions would be a factor of stability that would facilitate the work of the humanitarian organizations.⁹⁹ The representative of Mali declared that United Nations coordination backed by a fully-deployed MONUC would allow for improved effectiveness of humanitarian assistance.¹⁰⁰ The representative of Namibia had no doubt that the Mission’s presence on the ground would act as a deterrent and improve the humanitarian situation and thus prevent further loss of life and displacement.¹⁰¹ In contrast, the representative of Canada noted that certain non-governmental organizations believed that a significant deployment of MONUC might further hamper humanitarian access by provoking hostile forces to oppose any international presence.¹⁰² The representative of France suggested incorporating a civilian component into MONUC, distinct from military observers, which would enable the Mission to better assess the humanitarian situation and liaise with civil society.¹⁰³ Answering the queries of Council members, the Emergency Relief Coordinator expressed the view that the presence of MONUC, with its additional security it would provide, would facilitate humanitarian assistance. While acknowledging that the United Nations presence was seen as controversial, she held that given the prevailing situation on the ground, the security provided by

⁹³ S/PV.4237, pp. 2-5.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Canada); pp. 8-9 (Argentina); p. 11 (Namibia); and p. 16 (Jamaica).

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Bangladesh); p. 9 (Argentina); p. 15 (Tunisia); and p. 16 (Jamaica).

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Bangladesh); pp. 8-9 (Argentina); p. 10 (France); p. 12 (United States); p. 13 (China); p. 14 (Russian Federation); and p. 16 (Jamaica).

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

MONUC would be welcomed, in terms of providing potential access and escorts.¹⁰⁴

At its 4247th meeting, on 14 December 2000, the Council included in its agenda the fifth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC, dated 6 December 2000.¹⁰⁵ In his report, the Secretary-General noted that, despite substantial compliance with the ceasefire in most parts of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, fighting had occurred in the Equateur and Katanga provinces. He further pointed out that the clashes that had occurred in border areas threatened to spill over into the Republic of the Congo, the Central African Republic and Zambia. In view of the situation, he recommended that the Mission's mandate be extended for six more months, while expressing his intention to recommend the deployment of infantry units in support of the military observers. Lastly, he indicated that a broader agreement needed to be reached on the key questions that had so far not been resolved and suggested creating a permanent mechanism to pursue genuine and workable arrangements to solve the underlying questions at the core of the conflict.

The President (Russian Federation) drew attention to a letter dated 13 December 2000 from the representative of Rwanda to the President of the Council.¹⁰⁶

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the only speaker at the meeting,¹⁰⁷ hoped that a rapid and appropriate solution could be achieved, taking into account the interests of the warring parties, including the re-establishment of its sovereignty and territorial integrity; halting of the flagrant violations of human rights and other atrocities; halting of the exploitation of natural resources; and addressing the security concerns of Rwanda, Uganda and Burundi. He noted that his Government expected the immediate withdrawal of the armed forces of Rwanda, Uganda

and Burundi from its territory and that the disengagement sub-plans would be immediately implemented in accord with the three-phase schedule adopted at Harare on 6 December. Therefore, he urged the Security Council to take advantage of the Harare disengagement sub-plans by authorizing the deployment of neutral forces along the common border with Rwanda and Uganda and offered assurances that his Government would work to ensure freedom of movement of MONUC and cooperate on the rapid deployment of United Nations troops. He cautioned that parties could create insecurity at the border and relaunch fighting to delay the deployment of the neutral observers and United Nations troops. The representative maintained that his Government considered it militarily impossible to disarm the armed groups in the presence of Rwandan and Ugandan troops. He further conveyed his Government's commitment to the inter-Congolese dialogue and announced the release of all prisoners of conscience in preparation for the meeting to be held in Libreville later that month.¹⁰⁸

The President drew attention to a draft resolution;¹⁰⁹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1332 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of MONUC until 15 June 2001;

Called on all parties to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement to cease hostilities and to continue to intensify their dialogue to implement that Agreement, as well as the Kampala, Maputo and Harare Agreements, and to take additional steps, within the framework of those Agreements, to accelerate the peace process;

Endorsed the proposal made by the Secretary-General to deploy, as soon as he considered that conditions would allow it and in accordance with the relevant provisions of resolution 1291 (2000), additional military observers, in order to monitor and verify the parties' implementation of the ceasefire and disengagement plans adopted in Maputo and Lusaka.

Decision of 22 February 2001 (4282nd meeting): resolution 1341 (2001)

At its 4271st meeting,¹¹⁰ on 2 February 2001, the Council included in its agenda a briefing by Major

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹⁰⁵ S/2000/1156, submitted pursuant to resolutions 1291 (2000) and 1316 (2000).

¹⁰⁶ S/2000/1186; the representative of Rwanda requested that the Council support the Government of Zambia in disarming and repatriating the ex-Rwandese Armed Forces and Interahamwe forces currently on Zambian territory as part of the armed groups that had fled the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

¹⁰⁷ The Democratic Republic of the Congo was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation.

¹⁰⁸ S/PV.4247, pp. 3-6.

¹⁰⁹ S/2000/1182.

¹¹⁰ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XII, part I, sect. B, case 4, with regard to Article 2 (4) of the Charter.

General Joseph Kabila, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Following briefings by the Secretary-General and the President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, statements were made by all Council members.

The President (Tunisia) stated that the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement had gone through critical phases and faced many challenges since the Council meeting on 24 January 2000. Foreign troops had not withdrawn from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the national dialogue had come to a standstill and the deployment of MONUC had been delayed.¹¹¹

The Secretary-General highlighted the window of opportunity in the Democratic Republic of the Congo created by the absence of violations of the ceasefire in the previous two weeks. He urged the parties to adhere to the 6 December 2000 disengagement plan they had agreed to. He announced that in his forthcoming report, he would propose the elements of a revised concept of operations for the MONUC deployment in support of the disengagement plan. Underlining the importance of the inter-Congolese dialogue, he welcomed the willingness of the new Government to work with the neutral Facilitator appointed under the Lusaka Agreement, with the help of a co-Facilitator. He also called for the early withdrawal of all foreign forces and commended the new Government for its commitment to peace.¹¹²

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo insisted that, to be effective, the Lusaka Agreement had to be reinforced by a binding mechanism that would punish the parties who violated the ceasefire and did not respect the measures taken for deployment and disengagement. Noting that the situation in his country had not changed significantly since the Council's high-level meeting on 24 January 2000, he called on the Council to devise a new and precise timeframe to include: (1) the disengagement provided for in the Harare Agreement; (2) the deployment of United Nations troops; (3) the unconditional withdrawal of uninvited forces; and (4) the withdrawal of troops from other countries that had been invited. Pointing out that the illegal exploitation of natural resources continued to fuel conflict, he looked forward to the next report of the Panel of Experts on the issue. In anticipation of the

Council's decision whether to deploy phase II of MONUC, he reiterated his Government's commitment to cooperate closely with the Mission. He added that once peace and territorial integrity had been restored, preparations would be made for free and transparent elections.¹¹³

Council members called on the parties to fulfil their commitments under the signed agreements and underlined the importance of implementing the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and the Kampala and Harare disengagement plans. Echoing the Secretary-General, speakers stressed the importance of the inter-Congolese dialogue and encouraged President Kabila and his Government to take concrete steps in cooperation with the neutral Facilitator. Council members held that peace and democratization were intrinsically linked and supported President Kabila's intention to work towards the establishment of a democratic country and prepare for the holding of free and fair elections.

Speakers stressed that the full deployment of MONUC was contingent on the disengagement of troops of the warring parties, and that free access, security and safety had to be provided for MONUC and humanitarian agency personnel. Council members also welcomed the remarks of President Kabila in support of MONUC and the peace process and called for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The representative of the United States recalled that while the Council had authorized phase II of MONUC almost a year ago, the Secretary-General had delayed the deployment of additional personnel because conditions on the ground had not yet been conducive to a successful mission, which was not a popular but right decision.¹¹⁴ The representative of France believed that the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Democratic Republic of the Congo had to be accompanied by the rapid deployment of MONUC.¹¹⁵ The representatives of Mali and Mauritius held that the deployment of the second phase of MONUC was essential to the peace process.¹¹⁶ In the view of the representative of Mauritius, the undue delay in the deployment of the United Nations peacekeeping operation had undoubtedly contributed to the stagnation of the Lusaka process.¹¹⁷ Urging the

¹¹¹ S/PV.4271, pp. 2-3.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11 (Mali); and p. 16 (Mauritius).

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

parties to make progress in implementing the Lusaka Agreement, the representative of China expressed hope that the Council would, in view of the changing situation, take specific steps for the deployment of phase II of MONUC.¹¹⁸ The representative of the Russian Federation stated that, in considering the deployment of phase II of MONUC, the Council would take into consideration whether the parties showed genuine political will to fulfil their commitments.¹¹⁹ The representative of Bangladesh declared that real progress on the ground had to be achieved in order for the Council to take a decision on the full deployment of MONUC at its authorized strength.¹²⁰ The representative of the United Kingdom stressed that MONUC could deploy and carry out its role only in parallel with implementation by the parties of the Lusaka Agreement.¹²¹

At its 4279th meeting, on 21 February 2001, the Council included in its agenda the sixth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC, dated 12 February 2001.¹²² In his report, the Secretary-General expressed satisfaction at the lack of significant ceasefire violations since mid-January. He indicated that there were hopeful signs that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo might be willing to accept the role of Sir Ketumile Masire as the neutral Facilitator for the inter-Congolese dialogue. Under those circumstances, he recommended the adoption of a revised concept of operations for MONUC which would enable the Mission to assist the parties in carrying out the disengagement of their forces along a confrontation line. He further recommended that MONUC be strengthened with the additional civilian staff, including a reinforced human rights component. He deplored the outbreaks of intercommunal violence in Bunia and South Kivu and called on the local authorities to find peaceful ways of resolving the issues. He also commended the involvement of regional Heads of State in the search for solutions to the conflict.

At the meeting, the President (Tunisia) drew attention to two letters from the representatives of Rwanda and Uganda, respectively, addressed to the

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹²² S/2001/128, submitted pursuant to resolution 1332 (2000).

President of the Council.¹²³ The Council was briefed by the Secretary-General and the representative of Zimbabwe, in his capacity as Chairman of the Political Committee.¹²⁴

Acknowledging the initiatives of many African leaders and OAU, the President (Tunisia) welcomed the progress that had been made in the previous few weeks towards respect for the Ceasefire Agreement and the readiness of the Congolese authorities to implement the inter-Congolese dialogue with its Facilitator. He announced that the United Nations was preparing to implement the deployment of MONUC, and called on all parties to cooperate in the Mission's deployment. He also expressed concern at the deterioration of the humanitarian situation.¹²⁵

The Secretary-General reported an improvement in the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, with the parties talking to each other, the

¹²³ By a letter dated 18 February 2001, the representative of Rwanda informed the Council that his Government had taken note of the results of the Third Summit of the signatories of the Lusaka Agreement, in Lusaka on 15 February 2001, and had reaffirmed its earlier offer to pull back its forces present in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (S/2001/147). By a letter dated 20 February 2001, the representative of Uganda forwarded a statement by his Government reaffirming that the Lusaka Agreement remained the most viable framework for the resolution of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, welcoming the planned deployment of MONUC observers by 26 February 2001 and announcing its decision to withdraw an additional two battalions from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, under the supervision of MONUC (S/2001/150).

¹²⁴ The representatives of Togo, Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Namibia, Rwanda, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe, as well as the representatives of MLC to the Joint Military Commission and of RCD-Kisangani, the Secretary-General of RCD and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Democratic Republic of the Congo were invited to participate but did not make statements. Togo was represented by the Special Envoy of the President of Togo; Angola by its Minister for External Relations; the Democratic Republic of the Congo by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation; Rwanda by the President of the Republic; Uganda by its Minister of State for Foreign Affairs; Zambia by its Minister for Presidential Affairs; and Namibia and Zimbabwe by their respective Ministers of State for Foreign Affairs.

¹²⁵ S/PV.4279, pp. 3-4.

Congolese people being able to take part in the governance of the country, and a de facto cessation of hostilities prevailing throughout much of the country. Under the plan devised by the Joint Military Commission and approved by the Political Committee, the opposing foreign troops could soon begin to withdraw from their advance positions and take a step back from the line of confrontation. The concept of operations that had been submitted to the Council proposed that United Nations military personnel should be deployed to monitor and verify the actions taken by the parties in implementing the Harare disengagement plan. Welcoming the readiness of the Congolese authorities to engage in the inter-Congolese dialogue, he encouraged all parties to cooperate in achieving peace. Referring to complaints with regard to the slowness of the United Nations to act and the small size of the forces it planned to deploy, the Secretary-General explained that many troop-contributing countries were not convinced that they should risk their soldiers' lives in circumstances where the parties to the conflict were not reliably committed to the peace process. He saluted the decision of President Kagame to withdraw his troops from Pweto and pull back all his forces, in accordance with the Harare disengagement and redeployment plan.¹²⁶

The representative of Zimbabwe, speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Political Committee, noted that a radically transformed situation now existed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, giving rise to renewed hope and optimism for the peace process. While observing that it was "patently evident" that the parties continued to take their obligations seriously, and that this turn of events could move the peace process even further and in more tangible ways, he noted with concern that in adopting a "gradualist and minimalist" concept of operations for MONUC, the United Nations conveyed an unfortunate impression of hesitation and doubt about the peace process. In his opinion, the reduction in the number of MONUC troops to be deployed from the 5,537 authorized under resolution 1291 (2000) to under 3,000 signalled a lack of seriousness and commitment to the peace process and amounted to amending resolution 1291 (2000) "by the back door", through administrative fiat. Consequently, he appealed to the Council to reconsider the proposed figure for deployment under the new concept and called on the Council to act swiftly and

decisively to promote peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and be willing to take calculated risks, if need be.¹²⁷

At its 4282nd meeting,¹²⁸ on 22 February 2001, the Council again included in its agenda the sixth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC, dated 12 February 2001.¹²⁹ Statements were made by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Zimbabwe, the latter speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Political Committee.

The representative of the United Kingdom asked the Chairman of the Political Committee to confirm that the first step of withdrawal in Katanga province which the parties had agreed on was founded on the Kampala Agreement of 8 April 2000.¹³⁰ In response, the Chairman of the Political Committee explained that the positions agreed to by the parties were based on both the Kampala Agreement and the Harare sub-plans and offered assurances that there was no confusion as to which positions had been intended.¹³¹

The President (Tunisia) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹³² it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1341 (2001), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, inter alia:

Demanded once again that Ugandan and Rwandan forces and all other foreign forces withdraw from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Demanded that the parties implement fully the Kampala plan and the Harare sub-plans for disengagement and redeployment of forces without reservations within the 14-day period stipulated in the Harare Agreement, starting 15 March 2001;

¹²⁷ Ibid., pp. 6-8.

¹²⁸ At the 4280th meeting, held in private on 21 February 2001, the members of the Council, the members of the Political Committee, the representative of Zambia, the Special Envoy of the Chairman of OAU, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs of OAU and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Democratic Republic of the Congo had a constructive, interactive discussion. At the 4281st meeting, held in private on 22 February 2001, the Council was briefed by the Facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue.

¹²⁹ S/2001/128.

¹³⁰ S/PV.4282, p. 2.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² S/2001/157.

¹²⁶ Ibid., pp. 4-5.

Urged the parties to the Lusaka Agreement to prepare to adopt not later than 15 May 2001 a precise plan and schedule which would lead to the completion of the orderly withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Condemned the massacres and atrocities committed and demanded that all the parties concerned put an immediate end to violations of human rights and international humanitarian law;

Demanded that all those concerned bring an end to the recruitment, training and use of children in their armed forces;

Called on all parties to ensure the safe and unhindered access of relief personnel to all those in need;

Called the parties to the conflict to cooperate fully with the deployment of MONUC;

Requested the parties to relocate the Joint Military Commission to Kinshasa, co-locating it at all levels with MONUC;

Endorsed the Secretary-General's updated concept of operations for the deployment of MONUC; expressed its readiness to consider possible measures which could be imposed in accordance with its responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations in case of failure by parties to comply fully with the resolution.

**Decision of 3 May 2001 (4318th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4317th meeting,¹³³ on 3 May 2001, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 12 April 2001 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Council, transmitting the report of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.¹³⁴

In its report, the Panel of Experts concluded, *inter alia*, that the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo had become mainly about access, control and trade of mineral resources; the exploitation of natural resources of that country had become systematic and systemic; a number of private companies had been involved and fuelled the war directly, trading arms for natural resources; bilateral and multilateral donors had sent mixed signals to Governments with armies in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and top military

¹³³ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51 of the Charter.

¹³⁴ S/2001/357; the report was submitted pursuant to the statement by the President of 2 June 2000 (S/PRST/2000/20).

commanders from various countries required the conflict for its lucrative nature and for temporarily solving some internal problems in those countries. The Panel recommended, *inter alia*, that the Council should (1) extend the mandate of the Panel to allow it to conduct a follow-up investigation and report; (2) declare a temporary embargo on certain natural resources from, or to, Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda until the involvement of those countries in the exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was made clear and declared so by the Council; (3) decide that all Member States freeze without delay the financial assets of the rebel movements and their leaders; (4) strongly urge all States to freeze the financial assets of those companies or individuals participating in the illegal exploitation of natural resources; (5) declare an immediate embargo on the supply of weapons and all military materiel to the rebel groups operating in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and consider extending the embargo to the States that supported or assisted those groups; and (6) decide that all military cooperation with States whose military forces were present in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in violation of its sovereignty be suspended immediately until those armies withdrew. The Panel also made recommendations with respect to financial and economic matters, the diamond business and transit of timber and timber certification.

At the meeting, at which the President (United States) drew attention to three letters to the President of the Council,¹³⁵ the Council was briefed by the Chairperson of the Panel of Experts. Statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Angola, Burundi, Canada, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, Namibia, Rwanda, the Sudan, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union¹³⁶), Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.¹³⁷

¹³⁵ Letter dated 16 April 2001 from the representative of Uganda (S/2001/378), letter dated 24 April 2001 from the representative of Rwanda (S/2001/402) and letter dated 1 May 2001 from the representative of Burundi, each transmitting the respective Government's reaction to the report of the Panel of Experts (S/2001/433).

¹³⁶ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey associated themselves with the statement.

¹³⁷ Burundi was represented by its Minister of Finance; the Democratic Republic of the Congo by its Minister for

In her briefing, the Chairperson of the Panel of Experts noted that the Panel's mandate had been to consider the illegal exploitation of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; to research and analyse the links between the exploitation of resources and the continuation of conflict; and to make recommendations to the Council. Elaborating on the report's findings, she held that the Rwandan and Ugandan armies, and to a lesser extent the Burundi army, had been engaged in the illegal exploitation of resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo since 1998. The links between the exploitation of resources, which took the forms of mass-scale looting and the systematic and systemic exploitation of resources, and the continuation of war were found at three levels: (1) at the level of personal gain of high-ranking military and civilian officials; (2) in the field, where there was more fighting in mining areas than at the official front; and (3) at the level of the financing of the conflict, because of the gap between the military expenditures of the various armies and the level of the defence budget of the various countries.¹³⁸

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo stated that the report had confirmed that border insecurity was not the real reason for the troops of Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda to be in his country. Instead, the real motive for the aggression was the systematic plundering and illegal exploitation of his country's natural resources. Emphasizing that the illegal exploitation violated the rights of the Congolese people to self-determination as well as the principle of territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, he called on the Council to implement the Panel's recommendations.¹³⁹

The representative of Angola saluted the distinction made in the report between the "invited forces" and the "invading forces" present in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He noted that the troops of Angola and Namibia were funded from their regular budget and did not behave in a "suspicious" way.¹⁴⁰ The representative of Zimbabwe believed that the report should compel the Council to force the

withdrawal of the uninvited forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo.¹⁴¹

The representatives of Rwanda and Uganda believed that the Panel did not take into account the Lusaka Agreement in defining illegality. Under the Agreement, they pointed out, the three Congolese signatories — the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie (RCD) and the Mouvement de libération du Congo (MLC) — would each be charged with the responsibility of administering the area that it controlled until State administration was re-established. However, the Panel had deemed illegality to be the activity carried out in violation of regulations established by the Government in Kinshasa.¹⁴² The representative of Rwanda further stressed that terms such as "illegal", "legitimate", "power" and "control" should be established in relation to the specific and unique political situation prevailing in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.¹⁴³ The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania contested the veracity of the allegations made by the Panel regarding his country's involvement in the illegal exploitation of natural resources.¹⁴⁴ The representatives of Rwanda, Uganda and Burundi expressed their doubts at the quality of the information used in drafting the report, which in their view undermined the credibility of the conclusions.¹⁴⁵ Consequently, the representative of Rwanda proposed that the report be dropped altogether. In his opinion, the Panel's request for a mandate extension to finish its investigation was designed only to pre-empt reactions from the wrongly accused countries, such as his own.¹⁴⁶

In contrast, the representative of France insisted that the Panel had followed "strictly" the mandate given to it by the Council.¹⁴⁷ Similarly, the representative of Namibia argued that the Panel had produced an objective, comprehensive and well-substantiated report, using sound working methods.¹⁴⁸

Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation; Rwanda by the Special Envoy of the President of Rwanda; and Uganda by its Minister of State for Foreign Affairs and Regional Cooperation.

¹³⁸ S/PV.4317, pp. 3-4.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-8.

¹⁴⁰ S/PV.4317 (Resumption 1), p. 18.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹⁴² S/PV.4317, pp. 8-9 (Rwanda); and p. 12 (Uganda).

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

¹⁴⁴ S/PV.4317 (Resumption 1), p. 19.

¹⁴⁵ S/PV.4317, p. 10 (Rwanda); p. 14 (Uganda); and pp. 15-16 (Burundi).

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹⁴⁸ S/PV.4317 (Resumption 1), p. 15.

Noting that the report provided “sombre” information about the scope of the illegal exploitation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the representative of Tunisia believed that the Panel’s recommendations merited careful consideration and constructive dialogue with the parties concerned.¹⁴⁹

A majority of the representatives spoke in favour of extending the Panel’s mandate for three months. While endorsing the extension, the representative of China noted that in some instances there was no clear distinction between the cases with conclusive evidence and those with evidence that was either inadequate or hearsay. He further expressed hope that, in the next phase of its work, the Panel would apply stricter standards.¹⁵⁰

With respect to the Panel’s recommendations regarding the introduction of sanctions and the adoption of reparatory measures, a number of representatives believed that the Council should not rush into making a decision and should wait until additional information was gathered.¹⁵¹ The representative of Bangladesh recommended that in the short term the Council should call for the immediate cessation of the illegal exploitation of mineral and other resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.¹⁵² The representative of Namibia expressed his full support for the conclusions reached by the Panel and for the implementation of its recommendations.¹⁵³

At its 4318th meeting, on 3 May 2001, the Council again included in its agenda the letter dated 12 April 2001 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Council transmitting the report of the Panel of Experts.¹⁵⁴ The President (United States) then drew attention to a letter dated 24 April 2001 to the President of the Council, by which the Secretary-General transmitted the action plan for the extension of the mandate of the Panel of Experts prepared by the Chairperson of the Panel.¹⁵⁵

At the same meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁵⁶ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Noted the disturbing information about the illegal exploitation of Congolese natural resources;

Condemned the illegal exploitation of the natural resources and expressed serious concern at those activities;

Urged Governments to conduct their own inquiries into that information; and noted with concern the terrible toll the conflict was taking on the people, economy and environment of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Stated its belief that the only viable solution to the crisis was the full implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and relevant Council resolutions;

Requested the Secretary-General to extend the mandate of the Panel for a final period of three months, and requested that the Panel submit a final report to the Council.

**Decision of 15 June 2001 (4329th meeting):
resolution 1355 (2001)**

At its 4327th meeting, on 13 June 2001, the Council included in its agenda the eighth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC, dated 8 June 2001.¹⁵⁷ In his report, the Secretary-General noted that, while the parties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to adhere to the ceasefire, which had engendered cautious optimism about the immediate future of the Lusaka peace process, reports indicated disturbing eastward movements of armed groups and their recent incursions into Rwanda, Burundi and the United Republic of Tanzania to avoid participation in the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration programme. Welcoming the cooperation of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo with MONUC, he called on the rebel movements to extend the same level of cooperation. He announced that the plans drawn up by the Joint Military Commission and the Political Committee, in consultation with MONUC, for the total withdrawal of all foreign forces from the country and the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration of armed groups did not constitute a sufficient basis for further action by the United Nations. He consequently urged the parties to provide as soon as possible the detailed information

¹⁴⁹ S/PV.4317, p. 17.

¹⁵⁰ S/PV.4317 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

¹⁵¹ S/PV.4317, p. 22 (Russian Federation); S/PV.4317 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Colombia); pp. 4-5 (Norway); and pp. 13-14 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union).

¹⁵² S/PV.4317 (Resumption 1), p. 6.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

¹⁵⁴ S/2001/357; the report was submitted pursuant to the statement by the President of 2 June 2000 (S/PRST/2000/20).

¹⁵⁵ S/2001/416.

¹⁵⁶ S/PRST/2001/13.

¹⁵⁷ S/2001/572, submitted pursuant to resolutions 1332 (2000) and 1341 (2001).

required for the Secretariat to be able to recommend specific adjustments to the mandate and the force structure of MONUC. Nevertheless, though incomplete, the substantial progress made in the disengagement of forces, which constituted phase II of MONUC deployment, demanded an appropriate follow-up. He therefore recommended to the Council that it authorize a transition to phase III of MONUC deployment. During the transitional stage, he recommended expanding considerably the civilian components of MONUC, including a new civilian police component, as well as its logistical capabilities. Lastly, he welcomed the preparatory meeting for the inter-Congolese dialogue, set to begin on 16 July 2001, as well as the reopening of the Congo River, which would revitalize economic activity.

At the meeting, the President (Bangladesh) drew attention to the report of the Security Council mission to the Great Lakes region, 15 to 26 May 2001.¹⁵⁸

The Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict. Statements were made by all members of the Council, as well as by the representatives of Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo,¹⁵⁹ Egypt, Japan, Namibia, Rwanda, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union¹⁶⁰) and Uganda.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, reiterating the recommendations in the Secretary-General's report, made it clear that, while the Secretary-General was not seeking to exceed the authorized troop strength of 5,537 approved by resolution 1291 (2000), it was

envisaged to continue building up the military contingent of MONUC within that figure. He also noted that since the completion of the report there had been several new developments, including allegations from RCD that the Congolese armed forces had occupied positions vacated by RCD, which MONUC would investigate. In addition, he reported that Ugandan and Zimbabwean troops continued to withdraw from the Democratic Republic of the Congo.¹⁶¹

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict informed the Council about the direct and indirect impact of the war on children who were affected by malnutrition and preventable diseases, subjected to child labour and prostitution, and recruited and used as child soldiers. Emphasizing the urgency of addressing the situation of war-affected children in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, he informed the Council about the five-point programme accepted by the parties, which included (1) prevention of recruitment of children under 18 as soldiers; (2) establishment of a mechanism to monitor and report on the application of that commitment; (3) a major public-awareness campaign to sensitize the military, civil society and local communities; (4) joint visits by MONUC, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and military authorities to military camps where children were suspected of being housed; and (5) establishment of the necessary capacity and structures for the demobilization, rehabilitation and reintegration of child soldiers. Furthermore, noting that the presence of MONUC on the ground had brought confidence and reassurance to the local population, he strongly recommended the expansion and strengthening of the humanitarian role played by MONUC.¹⁶²

At the meeting, the majority of speakers concurred with the Secretary-General that cautious optimism had emerged, although the irreversibility of the peace process was still uncertain. They also deplored the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo with regard to humanitarian need, and expressed their concern in particular about the situation of children in that country. In that regard, several speakers expressed their support for the five-point programme laid out by the Special Representative of

¹⁵⁸ S/2001/521 and Add.1. In the report, the Council mission found that, inter alia, in spite of the fact that the ceasefire had continued to hold in the previous four months, serious obstacles remained for achieving peace, such as the reluctance of the leader of the Front de libération du Congo to disengage his forces and the slow finalization of the plans for the withdrawal of foreign troops and the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration of armed groups.

¹⁵⁹ The Democratic Republic of the Congo was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation.

¹⁶⁰ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey associated themselves with the statement.

¹⁶¹ S/PV.4327, pp. 2-5.

¹⁶² Ibid., pp. 5-7.

the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict.¹⁶³ Stressing the importance of economic recovery of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, several speakers saluted the reopening of the Congo River for commerce and the establishment of the Congo River Basin Commission.¹⁶⁴

A few representatives expressed concern at the reports of eastward movement of armed groups and their recent incursions into the neighbouring countries, given the implications for the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the region.¹⁶⁵ Following the announcement made by the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo regarding his Government's intention to open direct contacts, "at the highest level", with the leaders of the neighbouring countries,¹⁶⁶ a number of speakers encouraged such bilateral and regional contacts.¹⁶⁷

Several representatives believed that there could be no lasting peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo without a comprehensive settlement of the situation in Burundi.¹⁶⁸ According to the representative of Burundi, peace would be regional or there would be no peace. He asked the Council not to allow the Lusaka and Arusha processes to destroy each other, to find a formula that could ensure a deterrent presence at the borders of Burundi with the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Republic of Tanzania, and to provide for enforcement measures if the rebels refused a negotiated solution. The representative reiterated his Government's willingness to continue bilateral consultations, in particular with the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Republic of Tanzania.¹⁶⁹

A number of speakers expressed concern at the refusal of RCD to cooperate in the demilitarization of Kisangani and of the Front de libération du Congo and MLC to disengage to the agreed positions.¹⁷⁰ The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo asked the Council to determine a specific date for the effective and complete demilitarization of the city.¹⁷¹

Speaking on behalf of the European Union, the representative of Sweden called on the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Zimbabwe to cease all support to armed groups, and on Rwanda to honour its commitment with regard to the repatriation and reintegration of rebel groups.¹⁷² In that respect, the representative of Rwanda believed that the Council was "duty-bound" to assist his country and the entire region in disarming rebel groups, in accordance with the Lusaka Agreement.¹⁷³

Stressing that the peace process had not yet become irreversible, the majority of the speakers expressed their support for the extension of the mandate of MONUC for 12 months. A number of representatives agreed with the Secretary-General's assessment that for the Secretariat to prepare phase III of the Mission's deployment, detailed information on the location and composition of foreign forces and on their withdrawal routes was necessary.¹⁷⁴ While welcoming the transition phase, the representative of Mauritius held that the full phase III of the Mission's deployment should not be delayed "unduly", which was echoed by the representative of Mali.¹⁷⁵ Similarly, acknowledging that there were "essential" prerequisites that had to be met before the deployment of phase III of MONUC, such as the provision by the parties of relevant information on their forces, the representative of Egypt hoped that the transitional phase would not be prolonged and stressed that the United Nations had to be ready to address the challenges and risks it might

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 21 (Mauritius); and p. 22 (Singapore); S/PV.4327 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Norway); p. 4 (Colombia); and p. 15 (Bangladesh).

¹⁶⁴ S/PV.4327, p. 11 (France); p. 14 (Ukraine); p. 17 (China); and p. 24 (United States); S/PV.4327 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Mali); p. 7 (Namibia); and p. 10 (Japan).

¹⁶⁵ S/PV.4327, p. 23 (United States); S/PV.4327 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Norway); and p. 4 (Colombia).

¹⁶⁶ S/PV.4327, p. 9.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 12 (France); p. 14 (Ukraine); pp. 16-17 (China); and p. 19 (Russian Federation); S/PV.4327 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Colombia); and p. 8 (Egypt).

¹⁶⁸ S/PV.4327, p. 18 (United Kingdom); and p. 22 (Singapore); S/PV.4327 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Norway); p. 3 (Mali); and p. 9 (Japan).

¹⁶⁹ S/PV.4327 (Resumption 1), pp. 10-11.

¹⁷⁰ S/PV.4327, pp. 11-12 (France); p. 13 (Ukraine); p. 15 (Jamaica); p. 18 (United Kingdom); and p. 24 (Ireland); S/PV.4327 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Mali).

¹⁷¹ S/PV.4327, p. 8.

¹⁷² S/PV.4327 (Resumption 1), p. 6.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹⁷⁴ S/PV.4327, p. 12 (France); p. 13 (Ukraine); p. 20 (Mauritius); p. 25 (Ireland); and p. 26 (Tunisia); S/PV.4327 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Norway); and p. 4 (Colombia).

¹⁷⁵ S/PV.4327, p. 20 (Mauritius); S/PV.4327 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Mali).

face in such an expanded operation.¹⁷⁶ The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo called on the Council to approve the transition and requested that the mandate of MONUC be redefined to endow it with a clear enforcement capacity. Moreover, he indicated that the withdrawal activities of foreign troops called for increased civilian, military and associated staff, so that the Mission could successfully carry out its tasks. Lastly, he invited MONUC to intensify its deployment in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.¹⁷⁷

A number of speakers endorsed the proposal to expand substantially the civilian components of MONUC.¹⁷⁸ Noting that the Mission did not have either the mandate or the resources to protect civilians, the representative of Singapore held that MONUC could “at the very minimum” perform a monitoring role, by alerting the Council of any serious threat to the security of civilians.¹⁷⁹ The representative of Ireland welcomed the proposal to deploy a civilian component to advise and assist the local authorities in discharging their duty to ensure the security of the population.¹⁸⁰ The representative of the Russian Federation believed that the new MONUC civilian police contingent would have to play a useful role in planning the Mission’s future tasks.¹⁸¹

Regarding the existing limit for the number of MONUC personnel, the representative of Namibia expressed hope that the threshold would be set higher, taking into account the many functions entrusted upon the Mission.¹⁸² Similarly, the representative of Uganda believed that the MONUC force was too small for the area which it was expected to cover.¹⁸³ On the other hand, the representative of the Russian Federation expressed support for extending the mandate of MONUC while maintaining the existing level of the maximum agreed strength of the Mission’s military component, which would allow for adequate

preparation for the onset of phase III.¹⁸⁴ In addition, the representative of Mauritius held the view that during the transition to phase III, MONUC should attain the ceiling of 5,537 set under phase II.¹⁸⁵

At its 4329th meeting, on 15 June 2001, the Council again included in its agenda the eighth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC, dated 8 June 2001.¹⁸⁶ The President (Bangladesh) again drew attention to the report of the Security Council mission to the Great Lakes region, 15 to 26 May 2001.¹⁸⁷

The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁸⁸ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1355 (2001), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Reiterated its urgent call on all parties to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement to implement this agreement, as well as the agreements reached in Kampala and Harare and all relevant Security Council resolutions; decided to extend the mandate of MONUC until 15 June 2002, and also decided to review progress at least every four months based on reporting by the Secretary-General;

Requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Council, once all necessary information had been provided by the parties to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, and subject to the continuing cooperation of the parties, proposals concerning the way MONUC could assist in, monitor and verify the implementation by the parties of the plans referred to above;

Approved the updated concept of operations put forward by the Secretary-General in paragraphs 84 to 104 of his report of 8 June 2001, including, for further planning purposes, the creation of a civilian police component and of an integrated civilian/military section to coordinate disarmament, demobilization, repatriation and reintegration operations, the strengthening of the MONUC presence in Kisangani, and the strengthening of the MONUC logistic support capability to support current and foreseen future deployment, with a view to preparing the transition towards the third phase of the deployment of MONUC after the necessary information had been provided by the parties;

Requested the Secretary-General to expand the civilian component of MONUC in order to assign to areas in which MONUC was deployed human rights personnel, so as to establish a human rights monitoring capacity, as well as civilian political affairs and humanitarian affairs personnel.

¹⁷⁶ S/PV.4327 (Resumption 1), p. 8.

¹⁷⁷ S/PV.4327, pp. 10-11.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 13 (Ukraine); p. 18 (United Kingdom); p. 25 (Ireland); and p. 26 (Tunisia); S/PV.4327 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Norway); p. 10 (Japan); and p. 15 (Bangladesh).

¹⁷⁹ S/PV.4327, p. 22.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹⁸² S/PV.4327 (Resumption 1), p. 6.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁸⁴ S/PV.4327, p. 19.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹⁸⁶ S/2001/572.

¹⁸⁷ S/2001/521 and Add.1.

¹⁸⁸ S/2001/587.

**Decision of 24 July 2001 (4349th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4348th meeting,¹⁸⁹ on 24 July 2001, the Council included in its agenda a briefing by Mr. Kamel Morjane, Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Head of MONUC.

The Council was briefed by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative. In addition to all Council members, the representatives of Belgium (on behalf of the European Union¹⁹⁰), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Namibia, Rwanda and Zimbabwe made statements.

The Secretary-General outlined several positive developments in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, but cautioned that the peace process was not yet irreversible. He elaborated on the various challenges that remained, which included the outcome of the inter-Congolese dialogue. He further underlined the need for progress in the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration process and called attention to the “appalling” humanitarian and human rights situation. He commended the efforts of the Facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue. He called for the continued resolve of the Council in support of the peace process.¹⁹¹

In his briefing, the Special Representative concurred that peace was not yet certain in spite of great prospects and real opportunities for a successful conclusion to the efforts to restore peace and security in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. As positive signs, he pointed to the respect for the ceasefire, the disengagement and redeployment of forces even if not yet fully accomplished, the political changes in Kinshasa, preparations for the inter-Congolese dialogue, and the deployment of military contingents of MONUC. Citing the recalcitrance of certain parties and the temptation to preserve the status quo as indications of threats to the peace, he underlined the

importance of confidence-building and continued dialogue among the parties. He further declared that the countries in the region had to reconcile their security concerns and requirements for regional stability with the need to respect the territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He indicated that the preparations for the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration plan for armed groups, as well as for the withdrawal of foreign forces, required the total cooperation of the parties with MONUC and the Joint Military Commission. Lastly, he welcomed the initiatives of the Governments of Uganda and Namibia to withdraw their troops from the Democratic Republic of the Congo.¹⁹²

Most speakers deplored the lack of progress in the demilitarization of Kisangani and the fact that RCD, which was required to withdraw from Kisangani under resolution 1304 (2000), had not done so. In that regard, the representative of the Russian Federation, echoed by others, held that the refusal of RCD to comply with its obligations had reached a point where the Council had to consider additional measures to ensure the demilitarization of Kisangani, such as the denial of entry visas to the leadership of RCD.¹⁹³ The argument made by RCD that its military presence was necessary to protect citizens was refuted by the representatives of the United States and Zimbabwe.¹⁹⁴ A number of representatives concurred that a demilitarized Kisangani would require a strengthened MONUC contingent.¹⁹⁵ The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo believed that, in order to preserve its credibility and prevent the peace process from being called into question, the Council had to implement the measures it had proposed, so that the reluctant parties which had not yet complied with the relevant Council resolutions would be induced to do so, including by taking measures as authorized by Articles 39 to 42 of the Charter.¹⁹⁶

Most speakers stressed the need to make progress in the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation,

¹⁸⁹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XII, part I, sect. B, case 4, with regard to Article 2 (4) of the Charter.

¹⁹⁰ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey associated themselves with the statement.

¹⁹¹ S/PV.4348, pp. 2-3.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 18 (Russian Federation); S/PV.4348 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Namibia); and p. 3 (Zimbabwe).

¹⁹⁴ S/PV.4348, p. 19 (United States); S/PV.4348 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Zimbabwe).

¹⁹⁵ S/PV.4348, p. 10 (Bangladesh); p. 11 (Mali); p. 19 (United States); and p. 26 (China).

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

resettlement and reintegration process, highlighting the role of MONUC in facilitating it, and some representatives called for enhancing the Mission's role in that regard.¹⁹⁷ The representative of the United States declared that the first step of the disarmament process would be the cessation of giving arms to the various groups and called on the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to immediately cease support to "negative forces". He further insisted that the remedy for the lack of progress was not for the United Nations to assume a greater role, but for the parties to recognize their common interests and make that progress a reality.¹⁹⁸

A number of representatives believed that MONUC should be expanded, so that it could properly carry out its tasks.¹⁹⁹ The representative of China believed that phase III of the deployment of MONUC represented a crucial step in consolidating durable peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.²⁰⁰

The representative of Singapore pointed out that one way of expediting the move to phase III was for the parties concerned to show a greater commitment to the process. Recalling that the Mission's mandate did not permit it to assume responsibility for the safety of civilians, he stressed that the Congolese parties had to assume their responsibility for the maintenance of law and order and for the safety and security of civilians under their de facto control.²⁰¹ The representative of Bangladesh questioned whether the Council could continue to say that MONUC could not provide security to civilians with respect for resolutions 1265 (1999) and 1296 (2000) and stressed that entry into the third phase of the Mission could not be delayed.²⁰² The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo hoped that the Council would increase the military personnel of MONUC devoted to monitoring the withdrawal of foreign troops.²⁰³

During the course of the discussion, the speakers noted, inter alia, their satisfaction with the progress made so far in the peace process; called on all the

parties to respect the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement; reiterated their demand for the full and orderly withdrawal of foreign troops from Congolese territory; emphasized the importance of the inter-Congolese dialogue; saluted the recent meeting of the Presidents of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda; expressed concern at the resumption of activities of armed groups in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo; expressed serious concern at the humanitarian situation and urged the parties to allow freedom of movement and access to humanitarian agencies and non-governmental organizations; condemned the violations of human rights and called for an end to impunity; and voiced support for the organization of an international conference on peace, security and development in the Great Lakes region.

At the 4349th meeting, on 24 July 2001, the President (China) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁰⁴ by which the Council, inter alia:

Stated that it was unacceptable that, more than one year after the adoption of its resolution 1304 (2000) containing the demand to completely demilitarize Kisangani, reiterated in resolution 1355 (2001), RCD had thus far failed to comply with it;

Called on RCD to implement fully and immediately its obligation under resolution 1304 (2000), and noted that continued failure to do so might have future implications;

Urged the relevant parties to expedite the conclusion of their investigation into the killing of six staff of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo, to report their findings to ICRC and to bring the perpetrators to justice;

Stressed the importance of the work of the United Nations Humanitarian Coordinator;

Expressed serious concern over the activities of the armed groups in the east of the country; requested the donor community, in particular the World Bank and the European Union, to provide financial and in-kind contributions as soon as possible to MONUC in the implementation of the mission.

**Decision of 5 September 2001 (4365th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4361st meeting, on 30 August 2001, the Council was briefed by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. Statements were made by all Council members, as well as by the representatives

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 8 (Tunisia); and p. 22 (Jamaica).

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 19.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 10 (Bangladesh); p. 12 (Mali); and p. 15 (Mauritius); S/PV.4348 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Namibia); and p. 4 (Zimbabwe).

²⁰⁰ S/PV.4348, p. 26.

²⁰¹ Ibid., p. 17.

²⁰² Ibid., p. 10.

²⁰³ Ibid., p. 29.

²⁰⁴ S/PRST/2001/19.

of Belgium (on behalf of the European Union²⁰⁵), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Namibia and Rwanda. The President (Colombia) drew attention to a number of communications.²⁰⁶

In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General indicated that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to be favourable in many respects, although some warning signs persisted. On the positive side, he drew attention to the continuation of the ceasefire along the confrontation line since January; the disengagement of forces from that line and their redeployment to new defensive positions; the continued withdrawal of Namibian and Ugandan forces; and the new agreement reached at the preparatory meeting in Gaborone that the inter-Congolese dialogue was to be convened in Addis Ababa in October 2001. On the negative side, he outlined several issues of concern: the continued fighting in the east; the need to demilitarize Kisangani; serious human rights violations; and poor humanitarian conditions. With respect to the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration process, he stressed that its success depended on the parties' willingness to reach an agreement on a clear and predictable political framework. Lastly, he indicated that the Secretary-General would make proposals on the measures necessary for the deployment of phase III of MONUC at a later date.²⁰⁷

²⁰⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey associated themselves with the statement.

²⁰⁶ Letter dated 1 August 2001 from the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to the President of the Council transmitting a press release issued by his Government denouncing the decision of the Executive Committee of RCD-Goma to establish so-called "federalism" in Congolese territories under Rwandan and Ugandan occupation (S/2001/759); letter dated 8 August 2001 from the representative of Rwanda to the President of the Council in response to the letter dated 1 August from the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (S/2001/774); and letter dated 17 August 2001 from the representative of Belgium to the Secretary-General transmitting a statement on the opening of the inter-Congolese dialogue issued on 17 August 2001 by the Presidency of the European Union on behalf of the European Union (S/2001/815).

²⁰⁷ S/PV.4361, pp. 2-5.

The majority of speakers took note of the Gaborone meeting and welcomed the parties' decision to convene the inter-Congolese dialogue. At the same time, many speakers emphasized that priority should be given to the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration process. The representative of the United Kingdom urged MONUC to be as proactive as possible and to make use of opportunities that might arise to advance that process.²⁰⁸

A number of speakers reiterated calls for the full and speedy withdrawal of foreign troops and in that regard welcomed the ongoing withdrawal of Namibian and Ugandan troops.²⁰⁹ The representative of Namibia declared that the withdrawal of Namibian troops was on schedule and proceeding well.²¹⁰ The representative of Singapore, praising the withdrawal of troops by Uganda and Namibia as a step forward, drew attention to reports that those forces continued to operate through rebel groups and militia proxies.²¹¹

A number of representatives again urged the Council to launch the deployment of phase III of MONUC.²¹² The representative of France was of the view that only once the parties agreed on the political framework, the international community should provide assistance to the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration programme, and then the Council would be able to reflect on and provide support for phase III.²¹³ Several speakers also reiterated their appeal to the Council to consider an increase in MONUC personnel, so that the Mission could carry out the tasks assigned to it.²¹⁴ In the view of the representative of Singapore, MONUC should be given the means to carry out its duties, as mandated under resolution 1291 (2001).²¹⁵ The representative of Tunisia also maintained that MONUC in phase III would require all the resources necessary to carry out

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Jamaica, Russian Federation); p. 12 (Ireland); p. 17 (Tunisia); p. 19 (Ukraine); p. 21 (Colombia); and p. 23 (Democratic Republic of the Congo).

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

²¹² *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Mali); p. 23 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); and p. 27 (Namibia).

²¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (France); p. 9 (Mauritius); p. 15 (Bangladesh); and p. 19 (Ukraine).

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

the “very complex and often dangerous tasks” assigned to it.²¹⁶ A number of speakers considered it essential that the parties continued to cooperate with MONUC, in view of threats and attacks against MONUC personnel, including the firing at a MONUC helicopter in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.²¹⁷

The majority of representatives deplored the lack of progress in demilitarizing Kisangani, which had been demanded in resolution 1304 (2000). While calling for the demilitarization of the city, the representative of France contended that this obligation would not affect the civilian presence of RCD-Goma, which could continue to administer the city until the crisis was resolved, and demanded that RCD-Goma withdraw its military force.²¹⁸ The representative of the United States reinforced this view, noting that the Kampala disengagement plan gave RCD-Goma the right to administer the town until new national structures could assume that function, and requested the Secretary-General to launch the process of implementing resolution 1304 (2000), in cooperation with the RCD leadership.²¹⁹

The representative of France believed that the Council should implement appropriate measures to end the illegal exploitation of natural resources.²²⁰ Other speakers also expressed their concern at the illegal exploitation of natural resources.²²¹

At the 4365th meeting,²²² on 5 September 2001, the President (France) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²²³ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the success of the preparatory meeting of the inter-Congolese dialogue, held in Gaborone from 20 to 24 August 2001;

Reiterated its strong support for the inter-Congolese dialogue and for the efforts of the Facilitator and his team in the field;

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (France); p. 8 (Norway); pp. 9-10 (Mauritius); p. 15 (Bangladesh); p. 16 (Singapore); and p. 26 (Belgium).

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Mauritius); p. 13 (China); and p. 17 (Tunisia).

²²² At the 4364th meeting, held in private on 5 September 2001, the Council was briefed by the Facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue.

²²³ S/PRST/2001/22.

Called on all the Congolese parties to further cooperate with each other and the Facilitator in the constructive spirit of Gaborone to ensure the successful outcome of the inter-Congolese dialogue starting on 15 October 2001, in Addis Ababa;

Stressed the importance for the dialogue to be free from outside interference, open, representative and inclusive, and emphasized the need to ensure adequate representation of Congolese women in the process.

**Decision of 24 October 2001 (4396th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4395th meeting, on 24 October 2001, the Council included in its agenda the ninth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC, dated 16 October 2001.²²⁴ In his report, the Secretary-General indicated that, despite difficulties, the overall situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to be favourable. The ceasefire along the confrontation lines had continued to hold since January and the disengagement of forces and their redeployment to the new defensive position was almost complete. Welcoming the withdrawal of Namibian and many of the Ugandan troops, he encouraged Uganda to complete the repatriation of its remaining forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Noting that outbreaks of fighting still occurred in the east, he emphasized that any military and logistical support provided to armed groups had to cease without delay. He saluted the announcement made by the Government of Rwanda that it was prepared to reintegrate the Rwandan former combatants. Commending the neutral Facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue for the success of the Gaborone meeting, he stressed that the Congolese parties had to demonstrate their continuing commitment to the dialogue and cooperate fully with the Facilitator and his team. He further recommended that the Council authorize MONUC to enter phase III of its deployment. Noting that the initial deployment would remain within the limit authorized by resolution 1291 (2000), he reported that preparations were under way for the recruitment and deployment of adequate numbers of United Nations civilian personnel to accompany the military deployment. Taking into consideration the complex situation in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo where Burundian armed groups were present, he believed that it was time for the parties to the Lusaka process to

²²⁴ S/2001/970, submitted pursuant to resolution 1355 (2001).

explore means of associating Burundi more closely with the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

At the meeting, the President (Ireland) drew attention to a letter dated 23 October 2001 from the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.²²⁵ The Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. Statements were made by all Council members, the representatives of Belgium (on behalf of the European Union²²⁶), the Democratic Republic of the Congo,²²⁷ Mozambique, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

In his briefing, the Special Representative detailed that the Secretary-General's plan for the third phase was to deploy MONUC personnel in the east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Envisaged to remain within the strength authorized by resolution 1291 (2000), MONUC would establish a secure base from which civilian personnel dealing with disarmament, demobilization, repatriation and reintegration, human rights issues and humanitarian assistance could carry out their work. MONUC would also continue to work on plans for the withdrawal of foreign forces and assist efforts to open the Congo River. It was expected that the Mission's presence would have a normalizing and stabilizing effect on the situation in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Regarding the inter-Congolese dialogue that had begun in Addis Ababa on 15 October, he informed the Council of objections raised by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo regarding the reduced number of participants, which led to a postponement of the discussion until a later date.²²⁸

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, *inter alia*, called on the Council to take measures to ensure that Rwanda and RCD met their

obligations under the Lusaka Agreement and resolution 1355 (2000) to demilitarize Kisangani and assured that his Government would not to occupy the city once it was demilitarized. Noting that the national dialogue had lost its inclusive character in the format used at Addis Ababa, he reaffirmed his Government's commitment to resume peace talks in the upcoming weeks in South Africa and implement both the political and military chapters of the Lusaka Agreement. He expressed support for the Secretary-General's recommendation that the Council authorize MONUC to start phase III of its deployment and insisted on the need for an increase in the number of MONUC personnel beyond the number set by resolution 1291 (2000). He announced that his Government, for its part, was unilaterally trying to find a solution for the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration of Rwandan citizens and, in that connection, had started to disarm and canton 3,000 individuals from armed groups of Rwandese origin in Kamina. Lastly, he declared that his Government would continue to commit itself to the Arusha process for Burundi.²²⁹

The majority of speakers expressed their support for the deployment of the third phase of MONUC and the revision of its concept of operations. The representative of China held that such a step-by-step deployment would not only have symbolic value for peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the region, but also have practical significance.²³⁰ In contrast, the representative of Namibia believed that the step-by-step approach proposed by the Secretary-General was too cautious and too limited in scope given the size of the country and the demands of the peacekeeping operation itself. He and the representative of Mozambique argued for a full-fledged deployment of phase III with an adequate level of force and resources.²³¹

Several representatives expressed concern at the continued fighting in the east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and welcomed the MONUC deployment to that region.²³² While the representative of France believed that the Mission's presence in the eastern part of the country should be increased so that

²²⁵ S/2001/998, transmitting the position expressed by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo at the end of the meeting in Addis Ababa on national dialogue.

²²⁶ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey associated themselves with the statement.

²²⁷ The Democratic Republic of the Congo was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation.

²²⁸ S/PV.4395, pp. 2-4.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-9.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 27 (Namibia); and p. 30 (Mozambique).

²³² *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Tunisia); p. 14 (Mauritius); p. 18 (Jamaica); p. 22 (Singapore); and p. 30 (Mozambique).

it could better support the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration programme, the representative of Singapore stressed that before MONUC was to establish such a presence, it should be given the appropriate means, and conditions conducive to achieving its objectives should be in place.²³³ The representatives of China and the Russian Federation believed it was the responsibility of the parties to the conflict to create an enabling environment for MONUC and to cooperate with the Mission.²³⁴ In that respect, the representative of Belgium urged the parties to provide MONUC the necessary information on the number, composition and exact positions of the armed groups in the field.²³⁵ Similarly, the representative of France observed that MONUC had to establish contact, and then a regular and trustworthy relationship, with those armed groups about which information was still lacking.²³⁶ The representative of Colombia stated that the parties should take the deployment of phase III of MONUC as a sign of the Council's intention to move forward despite the difficulties.²³⁷

Most speakers reiterated the necessity that foreign troops withdraw from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Several representatives noted that the withdrawal of the Namibian troops should be an example for other States and appealed to the Governments of Uganda and Rwanda to accelerate the withdrawal of their troops.²³⁸ With the deployment of phase III of MONUC, the representative of Tunisia expected the process of withdrawal to take place at an accelerated pace.²³⁹

The majority of representatives held that the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration process required the cooperation of all parties and encouraged continued dialogue between the leadership of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and that of Rwanda. Several representatives added that, for that process to be successful, all support to armed groups had to end.²⁴⁰

Noting the heightened tension in Burundi and between Rwanda and Uganda, the representative of France agreed with the Secretary-General's view that the situation in Burundi should be associated more closely with the Congolese peace process.²⁴¹ The representative of Tunisia encouraged "intensified" dialogue between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Burundi.²⁴²

At its 4396th meeting, on 24 October 2001, the Council again included in its agenda the ninth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC, dated 16 October 2001.²⁴³

The President (Ireland) made a statement on behalf of the Council.²⁴⁴ by which the Council, inter alia:

Welcomed the recommendations of the Secretary-General on the next phase in the deployment of MONUC;

Supported the initiation of phase III within the current mandated ceiling;

Reminded the parties to the conflict that it was up to them to create and to maintain the conditions conducive to the start of phase III of MONUC and a decision on the future of phase III of MONUC would be taken after ascertaining that the parties were advancing the peace process;

Recalled the importance it placed on the implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and the relevant resolutions of the Council.

Decision of 9 November 2001 (4412th meeting): resolution 1376 (2001)

At its 4410th meeting, on 9 November 2001, the Council was briefed by the Secretary-General. Statements were made by the representative of Angola, in his capacity as Chairman of the Political Committee on the Implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, and the President of the Security Council (Jamaica).²⁴⁵

p. 20 (Norway).

²⁴¹ Ibid., p. 10.

²⁴² Ibid., p. 11.

²⁴³ S/2001/970.

²⁴⁴ S/PRST/2001/29.

²⁴⁵ The representatives of Angola, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Namibia, Rwanda, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe were invited to participate but did not make statements. Angola, Zambia and Zimbabwe were represented by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs; Burundi by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation; the Democratic Republic of the

²³³ Ibid., pp. 9-10 (France); and p. 22 (Singapore).

²³⁴ Ibid., p. 17 (China); and p. 23 (Russian Federation).

²³⁵ Ibid., pp. 25-26.

²³⁶ Ibid., p. 10.

²³⁷ Ibid., p. 19.

²³⁸ Ibid., pp. 23-24 (Bangladesh); p. 26 (Belgium); and p. 29 (Zambia).

²³⁹ Ibid., p. 11.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 12 (United Kingdom); p. 16 (United States); and

Recalling his proposal for the commencement of phase III deployment of MONUC, the Secretary-General stressed that a number of issues had to be addressed for the deployment to be successful: ending the fighting in the east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo; enabling the voluntary return of all former combatants to their homes; reaching an understanding on the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration process; and demilitarizing Kisangani. He indicated that the deployment of MONUC in Kindu was aimed at creating a climate of security to encourage the armed groups to disarm, and noted with concern the decision of RCD and MLC to establish a special joint force based in Kindu. He further stated that the withdrawal of the Namibian and Ugandan troops from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was encouraging and urged the Governments of Angola, Zimbabwe and Rwanda to speed up preparations for the rapid withdrawal of their respective troops. He saluted the reopening of the Congo River and urged the members of the Political Committee to support the Facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue. Lastly, he urged the Congolese parties to continue efforts to improve human rights in the areas under their control.²⁴⁶

Speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Political Committee, the representative of Angola noted that the upholding of the ceasefire, despite some setbacks, demonstrated the will of the parties to end the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Nonetheless, the ongoing military activities in the east threatened the ceasefire and risked igniting a new round of hostilities. He believed that the solution should not be limited to the suspension of military aid to armed groups, but should provide also the conditions and guarantees for the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration of all armed groups living in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. As the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement progressed, he believed that the United Nations would need to become more involved in the

Congo by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation; Namibia by its Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, Information and Broadcasting; Rwanda by the Special Envoy of the President of Rwanda; and Uganda by its Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs.

²⁴⁶ S/PV.4410, pp. 2-3.

Democratic Republic of the Congo, in order to accelerate the return of peace.²⁴⁷

The President (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Council, remarked that MONUC had had an important effect on the peace process and announced that the concept of operations for the deployment of phase III was under the Council's serious consideration. Pointing out the interlinkages between the conflicts in Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, he held that a solution to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo had to be pursued at the regional level. He believed that there were several key issues which needed to be resolved in order to achieve sustainable peace: developing a credible plan for disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration; creating a comprehensive plan for the full withdrawal of all foreign forces; demilitarizing Kisangani; making progress in the inter-Congolese dialogue; and addressing the illegal exploitation of natural resources.²⁴⁸

At the 4412th meeting,²⁴⁹ on 9 November 2001, the representative of Belgium (on behalf of the European Union²⁵⁰) made a statement, in which he emphasized the importance of the coordinating meeting between the Council and the Political Committee in view of the disappointing developments on the ground. At a time when the United Nations was preparing to enter phase III deployment of MONUC and to mobilize additional resources, the parties to the conflict had to show their firm commitment to the peace process. He emphasized that the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration programme had to be carried in a systematic way and on a voluntary and peaceful basis. Noting that disengagement was the first step in the process of withdrawal of foreign forces, he emphasized the need to demilitarize Kisangani. He further expressed satisfaction at the withdrawal of Namibian troops and

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

²⁴⁹ At the 4411th meeting, held in private on 9 November 2001, the members of the Council and the members of the Political Committee had a frank and constructive discussion.

²⁵⁰ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey associated themselves with the statement.

encouraged the other Governments to expedite preparations for withdrawing their troops in accordance with resolution 1304 (2000). Regarding the inter-Congolese dialogue and the “poor” result of the Addis Ababa meeting, he urged the parties to hold further meetings to revive the peace process. Lastly, he deplored the violations of human rights and urged the signatory parties to the Lusaka Agreement to continue the peace process.²⁵¹

The President (Jamaica) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;²⁵² it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1376 (2001), by which the Council, determining that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to pose a threat to international peace and security in the region, inter alia:

Demanded once again that Kisangani be demilitarized rapidly and unconditionally in accordance with Security Council resolution 1304 (2000);

Stressed that progress in the peace process and the economic recovery and development of the country were interdependent, and in that regard underlined the urgent need for increased international economic assistance in support of the peace process;

Reiterated its condemnation of all illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, demanded that such exploitation cease and stressed that the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo should not be exploited to finance the conflict in that country;

Supported the launching of phase III of the deployment of MONUC and stressed, in that regard, the importance it attached to the deployment of MONUC in the east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in conformity with the new concept of operation and within the overall ceiling, including in the cities of Kindu and Kisangani;

Stressed that appropriate conditions would be necessary to allow MONUC to fulfil its role in Kindu and to ensure that discussions on the voluntary disarmament and demobilization of concerned armed groups took place in a neutral environment;

Affirmed that the implementation of phase III of the deployment of MONUC required steps from the parties and requested the Secretary-General to report on progress thereon.

Decision of 19 December 2001 (4441st meeting): statement by the President

At its 4437th meeting, on 14 December 2001, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated

²⁵¹ S/PV.4412, pp. 2-3.

²⁵² S/2001/1058.

10 November 2001 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Council, transmitting the addendum to the report of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.²⁵³

In the addendum to the report, the Panel noted that the primary and fundamental reason for the continuing and systematic exploitation of natural resources was the collapse of all State institutions and structures of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. While the conflict continued, the ceasefire was generally respected on the front line, leaving the exploitation of natural resources as the main activity of foreign troops and different armed groups. The Panel concluded that the military operations and presence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo had been transformed into self-financing activities, whereby no real budgetary burden was borne by the parties concerned and that the initial political and security-related motivation of foreign countries to intervene in the Democratic Republic of the Congo had been replaced by the motivation to extract the maximum commercial and material benefits. In that context, the Panel made a number of institutional recommendations, including that all concessions, commercial agreements and contracts signed since 1997 in rebel-held areas be reviewed and revised under the auspices of a special body created by the Council, and that MONUC accelerate the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process in order to reduce the security concerns expressed by a number of States in the region. The Panel also made recommendations of a financial and technical nature, proposing that the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and other international donors consider submitting to the Council their assessment of the role of their assistance in helping to finance the continuation of the conflict and the maintenance of the status quo in the Great Lakes region; a moratorium be imposed, temporarily banning the purchase and importing of certain natural resources; and revenues from the resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo be channelled through States’ budgets and tax collection and use be rigorously controlled, transparent and accountable. The Panel suggested that the Council consider the imposition of sanctions to deter the illegal

²⁵³ S/2001/1072; the addendum to the final report was submitted pursuant to the statement by the President of 3 May 2001 (S/PRST/2001/13).

exploitation of natural resources. Pending any action from the Council, a monitoring and follow-up mechanism which would report regularly to the Council on the progress made in the exploitation activities should be established.

At the meeting, the President (Mali) drew the attention of the Council to a number of communications to the President of the Council.²⁵⁴

The Council was briefed by the Chairman of the Panel of Experts. Statements were made by all of the Council members, as well as by the representatives of Angola, Belgium (on behalf of the European Union),²⁵⁵

²⁵⁴ Letter dated 14 November 2001, by which the representative of Uganda transmitted the interim report of the Judicial Commission of Inquiry set up following a previous report of the Panel of Experts, S/2001/357 (S/2001/1080); letters dated 21 November and 10 December 2001, by which the representative of Uganda transmitted the reactions of the Government of Uganda to the addendum to the report of the Panel of Experts (S/2001/1107 and S/2001/1163); letter dated 20 November 2001, by which the representative of the Sudan conveyed the comments of his Government on the statement made on 9 November 2001 to the Council by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda (S/2001/1113); letters dated 23 November and 7 December 2001, by which the representative of Rwanda communicated his Government's reactions to the addendum to the report of the Panel of Experts (S/2001/1102 and S/2001/1161); letter dated 10 December 2001, by which the representative of Rwanda transmitted the response of his Government to the communiqué issued by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo on 3 December 2001 (S/2001/1168); letter dated 3 December 2001, by which the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo informed the Council of the latest developments in his country which could jeopardize the peace process (S/2001/1143); letter dated 5 December 2001, by which the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo transmitted a note of his Government on the report and addendum to the report of the Panel of Experts (S/2001/1156); letter dated 6 December 2001, by which the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo conveyed the report of the National Experts Commission on the illegal exploitation of natural resources and other wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (S/2001/1175); and letter dated 13 December 2001, by which the representative of Burundi transmitted the position of his Government on the report of the Panel of Experts (S/2001/1197).

²⁵⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia,

Burundi, Canada, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.²⁵⁶

In his briefing, the Chairman of the Panel of Experts observed that the Lusaka Agreement had not addressed the issue of economic profits derived from the occupation of the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. However, in the light of the link between the exploitation of natural resources and the continuation of the conflict, he emphasized that laying the foundation for lasting peace required progress in drastically curbing the increasing exploitation of resources and redirecting the use of those resources to peaceful development for the benefit of the Congolese people. Through the establishment of a monitoring body, the United Nations could continue the international community's scrutiny of the exploitation activities. He further noted that the proposed moratorium, by stemming the profits from the exploitation of resources, would reduce what had become a powerful incentive to continue to fuel the conflict and thus legitimize the presence of thousands of foreign troops and the strengthening of rebel armies. Imposed on selected and easily detectable products, the moratorium would not have a significant impact on the Congolese people and would be implemented on a voluntary or mandatory basis, to be decided by the Council. As institutional reforms were critical to ensuring a strong State administration with the capacity and authority to safeguard and regulate its territory and reaches, he indicated that the Panel recommended that the international community assist the Democratic Republic of the Congo intensively in that area. The risks to the peace process posed by the low-intensity conflict in the eastern part of the country being considerable, the Chairman stressed the importance of disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement

Slovenia and Turkey associated themselves with the statement.

²⁵⁶ The Democratic Republic of the Congo was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation; Rwanda by its Adviser to the President; the United Republic of Tanzania by its Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation; Uganda by its Third Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs; and Zimbabwe by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

and reintegration as a key element of the Lusaka Agreement.²⁵⁷

The majority of speakers agreed that the plundering of natural resources had become a driving force of the conflict and that the illegal exploitation of resources was incompatible with the peace process.

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo noted that the addendum to the report had confirmed the systematic large-scale pillaging and illegal exploitation of his country's mineral resources. He observed that the illegal economic activities were self-sustaining and involved almost no financial burden on the countries concerned and expressed support for the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report.²⁵⁸

The representative of China stated that it was imperative for the Council to take appropriate measures to stop the illegal exploitation.²⁵⁹ The representative of Belgium, echoed by the representative of Nigeria, believed that the international community had to take action and set up control mechanisms and appropriate measures to halt the smuggling.²⁶⁰

A number of speakers expressed their discontent with the report's allegations of their nationals being involved in the illegal exploitation of natural resources and asked the Panel to present the evidence supporting its conclusions.²⁶¹ The representatives of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Zimbabwe believed that the addendum inaccurately reflected the motives held by the members of SADC which had sent troops into the Democratic Republic of the Congo and their involvement in the illegal exploitation of natural resources.²⁶² The representative of Zambia contested the report's finding that military training was being conducted in refugee camps established in his country and announced that his Government had taken measures to disarm ex-combatants.²⁶³ Several

representatives expressed their disappointment with the report's claims that their Governments had not cooperated fully with the Panel.²⁶⁴ While noting that the addendum to the report completely cleared Burundi of any suspicion of involvement in the illegal exploitation of the resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the representative of Burundi expressed concern at the allegation in the report that the Burundian armed groups, the front pour la défense de la démocratie (FDD) and the Forces nationales pour la libération (FNL) were receiving foreign assistance. He further reiterated his Government's willingness to negotiate a ceasefire with the FDD and FNL forces and to pursue dialogue with all neighbouring countries.²⁶⁵

Emphasizing the imperative of preserving momentum in the peace process, a number of speakers believed that the Council should first study the implications, humanitarian and economic, of imposing the moratorium suggested by the Panel.²⁶⁶ The representative of Uganda stated that the Council should move very cautiously on the issue, as such a measure would have the effect of sanctions against small farmers and artisan miners.²⁶⁷ Pointing out that a moratorium of resources from specific areas would likely be unenforceable because of the difficulty of tracking such commodities, the representative of the United States expressed doubts about the measure.²⁶⁸

The representative of Ireland declared that a voluntary moratorium on the import on specific goods might have an impact on consumers and persuade them to pressure companies that purchased the commodities to seek alternative sources.²⁶⁹ The representative of Jamaica noted that the moratorium should be targeted not only at the countries and groups in the region, but also at the end users.²⁷⁰ The representative of Nigeria favoured the imposition of a moratorium for a specific period of time, in addition to the standardization of certificates of origin for mineral resources.²⁷¹

²⁵⁷ S/PV.4437, pp. 3-5.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-10.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

²⁶⁰ S/PV.4437 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Belgium); and p. 9 (Nigeria).

²⁶¹ S/PV.4437, pp. 12-13 (Uganda); pp. 15-16 (United Republic of Tanzania); and p. 17 (Rwanda); S/PV.4437 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3 (South Africa).

²⁶² S/PV.4437, p. 7 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); and pp. 37-42 (Zimbabwe).

²⁶³ S/PV.4437 (Resumption 1), pp. 10-11.

²⁶⁴ S/PV.4437, p. 15 (United Republic of Tanzania);

S/PV.4437 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3 (South Africa); and p. 11 (Zambia).

²⁶⁵ S/PV.4437 (Resumption 1), pp. 6-8.

²⁶⁶ S/PV.4437, p. 25 (Bangladesh); p. 27 (Mauritius); and p. 36 (Mali); S/PV.4437 (Resumption 1), p. 14 (Japan).

²⁶⁷ S/PV.4437, p. 14.

²⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

²⁷¹ S/PV.4437 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

Several speakers agreed with the Panel's recommendation that all concessions and commercial agreements signed since 1997 should be reviewed and revised with international assistance.²⁷² While supporting the recommendation, the representative of the United States maintained that there was no need to establish a new mechanism to carry out the review, pointing to organizations such as the World Bank and IMF which had the necessary expertise to assist.²⁷³ The representative of Uganda agreed that the contracts should be negotiated under the auspices of the Security Council, while stressing that the transitional government, which would be established as a result of the inter-Congolese dialogue, should have the sovereign responsibility to handle all matters relating to the review of contractual obligations.²⁷⁴ Similarly, the representative of the Russian Federation maintained that the process lay fully within the competence of the national authorities of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and that, if necessary, there could be discussion of involving expert assistance from IMF and the World Bank.²⁷⁵

The representative of Angola argued that the renegotiation of concessions would constitute interference in the internal affairs of that country.²⁷⁶ Similarly, the representative of Namibia declared that his Government could not support the report's recommendation on the topic which, in his view, attempted to question or discredit sovereign decisions taken by the legitimate Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and characterized it as "unacceptable".²⁷⁷ The representative of Mauritius noted that some of the contracts had been contracted by the legitimate and sovereign Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and believed that any review of those concessions could be made only after the full implementation of the Lusaka Agreement and with the full agreement of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.²⁷⁸ The representative of Zimbabwe held that the proposal to review all concessions was introducing the concept of

"unequal treaties" and pointed out that its joint ventures in the Democratic Republic of the Congo had been a Congolese initiative.²⁷⁹

With respect to the Panel's recommendation of imposing sanctions, the representative of Bangladesh expressed hope that the parties would cooperate with the Council to avert the imposition of such measures.²⁸⁰ The representative of Mauritius believed that the Panel's recommendation to the Council to consider sanctions required thorough study.²⁸¹ In contrast, the representative of Nigeria urged the Council to consider the imposition of sanctions on any country that violated the Council resolution on the exploitation of mineral resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.²⁸²

Many speakers recommended the renewal of the Panel's mandate. The representative of Bangladesh held that such an extension would enable the Panel to further investigate reactions and complaints of those named in the report, as well as to examine the feasibility and possible impact of the proposed measures.²⁸³ The representative of the United States opined that, during the extension, the Panel should provide recommendations for specific actions to address the issues noted in the addendum.²⁸⁴ The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was of the opinion that the Council should also strengthen the Panel's expertise to enable it to better define, mainly at a purely technical level, the responsibilities related to the illegal exploitation of natural resources in his country.²⁸⁵

At its 4441st meeting, on 19 December 2001, the Council again included in its agenda the letter dated 10 November 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council.²⁸⁶

At the meeting, the President (Mali) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁸⁷ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

²⁷² S/PV.4437, p. 23 (Ireland); p. 25 (Jamaica); and p. 26 (Bangladesh); S/PV.4437 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Belgium on behalf of the European Union).

²⁷³ S/PV.4473, p. 31.

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

²⁷⁶ S/PV.4437 (Resumption 1), p. 5.

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

²⁷⁸ S/PV.4473, p. 27.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

²⁸² S/PV.4437 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

²⁸³ S/PV.4473, p. 26.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²⁸⁶ S/2001/1072.

²⁸⁷ S/PRST/2001/39.

Strongly condemned those activities, which were perpetuating the conflict in the country, impeding the economic development of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and exacerbating the suffering of its people, and reaffirmed the territorial integrity, political independence and sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including over its natural resources;

Thanked the Panel of Experts for its recommendations on the institutional, financial and technical aspects of the issue, and for its advice on possible measures to be imposed by the Security Council;

Requested the Secretary-General to renew the mandate of the Panel of Experts for a period of six months at the end of which the Panel should report to the Council;

Urged the Governments named in the previous reports to conduct their own inquiries, cooperate fully with the Panel of Experts and take the necessary steps to end all illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, by their nationals or others under their control.

Decision of 25 February 2002 (4476th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4476th meeting,²⁸⁸ on 25 February 2002, the Council included in its agenda the tenth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC, dated 15 February 2002.²⁸⁹ In his report, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Mission was facing difficulties in implementing the third phase of its deployment, including obstructions and delays in deploying to Kisangani and Kindu, as well as in its efforts to repatriate a group of combatants from Kamina. No major change had been observed in the positions of the countries with foreign troops stationed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and not much progress had been achieved on the demilitarization of Kisangani. Noting that careful assessments showed that MONUC would not be able to fulfil its tasks with its existing troop strength, the Secretary-General recommended that the Council consider increasing the authorized military strength by 850 and the civilian police strength by 85 and endorse the revised concept of operations for MONUC as proposed in the report.

²⁸⁸ At the 4459th meeting, held in private on 29 January 2002, the Council and the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo had a constructive discussion.

²⁸⁹ S/2002/169, submitted pursuant to resolution 1355 (2001).

At the meeting, the President (Mexico) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁹⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the tenth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC;

Stressed the importance of the inter-Congolese dialogue, which was an essential element to achieve lasting peace; and reiterated its call for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Also stressed that the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration process of the armed groups mentioned in chapter 9.1 of annex A to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement was another key element for the settlement of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; expressed its concern at the persistent human rights violations, in particular in the east of the country and called on all parties to put an end to those violations.

Decision of 19 March 2002 (4495th meeting): resolution 1399 (2002)

By a letter dated 18 March 2002 to the President of the Council²⁹¹, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo reported that, in flagrant violation of the ceasefire, troops of the Rwandan Patriotic Army (APR), assisted by elements of RCD-Goma, had besieged the town of Moliro, in Katanga province, on 16 March 2002. In that context, the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo called on the Council to meet urgently to, *inter alia*, demand the cessation of hostilities, the strict implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Rwandan troops.

The 4495th meeting of the Council was held on 19 March 2002, in response to that request and included the letter in the agenda.

At the meeting, at which no statements were made and the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was invited to participate, the President (Norway) drew attention to a letter dated 18 March 2002 from the representative of Rwanda to the President of the Council.²⁹²

²⁹⁰ S/PRST/2002/5.

²⁹¹ S/2002/286.

²⁹² S/2002/287, transmitting the reactions of Rwanda to the attitude of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo regarding the inter-Congolese dialogue in Sun City, and a statement by the Government of Rwanda

The President also drew attention to a draft resolution;²⁹³ it was adopted unanimously as resolution 1399 (2002), by which the Council, determining that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo posed a threat to international peace and security in the region, inter alia:

Condemned the resumption of fighting in the Moliro pocket, and the capture of Moliro by RCD-Goma, and stressed that that was a major violation of the ceasefire;

Demanded that RCD-Goma troops withdraw immediately and without condition from Moliro and also demanded that all parties withdraw to the defensive positions called for in the Harare disengagement sub-plans;

Demanded also that RCD-Goma withdraw from Pweto and that all other parties also withdraw from locations they occupied in contravention of the Kampala and Harare disengagement plan;

Called on Rwanda to exert its influence on RCD-Goma so that RCD-Goma implemented the demands of the resolution.

**Decision of 24 May 2002 (4544th meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4544th meeting, on 24 May 2002, the President (Singapore) made a statement on behalf of the Council.²⁹⁴ by which the Council, inter alia:

Strongly condemned the killings, in particular of civilians, that had recently taken place in Kisangani;

Called for an immediate cessation of all violations of human rights and international humanitarian law;

Reiterated its demand that the city be demilitarized in accordance with relevant resolutions and called on the parties to cooperate to the full reopening of the Congo River, including to commercial traffic;

Stressed the importance of MONUC assisting, within the current mandate, in the full demilitarization of Kisangani and welcomed the proposal by the Secretary-General to reinforce the civilian police unit of MONUC with 85 officers to assist in the training of the local police.

**Decision of 5 June 2002 (4548th meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4548th meeting, on 5 June 2002, in which the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was invited to participate, the President

concerning the accusations made by France in the Security Council regarding the Moliro attack.

²⁹³ S/2002/290.

²⁹⁴ S/PRST/2002/17.

(Singapore) made a statement on behalf of the Council.²⁹⁵ by which the Council, inter alia:

Condemned in the strongest terms the acts of intimidation and unfounded public statements against MONUC, in particular attempts by RCD-Goma to “ban” the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the “expulsion” of several MONUC and other United Nations personnel from areas under its control;

Reaffirmed its full support for the Special Representative and for the dedicated staff of MONUC;

Reiterated its condemnation of the killings and attacks against civilians and soldiers that had followed the events that had taken place on 14 May and thereafter in Kisangani; called upon Rwanda to exert its influence to have RCD-Goma meet without delay all its obligations under the resolutions of the Council and the presidential statement;

Encouraged the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, MLC and RCD-Goma to hold new discussions as soon as possible and in good faith in order to reach an all-inclusive agreement on the political transition.

**Decision of 14 June 2002 (4554th meeting):
resolution 1417 (2002)**

At its 4554th meeting, on 14 June 2002, the Council included in its agenda the eleventh report of the Secretary-General on MONUC, dated 5 June 2002.²⁹⁶ In his report, the Secretary-General noted that, in spite of several positive developments, the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo faced considerable difficulties, including intensified fighting in the east, human rights violations and a lack of dialogue between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda on their respective security concerns. He deplored the violence that had afflicted the city of Kisangani and stressed that, while the reduction in the number of foreign forces in the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was encouraging, the conflict could not be resolved without the total withdrawal of all foreign forces. He pointed out that MONUC did not have the means to provide broader protection to civilians at large. He asked the Council to consider adjusting the strength of MONUC with a view to reconfiguring and re-equipping contingents in order to permit them both to protect more effectively civilians under imminent threat of physical violence and to intervene more actively. Continued unrest in the east, and difficulties in

²⁹⁵ S/PRST/2002/19.

²⁹⁶ S/2002/621, submitted pursuant to resolution 1355 (2001).

identifying a militarily capable troop-contributing country that would enable MONUC to establish an effective presence there, had limited the prospects of making rapid progress in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process. Consequently, he invited the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to fully support the process by, inter alia, ensuring that no military supplies reached armed groups operating in the east, investigating reports that persons suspected of crimes against humanity might be present on its territory, cooperating with the International Tribunal for Rwanda, and taking steps to ensure that its territory was not used as a base for attacking neighbouring countries.²⁹⁷

At the meeting, in which the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was invited to participate, the President (Syrian Arab Republic) drew attention to a draft resolution;²⁹⁸ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1417 (2002), by which the Council, determining that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to pose a threat to international peace and security in the region, inter alia:

Decided to extend the mandate of MONUC until 30 June 2003;

Called upon Member States to contribute personnel to enable MONUC to reach its authorized strength of 5,537, including observers, within the time frame outlined in its concept of operation;

Condemned ethnically and nationally based calls for violence and the killings and attacks against civilians and soldiers that had followed the events that had taken place on 14 May and thereafter in Kisangani;

Condemned the exploitation of ethnic differences in order to incite or carry out violence or human rights violations;

Reiterated its full support for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and for all the dedicated MONUC personnel who operated in challenging conditions; demanded that RCD-Goma provide full access and lift all restrictions on MONUC personnel, and fully cooperate with MONUC in the implementation of its mandate, and urged Rwanda to exert its influence to have RCD-Goma meet without delay all its obligations;

Requested MONUC to proceed expeditiously in the deployment of the additional 85 police trainers to Kisangani;

Supported the role of MONUC in disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration;

Demanded the total and expeditious withdrawal of all foreign forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Requested all parties and relevant States to extend their full cooperation to the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo; requested the Secretary-General to report at least every four months to the Council on progress in the implementation of the resolution.

**Decision of 23 July 2002 (4583rd meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4583rd meeting, on 23 July 2002, at which no statements were made and the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was invited to participate, the President (United Kingdom) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁹⁹ by which the Council, inter alia:

Recalled the seriousness of the events that had taken place in Kisangani on 14 May 2002; stressed that RCD-Goma would be held accountable for any extrajudicial executions, including among members of the civil society or detainees at the detention centres of RCD in Kisangani;

Also stressed that Rwanda had a duty to use its strong influence to ensure that RCD-Goma took no such action;

Also reiterated that RCD-Goma had to demilitarize Kisangani without any further delay or condition and that RCD-Goma had to also cooperate with MONUC and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in their investigation to identify all the victims and perpetrators in Kisangani so that the latter would be brought to justice;

Expressed its deep concern at the strengthening of troops in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Called for cessation of the fighting;

Welcomed efforts and good offices of the Republic of South Africa to help the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda to reach an agreement to tackle the problem of armed groups and to take forward the withdrawal of Rwandan troops;

Called on all parties to recommit themselves to taking forward the progress for peace and refrain from any military action that would undermine it.

²⁹⁹ S/PRST/2002/22.

²⁹⁷ S/2002/621.

²⁹⁸ S/2002/665.

**Decision of 15 August 2002 (4602nd meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4596th meeting,³⁰⁰ on 8 August 2002, at which the Council was briefed by the Secretary-General, statements were made by the representatives of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda and South Africa.³⁰¹

The Secretary-General welcomed the signing of the peace agreement between the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda in Pretoria on 30 July 2002,³⁰² as an important political milestone which could help pave the way towards a lasting resolution of the conflict. He applauded President Mbeki of South Africa for his contribution to the agreement in his capacity as Chairman of the African Union. The Secretary-General urged the parties to take the steps required to operationalize the agreement as soon as possible and called on the international community to provide support to the parties for its implementation. He reported that he had instructed MONUC to determine which actions it could take, within its mandate and resources, to assist the parties, and stressed that the parties needed to provide the necessary information to enable MONUC to define its role. He announced that he would revert to the Council in due course with specific recommendations for MONUC after the Secretariat undertook extensive consultations with the parties concerned.³⁰³

The representative of South Africa stated that the conflict could not be resolved until the issue of armed groups had been addressed. In that context, she welcomed the declared wish of the Democratic Republic of the Congo not to have the armed groups utilize its territory for launching attacks against its neighbours, as well as the commitment of Rwanda to withdraw its forces as soon as those armed groups ceased to be a threat to the people of Rwanda. In her view, the Pretoria Agreement was at the centre of the

peace process, complementing the Lusaka Agreement, and not supplanting it. The need for the Pretoria Agreement stemmed from the recognition that progress in establishing lasting peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo could not be achieved without resolving the conflict between that country and Rwanda.³⁰⁴

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo held that the Pretoria Agreement would facilitate and speed up the completion of the remaining phases provided for in the timetable for the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement. The new agreement, he noted, provided a response to the security concerns of Rwanda and created the conditions for the restoration of the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. On disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration, the representative held that his Government had undertaken to faithfully implement its obligations under the Pretoria Agreement, including the demobilization and disarmament of Rwandese combatants in Kamina. On the withdrawal of foreign forces, he noted that Angola and Zimbabwe had withdrawn a large number of their troops, while Namibia had withdrawn completely. At the same time, with respect to the “uninvited forces”, withdrawal movements had been observed only on the part of Uganda and Burundi, while Rwanda had considerably increased its forces and was still engaged in large-scale military activities in his country. He further called for the beginning of demilitarization of Kisangani as well as an end to the illegal exploitation of natural resources. For its part, the United Nations could help by formulating a new concept of operations for MONUC that would effectively activate phase III of the Mission’s deployment and enable it to support the verification mechanism and to participate in the structure that the third party would put in place under the Pretoria Agreement. He underlined the need for his Government to sign similar agreements with the Governments of Uganda and Burundi.³⁰⁵

The representative of Rwanda observed that the Pretoria Agreement represented a solemn commitment by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to track, assemble and disarm ex-Rwandese

³⁰⁰ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XII, part I, sect. B, case 4, with regard to Article 2 (4) of the Charter.

³⁰¹ The Democratic Republic of the Congo was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation; Rwanda was represented by its Special Envoy of the President of Rwanda on the Great Lakes Region; and South Africa was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

³⁰² S/2002/914.

³⁰³ S/PV.4596, pp. 2-3.

³⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-8.

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

Armed Forces and Interahamwe in collaboration with MONUC, the Joint Military Commission and the third party. For its part, Rwanda undertook to withdraw its troops as soon as the process got under way and was judged to be irreversible. He added that through the work of MONUC and the Joint Military Commission, Rwanda was aware of or would have an idea where the ex-Rwandese Armed Forces and Interahamwe were operating and how they were organized. His Government needed assistance from MONUC to make the assembly areas for those groups operational and secure.³⁰⁶

At the 4602nd meeting,³⁰⁷ on 15 August 2002, in which the representatives of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda were invited to participate, the President (United States) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁰⁸ by which the Council, inter alia:

Expressed its appreciation to the Foreign Ministers of South Africa and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and to the Special Envoy of the President of Rwanda, who had participated in its meeting on the Democratic Republic of the Congo on 8 August 2002;

Expressed its full support for the implementation of the Peace Agreement;

Commended the Government of the Republic of South Africa for its facilitation of the Peace Agreement;

Stressed in particular the responsibilities of the two parties set out in the Peace Agreement and Implementation Plan and called upon the international community to assist and expedite the carrying out of those responsibilities;

Reiterated its support for the mandate of MONUC, as established by its resolution 1417 (2002).

Decision of 18 October 2002 (4626th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4626th meeting,³⁰⁹ on 18 October 2002, in which the representative of the Democratic Republic of

the Congo was invited to participate, the President (Cameroon) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³¹⁰ by which the Council, inter alia:

Welcomed the withdrawal of foreign forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and called for the implementation of all agreements signed by parties and all relevant resolutions of the Security Council;

Condemned the continuing violence in the east of the country and noted with great concern that those actions added to instability in the east of the country, threatened regional stability and had severe humanitarian consequences; called on all parties to the conflict to cease hostilities immediately and without preconditions;

Urged all Congolese parties to accelerate efforts to reach an agreement on an all-inclusive transitional government; called on all parties and armed groups involved in the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to commit themselves to achieving a peaceful settlement for the region and condemned any attempt to use military action to influence the peace process.

Deliberations of 24 October and 5 November 2002 (4634th and 4642nd meetings)

At its 4634th meeting, on 24 October 2002, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 15 October 2002 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Council, transmitting the final report of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.³¹¹

In the report, the Panel noted that an embargo or a moratorium banning the export of raw materials originating in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was not a viable means for improving the situation of the country's Government, citizens or natural environment. Restrictive measures, nevertheless, had to be taken vis-à-vis the role of companies and individuals involved in arms supply and resource plundering. The Panel concluded that the establishment of a transitional government in Kinshasa should be accompanied by: the disarmament of all rebel groups; phased withdrawal of foreign troops; measures to drastically curb the illegal exploitation of natural resources and encourage legal exploitation; the

Congo, the President of Rwanda and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa had a constructive discussion.

³¹⁰ S/PRST/2002/27.

³¹¹ S/2002/1146; the final report was submitted pursuant to the statement by the President of 19 December 2001 (S/PRST/2001/39).

³⁰⁶ Ibid., pp. 8-9.

³⁰⁷ At the 4597th meeting, held in private on 8 August 2002, the members of the Council, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa and the Special Representative of the President of Rwanda on the Great Lakes Region had a constructive discussion.

³⁰⁸ S/PRST/2002/24.

³⁰⁹ At the 4608th meeting, held in private on 13 September 2002, the Secretary-General, the members of the Council, the President of the Democratic Republic of the

application of serious leverage on the parties through multilateral pressures and incentives; and a dynamic monitoring process. To readjust the existing process of illegal exploitation and encourage legal activities, the Panel proposed the imposition of forceful disincentives and incentives, monitored through a proactive monitoring body. In the light of the new dynamic and progress created by the signing of the political and military agreements in Sun City, Pretoria and Luanda, the Panel believed that a set of agreements or initiatives on reconstruction and sustainable development were needed to address the economic dimension of the Lusaka peace process and provide incentives for continuing progress, and detailed those incentives. The Panel also suggested a number of institutional reforms, including the reconstruction and reform of State institutions; professionalizing the national security apparatus; promoting legitimate and accountable civil administrations in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo; and reviewing all concession and contracts signed during the wars. In the event of non-compliance with the recently signed agreements and continuing illegal exploitation of natural resources, the Panel recommended a series of financial and technical measures, such as: the assumption of responsibility by the Governments of the countries of individuals and entities involved in illicit activities; the reduction of official development assistance with the goal of making aid disbursements to Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda and Zimbabwe conditional on their compliance with the agreements; restrictions on business enterprises and individuals; and adherence of business enterprises to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. The Panel also recommended that a monitoring body be established to, inter alia, report to the Council on any State or company that might be involved in the illegal exploitation of natural resources.

At the meeting, the Council was briefed by the Chairman of the Panel of Experts and the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo made a statement.³¹²

Introducing the report, the Chairman reaffirmed that economic exploitation remained the most potent means for continued conflict in the Democratic

³¹² The Democratic Republic of the Congo was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation.

Republic of the Congo. The Panel had identified three distinct groups, called “elite networks”, which had carved out separate spheres of economic control in various areas of the country controlled by the Rwandan army, the Ugandan army and the Kinshasa Government with the help of the Zimbabwean military, respectively. The war economy directed by those networks working in collaboration with organized criminal groups functioned under the cover of armed conflict and drained the public treasury of revenues, undermined the stability and the restoration of State authority, and led to more instability and violence. He warned that the networks’ core members, acting with impunity, had the capacity to subvert the peace process in order to protect their economic interests and to ensure continued control over revenue-generating activities. Stating the Panel’s conviction that reconstructing and reorienting the region’s economies was essential to peacemaking and peacebuilding, he stressed the need for decisive action by the Council to build on the momentum of military and political gains to consolidate what could become durable peace in the Great Lakes region and to begin rebuilding the region’s economies.³¹³

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo noted that the Panel’s report had come at a time when real signs for peace had emerged. He commended the Panel for showing that the presence of Rwandan troops was based on the desire to pursue criminal activities in his country and for confirming the training by the Ugandan armed forces in Ituri region of young people for the purpose of perpetuating disorder once their troops left. He added that the report also confirmed that it was the large-scale, systematic and systemic exploitation that fuelled and perpetuated the armed aggression against and occupation of his country. In his view, the Council had to take into account the economic dimension of the war for its actions to be effective. Stressing that the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo should benefit first and foremost from the country’s natural resources, he called on the Council to implement the recommendations made by the Panel. In particular, he believed it was necessary to increase the oversight capacity of the United Nations, stressing that the terms of reference for a monitoring body be established with his Government’s approval and in respect of the prerogatives of its national sovereignty. The

³¹³ S/PV.4634, pp. 2-5.

representative further called on the Council to consider the establishment of an ad hoc international criminal court for the Democratic Republic of the Congo to judge and convict those guilty of crimes against humanity. He also announced the creation by his Government of an ad hoc commission to consider the validity of agreements that could serve as a framework for the reconsideration of certain contracts and concessions signed during the war. Referring to accusations in the report directed at members of his Government, he noted that his country retained the legal ability to prosecute those individuals.³¹⁴

At its 4642nd meeting,³¹⁵ on 5 November 2002, the Council again included in its agenda the letter dated 15 October 2002 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Council, transmitting the report of the Panel of Experts.³¹⁶

The President (China) drew attention to a number of communications to the President of the Council.³¹⁷ Statements were made by all members of the Council, and the representatives of Angola, Belgium, Canada, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union³¹⁸), Oman, Rwanda, South Africa, Uganda and Zimbabwe.³¹⁹ The

³¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-9.

³¹⁵ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41.

³¹⁶ S/2002/1146.

³¹⁷ Letter dated 23 October 2002 from the representative of Rwanda transmitting the response of the Government of Rwanda to the report of the Panel of Experts (S/2002/1187); letter dated 25 October 2002 from the representative of South Africa transmitting the position of his Government with regard to the report (S/2002/1199); letter dated 25 October 2002 from the representative of Uganda transmitting a statement dated 23 October 2002 by the Government of Uganda on the report (S/2002/1202); letter dated 28 October 2002 from the representative of Rwanda sent in protest to the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of the Congo on 24 October 2002 in the Council (S/2002/1207); and letter dated 4 November 2002 from the representative of Uganda transmitting the response, dated 1 November 2002, of the Government of Uganda to the final report (S/2002/1221).

³¹⁸ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey associated themselves with the statement.

³¹⁹ The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was invited to participate but did not make a statement. Uganda was represented by its Third Deputy

Chairman of the Panel of Experts responded to questions and comments made in the discussion.

Most speakers welcomed the work of the Panel and stated that its conclusions and recommendations merited close examination with a view to putting an end to the illegitimate exploitation of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which represented a serious obstacle to the peaceful resolution of the conflict.

While in agreement with the basic premises of the peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, a number of speakers, some representing States whose Governments or nationals and companies had been named in the report as being involved in the illegal exploitation, directly or through “elite networks”, denied the accusations against them and questioned the methodology used by the Panel, as well as the report’s conclusions and recommendations.³²⁰ The representative of South Africa urged the Council to require the Panel to further investigate and substantiate the allegations and recommendations made in the report, adding that the report contradicted the aims and intentions of the Council.³²¹ Pointing out that the Panel suggested that those companies and individuals named in the list annexed to the report be subjected to sanctions, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic believed that there was an urgent need to re-evaluate the entire contents of the report.³²² The representatives of Uganda and Rwanda accused the Panel of ignoring their legitimate security concerns, while the representative of Rwanda further denounced the report as “biased”, “politically motivated” and “unsubstantiated”.³²³ The representative of Zimbabwe believed that the report deliberately misrepresented the nature of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, portraying it as motivated by “the greedy desire of the African military and security leaders to loot, plunder and profiteer” from the riches of that country.³²⁴

Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs.

³²⁰ S/PV.4642, pp. 5-7 (Uganda); pp. 9-12 (South Africa); pp. 15-17 (Rwanda); pp. 18-19 (Oman); pp. 19-23 (Zimbabwe); S/PV.4642 (Resumption 1), pp. 5-6 (Syrian Arab Republic).

³²¹ S/PV.4642, p. 9.

³²² S/PV.4642 (Resumption 1), p. 6.

³²³ S/PV.4642, p. 4 (Uganda); and pp. 16-17 (Rwanda).

³²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

Several speakers supported in general the work of the Panel, but underlined the right of those cited in the report as allegedly involved in the illegal exploitation of natural resources to defend themselves.³²⁵ While affirming that the Panel's recommendations deserved the Council's serious consideration, the representative of Canada expressed disappointment that the Panel had named as violators of OECD Guidelines companies whose alleged violations, with a few exceptions, were neither specified nor substantiated in the body of the report, creating controversy for the companies concerned and attracting attention away from the other valuable information and conclusions in the report.³²⁶ The representative of the United Kingdom encouraged the Panel to share information with the companies and individuals named in the report to the extent possible so as to allow them to investigate and take any necessary action.³²⁷ To address concerns voiced by parties named in the report, the representative of France proposed that a addendum to the report be published.³²⁸

The representative of Ireland found the report compelling in its analysis and its general conclusions, characterizing its recommendations as measured and fair.³²⁹ The representative of Norway advocated the continued use of panels of experts to assist the Council and promoted more cross references between the reports of the Panel of Experts and those of MONUC.³³⁰

Turning to the specific recommendations of the Panel, a number of speakers expressed their support for the establishment of a monitoring body that would report on developments on the ground and make recommendations to the Council.³³¹ The representative of Belgium believed that such a body should, inter alia, continue the Panel's investigative efforts and update the relevant lists of individuals and companies, once it had heard all those who wished to be heard.³³² In

contrast, the representative of Rwanda firmly opposed the creation of such a body as, like the Panel, it would merely "foment, rather than reduce, tension and conflict in the region" and would be vulnerable to competing influences and other forms of foreign manipulation and only paralyse the economies of the region.³³³ The representative of the Russian Federation believed that the establishment of a new monitoring mechanism would require additional consideration by the Council.³³⁴ The representative of France stressed the need for the Council to receive periodic reports on the issue and, in that context, believed that a monitoring body was an option.³³⁵

With respect to the introduction of sanctions on individuals and organizations accused of illegal exploitation, the representative of Belgium viewed that as a possibility.³³⁶ Emphasizing the importance of due process, the representative of Singapore agreed with the Panel's recommendation that a grace period be given before the recommended restrictions were put in place.³³⁷ The representative of Mauritius declared that the recommendation should be implemented only after Governments had had an opportunity to respond to allegations.³³⁸ In contrast, the representative of the Russian Federation questioned the recommendation, since he held that combating economic crime fell in the purview of States and not of the Council. Furthermore, he believed that it would be extremely difficult to prove that activities of any type of commercial enterprise or individual posed a threat to international peace and security, pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter, the determination required before imposing sanctions.³³⁹ The representative of Zimbabwe asserted that imposing sanctions only upon companies and individuals from non-OECD countries amounted to unequal treatment.³⁴⁰

In response, the Chairman of the Panel of Experts, inter alia, insisted that the findings included in the report were based on insider information and

³²⁵ Ibid., p. 12 (Denmark); p. 14 (Belgium); p. 25 (France); S/PV.4642 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Singapore).

³²⁶ S/PV.4642, p. 23.

³²⁷ S/PV.4642 (Resumption 1), p. 11.

³²⁸ S/PV.4642, p. 25.

³²⁹ S/PV.4642 (Resumption 1), pp. 8-9.

³³⁰ S/PV.4642, p. 26.

³³¹ Ibid, p. 15 (Belgium); and p. 23 (Canada); S/PV.4642 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Mauritius); p. 4 (Singapore); p. 7 (Guinea); p. 9 (Ireland); p. 11 (Cameroon); and p. 16 (Bulgaria).

³³² S/PV.4642, p. 15.

³³³ Ibid., pp. 17-18.

³³⁴ Ibid., p. 28.

³³⁵ Ibid., p. 25.

³³⁶ Ibid., p. 14.

³³⁷ S/PV.4642 (Resumption 1), p. 4.

³³⁸ Ibid., p. 3.

³³⁹ S/PV.4642, pp. 27-28.

³⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 22.

documentary evidence, samples of which could be shown to Council members, if they so desired.³⁴¹

Decision of 4 December 2002 (4653rd meeting): resolution 1445 (2002)

At its 4653rd meeting, on 4 December 2002, the Council included in its agenda the special report of the Secretary-General on MONUC dated 10 September 2002.³⁴² In the report, the Secretary-General acknowledged the importance of the bilateral agreements between the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Governments of Rwanda and Uganda, respectively. Referring to reports of intensified military activities in the east, he called on the parties to achieve an immediate ceasefire and end all support to the armed groups, as a sign of good will. In the framework of the Luanda Agreement, he urged the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda to continue their consultations to address the situation in Ituri and ensure that there was no security vacuum in the region. He also called on the Government of Zimbabwe to cooperate with MONUC to ensure a transparent and orderly withdrawal of its troops, and emphasized that Rwanda should also demonstrate its willingness to withdraw its forces. He recommended that quick-impact project funding for MONUC be extended; MONUC shift the emphasis of its activity eastward, enhance its capacity with respect to disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration and strengthen its presence; and the Council authorize an increase in the military strength of MONUC up to 8,700.

At the meeting, the President (Colombia) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;³⁴³ it was adopted unanimously, and without debate as resolution 1445 (2002), by which the Council, determining that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to pose a threat to international peace and security in the region, inter alia:

Stressed the voluntary nature of the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, reintegration or resettlement of the armed groups and called on leaders and members of the armed groups to enter that process;

Stressed the importance of early and substantial progress on the process of voluntary disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration throughout the country to match the progress achieved on the withdrawal of foreign forces, and urged all parties concerned to cooperate fully with MONUC in that regard;

Stressed that the main responsibility for resolving the conflict rested with the parties themselves;

Stressed the crucial importance of preventing the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo from having a further destabilizing effect on the neighbouring States and called on all parties concerned to cooperate in good faith to that end and to facilitate continuing observation efforts by MONUC in the areas of its deployment.

Decision of 24 January 2003 (4691st meeting): resolution 1457 (2003)

At its 4691st meeting, on 24 January 2003, the Council again included in its agenda the letter dated 15 October 2002 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Council transmitting the report of the Panel of Experts³⁴⁴ and extended an invitation to the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to participate in the discussion.

The President (France) drew attention to a draft resolution;³⁴⁵ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1457 (2003), by which the Council, determining that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to constitute a threat to international peace and stability in the Great Lakes region, inter alia:

Strongly condemned the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Reiterated that the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo should be exploited transparently, legally and on a fair commercial basis, to benefit the country and its people;

Stressed that the completion of the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo as well as the early establishment of an all-inclusive transitional government in the country were important steps towards ending the plundering of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Stressed the importance of following up the independent findings of the Panel regarding the link between the illegal

³⁴¹ S/PV.4642 (Resumption 1), p. 22.

³⁴² S/2002/1005, submitted pursuant to the statement by the President of 15 August 2002 (S/PRST/2002/24).

³⁴³ S/2002/1309.

³⁴⁴ S/2002/1146; the report was submitted pursuant to the statement by the President of 19 December 2001 (S/PRST/2001/39).

³⁴⁵ S/2003/83.

exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the continuation of the conflict, and stressed the importance of exerting the necessary pressure to put an end to such exploitation;

Stressed that the new mandate of the Panel should include further review of relevant data and analysis of information previously gathered by the Panel, as well as any new information; information on actions taken by Governments in response to the Panel's previous recommendations; an assessment of the actions taken by all those named in the reports; and recommendations on measures to ensure the resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo were exploited legally and on a fair commercial basis to benefit the Congolese people;

Stressed the importance of dialogue between the Panel, individuals, companies and States;

Requested the Panel to provide information to the OECD Committee on International Investment and Multinational Enterprises and to the National Contact Points;

Urged all States to conduct their own investigations in order to clarify credibly the findings of the Panel;

Expressed its full support to the Panel and reiterated that all parties and relevant States had to extend their full cooperation to the Panel, while ensuring the necessary security for the experts.

**Decision of 20 March 2003 (4723rd meeting):
resolution 1468 (2003)**

At its 4705th meeting, on 13 February 2003, the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Statements were made by a majority of the Council members³⁴⁶ and the representatives of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations elaborated on the progress of the inter-Congolese dialogue, noting that the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General was preparing for the convening of two technical committees in Pretoria from 20 to 25 February to discuss the pending issues, namely finalizing the transitional constitution and military and security questions. Noting that the overall situation in the north-east was of growing concern and reiterating the key importance of a political solution, he reported that MONUC had been working hard to defuse tensions and was meeting political actors in Bunia to organize a local-level ceasefire leading to the

³⁴⁶ The representative of Guinea did not make a statement.

convening of the Ituri Pacification Commission, scheduled for 17 to 20 February. Touching on the human rights situation, the Under-Secretary-General observed that progress on the political front would be hard to achieve if there was no end to the existent culture of impunity. He suggested that the Council consider how to ensure that more attention was paid to human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.³⁴⁷

The High Commissioner for Human Rights stated that all parties to the conflict continued, with impunity, to commit grave violations of human rights, therefore threatening the peace process. The most shocking violations found by the MONUC multidisciplinary team sent to the Beni region to investigate allegations of serious human right violations included some 220 extrajudicial executions, 122 cases of forced disappearances, 95 cases of rape and 32 cases of torture, acts of mutilation as well as cannibalism. The High Commissioner held that those responsible for such crimes should be immediately arrested and brought to justice, including those who continued to exercise military command functions. The High Commissioner urged the Council to, inter alia, call on the belligerents and their foreign supporters to put an immediate end to human rights violations and to the culture of impunity; call for the effective implementation of those sections of the Pretoria Agreement calling for a national observatory on human rights and a truth and reconciliation commission; consider the establishment of an international commission of inquiry to look into all serious human rights violations committed by all sides; and provide a clear mandate to strengthen the ability of human rights officers and MONUC to fully play their role in helping to find a peaceful solution in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.³⁴⁸

The majority of Council members condemned all abuses of human rights committed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and stressed the need to end the culture of impunity and to bring the perpetrators of crimes to justice.

A number of speakers expressed support for the establishment of an international commission to investigate allegations of human rights violations by all

³⁴⁷ S/PV.4705, pp. 2-4.

³⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 4-7.

parties.³⁴⁹ A few representatives supported the High Commissioner's call for the implementation of the provision of the Pretoria Agreement on the establishment of a national observatory for human rights.³⁵⁰ In that regard, the representative of Mexico believed that the Council had to demand that the parties to the conflict respect human rights, and was in favour of sending a fact-finding commission to help determine where the responsibilities lay.³⁵¹

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo argued that the Council had to assume its responsibilities and set up an international criminal tribunal capable of tracking down and punishing those responsible of crimes. In the absence of such a tribunal, the Council could opt for a special criminal court based on the models established in Sierra Leone and Cambodia. Furthermore, he stated that the demand for justice was an integral part of any lasting peace, and that the message of the international community and the Council was lacking in clarity in that regard.³⁵²

The representative of Rwanda denied all allegations directed against his country and reasserted that Rwanda had entered the Democratic Republic of the Congo for security reasons. Strongly condemning human rights violations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, he requested that country to implement all peace agreements signed in Lusaka, Pretoria and Angola, as well as to put in place an all-inclusive Government which would address the humanitarian situation. He reaffirmed that the Rwandan defence forces had withdrawn completely from the Democratic Republic of the Congo on 5 October 2002, as confirmed by MONUC and the third-party verification mechanism.³⁵³

At the 4723rd meeting, on 20 March 2003, the President (Guinea) drew attention to the thirteenth report of the Secretary-General on MONUC, dated 21 February 2003³⁵⁴ and to a note by the President of

the Council transmitting the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.³⁵⁵

In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the prompt inauguration of the transitional Government would be critical if the political momentum created by the Pretoria Agreement was not to be lost. He further noted that, despite the declared withdrawal of most of the foreign forces and the commencement of the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration process, the military situation on the ground, in particular in the Ituri region and the Kivus, continued to be volatile. He stressed the importance of establishing the Ituri Pacification Commission for the peace process and urged all involved parties and States to engage constructively in establishing the Commission without delay. He indicated that MONUC was well placed to create conditions conducive to the holding of free and fair elections and urged the international community to remain engaged in addressing the fundamental problems affecting the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The report of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, which was circulated in response to requests made by Council members at the 4705th meeting, detailed the human rights violations observed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and emphasized the need for the Council to activate means to bring those responsible to justice. The High Commissioner recommended the establishment of an international commission of inquiry to investigate serious human rights violations committed by all sides and called for the creation of a national observatory on human rights and a truth and reconciliation commission, as provided for in the Pretoria Agreement.

The President drew attention to a draft resolution;³⁵⁶ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1468 (2003), by which the Council, determining that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to pose a threat to international peace and security in the region, inter alia:

Welcomed the agreement reached by the Congolese parties in Pretoria on 6 March 2003 on the transitional arrangements;

Strongly encouraged the Congolese parties forming the Transitional Government to establish as soon as possible a Truth

³⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 11 (Chile); p. 12 (Bulgaria); and p. 15 (Cameroon).

³⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 11 (Chile); p. 12 (Bulgaria); and p. 13 (Mexico).

³⁵¹ Ibid., p. 13.

³⁵² Ibid., pp. 18-19.

³⁵³ Ibid., pp. 20-21.

³⁵⁴ S/2003/211, submitted pursuant to resolution 1417 (2002).

³⁵⁵ S/2003/216.

³⁵⁶ S/2003/334.

and Reconciliation Commission charged with determining responsibility for serious violations of international humanitarian and human rights law, as set forth in the resolutions adopted in the framework of the inter-Congolese dialogue in Sun City in April 2002;

Requested the Secretary-General to increase the presence of MONUC in the Ituri area, in particular military observers and human rights personnel, to monitor developments on the ground;

Demanded that all Governments in the Great Lakes region immediately cease military and financial support to all the parties engaged in armed conflict in the Ituri region;

Expressed its deep concern at the rising tensions between Rwanda and Uganda and their proxies on the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and stressed that the Governments of those two countries had to take steps to build mutual confidence, settle their concerns through peaceful means, and without any interference in Congolese affairs, and must refrain from any action that could undermine the peace process;

Demanded also that all the parties to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and in particular in Ituri, ensure the security of civilian populations and grant MONUC and humanitarian organizations full and unimpeded access to the populations in need.

**Decision of 16 May 2003 (4756th meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4756th meeting, on 16 May 2003, in which the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was invited to participate, the President (Pakistan) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁵⁷ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Condemned the recent killings, the violence and other human rights violations in Bunia, as well as the attacks against MONUC and internally displaced persons;

Reiterated that perpetrators would be held accountable and demanded that all hostilities in Ituri cease immediately;

Fully supported the work of the Ituri Pacification Commission and called on all parties in the region to end all support to armed groups;

Expressed its concern at the deteriorating humanitarian situation in Bunia and demanded that all parties grant full and unimpeded access for humanitarian aid and guarantee the safety and security of humanitarian personnel;

Demanded that all Congolese parties and regional States refrain from any action that could undermine the possible deployment of an international force, and support it.

³⁵⁷ S/PRST/2003/6.

**Decision of 30 May 2003 (4764th meeting):
resolution 1484 (2003)**

At the 4764th meeting, on 30 May 2003, in which the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was invited to participate, the President (Pakistan) drew attention to a draft resolution;³⁵⁸ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1484 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Authorized the deployment until 1 September 2003 of an Interim Emergency Multinational Force in Bunia in close coordination with MONUC;

Stressed that the Interim Emergency Multinational Force was to be deployed on a strictly temporary basis, authorized the Secretary-General to deploy, within the overall authorized MONUC ceiling, a reinforced United Nations presence to Bunia, and requested him to do so by mid-August 2003;

Called on Member States to contribute personnel, equipment and other necessary financial and logistic resources to the multinational force;

Demanded that all the parties to the conflict in Ituri and in particular in Bunia cease hostilities immediately; strongly condemned the deliberate killing of unarmed MONUC personnel and staff of humanitarian organizations in Ituri and demanded that the perpetrators be brought to justice;

Demanded that all Congolese parties and all States in the Great Lakes region respect human rights, cooperate with the Interim Emergency Multinational Force and with MONUC in the stabilization of the situation in Bunia;

Requested the leadership of the Interim Emergency Multinational Force in Bunia to report regularly to the Council, through the Secretary-General, on the implementation of its mandate.

**Decision of 26 June 2003 (4780th meeting):
resolution 1489 (2003)**

At its 4780th meeting, on 26 June 2003, the Council included in its agenda the second special report of the Secretary-General on MONUC, dated 27 May 2003.³⁵⁹ In his report, the Secretary-General reported that the peace process had moved beyond the Lusaka framework and begun a new chapter that, more than ever, would require the comprehensive engagement and assistance of the United Nations and the international community at large. In his view, MONUC was well, if not uniquely, placed to play a

³⁵⁸ S/2003/578.

³⁵⁹ S/2003/566 and Corr.1, submitted pursuant to resolutions 1417 (2002) and 1468 (2003).

central catalytic role in assisting the parties through the transition process and recommended that the Mission be reconfigured and augmented accordingly. He noted that the immediate priority was to assist in the establishment of the Transitional Government and announced his intention to establish a small electoral assistance cell to commence planning the possible United Nations role in support of elections. He drew attention to the brutal conflict in Ituri and in the Kivus and stressed that there could be no justification for supplying weapons to armed groups. In that respect, he recommended that the Council consider imposing an arms embargo in those regions. He expressed concern at the Mission's limited presence in Ituri and appealed to the Council to urgently approve the deployment of a task force to Bunia, as well as the concept of operations for a MONUC brigade-size force. Emphasizing the importance of the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration process, he proposed that the mandate of MONUC should be expanded to assist the Transitional Government and to plan that process for Congolese combatants at its request. He also recommended that the mandate of MONUC be expanded for another year, with an increase in the authorized military strength to 10,800 and in the number of civilian personnel.

The President (Russian Federation) drew attention to a draft resolution;³⁶⁰ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1489 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*, decided to extend the mandate of MONUC until 30 July 2003; and to remain actively seized of the matter.

**Decision of 28 July 2003 (4797th meeting):
resolution 1493 (2003)**

At its 4784th meeting, on 7 July 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 25 June 2003 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Council,³⁶¹ transmitting two reports, one from MONUC and the other from the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, regarding the events which had occurred in the Democratic Republic of the Congo — in December 2002 and January 2003 in Mambasa, and on 3 April 2003 in Drodoro, respectively.

At the meeting, at which statements were made by all Council members and by the representative of

the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations and the Deputy United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

Noting the breakdown of law and order in the Ituri region, the Under-Secretary-General stressed that the Democratic Republic of the Congo was in desperate need of an institutional framework whereby those guilty of crimes were held accountable. He called on the international community to support the establishment of a truth and reconciliation commission as well as a national observatory on human rights, as envisaged under the All-Inclusive Agreement of 17 December 2002. He remarked that the overall security situation in Bunia was stable and recalled that the rationale behind an enhanced security presence there had been to create sufficient political space for the Ituri interim administration to establish itself on a firmer footing. Noting that the deployment of the Interim Emergency Multinational Force in Bunia had benefited thousands of civilians, he believed it was vital that the MONUC brigade-size force recommended by the Secretary-General to replace it was configured with enough strength so that it could build on the achieved results of the current stabilizing presence of the Interim Force. He further announced that the problem regarding the distribution of military command posts had been finally resolved, and that President Kabila had issued a decree announcing the composition of the Transitional Government.³⁶²

The Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights updated the Council on the human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and reported on specific cases of killings, torture, looting and destruction of property, mainly in Ituri. He declared that all parties in the eastern part of the country had continued to resort to human rights violations as a means of creating an atmosphere of terror and oppression in order to secure control over the population and natural resources, and that insecurity, terror and lack of cooperation from the parties had prohibited the conduct of thorough and comprehensive investigations into many cases of human rights violations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He emphasized that failure to take the necessary action to end the reign of impunity in the Democratic Republic of the Congo would encourage

³⁶⁰ S/2003/667.

³⁶¹ S/2003/674.

³⁶² S/PV.4784, pp. 2-5.

the perception of passivity and double standards on the part of the international community.³⁶³

The majority of speakers welcomed the establishment of the Transitional Government and expressed the hope that it would contribute to the settlement of the conflict and reconciliation, peace and economic rehabilitation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. At the same time, speakers expressed their shock and revulsion at reports of continuing massacres, rapes and other atrocities. They agreed that putting an end to the culture of impunity and ensuring strict respect for human rights were essential for the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Several speakers believed that the Transitional Government should establish mechanisms to ensure that the perpetrators of serious human rights violations were brought to justice.³⁶⁴ In that context, the representative of Cameroon favoured setting up a national jurisdiction as part of the transitional institutions to which the international community would provide its support.³⁶⁵ Noting the positive role of the International Criminal Court in preventing impunity in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the representative of Germany encouraged the Government of that country, a State party to the Court's statute, to seek assistance in addressing the shortcomings of its judicial system and to cooperate closely with the Court.³⁶⁶

A number of speakers also noted that the international community should assist the Congolese authorities in the establishment of a truth and reconciliation commission and a national observatory for human rights.³⁶⁷

At the 4790th meeting,³⁶⁸ on 18 July 2003, the President (Spain) drew attention to a letter dated

³⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-9.

³⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Cameroon); p. 14 (France); p. 15 (Germany); and p. 18 (Bulgaria).

³⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

³⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

³⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Cameroon); p. 12 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 14 (France); p. 16 (Chile); p. 17 (Guinea); p. 18 (Bulgaria); and p. 21 (Mexico).

³⁶⁸ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41, and part IV, sect. B, with regard to Article 42.

14 July 2003 from the representative of Italy to the President of the Council.³⁶⁹

At the meeting, the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations and the former Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Statements were made by all Council members, the representatives of Bangladesh, Brazil, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Indonesia, Italy,³⁷⁰ Japan, Nepal, the Philippines, Rwanda and South Africa, and by the Secretary-General and High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations focused on the situation in Bunia, where the security situation remained calm but tense, following a military operation undertaken by the Interim Emergency Multinational Force against the Union des patriotes congolais on 11 July. He reported that the increased return of internally displaced people to Bunia had required reinforced security measures and that the humanitarian situation, although much improved, remained a source of concern. Regarding the efforts of MONUC to operationalize the actions of the Ituri interim administration, he announced that the Mission, together with its partners, had taken a number of concrete measures, including human rights training, preliminary recruitment of Iturian police and preparing an interim operation plan for the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of child soldiers. In spite of encouraging initial steps towards the normalization of life in Bunia, the Under-Secretary-General noted that many challenges remained, in particular the need to end the pervasive culture of war and impunity in the region. To that end, many efforts were under way to encourage armed groups in Ituri to engage in the political process. To dissuade further military action in Bunia, he declared that it was crucial to maintain the robust character of the troops stationed there and announced that the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and MONUC were working

³⁶⁹ S/2003/709. The representative of Italy requested that the Secretary-General and High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union be allowed to participate on behalf of the European Union in the Council's discussion.

³⁷⁰ On behalf of the Presidency of the Council of the European Union.

hard to ensure a seamless transition from the Interim Force to the MONUC force.³⁷¹

Focusing on the transitional process, the former Special Representative for the Democratic Republic of the Congo informed the Council that on 17 July several former opposition leaders had been formally sworn in as Vice-Presidents of the Transitional Government, which he termed a “landmark event” in the peace process. He pointed out that representatives of all entities of the inter-Congolese dialogue presently occupied ministerial positions in the Transitional Government. Noting that several challenges remained for the Transitional Government, he was encouraged by a Council draft resolution³⁷² containing wording for the deployment to Ituri of a robust force with an appropriate mandate. He stressed that additional action had to be taken to end the reign of impunity, not only in Ituri, but throughout the country, and called on the Council to maintain its active interest in moving the peace process forward.³⁷³

The Secretary-General and High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union noted that the rapid deployment of the Interim Force, which marked the first time the European Union had sent military contingents outside Europe, had halted the massacres in Bunia, improved the security conditions and helped relaunch the peace process. He underlined the need to preserve the achievements made to date and expressed support for the Secretary-General’s recommendation to deploy a strengthened MONUC to Bunia within the planned time frame, with a mandate under Chapter VII of the Charter. In his view, security throughout the region could be achieved only by deploying more forces. At the same time, he stressed that strong pressure should be brought to bear on the warlords who were leading militias. In that connection, he noted that the European Union resolutely supported the proposal for an arms embargo aimed at the Kivus and Ituri. The European Union also intended to promote initiatives to prevent those responsible for war crimes, crimes against humanity and acts of genocide committed in the country from escaping punishment.³⁷⁴

The majority of speakers welcomed the establishment of the Transitional Government of national unity and paid tribute to the European Union, in particular to France, for the deployment of the Interim Force. They noted that the Transitional Government faced many challenges ahead, including the organization of free and fair elections.

Several speakers stressed that without having strong national human rights protection structures in place and putting an end to the widespread culture of impunity, there could not be genuine reconciliation or the consolidation of long-term, sustainable peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.³⁷⁵ Some speakers further noted with the interest the announcement made by the Prosecutor of International Criminal Court that the situation in Ituri had been designated as a most urgent situation to be followed.³⁷⁶ The representative of Germany welcomed the statement of the Prosecutor on the principle of complementarity of Court action and national actions.³⁷⁷

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo declared that the issue of impunity would be among the priorities of the Transitional Government. He added that an “adequate institutional framework” was necessary and called for support by the international community for the establishment of a truth and reconciliation commission and the national observatory for human rights.³⁷⁸

Speakers shared the view that the enormous challenges facing the Transitional Government included the need to: extend its authority throughout the territory; reform and integrate the armed forces and the police; further promote the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process; and dismantle the armed groups. The circulation of weapons was seen as a major obstacle to durable peace. A number of speakers therefore welcomed the imposition of an arms embargo against all rebel groups operating in eastern Congo and stressed the importance of establishing an effective monitoring mechanism of the proposed embargo.³⁷⁹

³⁷¹ S/PV.4790, pp. 2-4.

³⁷² Not issued as a document of the Council.

³⁷³ S/PV.4790, pp. 4-5.

³⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 25 (Pakistan); p. 26 (Bulgaria); and p. 33 (Brazil).

³⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Germany); p. 11 (France); and p. 26 (Bulgaria).

³⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

³⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Germany); p. 17 (United Kingdom); p. 19

The majority of speakers stated that in order to prevent a security vacuum in eastern Congo following the expiration of the mandate of the Interim Force on 1 September, it was of utmost importance that the personnel of MONUC was increased and that the Mission was given a more robust mandate under Chapter VII of the Charter. They, therefore, supported the draft resolution before the Council³⁷² and urged the Council to adopt it as soon as possible. Noting the special character of Chapter VII mandates, the representative of Japan opined that the draft resolution should establish under what conditions and in which geographical areas the mandate would be exercised. He stressed that such a mandate should be given to peacekeepers only in exceptional cases in which the urgency of the situation made it absolutely necessary and in which there were countries willing to contribute troops, as well as the clear prospect that the troops dispatched with such a mandate would contribute to the improvement of the situation. Furthermore, while acknowledging the need for strengthening MONUC to address the situation in Ituri, he considered it unrealistic to decide to send more troops in every region of the country.³⁸⁰ The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo called for the Council to adapt the mandate of MONUC to allow it not only to build on the achievements of the Interim Force, but to transform itself into a vast multidisciplinary operation for peacekeeping, operating throughout the entire national territory.³⁸¹

Speakers agreed that, beyond the support of the international community, a durable peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was largely dependent on cooperation of neighbouring States with the peace process and reiterated their support for the holding of a regional conference on the Great Lakes region.³⁸²

At its 4797th meeting, on 28 July 2003, the Council again included in its agenda the second special report of the Secretary-General on MONUC, dated 27 May 2003.³⁸³ The President (Spain) drew attention

(Chile); p. 24 (Pakistan); p. 25 (Bulgaria); p. 33 (Brazil); p. 34 (Japan); and p. 39 (Nepal).

³⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 34.

³⁸¹ Ibid., p. 27.

³⁸² Ibid., p. 11 (France); p. 16 (Russian Federation); p. 18 (United Kingdom); p. 19 (Chile); p. 21 (Cameroon); p. 24 (Pakistan); p. 32 (Egypt); and p. 37 (Philippines).

³⁸³ S/2003/566 and Corr.1.

to the report of the Security Council mission to Central Africa, 7 to 16 June 2003.³⁸⁴

At the meeting, at which the Secretary-General made a statement,³⁸⁵ the President also drew attention to a draft resolution;³⁸⁶ it was adopted unanimously as resolution 1493 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of MONUC until 30 July 2004;

Approved the temporary deployment of MONUC personnel; approved also the reconfiguration of the MONUC civilian police component; authorized MONUC to assist the Government of National Unity and Transition in disarming and demobilizing those Congolese combatants;

Demanded that all States and in particular those in the region, including the Democratic Republic of the Congo, ensure that no direct or indirect assistance, especially military or financial assistance, was given to the movements and armed groups present in the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Decided that all States, including the Democratic Republic of the Congo, should, for an initial period of 12 months from the adoption of the resolution, take the necessary measures to prevent the direct or indirect supply, sale or transfer, from their territories or by their nationals, or using their flag vessels or aircraft, of arms and any related materiel, and the provision of any assistance, advice or training related to military activities, to all foreign and Congolese armed groups and militias operating in the territory of North and South Kivu and of Ituri;

Decided that, at the end of the initial 12 months, the Council would review the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in particular in the eastern part of the country, with a view to renewing the measures stipulated in paragraph 20 if no significant progress had been made in the peace process, in particular an end to support for armed groups, an effective ceasefire and progress in the disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, reintegration or resettlement by foreign and Congolese armed groups;

Authorized MONUC to use all necessary means to fulfil its mandate in the Ituri district and, as it deemed it within its capabilities, in North and South Kivu.

In his statement, the Secretary-General congratulated the Council on adopting the resolution and giving MONUC the strong mandate it needed to fulfil its difficult mission. While pointing out the

³⁸⁴ S/2003/653.

³⁸⁵ The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

³⁸⁶ S/2003/757.

inauguration of the Transitional Government, he stressed that the road ahead over the next two to three years towards free and fair elections would be difficult. He believed MONUC would play a key role in helping the Congolese achieve a sustainable peace leading up to a democratically elected Government. Lastly, he emphasized that there would be no substitute for the resolve of the Congolese leaders to implement their commitment to peace.³⁸⁷

**Decision of 13 August 2003 (4807th meeting):
resolution 1499 (2003)**

At its 4807th meeting, on 13 August 2003, the Council again included in its agenda the letter dated 15 October 2002 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Council,³⁸⁸ transmitting the final report of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Secretary-General also transmitted, as requested in resolution 1457 (2003), the reactions from individuals, companies and States named in the report.³⁸⁹

At the meeting, in which the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was invited to participate, the President (Syrian Arab Republic) drew attention to a draft resolution;³⁹⁰ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1499 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Requested the Secretary-General to extend the mandate of the Panel until 31 October 2003 to enable it to complete the remaining elements of its mandate, at the end of which the Panel would submit a final report to the Council;

Reiterated its demand that all States concerned take immediate steps to end the illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth in the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Requested the Panel to provide the necessary information to the Governments concerned as required in paragraphs 12 and 13 of resolution 1457 (2003), with due regard to safety of sources, in order to enable them, if necessary, to take appropriate action according to their national laws and international obligations;

Called on all States to respect the relevant Security Council resolutions in that regard; and decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

³⁸⁷ S/PV.4797, pp. 2-3.

³⁸⁸ S/2002/1146.

³⁸⁹ S/2002/1146/Add.1 and Corr.1.

³⁹⁰ S/2003/803.

**Decision of 26 August 2003 (4813th meeting):
resolution 1501 (2003)**

At its 4813th meeting, on 26 August 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 14 August 2003 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Council,³⁹¹ by which the Secretary-General announced that the preparations for the deployment by MONUC of a brigade-size force to Bunia were well under way. The preparedness of MONUC to take over from the Interim Emergency Multinational Force on 1 September notwithstanding, it was expected that the situation in Bunia could become volatile during the transition period. Informing that while it would begin to disengage following the transfer of authority on 1 September, the Interim Force would be ready to provide emergency support to MONUC, at the latter's request, to assist it in the performance of its mandated responsibilities in and around Bunia, if circumstances required. Taking into account that such support would contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security in the area during the transition period, the Secretary-General asked the Council to consider authorizing the Interim Force to provide assistance to the MONUC troops deployed in and around Bunia.

The President (Syrian Arab Republic) drew attention to a draft resolution;³⁹² it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1501 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Approved the recommendation contained in the Secretary-General's letter of 14 August 2003;

Authorized the States members of the Interim Emergency Multinational Force to provide assistance to the MONUC contingent deployed in the town and its immediate surroundings, if MONUC requested them to do so and if exceptional circumstances demanded it, during the period of the Force's disengagement which should last until 15 September 2003 at the latest;

Decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

**Decision of 19 November 2003
(4863rd meeting): statement by the President**

At its 4863rd meeting, on 19 November 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 23 October 2003 from the Secretary-General to the

³⁹¹ S/2003/821.

³⁹² S/2003/832.

President of the Council, transmitting the report of the Panel of Experts.³⁹³

In the report, the Panel of Experts noted that in the absence of a strong, central and democratically elected Government in control of its territory, the illegal exploitation of natural resources would continue and serve as motivation and fuel for continued conflict in the region. While the establishment of the Transitional Government was a significant step in the right direction, the Panel believed that the peace process was not yet irreversible. One of the most significant challenges was enabling the timely extension of the transitional authority throughout the national territory, in particular in such problematic areas as Ituri and the Kivus. Parallel to the extension of government authority, the Panel recommended that a number of institutional reforms be initiated to allow the democratically elected central Government, once in place, to ensure the legal exploitation of natural resources. Such institutional changes included the effective control of national borders, strengthening the accounting and auditing system, and breaking up the large State-owned resources enterprises. The Panel also believed that the most helpful factor in ensuring the reunification of the national territory would be the effective integration of the new armed forces. The Panel recommended the consideration of immediate interim measures to end the illegal exploitation of

natural resources, including stopping the flow of illegal arms to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Stressing that the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo needed to be quickly convinced that peace was better than conflict, the Panel recommended that specific quick-impact projects re-establishing social and economic infrastructure be undertaken to convince people of the advantages of peace. Lastly, the Panel believed that none of its recommendations could be sustained in the long term unless a regional solution was found.

At the meeting, in which to the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was invited to participate, the President (Angola) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁹⁴ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Condemned the continuing illegal exploitation of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Reaffirmed the importance of stopping them by exerting, if need be, the necessary pressure on the armed groups, traffickers and all other actors involved;

Urged all States concerned, especially those in the region, to take the appropriate steps to end those illegal activities, by proceeding with their own investigations, on the basis, in particular, of information and documentation accumulated by the Panel during its work and forwarded to Governments, including through judicial means where possible, and, if necessary, to report to the Council.

³⁹³ S/2003/1027; the report was submitted pursuant to resolutions 1457 (2003) and 1499 (2003).

³⁹⁴ S/PRST/2003/21.

11. The situation in the Central African Republic

Decision of 10 February 2000 (4101st meeting): statement by the President

At its 4101st meeting, on 10 February 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the ninth report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA).¹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that it appeared that the authorities of the Central African Republic had accepted the prospects of the withdrawal of MINURCA on 15 February 2000, despite their preference to have the drawdown delayed until December 2000. Noting that he had received a letter

from the President of Algeria and the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity² urging that more time be given to allow the new Government to consolidate peace, the Secretary-General noted that he had responded by stressing the importance of the determination of the parties to consolidate the progress made. The Secretary-General held that the people and Government of the Central African Republic had already demonstrated their strong commitment to democracy and peaceful development, but cautioned that the country remained vulnerable to the volatile situation in the subregion and that challenges remained, particularly with regard to the restructuring

¹ S/2000/24, submitted pursuant to Security Council resolution 1271 (1999).

² On 8 July 2002, the Organization of African Union ceased to exist and was replaced by the African Union.

of the security and armed forces. The Secretary-General pointed out that as from 15 February 2000, the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic (BONUCA) would take over from MINURCA. BONUCA would support the efforts of the Government to consolidate peace and democracy in the Central African Republic and added that preparations had begun on the restructuring and demobilization programmes.

At the meeting, the President (Argentina) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Commended MINURCA and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the contribution they had made to the restoration of peace and security in the Central African Republic;

Recognized the significant progress made by the Government of the Central African Republic in implementing the Bangui Agreements;

Urged the Government of the Central African Republic to continue to conform to the requirements of the economic reform and financial consolidation programmes agreed with the international financial institutions;

Welcomed the promulgation by the Central African authorities of three laws on the restructuring of the armed forces;

Welcomed in particular the decision by the Government of the Central African Republic to disband the Special Force for the Defence of the Republican Institutions;

Welcomed the decision by the Secretary-General, which had been accepted by the Government of the Central African Republic, to establish, for an initial period of one year that began on 15 February 2000, the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic, headed by a representative of the Secretary-General.

Decision of 23 January 2001 (4262nd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4261st meeting, on 23 January 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in the Central African Republic and on the activities of BONUCA.⁴

In his report, the second on the subject, the Secretary-General observed that the situation in the Central African Republic was a source of great

concern. He warned that the lack of any political dialogue between the Government and the opposition did not contribute to the consolidation of the country's young democratic institutions. At the same time, the Secretary-General welcomed the fact that the Bretton Woods institutions had started providing assistance to the Government of the Central African Republic as the socio-economic situation in the country was extremely volatile and continued to cause social upheaval and strikes. Reporting that on 19 December 2000 an opposition rally, taking place in defiance of a Government ban, had been dispersed by security forces, and 73 people, including four parliamentarians had been arrested, he characterized the social situation in the country as "explosive". Moreover, the Secretary-General cautioned that the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo had a negative impact on the Central African Republic through increased refugee flows, and reported that he had sent a Special Envoy to assess the impact of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo on the Central African Republic and the Republic of the Congo.

At the meeting, the Council heard briefings by the Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of BONUCA, the Acting Deputy Director of the Regional Bureau for Africa of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the Vice-President for External Affairs and United Nations Affairs of the World Bank. During the meeting, statements were made by all members of the Council, as well as by the representative of the Central African Republic⁵ and the Permanent Observer for the International Organization of la Francophonie.

Introducing the Secretary-General's report, the Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of BONUCA stressed the increase in tensions between the Government and the opposition, with the former delaying dialogue and the latter seemingly favouring confrontation and calling for the President's resignation. He cautioned that the socio-economic situation remained precarious, as did the human rights situation particularly with regard to "neighbourhood justice" and the situation for detainees. Noting that the security situation remained calm and that progress was being made in disarmament and restructuring of the security and defence forces, he pointed out that there

³ S/PRST/2000/5.

⁴ S/2001/35, submitted pursuant to the statement by the President of 10 February 2000 (S/PRST/2000/5).

⁵ The Central African Republic was represented by the Minister for the Promotion of Civic Responsibility in charge of relations with the Parliament.

had been no tangible progress on the demobilization and reintegration programme.⁶

The Acting Deputy Director of the Regional Bureau for Africa of UNDP reported that the National Programme for Demobilization and Reintegration, with support from UNDP, had established the technical conditions for implementation and was moving into its initial phase.⁷

The Vice-President for External Affairs and United Nations Affairs of the World Bank held that international institutions could provide some temporary relief for pressing problems like civil service salary arrears, but only determined efforts by the Government could address the root causes of the crisis — especially weak governance — and provide a lasting solution.⁸

During the debate, most speakers expressed serious concern about the political tensions and lack of dialogue in the Central African Republic, which, many members said, posed an obstacle to consolidation of the new democratic institutions in the country, and threatened to unravel the progress made over the past four to five years. While welcoming the progress made by BONUCA with regard to disarmament and restructuring of the security and defence forces, they deplored the slow pace of the demobilization and reintegration programme. Most speakers underlined the importance of international involvement in the Central African Republic, while emphasizing that the political will of the people of that country was imperative in order to move towards dialogue and national reconciliation. A number of speakers urged the Government of the Central African Republic to initiate dialogue, and called on the opposition to respond favourably to such an initiative.

Most members of the Council were concerned with the inadequate financial resources to deal with the problems facing the Central African Republic, and commended the assistance provided by the Bretton Woods institutions. Some Council members welcomed the approval by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) of debt relief for the country.⁹ Several speakers expressed concern with the arrears in the payment of civil servants, which contributed to the political and

social tensions, and prevented the proper functioning of the country's public institutions.

A number of Council members expressed concern for the repercussions of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, particularly the impact of a new flow of refugees and of an increased circulation and trafficking in small arms. Many members looked forward to receiving recommendations from the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General on this issue.

The representative of the Central African Republic reaffirmed the interest of his Government in consolidating the country's democratic institutions, despite the logic of confrontation pursued by "some extremist political leaders". Moreover, he emphasized that the Central African Republic did not have a political crisis, as 95 percent of the institutions provided for in the Constitution were functioning well; but a social crisis, rooted in the events of the 1990s, which had created a backlog in payment to civil servants. He added that this economic backlog had only been worsened by the fuel crisis and the impact of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. At the same time, the representative pointed to improvements in the human rights situation in his country. While noting that some "corrupt politicians" continued their disruptive and irresponsible activities, he indicated that the governing party did not have a militia. He pointed out that his Government continued to reiterate its openness to dialogue, and added that the opposition leaders did "sometimes visit" on non-political occasions.¹⁰

The representative of the International Organization of la Francophonie warned that the social crisis and lack of political dialogue in the Central African Republic could endanger reconciliation efforts. Recalling the efforts by that organization and its members in the Central African Republic, he reported that a recent mission, initiated by its Secretary-General, had recommended a comprehensive assessment of the implementation of the Bangui Agreements and of the National Reconciliation Plan as a way to renew dialogue among all actors in the country.¹¹

At its 4262nd meeting, on 23 January 2001, the Council again included the report of the Secretary-

⁶ S/PV.4261, pp. 3-4.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Mauritius); p. 10 (Bangladesh); p. 15 (China); p. 16 (Ireland); and p. 20 (Tunisia).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-24.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 24-27.

General on BONUCA in its agenda.¹² The President (Singapore) then made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹³ by which Council, *inter alia*:

Commended BONUCA and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the efforts they have constantly made to contribute to peace and stability, expressed its concern at the political and social tensions which had recently resurfaced, and noted the absence of dialogue between the Government and the opposition;

Welcomed the contributions from bilateral and multilateral donors for the consolidation of public finances;

Strongly encouraged the Government to do everything in its power to strengthen democratic institutions and to take concrete measures to implement economic reforms;

Encouraged the Government to take all the necessary financial measures to relaunch the demobilization and reintegration programmes;

Urged all political actors to contribute to the reduction of tension;

Requested the Secretary-General to keep the Council informed on the progress made and to submit a report by 30 June 2001.

Decision of 17 July 2001 (4347th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4347th meeting, on 17 July 2001, the Council included in its agenda the third report of the Secretary-General on BONUCA.¹⁴ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that the situation in the Central African Republic had been further exacerbated by the unexpected attempted coup d'état, which had occurred on the night of 27-28 May 2001. Recalling his own as well as the Security Council's condemnation of the attempted coup, he reported that the former President of the Republic, General André Kolingba, had claimed responsibility for the attempt. The Secretary-General indicated that the Government of the Central African Republic had rejected an offer of negotiations by General Kolingba, allowing the fighting between loyalists and putschists to continue until 6 June 2001. He added that the President Ange-Félix Patassé, had reaffirmed that the trial of the putschists would be subject to international observation and had requested a Security Council delegation to be sent to Bangui to ascertain that weapons had been

found in the residence of former President Kolingba. The Secretary-General pointed out that the attempted coup d'état had further complicated the already tense social and economic situation, and had led to increased violations of human rights. Noting that the Front de libération du Congo, led by Jean-Pierre Bemba, had provided support to President Patassé during the attempted coup d'état, the Secretary-General voiced concern that the impact of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo on the Central African Republic risked getting a political dimension, in addition to the economic, humanitarian and security dimensions already at play. However, a recent visit by a Congolese delegation to Bangui seemed to have cleared up the misunderstandings between the two Governments.

At the meeting, the President (China) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁵ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reiterated its condemnation of the recent attempted coup in the Central African Republic;

Expressed deep concern at the precarious situation in the country and the persisting acts of violence;

Strongly condemned the killing of the security coordinator for the United Nations system in the Central African Republic and urged to bring those responsible to justice;

Requested the Secretary-General to submit to it by 30 September 2001 recommendations on how the United Nations might further contribute to the recovery of the country;

Urged all States that made pledges at the special donor meeting to fulfil them; and called on the Bretton Woods institutions to conclude programmes with the country;

Stressed the crucial importance of poverty eradication, debt payment and public administration.

Decision of 26 September 2001 (4382nd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4380th meeting, on 21 September 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in the Central African Republic.¹⁶ In his report, the Secretary-General characterized the situation in the Central African Republic following the coup attempt as seriously destabilized and requiring immediate and

¹² S/2001/35.

¹³ S/PRST/2001/2.

¹⁴ S/2001/660, submitted pursuant to the statement by the President of 10 February 2000 (S/PRST/2000/5).

¹⁵ S/PRST/2001/18.

¹⁶ S/2001/886, submitted pursuant to the statement by the President of 17 July 2001 (S/PRST/2001/18).

increased levels of external assistance. He observed that the period since the failed coup attempt had been marked by sharp political tensions with political dialogue no longer being on the agenda; further economic decline with the State being unable to pay salaries to public servants on a regular basis; simmering social tensions; and a lack of security as the crisis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to spill over into the Central African Republic with increased proliferation of weapons and refugee flows. The Secretary-General added that more than 20,000 people had fled the Central African Republic during the violence surrounding the coup attempt, most of whom had crossed the border into the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He noted that the presence of a number of presumed putschists among those refugees constituted a security concern for the Central African authorities, who had since closed the border between the two States. The Secretary-General recommended a strengthening of the mandate of BONUCA with a special focus on promoting political dialogue and national reconciliation; monitoring the security situation and establishing an early warning mechanism; promoting respect for human rights; and providing political support for the mobilization of resources with a view to economic reconstruction of the country. The Secretary-General stressed that the proposed revision of the mandate of BONUCA would require a significant increase in the Mission's human, financial and material resources, and suggested that the mandate of a revamped BONUCA be extended for an additional year beyond 31 December 2001.

At the meeting, the Council received briefings by the Representative of the Secretary-General and by the Country Director of the World Bank. During the meeting, statements were made by all Council members, as well as by the representatives of Belgium (on behalf of the European Union¹⁷) and Egypt.¹⁸

In addition to introducing the report of the Secretary-General, the Representative of the Secretary-General reported on the efforts of BONUCA in helping the Government of the Central African Republic ease political and social tensions. He noted that, while

¹⁷ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁸ The representative of the Central African Republic was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

efforts were also under way in the economic and security realms, the attempted coup d'état had exacerbated the situation to such an extent that the country was "almost completely devastated" and called on the country's partners to provide emergency assistance commensurate with the situation.¹⁹

The Country Director at the World Bank reported on the efforts by the World Bank and IMF to assist the Government of the Central African Republic in improving its economic management. He hoped that, in the coming months, the World Bank would be able to contribute to solving the economic management problems in the country.²⁰

All speakers expressed concern about the political, social, economic, human rights and security situation in the Central African Republic, and underlined the need for a coherent programme to address the numerous challenges related to peacebuilding in that country. In that connection, it was repeatedly stressed that while the primary responsibility for achieving progress rested with the Central Africans themselves, international assistance remained crucial. Some delegations pointed out that peacebuilding efforts were not just a matter for the Security Council, but should include a variety of international partners, and would require greater coordination between the Council and other United Nations organs.²¹

On the socio-economic challenges facing the Central African Republic, most speakers expressed particular concern with the arrears in payment of salaries to public employees and by the decision of the World Bank to suspend its disbursements to the country in the wake of the inability of the authorities to pay their exterior debt. Several speakers expressed the hope that the World Bank would soon resume its disbursements to the Central African Republic.²² In that context, the representative of Jamaica reiterated his view that structural adjustment programmes often did not take into account the special conditions in post-conflict societies.²³

¹⁹ S/PV.4380, pp. 2-4.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 5.

²¹ S/PV.4380, p. 7 (Ukraine); p. 10 (United Kingdom); and p. 11 (Bangladesh).

²² Ibid., p. 8 (Tunisia); and p. 9 (China).

²³ Ibid., p. 15.

Most speakers stressed the importance of restructuring the armed forces of the Central African Republic and of improving efforts to collect weapons throughout the country. Noting the destabilizing impact of the crisis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo on the already fragile situation in the Central African Republic, a number of delegations welcomed the close cooperation between the Representatives of the Secretary-General in the two countries and emphasized the importance of dialogue between all the countries in the region. In that context, several speakers were concerned by the refugee flows, and the thousands of refugees who had fled to the Democratic Republic of the Congo following the attempted coup d'état, and particularly with the alleged presence among them of a number of putschists. The representative of the United States observed that for these refugees to be able to return home, the border between the two countries needed to be reopened and the Government of the Central African Republic needed to guarantee that they would not be harmed upon return.²⁴ The representative of the Russian Federation agreed that refugees who had left the country out of fear of ethnic persecution needed to be enabled to return home safely.²⁵ The representative of the United Kingdom advocated that those forces that had fled following the coup be reintegrated into the armed forces instead of seeking to expand new recruitments.²⁵

Many speakers expressed concern about the general deterioration of the human rights situation in the Central African Republic, condemning human rights abuses, including extrajudicial violence on the part of the Government. Some delegations called on the Central African authorities to honour their commitment to ensure a fair and transparent trial for those responsible for instigating violence in connection with the attempted coup.²⁶

With regard to the recommendations of the Secretary-General to strengthen the mandate of BONUCA, most speakers expressed support for the proposals, but a number of delegations held that there was a need for the Council to receive further clarification of the budgetary implications.²⁷ At the same time, the representative of Singapore cautioned

against approving the new tasks for BONUCA without ensuring commensurate resources to the mission, as that would harm its credibility on the ground.²⁸ The representative of the United States indicated that any increase in the resources for BONUCA would depend on the efforts of the Government in working with BONUCA and in improving the domestic political dialogue.²⁹ The representative of France stated that the Council might have reduced the international presence "excessively" after the withdrawal of MINURCA, and expressed support for strengthening BONUCA. As a symbolic gesture, he also suggested that the Representative of the Secretary-General be promoted to Special Representative.³⁰

At its 4382nd meeting, on 26 September 2001, the Council invited the representative of the Central African Republic to participate and again included the report of the Secretary-General on the Central African Republic in its agenda.³¹ The President (France) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Expressed its continued deep concern at the precarious situation in the Central African Republic;

Reiterated its call on all parties for political dialogue, national reconciliation and respect for human rights in the spirit of the 1998 National Reconciliation Pact; and called on the Central African authorities to follow the internationally accepted standards for due process in the course of investigations and court trials of individuals involved in the coup attempt in May 2001;

Encouraged UNDP and the international financial institutions to consider, in consultation with the Government of the Central African Republic and the Secretary-General's Representative, ways of strengthening the capacities of the Government of the Central African Republic in the management of its economic and financial affairs, including through secondment of high-level experts;

Took note with interest of the intention of the Secretary-General, in coordination with the Government of the Central African Republic, to extend the mandate of BONUCA and to strengthen it in accordance with paragraph 29 of his report of 19 September 2001;

Underlined the need to continue the restructuring of the Central African armed forces to enable them to fulfil their role

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (United States); and p. 13 (Ireland).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (United States); p. 10 (United Kingdom); p. 11 (Russian Federation); and p. 17 (France).

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

³¹ S/2001/886.

³² S/PRST/2001/25.

effectively, loyally and impartially, in the service of the Central African people;

Also recalled the importance of implementing an effective arms-collection programme.

**Decision of 18 October 2002 (4627th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4627th meeting,³³ on 18 October 2002, the Council invited the representative of the Central African Republic to participate. The President (Cameroon) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁴ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

³³ At its 4571st meeting, held in private on 11 July 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of BONUCA. At its 4658th meeting, held in private on 9 December 2002, the Council had a discussion with the Prime Minister of the Central African Republic.

³⁴ S/PRST/2002/28.

Welcomed the holding of the Summit of the Central African Economic and Monetary Community in Libreville on 2 October 2002 to consider the situation between the Central African Republic and the Republic of Chad;

Strongly supported the intention of the President of the Republic of Chad to visit Bangui in the very near future;

Also welcomed the readiness expressed by the African Union to continue to contribute towards ongoing efforts to normalizing the relations between Central African Republic and Chad and to promote peace and stability in the Central African region as stipulated in the communiqué of the eighty-fifth ordinary session of the central organ of the mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution issued on 11 October 2002, in Addis Ababa;

Expressed its full support for the decision to deploy in the Central African Republic an International Observation Force of 300 to 350 troops from Gabon, Cameroon, the Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea and Mali with three main tasks: ensuring the safety of the President of the Central African Republic; observing and ensuring security on the border between Chad and the Central African Republic; and participating in the restructuring of the Central African Republic armed forces;

Requested the Secretary-General, through his Representative, to establish appropriate liaison with the Force; and invited the leadership of the Force to provide periodic reports, at least every three months.

12. The situation in Africa

**Deliberations of 10 January 2000
(4087th meeting)**

At its 4087th meeting,¹ on 10 January 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled "The impact of AIDS on peace and security in Africa". At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Secretary-General, following which statements were made by most Council members,² the

¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. I, part V, case 12, with regard to the order of speakers under rule 27 of the provisional rules of procedure; chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter and interpretations of what constitutes a threat to international peace and security; and chap. VI, part II, sect. B, case 5, with regard to relations between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, in relation to Article 65.

² The representatives of China and the Russian Federation did not make statements. The representative of Mali, in addition to a statement in his national capacity, read out

representatives of Algeria, Australia, Brazil, Cape Verde (on behalf of the Group of African States), Cuba, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, New Zealand,³ Nigeria, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union⁴), the Republic of Korea, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe, as well as by the President of the World Bank, the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Executive Director of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, and the Assistant Secretary

a message on behalf of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS).

³ Australia, Fiji, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu aligned themselves with the statement.

⁴ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

for Health and Surgeon-General of the United States of America.⁵

The President of the Security Council (United States) noted that the debate represented the first time the Council was discussing a health issue as a “security threat” which constituted a step away from the classic security agenda of the Council. Observing that when a single disease threatened “everything from economic strength to peacekeeping”, a security threat of the greatest magnitude was clearly to be faced and called for the new agenda to be pursued with determination, adequate resources and creative use of the new tools at the world’s disposal.⁶

Recognizing that HIV/AIDS was causing social and economic crises which in turn threatened political stability, the Secretary-General stated that the fight against HIV/AIDS in Africa should be an immediate priority as part of the efforts to achieve peace and security in the continent and welcomed the Council as an additional partner in the fight against the disease.⁷

In his briefing, the President of the World Bank observed that, AIDS being an issue that affected the peace and security of Africa, concerted efforts by the United Nations, as well as other actors such as the private sector and civil society, were needed. In this connection, he added, the focus on the priorities could be given by the Security Council. Recalling that poverty and development were the root causes of most of the conflicts, he held the view that it was essential for the Security Council to take actions in anticipation of a world that, without such action, would be a world in conflict.⁸

In his briefing, the Administrator of UNDP proposed to the Council a set of actions which included, inter alia, the support of Africa’s front-line efforts to combat HIV/AIDS; the promotion of inter-country cooperation; the allocation of adequate resources; a coordinated response by all stakeholders;

new public-private partnerships; cooperation with the pharmaceutical industry to bring down treatment costs. Emphasizing that HIV/AIDS was a “particularly cruel manifestation” of wider development challenges, he welcomed the fact that the Council had elevated it from a long-term economic and social issue to a current danger to be addressed as a matter of political priority.⁹

Recalling that over the past year African Governments, the United Nations, international donors, civil society and the private sector had come together to form a new international partnership against AIDS in Africa, the Executive Director of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS noted that there were no development problems that more urgently commanded a collective response from the international community.¹⁰

In their statements, speakers, inter alia, welcomed the initiative to discuss in the Council the impact of HIV/AIDS on peace and security in Africa; acknowledged that HIV/AIDS posed a threat to security, economic, social, and political development in Africa and elsewhere; highlighted that human security encompassed not only traditional threats to security but also humanitarian concerns; stressed the need for continued and concerted international cooperation to combat the disease; welcomed the fact that the United Nations and the Security Council had recognized the relationship between the spread of HIV/AIDS and the challenge of peace and security in Africa and their intent to coordinate efforts to combat the spread of the pandemic; concurred that, to combat the scourge of HIV/AIDS, some priority measures should be taken, including, inter alia, new private-public partnerships and the allocation of adequate resources, both for prevention and treatment; suggested different courses of actions that the United Nations could undertake, including, inter alia, the convening of a special session of the General Assembly and a more systematic cooperation between the Security Council and the other organs and bodies of the United Nations.

Deliberations of 31 January 2000 (4096th meeting)

At its 4096th meeting, on 31 January 2000, the Council heard a statement by the Deputy Secretary-General, following which all members of the Council,

⁵ The representatives of Bulgaria and Croatia were invited to participate in the meeting, but did not make statements. Namibia, Uganda and Zimbabwe were represented by their respective Ministers of Health. The President of the Security Council was represented, for the first part of the meeting, by the Vice-President of the United States.

⁶ S/PV.4087, pp. 2-4.

⁷ Ibid., pp. 4-5.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 8-9.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 9-11.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 11-12.

as well as the representatives of Algeria (on behalf of the Organization of African Unity (OAU)), South Africa and Zambia made statements.¹¹

In her opening statement, the Deputy Secretary-General encouraged the Council to undertake an energetic follow-up of the proposals made during the Security Council's "month of Africa". Noting, inter alia, that the Council had given new impetus to the fight against HIV/AIDS by recognizing the pandemic as a threat to Africa's security, she welcomed the fact that the Council had reaffirmed its long-standing engagement with Africa and pledged that the Secretariat would do everything possible to sustain the momentum generated by the "month of Africa" and to make sure that it was effectively harnessed with the United Nations system.¹²

In their statements, speakers expressed support for the "month of Africa" in the Security Council and concurred that it had raised public consciousness about important issues related to Africa and had broadened the definition of issues affecting peace and security; agreed that it was imperative to strengthen the momentum generated by the "month of Africa" and follow up with concerted and timely action on the issues of providing assistance to internally displaced persons as well as on the initiative on HIV/AIDS in Africa through the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. Many speakers raised points that dealt with specific situations. With regard to the situation in Burundi, they expressed support for the ongoing Arusha peace process and the facilitation efforts of former President Mandela. With regard to the situation in Angola, they welcomed the reiteration by the Government of Angola of its commitment to the Lusaka Protocol, expressed concern for the humanitarian situation, and supported the innovative work undertaken by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola. With regard to the situation in Sierra Leone, many speakers supported the expansion of the mandate of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) and, in connection with the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, agreed that the Council needed to rapidly adopt a resolution authorizing a

peacekeeping operation with a mandate under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and expressed support for the Facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue, Sir Ketumile Masire; called for closer collaboration with OAU; and supported the convening of an international conference on peace, security, democracy and development in the Great Lakes region.

**Decision of 31 January 2002 (4465th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4460th meeting,¹³ on 29 and 30 January 2002, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 10 January 2002 from the representative of Mauritius addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitting a guideline document for the meeting.¹⁴ At the meeting, the Council heard briefings by the Deputy Secretary-General and the Secretary-General of OAU, following which statements were made by all members of the Council,¹⁵ the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine and Zambia,¹⁶ as well as by the President of the Economic and Social Council, the High Representative of the European Union for the European Union Common Foreign and Security Policy,

¹³ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. VI, part II, sect. B, case 8, with regard to relations between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council in relation to Article 65 of the Charter; and chap. XII, part III, sect. A, with regard to the role of regional organizations and Articles 52 to 54.

¹⁴ S/2002/46.

¹⁵ The United Kingdom was represented by its Under-Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs; Guinea and Ireland by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs; Mexico by its Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs for Africa, Asia-Pacific, Europe and the United Nations; and Norway by its State Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

¹⁶ The representative of Djibouti was invited to participate but did not make a statement. The Democratic Republic of the Congo, Senegal and Zambia were represented by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs; Mozambique and Morocco by their respective Deputy Ministers for Foreign Affairs; Algeria by its Minister in Charge of African Affairs; Angola by its Vice-Minister for External Relations; and South Africa by its Minister for Environmental Affairs and Tourism.

¹¹ South Africa and Namibia were represented by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs, and Zambia by the President of the Republic.

¹² S/PV.4096, pp. 2-4.

and the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs.

In her opening statement, the Deputy Secretary-General focused on the need to build a stronger relationship between the United Nations, OAU, and African subregional organizations in order to develop integrated approaches to conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Noting that OAU, subregional organizations and individual African States had shown a commendable interest in assuming a more prominent role in peacekeeping in Africa, she pointed out that it was vital for the international community to make more serious and concerted efforts to build up and sustain regional capacities in peacekeeping. In the area of post-conflict peacebuilding, highlighting the crucial importance of national reconciliation and accountability for atrocities, she stressed the need to put disarmament, demobilization and, especially, reintegration programmes on a solid, long-term financial footing and suggested that the Council might wish in the future to include such matters in United Nations mandates it authorized. Regarding the effectiveness of sanctions, the Deputy Secretary-General noted the progress achieved since the Security Council had taken to establishing panels of experts to investigate violations of sanctions regimes. Recalling the mechanism envisaged by resolution 1373 (2001) to deal with those who sought to use commercial and financial transactions for illegal and violent ends, she expressed the hope that the Council would use the political momentum to reinforce its call on Member States to make the violations of arms embargoes it had imposed a criminal offence under their national laws.¹⁷

The Secretary-General of OAU stated that the United Nations should intensify its cooperation with OAU and regional and subregional organizations, which remained the key partners in any global settlement of conflicts in Africa, and therefore proposed the creation of a consultative mechanism between the Security Council and the Central Organ of OAU on conflict resolution. Highlighting the paramount responsibility of the Security Council in the partnership between the United Nations and OAU, he noted that Africa itself must shoulder its responsibilities, playing a more active role in the area of conflict prevention, management and resolution.¹⁸

Emphasizing that the multidimensional nature of conflict prevention and post-conflict peacebuilding demanded a multidisciplinary approach, the President of the Economic and Social Council underlined the importance of effective collaboration between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, so that they could work in the field in a complementary fashion.¹⁹

In their statements, delegations touched on a wide variety of issues and concurred, *inter alia*, on the need to: adopt a comprehensive, pragmatic and result-oriented approach to conflict prevention, crisis management, conflict resolution and post-conflict rehabilitation, reconstruction and development, as outlined in the report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa;²⁰ implement quickly the conclusions and recommendations contained in the Millennium Declaration relating to Africa; respond to the changing nature of conflicts and the prevailing nature of regional and intra-State conflicts by modifying the approach to peacekeeping so as to reflect the new realities and by shifting from a policy of reaction to a policy of conflict prevention; undertake a more active and structured dialogue between OAU, African subregional organizations and the United Nations; promote a better coordination between the relevant United Nations organs, programmes and mechanisms, in particular the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, in dealing with conflict and post-conflict situations in Africa, as well as a better coordination of peace initiatives, both in areas of conflict prevention, conflict management and conflict settlement; support the implementation of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD); encourage African institutions to take a leading role in dealing with issues of conflict prevention, conflict management and post-conflict reconstruction and development, with the assistance of the United Nations and the international community.

Furthermore, during the debate, several conclusions containing specific proposals for the improvement of the Security Council's action in Africa were put forward by speakers. In particular, with regard to conclusions of a more institutional nature, several speakers concurred, *inter alia*, on the need to:

¹⁷ S/PV.4460, pp. 2-5.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-9.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 34-35.

²⁰ S/1998/318.

strengthen the framework for cooperation between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council at the institutional level,²¹ including through the establishment of an ad hoc working group of the Security Council;²² strengthen the cooperation between the Security Council and regional and subregional organizations, particularly OAU;²³ create a framework for consultative cooperation between the Security Council and OAU Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution and such organs as exist within the subregional organizations;²⁴ strengthen the early warning and conflict-prevention mechanisms in Africa, within the framework of OAU and the relevant subregional organizations;²⁵ strengthen the cooperation between the United Nations and the Bretton Woods institutions with regard to the problems of peace, security and development in Africa²⁶.

With regard to recommendations of a more operational nature, proposals by delegations included, inter alia, regular consultations, information sharing and joint projects between African organizations and the United Nations and its structures;²⁷ further coordination in the improvement of the efficiency of sanctions and in minimizing their detrimental effects on the general population, for instance through the

creation of a “permanent follow-up mechanism” on the application of measures imposed by the Council;²⁸ more Security Council visits on the ground in connection with peacekeeping operations in Africa;²⁹ establishment by the Security Council of a working group on Africa with a clear action-oriented mandate;³⁰ more importance and adequate funding for post-conflict development, for instance through programmes of disarmament and reintegration of former combatants to ensure a smoother transition from conflict settlement to post-conflict rehabilitation;³¹ better coordination of activities aimed at curbing the traffic of small arms and light weapons and the illegal exploitation of natural resources of Africa;³² better coordination of activities to tackle the illicit exploitation of natural resources;³³ strengthening the peacekeeping potentials of African States and organizations, including through training and military exercises, exchange of information, logistical support and financing.³⁴

²¹ S/PV.4460, p. 12 (Ireland); p. 21 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); and p. 34 (South Africa, President of the Economic and Social Council); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Colombia); p. 11 (Singapore); p. 18 (Mauritius); and p. 28 (Bangladesh); and S/PV.4460 (Resumption 2), p. 5 (Jamaica).
²² S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 18 (Mauritius); and S/PV.4460 (Resumption 2), p. 15 (Kenya).
²³ S/PV.4460, p. 16 (Mexico); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), pp. 3-4 (China); p. 13 (Syrian Arab Republic); pp. 25-26 (Tunisia); p. 30 (Cuba); and p. 37 (Nigeria); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 2), p. 4 (Ghana); p. 5 (Jamaica); p. 7 (India); and p. 13 (Malaysia).
²⁴ S/PV.4460, p. 10 (United Kingdom); p. 12 (Ireland); p. 19 (Guinea); and p. 20 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Colombia); p. 17 (United States); pp. 21-22 (Egypt); p. 23 (Tunisia); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 2), p. 4 (Ghana); and p. 10 (Ukraine).
²⁵ S/PV.4460, p. 10 (United Kingdom); p. 12 (Ireland); p. 15 (Norway); p. 22 (Algeria); and p. 34 (South Africa); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), pp. 3-4 (China); p. 5 (Russian Federation); p. 7 (Bulgaria); and p. 10 (Singapore).
²⁶ S/PV.4460, p. 15 (Mexico); and S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 28 (Bangladesh).
²⁷ S/PV.4460, p. 10 (United Kingdom); and S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 12 (Syrian Arab Republic).

²⁸ S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 15 (France).
²⁹ S/PV.4460, p. 29 (Mozambique); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 2), p. 3 (Ghana); and p. 13 (Malaysia).
³⁰ S/PV.4460, p. 10 (United Kingdom); p. 18 (Guinea); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 11 (Singapore); p. 15 (France); p. 41 (Canada); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 2), p. 4 (Ghana); and p. 14 (Malaysia).
³¹ S/PV.4460, p. 12 (Ireland); p. 15 (Mexico); pp. 22-23 (Algeria); p. 26 (Zambia); p. 34 (South Africa); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Colombia); pp. 5-6 (Russian Federation); pp. 9-10 (Cameroon); p. 10 (Singapore); p. 13 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 26 (Tunisia); p. 28 (Bangladesh); p. 34 (Côte d’Ivoire); p. 39 (Sierra Leone); and S/PV.4460 (Resumption 2), p. 13 (Malaysia).
³² S/PV.4460, p. 12 (Ireland); p. 16 (Mexico); p. 23 (Algeria); p. 34 (South Africa); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Colombia); p. 7 (Bulgaria); p. 27 (Tunisia); p. 37 (Nigeria); p. 39 (Sierra Leone); p. 41 (Canada); and S/PV.4460 (Resumption 2), p. 3 (Ghana); p. 6 (Jamaica); and p. 16 (Kenya).
³³ S/PV.4460, p. 16 (Mexico); p. 21 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); and S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), pp. 41-42 (Canada).
³⁴ S/PV.4460, p. 23 (Algeria); p. 34 (South Africa); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Colombia); p. 5 (Russian Federation); p. 9 (Cameroon); p. 22 (Egypt); p. 26 (Tunisia); and S/PV.4460 (Resumption 2), p. 3 (Ghana); p. 8 (India); and p. 12 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).

At the 4465th meeting, on 31 January 2002, the President (Mauritius) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁵ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed the principles of political independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of all States;

Underscored the importance of partnership and enhance coordination and cooperation between the United Nations, OAU and subregional organizations in Africa in the promotion of regional peace and stability; called on the United Nations system to intensify its cooperation to OAU and subregional organizations in Africa; stressed that good governance, democracy, rule of law, disarmament, and respect of human rights and the fight against poverty were essential for peace, stability and sustainable development in Africa;

Expressed concern over the effects of conflicts on civilian populations and underlined the need to address the problem of refugees and displaced persons;

Urged the international community and donors to coordinate their effort in the fight against AIDS;

Called upon donor countries and the Bretton Woods institutions to continue assisting Africa in implementing initiatives in support of economic growth and poverty reduction.

Deliberations of 22 May 2002 (4538th meeting)

At its 4538th meeting,³⁶ on 22 May 2002, the Council included in its agenda the question of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa. The Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Africa, following which statements were made by some Council members (Colombia, China, France, Ireland, Mauritius, Mexico, Norway and the United Kingdom),³⁷ the representatives of Algeria, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin (on behalf of the Group of African States), the Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (on behalf of the Community of Sahelo-Saharan States),³⁸

Japan, Malawi, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain (on behalf of the European Union³⁹), South Africa, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia, as well as by the Permanent Observer of OAU,⁴⁰ the President of the Economic and Social Council, the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, and the Special Representative of the European Union Presidency for the Mano River Union countries.⁴¹

In his introductory remarks, the President of the Council (Singapore) noted that, following the establishment of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Africa in February 2002, the meeting was envisaged as an "outreach" session that would give the wider membership an opportunity to provide its input and feedback on the work of the Working Group, through a frank and interactive discussion.⁴²

In his first briefing to the Council, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Africa noted that the Working Group had been set up to monitor the recommendations contained in the statement by the President of 31 January 2002 and to enhance coordination with the Economic and Social Council.⁴³ He then outlined the programme of work of the Working Group which, on the basis of the note by the President dated 1 March 2002,⁴⁴ included

Republic, Chad, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, the Gambia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Morocco, the Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, the Sudan, Togo and Tunisia, with Liberia as an observer.

³⁹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement. The representative of Spain, after his statement, gave the floor to the Special Representative of the Presidency of the European Union to countries of the Mano River Union.

⁴⁰ At the outset of the meeting, the President of the Security Council drew the attention of Council members to a letter dated 20 May 2002 from the representative of Mauritius addressed to the President of the Security Council, requesting that the Council extend an invitation to the Permanent Observer of OAU to the United Nations (S/2002/554).

⁴¹ The representatives of Angola, Burundi, Cape Verde, Gabon, Pakistan and Malaysia were invited to participate in the meeting but did not make statements.

⁴² S/PV.4538, p. 3.

⁴³ S/PRST/2002/2.

⁴⁴ S/2002/207.

³⁵ S/PRST/2002/2.

³⁶ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. VI, part II, sect. B, case 8, in regard to relations between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council in relation to Article 65 of the Charter; and chap. XII, part II, case 16, in regard to Article 24.

³⁷ The representatives of Bulgaria, Cameroon, Guinea, the Russian Federation, Singapore, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United States did not make statements.

³⁸ The members of the Community of Sahelo-Saharan States are Benin, Burkina Faso, the Central African

strengthening cooperation and coordination between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council; encouraging confidence-building in the region of the Mano River Union; enhancing the role of the special representatives of the Secretary-General in Africa; examining ways in which the United Nations could provide assistance to electoral observation and processes; the establishment of groups of friends for specific conflict situations; addressing the need for enhanced cooperation with OAU and other subregional organizations and the Security Council; and enlisting the contribution of non-governmental organizations, universities and academia in the work of the Working Group. Acknowledging that the programme of work was “quite ambitious”, the Chairman of the Working Group welcomed any views by non-Council members on how the Working Group could be operationalized to address the situation in Africa in concrete ways.⁴⁵

In his statement, the President of the Economic and Social Council welcomed the establishment of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Africa as another important step in the improvement of cooperation between major United Nations bodies. He noted that, as a central intergovernmental body for coordination in the United Nations system, the Economic and Social Council could help in addressing the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa and create an effective partnership with the Security Council on the implementation of conflict prevention and recovery strategies. He highlighted the proposal that the Economic and Social Council establish its own ad hoc advisory group on African countries emerging from conflict.⁴⁶

The Permanent Observer of OAU observed that OAU, being at a critical stage of its development that would lead to the creation of the African Union,⁴⁷ was undertaking a review of its structure and methods in the area of conflict prevention. Noting that one proposal which had emerged was the creation of a central organ for conflict prevention, he encouraged, inter alia, the Working Group to promote and strengthen cooperative mechanisms between OAU, subregional organizations and the Council in order to

rationalize efforts in the area of prevention of conflict.⁴⁸

The Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, while stressing that the Security Council had devoted considerable time and efforts over the past five years on African issues and had strengthened bilateral cooperation between the United Nations and African organizations, welcomed the establishment of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Africa as the missing link in the work of the Council that would enable it to strengthen its cooperation with regional and subregional organizations in Africa. In addition to the regular consultations between the Working Group and the Permanent Observer of OAU in New York, he proposed the rationalization of the system of international exchanges between the Security Council and the Central Organ of OAU for periodic discussion of questions on the agenda of the two organizations that could have an impact on peace and security in Africa. Such a system, he added, could also be extended to all subregional African organizations.⁴⁹

Speakers generally welcomed the establishment of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Africa and, inter alia, supported its mandate and programme of work. Stressing that the root causes of conflict included poverty and underdevelopment and highlighting the relationship between peacebuilding and socio-economic development, several speakers supported the increased cooperation being developed between the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council, also through the efforts of the Working Group; proposed to enhance cooperation between the Security Council and OAU, as well as with other African subregional organizations, on conflict prevention and resolution, in particular between the Central Organ of the OAU Mechanism and the Working Group; stressed the important role of African-driven initiatives, such as NEPAD, in promoting good governance and economic responsibility; recalling the importance of conflict prevention, emphasized that regional organizations could help in providing early warning to the Security Council and the United Nations in general.

⁴⁵ S/PV.4538, pp. 3-5.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

⁴⁷ On 8 July 2002, the Organization of African Unity ceased to exist and was replaced by the African Union.

⁴⁸ S/PV.4538, pp. 7-8.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-11.

Deliberations of 18 July 2002 (4577th meeting)

At the 4577th meeting,⁵⁰ on 18 July 2002, the President of the Security Council (United Kingdom) explained that, following introductory statements by the Secretary-General and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Sierra Leone and Guinea, the meeting would have the format of a workshop divided in two parts: “Lessons learned in Sierra Leone” in the morning session; and “Developing a coordinated action plan for the Mano River” in the afternoon session. Referring to the former session, the President acknowledged that, although peace was finally established in Sierra Leone, enormous post-conflict challenges remained in the delicate transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding. She therefore stated that it was important to learn the lessons from the United Nations experience that might be relevant to other conflict situations and to consider how the United Nations could focus more on peacebuilding in Sierra Leone. Concerning the situation in the Mano River Union, the President of the Security Council stressed the importance of looking at ways to work with the countries in the Mano River Union to support a regional approach and of raising the United Nations profile to facilitate and coordinate the peace process in Liberia.⁵¹

In his briefing, the Secretary-General stated that the United Nations peacekeeping experience in Sierra Leone offered invaluable lessons, not only because of the success achieved by the Mission, but also due to the trials encountered in the early stages of the peacekeeping operation. Noting that when the United Nations decided to get involved in operations in “fluid and ambiguous” situations, it had to be prepared for the unpredictable, the Secretary-General observed that the key factors were effective preparation, adequate resources, enough analysis and information to anticipate how the crisis could develop, and the resources and political will to stay engaged until the objectives were achieved.⁵²

The Ministers for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Sierra Leone, highlighting

various lessons learned from UNAMSIL as well as the unique character of the mission, held the view that in deciding to deploy a peace operation, the United Nations should, *inter alia*, take into account the particular circumstances of the conflict, the capacity of regional and subregional organizations to perform peacekeeping activities, the humanitarian dimension of the conflict, the role of natural resources in fuelling the conflict, and the special role of certain countries. He noted that the success of UNAMSIL in achieving its objectives was due in large part to the fact that the peace operation reflected the links among peacekeeping, peacebuilding, good governance, security, and post-conflict concerns, as well as to its acting in concert with regional and bilateral partners. However, citing the escalating violence in Liberia and the movements of refugees, he emphasized the importance of applying the lessons learned in Sierra Leone to the entire subregion.⁵³

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guinea argued that one of the key factors which contributed to the success of UNAMSIL was represented by the fact that the mission had been given a clear and precise mandate and that appropriate resources were devoted. Believing that the United Nations should continue to promote peacebuilding in Sierra Leone, he outlined a number of measures for consideration by the Council, which included, *inter alia*, the restructuring of the army and the police, the extension of State authority throughout the country, the promotion of good governance and human rights, and programmes to combat poverty. Expressing concern at the situation in Liberia, which, unlike Sierra Leone, had not experienced a real exit strategy at the end of the war, he hoped that a number of measures could be adopted, such as: a ceasefire; continued inter-Liberian dialogue; a genuine disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme; the adoption of an economic recovery programme; the extension of the Liberian authority throughout the country; and the continuation of sanctions until the conditions stipulated in the relevant Security Council resolutions were met by the Government of Liberia.⁵⁴

Following the remarks by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Sierra Leone and Guinea, the Council started the session regarding “Lessons learned

⁵⁰ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. VI, part II, sect. B, case 8, with regard to relations between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council in relation to Article 65 of the Charter; and chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to sanctions and Article 41.

⁵¹ S/PV.4577, p. 3

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-7.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.

in Sierra Leone". Statements were made by the representatives of some Council members,⁵⁵ Japan, as well as the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, the Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator, the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone, the President of the Economic and Social Council and the Deputy Permanent Observer of the African Union.⁵⁶

Focusing on the crisis which occurred in Sierra Leone following the abduction of several hundred United Nations peacekeepers, the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations maintained that the crucial factors for the success of UNAMSIL included the willingness of the Council to strengthen the Mission's mandate and to build up troop levels, as well as the readiness by Member States to provide the necessary resources for the Mission. Citing other key lessons from the experience of UNAMSIL, he highlighted different elements such as: unity among key actors, which had translated into clarity of objectives and clearer rules of engagement; quality, training and support for Mission personnel and political guidance behind the Mission; the integrated nature of the Mission; the reassessment of the mission in the light of changed circumstances on the ground; the review of the force command structure and the restructuring of the non-military elements; and the continuous political engagement of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) after the withdrawal of the ECOWAS Monitoring Group. While recognizing the role played by the United Kingdom in Sierra Leone, he noted that the "lead nation" approach would not necessarily be applicable to all future situations. In concluding his remarks, the Under-Secretary-General observed that sustained efforts were needed in the move from peacekeeping to peacebuilding, particularly by supporting the efforts of the Government of Sierra Leone to achieve long-term development, capacity-building, national reconciliation, security sector

development, good governance and the full reintegration of former combatants.⁵⁷

The Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator focused on the issue of the protection of civilians and the importance of an integrated approach in Sierra Leone. While recognizing that the UNAMSIL mandate was exemplary in terms of including the protection of civilians, she added that one of the lessons learned was that it could have been even more comprehensive had it specifically referred to the special protection and assistance needs of women and girls.⁵⁸

In his statement, the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997), outlining some lessons learned with respect to the sanctions applied in Sierra Leone, held the view that the arms embargo had a limited effect because the presence of UNAMSIL and the successful disarmament process had led to the eradication of the circulation of weapons in the country. Noting that sanctions were not a guarantee that weapons would not pass back into Sierra Leone, he stressed that emphasis should be placed on compliance with sanctions by third parties and that an additional effort should be made by the international community to identify the origin of the weapons circulating in the Mano River Union region and to review and update regularly the list of individuals subject to travel restrictions, in order to stimulate political processes in the countries of the region.⁵⁹

In their statements related to the lessons learned in Sierra Leone, speakers, *inter alia*, focused on the importance of the following factors: flexibility in responding to changing circumstances; integrated efforts, both within United Nations agencies and between the United Nations and regional players; comprehensive approach and regional cooperation; rapid agreement to an appropriate and robust mandate for any peacekeeping force, backed up with adequate financing and resources; integrated humanitarian efforts, economic rehabilitation and reconstruction both in the short and long term; security sector and justice reform in the post-conflict phase.

The representative of the United States expressed the view that each conflict had many variables, and "overpromising" and "overextending" the United

⁵⁵ Bulgaria, Cameroon, Colombia, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United States.

⁵⁶ The President of the Security Council drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 15 July 2002 from the representative of the United Kingdom addressed to the President of the Security Council requesting that the Deputy Permanent Observer of the African Union be invited to the meeting (S/2002/761).

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-12.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-16.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-19.

Nations capacity to deliver on the ground would not solve a conflict situation. He added that the United Nations and the Council should stand ready to support the parties' efforts and foster an environment in which peace could take root. However, while rejecting the idea that the events in Sierra Leone provided universal lessons for the United Nations, he stated that one of the lessons learned from Sierra Leone was that the Security Council and the United Nations could better manage their efforts in the peacekeeping, diplomatic and humanitarian field to support peace processes in conflict situations in which there was an existing commitment by the parties to resolve the conflict.⁶⁰

Upon the resumption of the 4577th meeting, devoted to the topic "Developing a coordinated action plan for the Mano River", the Council heard briefings by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, the Director for West Africa of UNDP, the Deputy Executive Secretary of ECOWAS,⁶¹ the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa and the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia. Statements were also made by some Council members,⁶² the representatives of Morocco and Sierra Leone,⁶³ and the Senior Social Protection Specialist for Regional Human Development of the World Bank.

Concentrating his remarks at the situation in Liberia and at the political efforts to stabilize the subregion, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs warned that the instability in Liberia risked hampering the significant gains made in the peace process in Sierra Leone. He opined that the current containment policy towards Liberia had its limitations and should therefore be complemented with a coherent and constructive political agenda. In that respect, he

held that the international community should encourage and support the efforts by ECOWAS and Liberian political and civil society organizations to exert pressure on President Taylor to create a conducive environment for carrying out security sector reforms and for promoting good governance, dialogue and national reconciliation. He also held the view that the time might have come for the establishment of a Contact Group on the Mano River Union.⁶⁴

Focusing on a development perspective, the Director for West Africa of UNDP suggested two strategies which included mandating the United Nations Office for West Africa to prepare, in association with the Mano River Union secretariat in ECOWAS, a coordinated and integrated United Nations Assistance Framework and Development Strategy for the region to support, on the development side, the Rabat peace process and help in building confidence among parties by focusing on key cross-border initiatives on issues such as HIV/AIDS, fishing rights and cross-border trade.⁶⁵

The Deputy Executive Secretary of ECOWAS held that peace and security in the Mano River region was based on three basic pillars: the maintenance of internal peace in Sierra Leone, through the continuation of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process, the reconstruction of State institutions and national reconciliation; peace in the Mano River region through, inter alia, the demobilization of armed groups in the region; and the importance of peace being restored in the subregion in the context of ECOWAS. With regard to the action that the Security Council could take to support the efforts of ECOWAS, he suggested that its institutions and decisions could be strengthened and efforts could be made to pressure all parties in Liberia to sit at the negotiating table.⁶⁶

Following the statements by the keynote speakers, most delegations, inter alia, noted the need to encourage regional efforts of reconciliation within Liberia and between Liberia and its neighbours; supported the Mano River Union and ECOWAS in their efforts to promote greater security and confidence-building measures between the three countries; recognized the importance of the new United

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 21.

⁶¹ Upon the resumption of the meeting, the President of the Security Council drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 15 July 2002 from the representative of the United Kingdom addressed to the President of the Security Council requesting that the Deputy Executive Secretary of ECOWAS be invited to the meeting (S/2002/760).

⁶² China, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union), France, Guinea, Ireland, Norway and the Russian Federation. Guinea was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

⁶³ Sierra Leone was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation.

⁶⁴ S/PV.4577 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3.

⁶⁵ Ibid., pp. 4-5.

⁶⁶ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

Nations Office for West Africa as a focal point for United Nations support of regional efforts and those within Liberia itself; concurred on the need to reinforce efforts to control the flow of small arms and stop the illegal exploitation of natural resources; agreed that sanctions had played a positive role in the search for peace in Sierra Leone, but at the same time, there was the need to reconcile differences between the Council and others on the future of sanctions, particularly in relation to Liberia; emphasized the need to strengthen the mediation and conflict resolution efforts of ECOWAS, and the possible role of the European Union

in that endeavour; concurred that it was crucial for the United Nations to mobilize resources for peacebuilding as well as peacekeeping in order to create the right environment to promote investment in the region over the long-term; stressed the importance for the international community of being engaged with Liberia and the need for a comprehensive conflict-resolution strategy for Liberia; acknowledged the critical role played by the Security Council in bringing key players together, including the international financial institutions and relevant countries in the region; and supported the creation of a Mano River Union Contact Group.

13. The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia

Decision of 12 May 2000 (4142nd meeting): resolution 1297 (2000)

At its 4142nd meeting,¹ on 12 May 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the report on the Security Council special mission visit to Eritrea and Ethiopia on 9 and 10 May 2000.² In its report, the mission noted that the Organization of African Unity (OAU) negotiations had produced a substantial number of agreements and drafts on a ceasefire, withdrawal, interim arrangements and arbitration and final demarcation of the disputed territory between Eritrea and Ethiopia. The mission observed that the differences between Eritrea and Ethiopia, while real, were clearly relatively small and manageable and could be resolved by intensive negotiations over time. Nevertheless, the two sides were on the verge of resuming a senseless war over these differences. The mission had concentrated on creating a mechanism to get past this blockage without going inside the “box” of the details of the OAU negotiations. The mechanism eventually agreed was a draft resolution calling for proximity talks to resume at the invitation of OAU, although the mission had stressed that any resolution would be the sole responsibility of the full Council and that the

mission would only seek the views of the two sides, not be bound by them.

The President (China) then drew the attention of the Council to several documents: a letter dated 12 May 2000 from the representative of Eritrea, in which he stated that Ethiopia had renewed aggression against Eritrea and requested the Council to condemn Ethiopia’s resumption of the war and to support Eritrea’s right to self-defence;³ letters dated 11 and 12 May 2000 from the representative of Ethiopia, asserting that Eritrea was the aggressor and had sabotaged the peace talks and calling on the Council to assist in stopping the war; and transmitting a letter of 12 May on the origins and current status of the conflict, respectively;⁴ and a letter dated 12 May 2000 from the representative of Algeria, transmitting a communiqué from the Chairman of OAU.⁵

He also drew attention to a draft resolution;⁶ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1297 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Strongly condemned the renewed fighting between Ethiopia and Eritrea;

Demanded that both parties immediately cease all military action and refrain from the use of force;

Demanded the earliest possible reconvening of substantive peace talks on the basis of the Framework

¹ During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held a number of meetings in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea, pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B.

The meetings were held on 10 September 2001 (4369th), 14 March 2002 (4491st), 13 August 2002 (4599th), 10 March 2003 (4716th) and 9 September 2003 (4821st).
² S/2000/413.

³ S/2000/420.

⁴ S/2000/421 and S/2000/422.

⁵ S/2000/427.

⁶ S/2000/419.

Agreement and the Modalities for Implementation⁷ and of the work conducted by OAU; resolved to meet again within 72 hours of the adoption of the resolution to take immediate steps to ensure compliance with this resolution in the event that hostilities continue;

Reaffirmed its full support for the efforts of OAU and of other interested parties;

Endorsed the Framework Agreement and the Modalities for Implementation as the basis for the peaceful resolution of the dispute between the two parties;

Endorsed also the communiqué of 5 May 2000 issued by the current Chairman of OAU, which recorded the achievements of OAU-led negotiations;

Called on both parties to ensure the safety of the civilian populations and fully respect human rights and international humanitarian law.

**Decision of 17 May 2000 (4144th meeting):
resolution 1298 (2000)**

At the 4144th meeting, on 17 May 2000, the President (China) drew the attention of the Council to the following documents: a letter dated 15 May 2000 from the representative of Ethiopia;⁸ a letter dated 15 May 2000 from the representative of Ethiopia;⁹ and a letter dated 12 May 2000 from the representative of Portugal.¹⁰

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by Bangladesh, Canada, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States;¹¹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as

resolution 1298 (2000), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, *inter alia*:

Strongly condemned the continued fighting between Eritrea and Ethiopia;

Demanded that both parties immediately cease all military action and refrain from the further use of force;

Requested that the current Chairman of OAU consider dispatching his Personal Envoy to the region to seek immediate cessation of hostilities and resumption of the peace talks; decided that all States should prevent: (a) the sale or supply to Eritrea and Ethiopia, by their nationals or from their territories, or using their flag vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles and equipment, paramilitary equipment and spare parts for the aforementioned, whether or not originating in their territory; (b) any provision to Eritrea and Ethiopia by their nationals or from their territories of technical assistance or training related to the provision, manufacture, maintenance or use of the items in (a) above;

Decided also that the measures imposed should not apply to supplies of non-lethal military equipment intended solely for humanitarian use, as approved in advance by the Committee established pursuant to the resolution;

Decided to establish a Committee of the Security Council consisting of all the members of the Council, to undertake tasks and to report on its work to the Council with its observations and recommendations;

Decided that the measures imposed above were established for 12 months and that, at the end of the period, the Council would decide whether the Governments of Eritrea and Ethiopia had complied with those measures, and, accordingly, whether to extend the measures for a further period with the same conditions;

Decided also that the measures imposed should be terminated immediately if the Secretary-General reported that a peaceful definitive settlement of the conflict has been concluded.

**Decision of 31 July 2000 (4181st meeting):
resolution 1312 (2000)**

At its 4181st meeting, on 31 July 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea of 30 June 2000,¹² in which the Secretary-General, *inter alia*, welcomed the signing of the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities on 18 June 2000. He noted that the parties had called upon the United Nations, in cooperation with OAU, to establish a peacekeeping

⁷ See S/1998/1223, annex, and S/1999/794, annex.

⁸ S/2000/430, transmitting a letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs, who stated that the Council had not been fair to Ethiopia, which was the victim of aggression, and expressed disappointment in resolution 1297 (2000). He reiterated that Ethiopia was prepared to go immediately to the proximity talks and commence where they had left off on 5 May 2000. Observing that the Council was contemplating punitive measures, including an arms embargo, on Ethiopia, he stressed that the decision would send a message that the principles of international law had no relevance to the region and would be a recipe for disaster.

⁹ S/2000/435, transmitting a communiqué of the sixty-fourth session of the Central Organ of the Organization of African Unity, which appealed to both parties to put an immediate end to hostilities.

¹⁰ S/2000/437, transmitting a statement by the Presidency of the European Union on behalf of the European Union.

¹¹ S/2000/440.

¹² S/2000/643.

operation and a Military Coordination Commission to assist in the implementation of the Agreement. Finally, he noted that the Agreement called upon the Council to adopt “appropriate measures” under Chapter VII of the Charter should the parties violate their commitments.

The President (Jamaica) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 19 June 2000 from the representative of Algeria;¹³ letters dated 20 June and 21 July 2000 from the representative of Eritrea;¹⁴ and letters dated 26 June and 18 July 2000 from the representative of Ethiopia.¹⁵

The President also drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁶ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1312 (2000), by which the Council, inter alia:

Decided to establish the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea consisting of up to 100 military observers and the necessary civilian support staff until 31 January 2001, in anticipation of a peacekeeping operation subject to future Council authorization;

Called on the parties to provide the Mission with the access, assistance, support and protection required for the performance of its duties; requested the parties to facilitate the deployment of mine action experts and assets under the United Nations Mine Action Service to further assess the mine and unexploded ordnance problem and to provide technical assistance to the parties to carry out emergency mine action required;

Decided that the measures imposed by paragraph 6 of its resolution 1298 (2000) should not apply to the sale or supply of equipment and related materiel for the use of the United Nations Mine Action Service, or to the provision of related technical assistance and training by that Service;

Requested the Secretary-General to continue planning for a peacekeeping operation and to begin to take the administrative measures for assembling such a mission, which would be subject to future Council authorization.

**Decision of 15 September 2000
(4197th meeting): resolution 1320 (2000)**

At its 4187th meeting, on 14 August 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 9 August 2000.¹⁷ In his report, the Secretary-General provided information on the establishment and progress of the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) and set out proposals regarding its expanded mandate and structure, which envisaged up to 2,400 personnel. He noted that the parties had proposed under the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities that UNMEE terminate with the successful conclusion of the delimitation and demarcation of the border. He expected that the parties would exercise every restraint and avoid provocative moves in complying with the commitments they had made under the Agreement and extend their full cooperation to UNMEE in the implementation of its mandate.¹⁸

At the meeting, the Council then heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, after which all Council members¹⁹ and the representatives of Ethiopia, Eritrea, Japan and Norway made statements. The President (Malaysia) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 11 August 2000 from the representative of Ethiopia.²⁰

The Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations detailed the concept of operations to be put into effect by UNMEE and informed the Council about its initial deployment. He also warned about the dire

¹³ S/2000/601, transmitting the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities.

¹⁴ Formally requesting that the United Nations take the necessary measures to deploy a peacekeeping mission under the auspices of OAU to assist the parties in implementing the agreement (S/2000/612); and requesting the Security Council to investigate the incident on 17 July 2000 when Ethiopian aircraft had violated Eritrean airspace (S/2000/726).

¹⁵ Formally requesting that the United Nations take the necessary measures to deploy a peacekeeping mission under the auspices of OAU to assist the parties in implementing the agreement and denying the allegations made by Eritrea (S/2000/627); and calling for a United Nations investigation into the claims (S/2000/704).

¹⁶ S/2000/729.

¹⁷ S/2000/785, submitted pursuant to paragraph 7 of resolution 1312 (2000).

¹⁸ For details regarding the mandate and structure of UNMEE, see chapter V.

¹⁹ The representative of France spoke on behalf of the European Union. Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁰ S/2000/793, transmitting a statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding the alleged expulsion of Ethiopians from Eritrea on 30 July and on 2, 4 and 7 August 2000, and calling on the international community to take a firm stand publicly against treatment of Ethiopians in Eritrea.

humanitarian situation in Eritrea and Ethiopia and called for massive humanitarian relief.²¹

In their statements, participants covered a number of general topics, including, *inter alia*, the humanitarian situation; the deployment of UNMEE; the importance of determining the common border; the need for demining; the arms embargo; and the importance of the public information component of the Mission, as well as the need for both sides to end negative propaganda. Most of the representatives welcomed the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities, the efforts of the President of Algeria and OAU, and the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General. A number of speakers expressed concern about the suspension of the latest round of talks between the parties.

The representative of Eritrea stressed that his country would remain committed to all agreements reached thus far and to those to come in the future between Eritrea and Ethiopia. He reiterated that Eritrea had been invaded and occupied by neighbouring Ethiopia since last May and that the act of invasion in the pursuit of territorial claims was of course a violation of the Charter of the United Nations, of OAU and of international law. He held the view that the report of the Secretary-General was not balanced on the humanitarian developments as it had omitted any mention of the 71,000 Eritreans that had been expelled from Ethiopia, of civilian casualties and of the deliberate destruction of infrastructure by the Ethiopian army. Finally, he emphasized that the deployment of the full peacekeeping operation needed to be expedited.²²

The representative of Ethiopia hoped the Security Council would act sooner rather than later in authorizing and deploying the peacekeeping force. He emphasized that his country had been a victim of blatant aggression, and they had made their best effort to end the conflict peacefully. He complained that while his Government had adhered to the peace agreement, thousands of people were being deported from Eritrea to Ethiopia under inhumane and harsh conditions. He also rejected the allegations made by Eritrea as blatant lies.²³

At its 4197th meeting, on 15 September 2000, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 9 August.¹⁷ The President (Mali) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;²⁴ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1320 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Authorized the deployment within UNMEE of up to 4,200 troops including up to 220 military observers until 15 March 2001;

Called on the parties to take whatever action might be necessary to ensure the Mission's access, safety and freedom of movement and to provide assistance, support and protection;

Requested the Governments of Ethiopia and Eritrea to conclude status-of-forces agreements with the Secretary-General within 30 days;

Urged the parties to ensure the safe and unhindered access of humanitarian personnel to all those in need;

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, decided that the measures imposed by paragraph 6 of its resolution 1298 (2000) should not apply to the sale and supply of arms, equipment and related materiel for the sole use in Ethiopia or Eritrea of the United Nations.

Decision of 21 November 2000 (4230th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4227th meeting, on 17 November 2000, the Council heard a briefing by the Secretary-General, after which most members of the Council made statements.²⁵

In his briefing, the Secretary-General observed that the military deployment of UNMEE was proceeding on schedule, and that the situation on the ground appeared to have stabilized in recent weeks.²⁶

Most of the representatives expressed appreciation at the good progress of the Mission deployment, but stressed that the conflict needed to be resolved through a comprehensive peace agreement between the two parties, supported by OAU and the Council. A number of speakers stressed the role of UNMEE was to provide breathing space to facilitate the resolution of differences and could not be considered as a solution to the conflict itself. A few

²¹ S/PV.4187, pp. 2-4.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 20-22.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

²⁴ S/2000/867.

²⁵ The representative of Tunisia did not make a statement.

The Netherlands was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

²⁶ S/PV.4227, p. 2.

speakers emphasized the importance of ensuring the safe access of humanitarian personnel to the population in need.

The President of the Security Council (Netherlands) proposed the establishment of a group of friends of the peace process, as well as some initial confidence-building measures, including the release of interned civilians, the opening of a land and air corridor for UNMEE, and an exchange of prisoners.²⁷ Many delegations welcomed the suggestions on confidence-building measures.²⁸

The representative of Argentina stressed that the use of force in international relations was not a valid means for the acquisition of territory under international law as could be seen from Article 2 (4) of the Charter, and that States were obliged to peacefully solve disputes, as stipulated in Article 2 (3) and 33. Therefore, the withdrawal of troops to defined positions did not prejudice the final status of the disputed territory, which could only result from negotiations conducted by the parties to delineate and demarcate the border.²⁹

At the 4230th meeting, on 21 November 2000, the President (Netherlands) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Noted with appreciation the rounds of proximity talks that have taken place and, pursuant to paragraph 14 of resolution 1320 (2000), called on the parties to continue negotiations and to conclude without delay a final and comprehensive peace settlement; emphasized that the deployment of UNMEE should contribute to a positive climate for negotiations and that it did not replace the need for such a peace settlement;

Reiterated its strong support for the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities between the Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia and the Government of the State of Eritrea signed in Algiers on 18 June 2000;

Underlined the important role which confidence-building measures could play in dispelling the remaining distrust between Ethiopia and Eritrea, and encouraged both States to agree on a package of such measures;

Encouraged the parties to agree on the immediate release and voluntary and orderly return of interned civilians under the auspices of the International Committee of the Red Cross

(ICRC); the opening of land and air corridors for UNMEE; an exchange of maps showing mined areas; the prompt release of prisoners of war and their return under the auspices of ICRC; and a moratorium on expulsions; underlined the importance of the full compliance of Member States with the arms embargo imposed by resolution 1298 (2000).

Decision of 9 February 2001 (4275th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4275th meeting, on 9 February 2001, the Council included in its agenda the progress report of the Secretary-General on Ethiopia and Eritrea of 12 January 2001.³¹ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that the Peace Agreement of 12 December signed by the parties constituted a major achievement. He added that UNMEE was deploying rapidly, but the delay in establishing the temporary security zone was a source of concern. The work of the Boundary Commission would be particularly crucial. As mines and unexploded ordnance remained the pre-eminent threat to UNMEE and the population around the temporary security zone, he urged the international community to increase its support for demining activities and mine-awareness programmes as well as for the Trust Fund and the Boundary Commission.

At the meeting, the President (Tunisia) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reiterated its strong support for the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities signed by the parties in Algiers on 18 June 2000 and welcomed the subsequent Peace Agreement signed in Algiers on 12 December 2000³³ and the agreement reached by the parties on 6 February 2001 to move forward with the establishment of the temporary security zone on 12 February 2001;

Expressed its strong support for the Secretary-General's role in continuing to help implement the Algiers Agreement; drew the urgent attention of Member States to the fact that funds provided to date for border delimitation and demarcation, through the United Nations Trust Fund, remained clearly inadequate to meet the expenses of the Boundary Commission; noted with appreciation the expeditious deployment of UNMEE and expressed appreciation to the troop-contributing countries and to those Member States that had provided UNMEE with additional assets;

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (United States); p. 6 (United Kingdom, France); p. 7 (Canada); p. 8 (Bangladesh); p. 10 (Jamaica); and p. 11 (Namibia).

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

³⁰ S/PRST/2000/34.

³¹ S/2001/45, submitted pursuant to paragraph 12 of resolution 1320 (2000).

³² S/PRST/2001/4.

³³ S/2000/1183, annex.

Urged the parties to cooperate fully with UNMEE in the implementation of its mandate and to facilitate mine action in coordination with the United Nations Mine Action Service;

Encouraged both parties to release civilians that remained interned and to ensure the continued safe and unhindered access of humanitarian assistance to those in need.

Decision of 15 March 2001 (4294th meeting): resolution 1344 (2001)

At its 4294th meeting, on 15 March 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 7 March 2001.³⁴ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that despite the difficulties that had emerged, particularly with regard to the establishment of the temporary security zone, Ethiopia and Eritrea had generally continued to demonstrate commitment to the implementation of the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities of 18 June 2000. He emphasized that it was essential that both parties granted UNMEE unconditional freedom of movement, including the establishment of the most practicable direct flights between the two capitals. He also stressed that the establishment of the Boundary Commission and the Claims Commission, and the submission of claims and evidence with the set time-frame, as the termination of UNMEE was linked to the final demarcation of the border. He recommended, *inter alia*, the inclusion of the support to the Boundary Commission in the budget of UNMEE, and the extension of the mandate of UNMEE for six months, and its adjustment to include the support to the Boundary Commission.

At the meeting, the President (Ukraine) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 15 March 2001 from the representative of Eritrea addressed to the President of the Security Council,³⁵ and to a draft resolution;³⁶ the draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1344 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

³⁴ S/2001/202, submitted pursuant to resolution 1320 (2000).

³⁵ S/2001/229, referring to the report of the Secretary-General and highlighting a number of points in the report that the Government of Eritrea felt had not been addressed adequately.

³⁶ S/2001/223.

Decided to extend the mandate of UNMEE at the troop and military observer levels authorized by its resolution 1320 (2000) until 15 September 2001;

Called upon the parties to continue working towards the full implementation of their agreement and to fulfil the following obligations: (a) to ensure freedom of movement and access for UNMEE; (b) to establish a direct air corridor between Addis Ababa and Asmara for the safety of United Nations personnel; (c) to conclude Status of Forces Agreements with the Secretary-General; (d) to facilitate mine action in coordination with the United Nations Mine Action Service;

Decided to consider the recommendations in paragraphs 50 and 53 of the Secretary-General's report upon receipt of more detailed information;

Called upon all States and international organizations to consider providing further support to the peace process.

Decision of 15 May 2001 (4320th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4310th meeting,³⁷ on 19 April 2001, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, after which all Council members made statements.

The Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations informed Council members about, *inter alia*, the establishment of the Temporary Security Zone on 18 April 2001, which marked the formal separation of the forces of Ethiopia and Eritrea. He noted that the most immediate challenge facing Eritrea was the return of up to 300,000 displaced persons to the Temporary Security Zone. He informed the Council that the deployment of UNMEE was almost complete. Noting that some issues relating to freedom of movement for UNMEE, including the question of direct flights between the capitals, were unresolved, he recommended that the Council encourage the parties to cooperate fully with UNMEE and with the Boundary Commission.³⁸

In their statements, delegations welcomed the establishment of the temporary security zone. Several participants expressed concern about the question of the internally displaced persons and refugees, as well as the issue of the direct flights between Addis Ababa and Asmara.

³⁷ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41 of the Charter.

³⁸ S/PV.4310 and Corr.1, pp. 2-4.

The representative of the Russian Federation maintained that the forward-moving process of stabilization in the conflict zone reaffirmed their consistent position regarding the need for an early lifting of sanctions against both States.³⁹

At the 4320th meeting, on 15 May 2001, the President (United States) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁴⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reiterated its strong support for the Secretary-General's role in helping to implement the Agreements; reiterated its appreciation for the continued deployment of UNMEE both to the troop-contributing countries and to those Member States that had provided UNMEE with additional assets;

Encouraged both parties to continue working towards the full and prompt implementation of the Agreements including cooperation with the Boundary Commission and, in this context, to take concrete confidence-building measures; stressed that the parties must provide free movement and access for UNMEE and its supplies as required throughout the territories of the parties, without any restrictions, including within the Temporary Security Zone and the 15-km wide adjacent area; called on the parties to cooperate fully and expeditiously with UNMEE in the implementation of its mandate;

Further called on the parties to continue to facilitate mine action in coordination with the United Nations Mine Action Service;

Noted that the current arms embargo would expire on 16 May 2001;

Urged the parties to ensure that efforts were redirected from weapons procurement and other military activities towards the reconstruction and development of both economies, and regional reconciliation, with a view to achieving stability in the Horn of Africa.

**Decision of 14 September 2001
(4372nd meeting): resolution 1369 (2001)**

At its 4372nd meeting, on 14 September 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 5 September 2001.⁴¹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that in its first year, UNMEE had seen gradual consolidation of the progress achieved previously. The Temporary Security Zone, established in April 2001, was operational and, despite the fact that the two Governments had not formally accepted the map, their

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁴⁰ S/PRST/2001/14.

⁴¹ The report (S/2001/843) was submitted pursuant to resolution 1344 (2001).

de facto respect for it on the ground was a good sign. The majority of internally displaced persons had also returned to their homes. However, freedom of movement for the Mission, including direct flights between Addis Ababa and Asmara, was still lacking, and political developments in both countries had given rise to anxieties about the peace process. Stressing that progress in the peace process could be sustained, he recommended that the mandate of UNMEE be extended for six months.

At the meeting, the President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution,⁴² it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1369 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of UNMEE at the troop and military observer levels authorized by its resolution 1320 (2000) until 15 March 2002;

Called on the parties to cooperate with UNMEE in the implementation of its mandate and to abide scrupulously by the letter and spirit of their agreements, including regarding cooperation with the Boundary Commission and facilitation of its work;

Called on the parties to urgently resolve the outstanding issues in accordance with the Algiers Agreements; further called on the parties, where relevant in cooperation with UNMEE, to explore and pursue a range of confidence-building measures;

Urged the parties to ensure that efforts were redirected from weapons procurement and other military activities towards the reconstruction and development of their economies and encourages both countries to continue and enhance the efforts to improve their relations in order to promote regional peace and security;

Expressed its intention to continue to monitor closely progress by the parties in implementing the provisions of the Algiers Agreements and the requirements of the resolution, and to consider a mission to the two countries before agreeing to a further mandate renewal in order to monitor progress and discuss possible further steps towards reconciliation.

**Decision of 16 January 2002 (4450th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4450th meeting,⁴³ on 16 January 2002, the Council included in its agenda the progress report of

⁴² S/2001/862.

⁴³ At the 4420th and 4421st meetings, both held in private on 16 November 2001, Council members and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Eritrea and Ethiopia, respectively, had constructive discussions.

the Secretary-General of 13 December 2001.⁴⁴ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that many of the Council's appeals to the parties remained unimplemented. He noted that the absence of mutual confidence between the parties kept the situation volatile, which was particularly important to overcome given the forthcoming decision on border delimitation by the Boundary Commission. He regretted that during the past few months, tensions had risen considerably in the mission area, with each of the two parties accusing the other of building up militarily. He maintained that both parties had also accused UNMEE, without foundation, of pursuing a policy of "appeasement" and negligence vis-à-vis violations. Finally, he again appealed to Eritrea to cooperate fully with UNMEE.

At the meeting, the President (Mauritius) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁴⁵ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Ethiopia and Eritrea;

Further reaffirmed its strong support for the comprehensive Peace Agreement between the Government of the State of Eritrea and the Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, signed in Algiers on 12 December 2000;³²

Reiterated its strong support for UNMEE and called on the parties to cooperate fully with UNMEE;

Reiterated its call on Eritrea to disclose the number, strength and disposition of its militia and police inside the Temporary Security Zone and to refrain from deployment close to the southern boundary of the Zone;

Further reiterated its call on Eritrea to conclude the status-of-forces agreement with the Secretary-General;

Expressed its determination to support the practical demarcation of the border; and confirmed its intention to send a mission to the two countries in February 2002.

**Decision of 15 March 2002 (4494th meeting):
resolution 1398 (2002)**

At its 4485th meeting, on 6 March 2002,⁴⁶ the Council included in its agenda the report of the Security Council mission to Ethiopia and Eritrea of 27 February 2002. In its report, the mission reported on

its meetings with the Governments of both countries, as well as with a range of other actors, including non-governmental organizations and religious leaders. It also made a number of recommendations on the mandate of UNMEE and the process for demarcating the border once the Boundary Commission had announced its decision. The mission also called for more trust-building contacts, at both the official and grass-roots level, between the two countries.

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the head of the Security Council mission to Eritrea and Ethiopia, following which all Council members⁴⁷ and the representatives of Eritrea, Ethiopia, Japan, the Netherlands and Spain (on behalf of the European Union)⁴⁸ made statements.

The head of the Security Council mission to Eritrea and Ethiopia indicated that the Prime Minister of Ethiopia and the President of Eritrea had announced that the decision of the Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission, established in accordance with the Algiers Agreements, on the demarcation of their common border would be final and binding. He also commended the parties for having chosen to resolve their differences through an international conflict-solving mechanism. He stated that the mission had impressed upon the parties, *inter alia*, the need to refrain from any kind of unilateral action, which could have seriously destabilizing effects; and the importance of transferring territory and civil authority, as well as population and troop movements, under an agreed framework.⁴⁹

Most of the speakers welcomed the contribution of UNMEE in building confidence between the two parties as well as the public commitments by the two countries to implement the decision of the Boundary Commission. Several delegations pointed out the importance of, *inter alia*, releasing the remaining prisoners of war and civilian detainees; confidence-building measures; and the continuing support of the international community, particularly for demining efforts. A few representatives observed that the work of the Security Council needed to focus on ensuring the

⁴⁴ S/2001/1194, submitted pursuant to resolution 1369 (2001).

⁴⁵ S/PRST/2002/1.

⁴⁶ S/2002/205.

⁴⁷ Norway was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

⁴⁸ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁴⁹ See S/PV.4485, pp. 2-4.

implementation of measures on demarcation and delimitation of the border.

The representative of Eritrea expressed concern about the appeal of the Security Council for an orderly transfer of administration and for population returns. He also expressed its caution against unilateral action without urging Ethiopia to respect its treaty obligations. He also complained that the Temporary Security Zone could not be established owing to Ethiopia's refusal to redeploy its troops in violation of the Agreement, which meant that more than 60,000 Eritrean civilians remained stranded in makeshift camps.⁵⁰

The representative of Ethiopia called on Eritrea to sign the status-of-forces agreement and to ensure the freedom of movement of UNMEE. He also believed that the decision of the Boundary Commission needed to be a judicial decision, with full transparency and void of any political considerations or pressures.⁵¹

At its 4494th meeting, on 15 March 2002, the Council included in its agenda the progress report of the Secretary-General of 8 March 2002.⁵² In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the delimitation and demarcation of the border would represent an important milestone in the peace process, and that the implementation of the Boundary Commission's final and binding decision would continue to demand statesmanship on the part of the two Governments and their leaders. He recommended that a wide-ranging mechanism aimed at consultation and problem-solving during the implementation of the delimitation decision be established, which could include the parties, UNMEE, guarantors, facilitators and witnesses. He also recommended the extension of the mandate of UNMEE for six months.

At the meeting, the President (Norway) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁵³ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1398 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of UNMEE at the troop and military observer levels authorized by its resolution 1320 (2000) until 15 September 2002;

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

⁵² S/2002/245, submitted pursuant to resolution 1369 (2001).

⁵³ S/2002/266.

Emphasized the importance of ensuring expeditious implementation of the upcoming decision by the Boundary Commission while maintaining stability in all areas affected by the decision, and encouraged the parties to consider further practical ways and means of conducting implementation-related consultations, possibly through appropriate strengthening of the Military Coordination Commission and/or other arrangement with the support of the guarantors, facilitators and witnesses of the Algiers Agreements;

Further emphasized that, in accordance with article 14 of the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities, the security arrangements were to remain in effect, and that, accordingly, arrangements for the separation of forces, as achieved by the Temporary Security Zone, would continue to be of key importance; urged Ethiopia to provide the United Nations Mine Action Coordination Centre with clarifications to the information already put forward, as promised in this regard.

Decision of 14 August 2002 (4600th meeting): resolution 1430 (2002)

At its 4600th meeting,⁵⁴ on 14 August 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 10 July 2002.⁵⁵ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that the parties had accepted the delimitation decision of the Boundary Commission as "final and binding" promptly after its announcement on 13 April 2002. He stressed that until the completion of the demarcation of the border and the transfers of territorial control, the security arrangements maintained by UNMEE would remain essential.

At the meeting, the President (United States) drew the attention of the Council to letters dated 5 July and 29 July 2002 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,⁵⁶ and to a draft resolution;⁵⁷ the draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as

⁵⁴ At the 4529th and 4530th meetings, both held in private on 13 May 2002, Council members and the representatives of Eritrea and Ethiopia, respectively, had constructive discussions.

⁵⁵ S/2002/744, submitted pursuant to resolution 1398 (2002).

⁵⁶ S/2002/732, transmitting a letter dated 28 June 2002 from the Registrar of the Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission enclosing the decision regarding the request for interpretation, correction and consultation submitted by Ethiopia on 13 May 2002; and S/2002/853, transmitting a letter from the Registrar of the Commission enclosing texts of two Commission Orders to the Parties, of 17 and 18 July 2002.

⁵⁷ S/2002/924.

resolution 1430 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to adjust the mandate of UNMEE, in order to assist the Boundary Commission in the expeditious and orderly implementation of its Delimitation Decision, to include with immediate effect: (a) demining in key areas to support demarcation, and (b) administrative and logistical support for the Field Offices of the Boundary Commission; endorsed the technical steps for territorial transfers as a broad framework for the process as recommended by the Secretary-General in his report, and decided to review, as necessary, the implications for UNMEE in this regard;

Called on the parties to cooperate with UNMEE in the implementation of its mandate; encouraged the parties to continue cooperating with UNMEE on providing the information and maps required by the Mission for the demining process;

Called on the parties to cooperate fully and promptly with the Boundary Commission; appealed to the parties to exercise restraint, and emphasized that in accordance with article 14 of the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities, the security arrangements were to remain in effect;

Called on the parties to refrain from unilateral troop or population movements; demanded that the parties allow UNMEE full freedom of movement and remove with immediate effect any and all restrictions on, and impediments to the work of, UNMEE and its staff in the discharge of its mandate.

Decisions of 6 September 2002 to 12 September 2003: resolutions 1434 (2002), 1466 (2003) and 1507 (2003) and statement by the President

At its 4606th, 4719th and 4822nd meetings,⁵⁸ the Council, after considering reports of the Secretary-General,⁵⁹ adopted unanimously resolutions 1434 (2002), 1466 (2003) and 1507 (2003), by which it extended the mandate of UNMEE for additional periods of six months.

In his reports, the Secretary-General stated, *inter alia*, that the overall situation in the Temporary Security Zone was good, but that the parties should immediately give to UNMEE and the Boundary Commission all necessary cooperation for the expeditious demarcation of the border and improve bilateral relations. By those resolutions, the Council *inter alia*: called on the parties concerned to refrain from troop movements or population movements until the border was delimited and to cooperate fully with UNMEE and the Boundary Commission; committed the Council to frequent reviews of the progress made by the parties in the implementation of their commitments under the Algiers Agreements; and extended the mandate of UNMEE. A complementary statement by the President (Spain) was released at the 4787th meeting, on 17 July 2003.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Held on 6 September 2002, 14 March 2003 and 12 September 2003, respectively.

⁵⁹ S/2002/977, S/2003/257 and S/2003/858.

⁶⁰ S/PRST/2003/10.

14. The situation in Guinea-Bissau

Decision of 29 March 2000 (4122nd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4121st meeting, on 29 March 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on developments in Guinea-Bissau.¹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the presidential elections held on 16 January 2000 had brought to an end the post-conflict transitional period in Guinea-Bissau that had started following the Abuja Accord of 1 November 1998, and had allowed the inauguration of a new pluralist parliament and the formation of a broad-based Government. He

acknowledged that the overall situation in Guinea-Bissau was peaceful and that the humanitarian situation, particularly that of refugees, had noticeably improved. He expressed the expectations that with the electoral process; the investiture of a new President; the inauguration of the new National Assembly; and the formation of a new Government, the transitional institutions deriving from the Abuja Accord had completed their role and that all such extra-constitutional structures would give way to the newly established constitutional institutions. The Secretary-General expressed concern over the public posture of the military and the circulation of small arms in civilian communities, noted the prominence of human rights issues after the election and welcomed the

¹ S/2000/250, submitted pursuant to resolution 1233 (1999).

improvement of relations with neighbouring countries. He reported that, following consultations with the new Government, he had proposed and the Council had approved the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNOGBIS) for one year.²

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs on the report of the Secretary-General, following which most members of the Council made statements.³ In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General expressed concern with the difficulties encountered in redefining the relationship between the new Government and the military establishment, but noted that the negotiations between the Government and the former military junta continued in an encouraging way, and that the Representative of the Secretary-General had provided his good offices as required. He noted that the President of Guinea-Bissau had offered five posts of minister of state to members of the military. He urged all Guinea-Bissau parties, including the former military junta, to fully accept the new democratic reality. He observed however, that the economic situation remained worrying and urged members of the international community to provide assistance for the Government's 100 days transitional programme.⁴

Following the briefing, most speakers welcomed the gradual return to constitutional and democratic order in Guinea-Bissau following the elections. Some speakers noted that Guinea-Bissau represented a success for the United Nations.⁵ Many speakers underlined the need to redefine the role of the military in accordance with the rule of law.⁶ The representative of the Netherlands stressed that a revival of the junta in any form on the political scene of Guinea-Bissau would not be tolerated.⁷ The representatives of France, Argentina and Bangladesh stressed the need to address the issue of the continuing circulation of large

quantities of small arms in civilian communities.⁸ The representative of the United Kingdom underlined the need to keep an eye on the situation in the region and emphasized peacebuilding as the main challenge facing the United Nations in Guinea-Bissau.⁹

At its 4122nd meeting, on 29 March 2000, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on developments in Guinea-Bissau.¹ The President (Bangladesh) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Paid tribute to the people of Guinea-Bissau for the success of the transitional process which has led to the organization of free, fair and transparent elections;

Welcomed the swearing in of President Kumba Yala on 17 February 2000 and the return to constitutional and democratic order in Guinea-Bissau;

Encouraged all concerned in Guinea-Bissau to work together closely in a spirit of tolerance to strengthen democratic values, to protect the rule of law, to depoliticize the army and to safeguard human rights;

Expressed its support for the newly elected Government of Guinea-Bissau and encouraged the new authorities to develop and to implement programmes devised to consolidate peace and national reconciliation.

Decision of 29 November 2000 (4239th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4238th meeting, on 29 March 2000, the Council heard briefings by the Secretary-General and the Vice-President of the World Bank. Following the briefings, statements were made by all members of the Council¹¹ as well as the representatives of the Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau,¹² Mozambique and Senegal and the Executive Secretary of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries. In his briefing, the Secretary-General pointed to the precariousness of the stability in Guinea-Bissau following an armed

² The extension of the mandate was approved through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (S/2000/201 and S/2000/202). See chapter V for more details.

³ The representative of the Russian Federation did not make a statement.

⁴ S/PV.4121, pp. 2-3.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (United States); p. 7 (France); and p. 9 (Tunisia).

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (United States); p. 6 (Malaysia); p. 9 (Netherlands); p. 10 (Ukraine); and p. 11 (Bangladesh).

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (France); p. 10 (Argentina); and p. 11 (Bangladesh).

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (United Kingdom); and p. 12 (Bangladesh).

¹⁰ S/PRST/2000/11.

¹¹ The representative of France made a statement on behalf of the European Union. Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement. The Netherlands was represented by the Minister for Development Cooperation.

¹² At this meeting, Guinea-Bissau was represented by the Vice-Prime Minister.

showdown between the head of the former military junta and the elected President, which had nearly plunged the country back into turmoil. In relation to that event he welcomed the quick response of the Council and of leaders in and outside the subregion and urged the Government to manage the aftermath of the crisis within the rule of law and with due regards to democratic principles and national reconciliation. He further stressed the need to address the root causes of the conflict in Guinea-Bissau, which included the weakness of the institutions, the disgruntled and highly politicized army, the endemic poverty, the crippling debt and the insecure internal and external environment. This required a serious long-term commitment to peacebuilding. He emphasized that post-conflict peacebuilding, because of its multidisciplinary nature, often fell between relief and traditional development assistance and was therefore frequently under funded. He therefore called on the support of Council members and of the donor community, in implementing one of the recommendations of the Brahimi report¹³ and allowing the Representative of the Secretary-General to fund quick-impact projects in order to prevent a relapse into a cycle of conflict and instability.¹⁴

The Vice-President of the World Bank, in his statement, pledged the World Bank's commitment to assist the Government of Guinea-Bissau in key sectors such as finances, education and health but emphasized the need for continued and expanded assistance from others in the international community. He further pointed to the fact that the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund were reviewing the eligibility of Guinea-Bissau for the Heavily Indebted Poor Country Initiative and held that if approved, the relief would represent the biggest debt relief granted to that date and would allow for sustained growth and poverty reduction.¹⁵

At the same meeting, the Vice-Prime Minister of Guinea-Bissau underlined the progress made by his country in the areas of good governance, poverty reduction and human rights. He acknowledged the successful response of the armed forces to the attempted coup of 22 November 2000. He, however, highlighted three challenges facing the country: the

reorganization of the military, the crippling debt burden and the achievement of peace and security at a regional level, especially in Casamance. On the latter, he pledged his country's intention to play a front-line role in the stability of the region and in the search for peaceful solutions of conflicts, while fully supporting the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity and the Charter of the United Nations.¹⁶

Most Council members welcomed the upholding of democratic order after the attempted coup; expressed concern over the role of the military in the country; underscored the need to strengthen democracy in Guinea-Bissau and promote national reconciliation; stressed the importance of regional stability and good-neighbourly by relations, and underlined the importance of the process of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of combatants for national stability.¹⁷ The representative of the United States, echoed by the representative of Malaysia, stressed that a return to military rule in Guinea-Bissau would not be accepted by the international community.¹⁸

Most speakers concurred on the relation between economic and political difficulties in Guinea-Bissau and underlined the need to develop an integrated, holistic approach to address them. The representative of Jamaica emphasized the concept of sustainable human development and requested that the Security Council ensure that peacebuilding measures be included as an integral part of the peace operations.¹⁹ The representative of Mali proposed an integrated joint approach involving the United Nations system and the international financial institutions.²⁰ The representative of Argentina proposed that Article 65 of the Charter on cooperation between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council be made more operational and effective.²¹ The representative of the Netherlands rejected the compartmentalization of pre-conflict, conflict and post-conflict approaches and advocated for the Security Council to undertake

¹³ Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (S/2000/809).

¹⁴ S/PV.4238, pp. 2-3.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-8.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Bangladesh); p. 12 (France); and p. 13 (Canada, United Kingdom); S/PV.4238 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (China); p. 5 (Ukraine); and p. 10 (Netherlands).

¹⁸ S/PV.4238, p. 10 (United States); and S/PV.4238 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Malaysia).

¹⁹ S/PV.4238 (Resumption 1), p. 4.

²⁰ S/PV.4238, p. 9.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

peacebuilding efforts in a coordinated way.²² Several speakers also discussed the provision of development assistance and debt relief in the context of a larger peacebuilding strategy. The representatives of Malaysia and Namibia raised the issue of ensuring the safe return of refugees and displaced persons.²³ The representative of Argentina underlined that lessons could be drawn from the situation of Guinea-Bissau and applied to other transition processes.²⁴ The Executive Secretary of the Community of Portuguese-speaking countries stressed the importance of the contact group of that organization in the process of restoring peace and security in Guinea-Bissau and requested that the Government be granted waivers for the implementation of development programmes needed by the country, as parameters and conditions for the implementation of a programme's objectives should not serve as an obstacle to development.²⁵

At the 4239th meeting, on 29 November 2000, the President (Netherlands) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁶ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reiterated its support for the democratically elected Government of Guinea-Bissau;

Welcomed the return to peace, democracy and constitutional order in Guinea-Bissau;

Called upon the members of the former military junta to subordinate themselves fully to the civilian institutions and to withdraw from the political process;

Commended the support provided by the Bretton Woods institutions to the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process in Guinea-Bissau;

Recognized and commended the important role played by the UNOGBIS towards helping consolidate peace, democracy and the rule of law; called upon Member States to provide generous support at the next round table scheduled for February 2001 in Geneva;

Acknowledged the relevance of the regional dimension;

Welcomed the initiatives the President of Guinea-Bissau and the President of Senegal had taken towards stabilization of their common border region.

²² S/PV.4238 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Malaysia); and p. 7 (Namibia).

²⁴ S/PV.4238, p. 14.

²⁵ S/PV.4238 (Resumption 1), pp. 15-16.

²⁶ S/PRST/2000/37.

Decision of 19 June 2003 (4776th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4776th meeting,^{27,28} on 19 June 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on developments in Guinea-Bissau and on the activities of UNOGBIS.²⁹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the situation had worsened in Guinea-Bissau and that the political instability and a deteriorating political climate had heightened tensions between the Government and its political opponents and weakened the respect for human rights. It had also prevented the holding of legislative elections, the promulgation of a revised constitution and the implementation of reforms. The Secretary-General welcomed the efforts of subregional organizations towards national reconciliation. He noted the pledge of the armed forces to democracy despite the rumours of coup attempts and desertion. He underlined the progress in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme but underlined that a professional national police force was still lacking. He stressed the worsening economic and social situation and the inability of the Government to pay salaries. In this regard, he noted the reclassification of Guinea-Bissau by the World Bank as a low-income country under stress, enabling the Bank to closely monitor economic and social conditions in the country. The Secretary-General urged the leaders of Guinea-Bissau to ensure that the rehabilitation and peacebuilding agendas could be put back on track and that all efforts be made towards the holding of free, fair and credible legislative elections. He held that if conditions were not conducive to credible elections, the United Nations could reconsider its electoral assistance. He reported that he had dispatched another electoral mission to Guinea-Bissau to review the situation.

At the meeting, the Council heard briefings by the Representative of the Secretary-General and Head

²⁷ At its 4567th meeting, held in private on 8 July 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of UNOGBIS. The members of the Council and the Representative of the Secretary-General had a constructive discussion.

²⁸ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. VI, part II, sect. B, case 9, with regard to relations between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

²⁹ S/2003/621, submitted pursuant to resolution 1233 (1999).

of UNOGBIS and the Chairman of the Economic and Social Council Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau,³⁰ following which statements were made by all members of the Council as well as by the representatives of Guinea-Bissau and the Gambia.³¹ In his briefing, the Representative of the Secretary-General echoed the Secretary-General's concerns over the evolution of Guinea-Bissau and the need to focus on returning the country to political and constitutional normality. While observing that the opposition had continued to accuse the Government of restrictions of civil liberties, he noted that donors had conditioned the support for the elections on the creation of conditions propitious for credible elections. He reported on the electoral needs assessment mission by the Department of Political Affairs, which noted some progress made in voter registration but concluded that the election date should be postponed to finalize the planned electoral census. He also noted the worrying economic situation and the periodic strike of public sector workers due to the non-payment of salary arrears by the Government. He further welcomed the Security Council's initiative to launch a mission to Guinea-Bissau with the participation of the Economic and Social Council.³²

The Chairman of the Economic and Social Council Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau, in his briefing, echoed the conclusion of the Secretary-General that the country might be sliding back towards chaos and even conflict. He also observed that Guinea-Bissau presented a unique case that did not qualify for the instruments applied by the Council to maintain international peace and security, or to the instruments applied by donors and the Bretton Woods institutions to countries in a post-conflict phase. He underscored that priority should be given to holding credible legislative elections in order to regain the confidence of the donor community, and that the uncertainty of the political situation had an impact on efforts to address the humanitarian needs of the country.³³

In their statements, most speakers expressed concern for the fragile human rights situation as well as the worsening social and economic situations and the need to restore donor confidence through the holding of free and fair elections. Speakers also underlined the necessity for national reconciliation, reasserted the importance of regional cooperation and welcomed the forthcoming visit of the joint Economic and Social Council and Security Council mission to Guinea-Bissau and the help of international donors. The representatives of Germany, France and Spain stressed that free and fair elections should be scheduled as soon as possible.³⁴ As a member of the European Union, Germany, supported by Bulgaria, stressed that adherence to the basic principles of good governance was a prerequisite for the return of Guinea-Bissau to democracy and sustained development and based the financial support of the European Union to the electoral process and humanitarian efforts in Guinea-Bissau on the commitment of Guinea-Bissau to these principles.³⁵ The representative of the United States also underlined that assistance to the electoral process should be conditional on clear and irrevocable steps ensuring free and fair elections and that the United Nations should not lend legitimacy to a flawed election process.³⁶

Some speakers pointed to the unique situation of Guinea-Bissau, which required specific flexibility from the international community.³⁷ The representative of the Gambia criticized "the unofficial regime of sanctions" applied to Guinea-Bissau, explaining that the exceedingly high expectations in the performance of the Government had prevented the delivery of humanitarian assistance and development support.³⁸

Concerning peacebuilding, the representative of Chile, echoed by the representatives of Pakistan and the Russian Federation, supported a multidisciplinary approach that could become a model of coordinated efforts between the Security Council and other United Nations organs to deal with pre-conflict and post-conflict situations.³⁹ The representative of the Russian Federation specifically proposed a two-way liaison

³⁰ The Chairman of the Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau also represented the President of the Economic and Social Council.

³¹ The representative of the Gambia spoke in his capacity as Chair of the Group of Friends of Guinea-Bissau.

³² S/PV.4776, pp. 2-4. For more details on the mission, see the case study in section 54 (Security Council mission) of the present chapter.

³³ S/PV.4776, pp. 3-5.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15 (France); p. 17 (Bulgaria); and p. 17 (Spain).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Germany); and p. 17 (Bulgaria).

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Gambia); p. 7 (Angola); p. 10 (Guinea); p. 13 (Cameroon); and p. 16 (Pakistan).

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Chile); p. 15 (Pakistan); and p. 19 (Russian Federation).

between the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council,⁴⁰ while the representative of Pakistan proposed the establishment of ad hoc composite committees with membership drawn from the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.⁴¹

At the same meeting, the President (Russian Federation) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁴² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Urged the country's leaders and the international community to work more purposefully together to ensure that the development, humanitarian and peacebuilding agendas were quickly put back on track; appealed to the President and Government of Guinea-Bissau to organize effectively and in a timely manner the forthcoming legislative elections and to ensure that those elections were conducted in a transparent, fair and credible manner, in accordance with the Constitution and the electoral law;

Called on the Government of Guinea-Bissau to take the necessary steps to facilitate a constructive dialogue with the international community and the Bretton Woods institutions and to fully endorse the partnership approach defined by the Economic and Social Council Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau;

Appealed the donor community to contribute financially to the implementation of the political and economical process in Guinea-Bissau, including necessary support for the legislative elections;

Expressed its concern with regard to the situation of human rights and civil liberties, and urged the Government of Guinea-Bissau to take the necessary measures in order to improve this situation;

Stressed the importance that freedom of speech and freedom of the press be fully respected.

Deliberations of 29 September 2003 (4834th meeting)

At its 4834th meeting,⁴³ on 29 September 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-

General for Political Affairs and by the Special Envoy of the Community of Portuguese-speaking countries, after which statements were made by most members of the Council and the representative of Guinea-Bissau.⁴⁴ The Assistant Secretary-General updated the Council on the situation in Guinea-Bissau following the military coup d'état on 14 September 2003. He reported that, thanks to the mediation efforts of regional organizations, an agreement was reached between the military and the President on 17 September 2003, providing for the return of the armed forces to the barracks, the resignation of the President, the establishment of a Transitional Government of National Unity led by a civilian interim President and the holding of general elections. A transitional Charter had been adopted on 28 September 2003 and provided for legislative elections to be held by 28 March 2004 and presidential elections to be held within one year of the election of the National Assembly. The Assistant Secretary-General noted the atmosphere of consensus between parties and called out to the international community for continued financial support to the Transitional Government.⁴⁵

The Special Envoy of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries to Guinea-Bissau noted that it seemed that the military intervention that brought down the elected President of Guinea-Bissau had been "welcomed by all of Guinea-Bissau's society". He saluted the strength, tolerance and spirit of solidarity of the people of Guinea-Bissau, who had remained peaceful despite the financial and political difficulties. He also welcomed the commitment of all parties to the return to normalcy and called for the international community to trust those responsible for the coup, as they did not wish to remain in power and had been motivated by the difficult social and economic conditions.⁴⁶

In their statements, most speakers called for a rapid return to constitutional normalcy and welcomed the coordinated efforts of regional organizations to mediate the crisis. Many speakers regretted the unconstitutional change of power in Guinea-Bissau and emphasized the importance of holding elections as soon as possible.⁴⁷ The representatives of Germany and France supported the stance of the African Union

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁴² S/PRST/2003/8.

⁴³ At the 4860th meeting, held in private on 18 November 2003, the Secretary-General, the President of Guinea-Bissau, members of the Council, the President of the Economic and Social Council, the representative of the current Chairman of the Economic Community of West African States, the representative of the Community of Portuguese-speaking countries, the Chairman of the Economic and Social Council Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Guinea-Bissau and the Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of UNOGBIS had a constructive exchange of views.

⁴⁴ The representatives of Bulgaria and the United Kingdom did not make statements.

⁴⁵ S/PV.4834, pp. 2-3.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (Germany); p. 7 (Russian Federation); p. 10 (Chile, Spain, France); and p. 12 (Mexico).

against the seizure of power by force and expressed concern that Guinea-Bissau could become a failed state.⁴⁸ The representative of Chile pointed out that all coups d'état should be repudiated, whether bloodless or violent.⁴⁹ The representatives of the Russian Federation, France and Guinea requested that the Council monitor the situation and ensure the holding of free and fair elections.⁵⁰ The representative of the Russian Federation also asked to be briefed on the means undertaken in preparation of the legislative elections in Guinea-Bissau and the use of the funds provided by the donors for that purpose.⁵¹ Some members stressed the possible negative consequences for the United Nations of a failure of the peacebuilding efforts in Guinea-Bissau.⁵² The representative of

Guinea hoped that the Council would make the extension of the peacebuilding mandate in Guinea-Bissau a priority.⁵³ The representative of Mexico considered that the task of the United Nations would be to ensure the holding of elections, monitor the economic crisis and coordinate efforts among the agencies involved.⁵⁴

The representative of Guinea-Bissau expressed regret that the use of force had appeared to be the only solution, but underlined that consensus was prevailing in Guinea-Bissau over the transitional Charter and asked the international community to recognize the differences between the coup of Guinea-Bissau and the events in the Central African Republic.⁵⁵

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 5 (Germany); and p. 10 (France).

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 9.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 7 (Russian Federation); p. 10 (France); and p. 11 (Guinea).

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 16.

⁵² Ibid., p. 8 (Pakistan); p. 11 (Guinea); and p. 13 (Mexico).

⁵³ Ibid., p. 11.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 13.

⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 13-15.

15. The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone

Initial proceedings

Decision of 21 December 2000 (4252nd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4252nd meeting, on 21 December 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled "The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone". The Council then invited the representative of Guinea to participate in the meeting. The President (Russian Federation) drew the attention of the Council to a letter from the representative of Mali,¹ transmitting the final communiqué of the twenty-fourth session of the Authority of Heads of State and Government of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), held at Bamako on 15 and 16 December 2000. The communiqué stressed the need for the disarmament of irregular armed groups and the restoration of peace in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone and called for an immediate deployment of interposition forces along their borders.

¹ S/2000/1201.

At the meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Condemned incursions into Guinea by rebel groups coming from Liberia and Sierra Leone;

Also condemned the looting of the facilities of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and other humanitarian organizations;

Reaffirmed its commitment to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Guinea; called on all States to refrain from providing any military support and from any act that might contribute to further destabilization of the borders between Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone;

Requested the Secretary-General to consider what support the international community might provide ECOWAS in order to ensure security on the border of Guinea.

² S/PRST/2000/41.

**Deliberations of 8 March 2001 and 14 May 2001
(4291st and 4319th meetings)**

At its 4291st meeting,³ on 8 March 2001, the Council heard a briefing by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, following which statements were made by most members of the Council⁴ and the representatives of Guinea and Sierra Leone.

In his briefing, the High Commissioner for Refugees reported that the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees had realized initial contacts with the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) regarding the principles of safe access and passage for displaced persons. He stated that he had invited both the Government of Guinea and RUF to refrain from military actions in the area of Kambia in order to allow the road from Forecariah to Kambia to be a safe passage for the return of refugees from Guinea to Sierra Leone. He further noted that, overall, the principles of “safe access to and safe passage of” were being respected by the three countries and RUF. Moreover, he observed that this was the beginning of the successful implementation of the mandate of resolution 1270 (1999). He stated that there were indications that RUF was prepared to leave the Kambia area under UNAMSIL control. Nevertheless, he argued that at that stage UNAMSIL was still too weak to effectively control the area and asked the Council to strengthen it with both additional troops and a new mandate.⁵

The majority of speakers expressed concern for the situation of the refugees and the need for an effective repatriation. They highlighted the need for a thorough assessment of the capacity of Sierra Leone to absorb such a large number of refugees and requested assistance in the process. On the role of RUF in the process, some speakers indicated their reluctance to

dialogue with such force, considering it unreliable.⁶ Others appreciated the efforts made by the High Commissioner for Refugees and argued that at that stage dialogue was possible and could be beneficial.⁷ Some speakers highlighted the need to create “safe corridors” in the RUF-controlled territory to allow refugees to return to Sierra Leone.⁸ Other speakers questioned the feasibility of such initiative, highlighting the insufficient strength of the troops of UNAMSIL and other issues.⁹ On this issue, some speakers favoured strengthening of UNAMSIL.¹⁰ Others underlined that the strengthening of such troops would require time and that the Council had to respond to the situation in a more timely manner.¹¹

The representative of Jamaica expressed concern for the fact that relocating the estimated 135,000 refugees in the Languette region would take considerable time. She therefore urged the High Commissioner for Refugees to develop a plan for a quick relocation of these refugees. Moreover, she observed that the key for stability in Sierra Leone was to bring the activities of RUF to an end and suggested that a strengthening of UNAMSIL would constitute a crucial factor in achieving this goal.¹²

The representative of the United Kingdom urged the Government of Guinea to avoid indiscriminate attacks from helicopters if they endangered refugee populations. He observed that strengthening of UNAMSIL would inevitably require time and argued that the Security Council should not disregard a short term plan that reflected the realities of what the United Nations was able to do and that had, as a priority, the relocation of refugees in dangerous areas to adequate camps away from the border. Specifically, he estimated that in order to create a safe corridor for the refugees out of the “parrot’s beak” into a safer area such as Kenema, UNAMSIL would require a force at least three times bigger than what was available. Finally, he

³ At its 4276th meeting, held in private on 12 February 2001, the Council met with the delegation of the Economic Community of West African States Mediation and Security Council, composed of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mali (leader of the delegation), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Togo and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria, regarding the situation in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone.

⁴ The representative of the Russian Federation did not make a statement.

⁵ S/PV.4291, pp. 2-5.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 8 (France); and p. 10 (United States).

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 13 (China, Singapore).

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12 (Mali); pp. 14-16 (Mauritius); and p. 24 (Sierra Leone).

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (United Kingdom); pp. 8-9 (France); and pp. 9-10 (United States).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13 (China); pp. 13-14 (Singapore); and pp. 14-16 (Mauritius).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7 (United Kingdom); pp. 8-9 (France); and p. 16 (Bangladesh).

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

expressed doubts on the reliability of RUF in abiding by its commitment with the High Commissioner and argued that a deterrent to encourage them to respond to the requests of the international community was necessary.¹³

The representative of Tunisia noted that the commitment of the parties was only the first step in a long process and stressed that it was essential to determine the authorities and mechanism for ensuring the safety of the refugees; who would be in charge of the operation since neither the army of Guinea nor UNAMSIL seemed to be able to do it; as well as to confirm the cooperation of all non-State actors.¹⁴

The representative of France expressed doubts about the cooperation of RUF and other rebel movements in the region, especially the United Liberation Movement of Liberia for Democracy. He therefore expressed concern for the feasibility of a safe repatriation of such a great number of refugees. He suggested that UNAMSIL would have to focus its energy on its mandate and not on other tasks until it could increase its numbers in a second phase. He finally argued that the best strategy in the short term was to provide more means to Guinea to help the refugees resettle on its territory the large numbers of refugees it had accepted, as well to continue the policy of welcoming refugees until they could be returned to their country of origin.¹⁵

The representative of the United States highlighted that the Security Council should focus on the refugees' immediate need for protection and relief. He stated that his country did not support the creation of "safe corridors" for refugees through RUF-held territory as RUF could not be considered trustworthy. He finally observed that the strengthening of UNAMSIL was a priority and a condition for a positive solution of the situation.¹⁶

The representative of Colombia noted that the interposition force that ECOWAS had called for in December 2000¹⁷ had not become a reality. Therefore, he observed that it might be necessary to review the options offered by the presence of UNAMSIL in the

field and the results of its most recent contacts with RUF.¹⁸

The representative of China observed that despite the risk that RUF was not reliable, its willingness to cooperate, as well as that of the three Governments, was encouraging.¹⁹

The representatives of Mali and Singapore concurred that the first priority of the Council should be to achieve a formal agreement between the Governments of Guinea and Sierra Leone and RUF, on the basic principles of freedom of access and safe passage.²⁰

The representative of Mauritius commented that some humanitarian organizations on the ground in Guinea had argued that the refugees would not utilize the safety corridors for fear of being attacked by RUF, no matter what guarantees had been secured. They argued that the refugees should be temporarily relocated to northern Guinea until the situation improved. He also stressed the importance of the President of Liberia being fully involved in finding a solution for the safe return of all refugees.²¹

The representative of Guinea stated that the "sole cause" of the humanitarian situation in the southeast of Guinea was the "armed attack perpetrated by rebel groups with the support of the Government of Liberia". He argued that a successful resolution of the refugee situation in the "parrot's beak" should take into account two conditions. First, a "safe corridor" within the territory of Sierra Leone needed to be set up for refugees' repatriation, followed by safe reception areas within Sierra Leone. Finally, he stated that Guinea was willing to transfer refugees that wanted to remain on its territory for safety reason in interior areas, with the cooperation of the High Commissioner for Refugees.²²

At the same meeting, the High Commissioner for Refugees replied to the comments of the other speakers and provided additional information on the situation in the "parrot's beak". He reiterated that there had been a remarkable slowdown of the hostilities in the region and that RUF demonstrated increasing willingness to dialogue. He noted that this change of attitude was

¹³ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 8-9.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 9-10.

¹⁷ See S/2000/1201, annex.

¹⁸ S/PV.4291, pp. 10-11.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 12-13.

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 11-12 (Mali); and pp. 13-14 (Singapore).

²¹ Ibid., p. 15.

²² Ibid., pp. 17-19.

probably determined by the fact that RUF had realized that the possible strengthening of UNAMSIL and the stronger position of the Sierra Leone Army would have eventually changed the balance of power in the region. Moreover, he noted that RUF was in an increasingly difficult situation, as it was being progressively isolated by the international community and non-governmental organizations. He indicated his reluctance to allow large flows of refugees and suggested that the opening of the border should be limited to the area from Forecariah to Kambia. He further argued that the mandate of UNAMSIL did not prevent its troops from taking over the Kambia area. Rather, the problem was the inadequate number of troops available at the moment. He finally noted that the efforts of repatriation of the refugees would be limited to a single corridor in the Forecariah-Kambia route, in the context of RUF pulling out and it becoming UNAMSIL territory.²³

Finally, the representative of Sierra Leone expressed his support for the idea of “safe corridors”, but highlighted that Sierra Leone had limited capacity to accept the returnees. He highlighted how his country was already overwhelmed by both the large number of returnees and the thousands of internally displaced persons.²⁴

At its 4319th meeting,²⁵ on 14 May 2001, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council,²⁶ transmitting the report of the Inter-Agency Mission to West Africa. The report provided a large number of recommendations on the crisis in Sierra Leone and West Africa, including, inter alia, the necessity of a comprehensive approach, the establishment of a United Nations office for West Africa, the need for a two-track strategy (short and long term), increased cooperation with ECOWAS, and various suggestions aimed, inter alia, at controlling

migrations and implementing disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes.

At the meeting, statements were made by all members of the Security Council, as well as the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs and the Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator. The President (United States) drew the attention of the Council to a letter from Mali dated 11 April 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,²⁷ transmitting the final communiqué of the Extraordinary Summit of the Heads of State and Government of ECOWAS held in Abuja on 11 April 2001. The communiqué highlighted the willingness of ECOWAS to deploy an interposition force along the borders of the countries concerned and the need to establish “safe corridors” for refugees to be repatriated.

At the outset, the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations briefed the Council on the recent political developments in the region. He stated that the major political development was the meeting of ECOWAS, the United Nations, Sierra Leone and RUF, held in Abuja on 2 May 2001. On this occasion, Sierra Leone and RUF had renewed their commitment to remove roadblocks and to refrain from military action. The meeting had called for the simultaneous disarmament of RUF and the Kamajors, as well as the establishment of a joint committee to implement the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme. Moreover, it had displayed the intention of Sierra Leone to facilitate the certification of RUF as a political party. The Under-Secretary-General further noted that RUF had committed itself to withdrawing from Kambia and argued that this action would facilitate efforts in repatriating refugees of Sierra Leone. Finally, he observed that progress had been made towards establishing the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.²⁸

The Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator stated that the regional approach had proven to be the right one, as the crisis in each country was fuelling the crises in the neighbouring countries. She highlighted that at the time between 200,000 and 300,000 persons were internally displaced in Guinea and she observed that the conditions for repatriation were still lacking. Significant numbers of refugees were spontaneously

²³ Ibid., pp. 19-23.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 24.

²⁵ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XII, part III, sect. B, with regard to encouragement or calls by the Security Council for action by regional arrangements in the pacific settlement of disputes, and part III, sect. D, with regard to consideration or authorization by the Security Council of enforcement action by regional arrangements.

²⁶ S/2001/434.

²⁷ S/2001/353.

²⁸ S/PV.4319, pp. 2-5.

returning to Sierra Leone, often via areas controlled by RUF, which was creating problems for the humanitarian community as well as posing risks for the refugees themselves. The reception of these returnees was creating difficulties for Sierra Leone, as their numbers were increasing and the resources to relocate them limited. She further observed that the situation in Liberia was not improving, as fighting was continuing along the border of Lofa County and between 60,000 and 80,000 people were displaced within its territory. She finally recommended the establishment of a subregional capacity by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in order to facilitate the exchange and analysis of strategic information.²⁹

The Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs highlighted the lack of progress in dialogue among the Heads of State in the Mano River subregion, and invited the Security Council and ECOWAS to intervene as facilitators. He observed that relaunching the peace process in Sierra Leone was essential, as well as introducing into the agenda the planning of elections to improve political stability. He then addressed the issue of institutional arrangements, observing that the establishment of a United Nations office for West Africa would be an appropriate means to develop an integrated approach to the different issues. Moreover, he recommended the creation of an inter-agency working group in order to coordinate the efforts of different bodies and increase the exchange of information. Finally, he called for the expansion of the mandate of UNAMSIL to include also Guinea and Liberia. This would offer the conditions for better monitoring the borders in the entire “parrot’s beak”. He observed that the disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration process should be developed under a regional perspective.³⁰

At the same meeting, the majority of the delegations acknowledged the importance of a regional approach in dealing with the situation in Guinea, as the numerous cross border issues required a wider perspective. In this regard, they encouraged increased cooperation with ECOWAS and welcomed the proposal for a regional office in West Africa as an important development. They also expressed support for the implementation of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes, as well as for initiatives

aimed at a strengthening of security and economic development. Several speakers stated that sanctions against Liberia were not to be lifted until the country complied with resolution 1343 (2001) and that the Council had to ensure the effectiveness of the arms embargo, the travel ban and the diamond embargo.³¹ With regard to regional security, some speakers argued that a cautious approach should be used when dealing with RUF. They noted that despite its collaborative attitude, RUF could not be fully trusted.³² In this respect, some speakers expressed support for the deployment of ECOWAS interposition forces on the borders, in order to monitor the situation and facilitate refugees’ repatriation.³³

The representative of Jamaica stressed that the proposal to expand the mandate of UNAMSIL into the neighbouring countries deserved serious attention.³⁴ The representative of Mali expressed support for the ECOWAS recommendation on broadening the mandate of UNAMSIL, and called on the Council to respond positively to the ECOWAS offer to strengthen UNAMSIL by 3,000 men.³⁵ The representative of Ukraine suggested that the proposal for the expanded role of UNAMSIL should be further studied by the Secretariat so that the Council could operate in the most effective way.³⁶

The representatives of the United Kingdom, the Russian Federation and the United States expressed disagreement with the proposal to expand the mandate of UNAMSIL to Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia. They noted that the problems that affected the three regions were different and that an approach focusing on the enhancement of the coordination of subregional structures in West Africa would produce better results.³⁷ The representative of Ireland noted that a substantial change to the mandate of a peacekeeping force already in operation presented practical difficulties.³⁸

²⁹ Ibid., pp. 5-9.

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 9-13.

³¹ Ibid., p. 16 (United Kingdom); p. 17 (Tunisia); and p. 18 (Ireland).

³² Ibid., p. 19 (Ireland); and p. 20 (Bangladesh).

³³ Ibid., p. 17 (Tunisia); p. 20 (Bangladesh); p. 21 (Russian Federation); p. 25 (Jamaica); and p. 28 (China).

³⁴ Ibid., p. 25.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 14.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 29.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 16 (United Kingdom); p. 21 (Russian Federation); and p. 31 (United States).

³⁸ Ibid., p. 19 (Ireland).

16. Security Council resolution 1054 (1996) of 26 April 1996

Initial proceedings

Decision of 28 September 2001 (4384th meeting): resolution 1372 (2001)

At its 4384th meeting, on 28 September 2001, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Security Council resolution 1054 (1996) of 26 April 1996". The President drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Bangladesh, Colombia, Jamaica, Mali, Mauritius, Singapore, Tunisia and Ukraine,¹ it was put to the vote and adopted, by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention (United States), as resolution 1372 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Noting the steps taken by the Government of the Sudan to comply with the provisions of resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1070 (1996),

Decided to terminate, with immediate effect, the measures referred to in paragraphs 3 and 4 of resolution 1054 (1996) and paragraph 3 of resolution 1070 (1996).

Statements were made by the representatives of the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, the United States and Ireland, as well as the representative of the Sudan.

The representative of the United States stated that his country expected the Sudan to demonstrate a full commitment to anti-terrorism, although it appreciated that the Sudan had been engaged in serious discussion on the issue with the Government of the United States. He also stated that the United States was deeply concerned that the suspects wanted in connection with the 1995 assassination attempt on the life of the President of Egypt in Ethiopia had not been brought to justice and urged the international community to continue the efforts to bring them to justice. The United States also had continuing concerns about the enormous suffering of the Sudanese people in the civil war, which had lasted 18 years. However, he stressed, along with the Russian Federation, the importance of the calls by Egypt and Ethiopia for the lifting of the sanctions, who were the victims of the incident that led to the Security Council actions on the Sudan and who had originally asked for the sanctions. He stated that,

¹ S/2001/916.

in the light of these considerations, his delegation had abstained on the resolution.²

The representatives of the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and Ireland expressed appreciation for the efforts undertaken by the Government of the Sudan to meet the demands in resolutions 1054 (1996) and 1070 (1996) and welcomed that the Sudan had met the conditions for the lifting of the sanctions.³ The representative of the Russian Federation also noted that the Organization of African Unity, the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of Arab States had made official statements that the Sudan had fully met with the demands for the lifting of the sanctions. Through the process in which the Sudan had been committed to meeting the demands of the Council, it had begun to make efforts to normalize the relationship with its neighbours and the entire region.⁴

The representatives of the Russian Federation and the United Kingdom expressed appreciation that the Sudan had ratified all international anti-terrorism conventions.⁵ Noting that the resolution sent a clear signal that the Council was ready to act once it had determined that a country had complied with the demands in a resolution, the representative of the United Kingdom also called on other States that supported terrorism to take note of the example set by the Sudan.⁶

The representatives of the United Kingdom and Ireland further emphasized the necessity of a political settlement for the civil war in the Sudan and of international support for its settlement and urged the Government of the Sudan to engage urgently in negotiations.⁷

The representative of the Sudan stated that the adoption of the resolution was a fruit of the enormous efforts undertaken by his Government in order to

² S/PV.4384, p. 3.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 2 (Russian Federation); and p. 3 (United Kingdom, Ireland).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 2 (Russian Federation); and p. 3 (United Kingdom).

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (United Kingdom, Ireland).

cooperate with the international community, especially the Council, and its commitment to promoting conditions for international peace and security. He also sent special thanks to the Non-Aligned Movement caucus in the Council. He stated that many useful and constructive bilateral talks, characterized by professional diplomacy, had been undertaken between

the Sudan and the Council members, although these had delayed the adoption of the resolution for some time. He believed that, the resolution represented a strong impetus for the Sudan to proceed forward and to cooperate in wider fields, particularly anti-terrorism, in order to realize justice, peace, security and stability in the world.⁸

⁸ Ibid., p. 4

17. Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council

Initial proceedings

Decision of 19 December 2001 (4440th meeting): statement by the President

By a letter dated 30 April 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹ the Secretary-General, recalling the endorsement received by the Council through a statement of its President of 21 December 2000,² to dispatch an Inter-Agency Mission to West Africa, submitted the report of the Mission, which visited 11 West African countries from 6 to 27 March 2001. In its report, the Inter-Agency Mission advocated a comprehensive approach to durable and sustainable solutions to priority needs and challenges in West Africa. Several recommendations were made, including the creation of a mechanism for systematic and regular consultations among United Nations entities and with Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and other subregional organizations. To enhance the United Nations capacity and collaboration in the subregion, the report proposed the establishment of a United Nations office for West Africa, to be headed by a Special Representative of the Secretary-General. Other recommendations related to peace and security, governance and human rights, humanitarian assistance, economic development and regional integration.³

At its 4439th meeting, on 18 December 2001, the Security Council included in its agenda without

objection the item entitled "Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council".

Statements were made by the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, as well as by all Council members and the representatives of Belgium (on behalf of the European Union⁴), Egypt, Guinea, Morocco, Nigeria and Sierra Leone.

In opening the meeting, the President (Mali) emphasized that the public debate demonstrated the Council's commitment to seek lasting solutions to the priority needs and problems of West Africa. He also underlined that the report of the Inter-Agency Mission contained a "clear-sighted and courageous" assessment of the situation as well as practical, relevant and feasible recommendations.⁵

In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs recalled that the report of the Inter-Agency Mission had recommended that the United Nations and the international community consider the adoption of an integrated, global and regional approach in the effort to prevent and manage the many conflicts in the region. Outlining the main challenges facing the United Nations with regard to West Africa, he focused on the issues of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, circulation of light weapons, children and armed conflicts, peace, justice and national reconciliation, humanitarian situation and

¹ S/2001/434.

² S/PRST/2000/41.

³ On the report of the Inter-Agency Mission, see also the discussion at the 4319th meeting of the Council in connection with the situation in Sierra Leone (Sect. 15 of the present chapter).

⁴ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁵ S/PV.4339, p. 2.

human rights. In light of these challenges, he emphasized the need for sustained support for ECOWAS and the Mano River Union as well as for the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for West Africa.⁶

In their reactions to the briefing, recognizing that the challenges facing West Africa had a subregional dimension, the majority of speakers endorsed the need for an integrated holistic strategy that would include the United Nations, the international community, the West African States concerned, and the regional and subregional players; supported the establishment of the Office of the Representative of the Secretary-General for West Africa; advocated the need to further increase coordination with and support for ECOWAS; and supported the implementation of effective disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes in the countries of the region. Some delegations hoped that further consideration would be given to the recommendations contained in the Inter-Agency Mission report which had not been fully implemented yet.

With regard to specific country situations, many speakers welcomed the progress achieved in the Mano River Union and emphasized the importance of confidence-building and cooperation, encouraging in this connection the States of the Mano River Union to hold a summit in the near future. Referring to the situation in Sierra Leone, although recognizing the presence of a few more challenges related to the Revolutionary United Front, many delegations noted progress, welcomed the upcoming elections and stressed the need for them to be democratic and all-

⁶ Ibid., pp. 2-8.

inclusive. In connection with Liberia, a number of delegations expressed concern over the security situation in the country and emphasized the importance of the continued engagement of the international community in the country, particularly in view of developments in Sierra Leone.

The representative of the United States drew attention to the issue of sanctions against Liberia and indicated that soon the Council would consider renewing or strengthening those sanctions since President Taylor had continued to violate the embargo on importation of arms and the ban on diamond exports. He also added that the Council should sanction those individuals most responsible for continuing threats to peace and the election process.⁷

At the 4440th meeting, on 19 December 2001, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁸ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed with satisfaction the report of the Inter-Agency Mission and fully supported initiatives taken with a view to implementing its recommendations;

Emphasized that greater subregional integration must remain a key goal for the United Nations system; stressed the need to further strengthen the capacities of ECOWAS;

Underlined the importance of taking steps to develop cooperation and coordination among the intergovernmental bodies and entities of the United Nations system which could influence the situation in West Africa;

Also emphasized the need to strengthen the capacity of ECOWAS to monitor and to stem the illicit flows of small arms and the establishment of militia;

Appealed to the international community for substantial financial assistance for the programme for the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants and other peace consolidating activities in Sierra Leone.

⁷ Ibid., p. 24.

⁸ S/PRST/2001/38.

18. Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security

Initial proceedings

Decision of 31 October 2002 (4640th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4630th meeting, on 22 October 2002, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled “Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security” and a letter dated 21 October 2002 from the representative of Cameroon addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹ transmitting a background note for the meeting, which outlined, *inter alia*, the slow progress in economic and social development in the Central African region; the difficulties in developing structures for regional cooperation; and the problem of building peace, including the requirement for the mobilization of major resources to support the demobilization, disarmament and reintegration operations.

At the same meeting, the Council heard briefings by the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, the Country Director for South Central Africa and the Great Lakes countries of the World Bank, the Director of the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the President of the Economic and Social Council. Statements were made by all members of the Council, as well as the representatives of Burundi, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Republic of the Congo (on behalf of the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS)), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union²), Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Japan, the Permanent Observer of the African Union and the Deputy Secretary-General of ECCAS.³

The Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, expressing serious concern at the political, social, economic, security and humanitarian situation in several of the countries in the subregion, pointed out that the numerous armed conflicts in Central African States had undermined efforts to achieve sustainable development and stability. He stressed the need for both national and subregional efforts to address the cross-cutting challenges facing Central African countries. Noting that the United Nations had been deeply involved in assisting the region, notably by promoting the development of subregional capabilities for early warning and prevention, the dispatching of Special Envoys, the authorization of peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations and the creation of the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa, focusing on disarmament, he stressed the importance of the Central African States taking the lead and showing the necessary political will.⁴

The Country Director for South Central Africa and the Great Lakes countries of the World Bank stressed the interconnectedness of development and conflict, noting that political and economic development failures had been among the key roots of conflict in Central Africa, and that the consequences of these conflicts in turn were taking a heavy toll on development efforts. He pointed out that the World Bank was involved through a variety of instruments and approaches, paying particular attention to the political economy of recovery in post-conflict countries, but cautioned that political leadership was required to create the best possible environment for the World Bank contributions to be successful. Finally, he noted that the World Bank’s Multi-Country Demobilization and Reintegration Programme for the greater Great Lakes region of Africa, which was seeking to operationalize the regional strategy for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, would complement the efforts of the United Nations.⁵

¹ S/2002/1179.

² Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³ The Central Africa Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea and Gabon were represented by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs.

⁴ S/PV.4630, pp. 4-5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-8.

The Director of the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery of UNDP also stressed the interdependence between poverty and conflict, which required development programmes to contribute to consolidation of peace and prevention of resumed conflict. She stated that the parameters of the strategic framework for UNDP were conflict prevention, recovery, peacebuilding, and capacity-building of regional and subregional organizations. In that context, she outlined a number of regional and country-level UNDP activities in Central Africa, particularly in the areas of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, capacity-building and awareness-raising at the community and State levels.⁶

The President of the Economic and the Social Council, noting that peacebuilding required a comprehensive approach, pointed out that the Economic and Social Council had a Charter-mandated role to play in addressing root causes of violence and assisting in peacebuilding processes. Recognizing the importance of cross-border influences, he stated that the Economic and Social Council would continue to advocate for the creation of a subregional United Nations coordinating capability in Central Africa. While welcoming recent progress in a number of Central African States, he deplored continued illegal exploitation of the region's natural resources. He believed that it was imperative for the countries of the subregion to own and lead their own reconstruction. He expressed the hope that the decision of the Economic and Social Council to establish, upon request, an ad hoc advisory group to examine humanitarian and economic needs would be successful.⁷

In their statements, participants covered a number of general topics, including the importance of African ownership of the peacebuilding processes; the development of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes; the fight against illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons; the need for international assistance as well as financial and material resources; the convening of an international conference on peace, security, democracy and development in the Great Lakes region; a proposal for the establishment of a United Nations regional office; and the coordination and coherence of the United Nations activities in Central Africa.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-10.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

Most speakers expressed concern at the proliferation and persistence of conflicts throughout Central Africa, and at the widespread poverty in a region of abundant natural resources. Many delegates emphasized that peacebuilding in Central Africa would require a regional and comprehensive approach, taking into account both the socio-economic, humanitarian, security and human rights dimensions.

The representative of Japan expressed support for the recommendation on strengthening the relationship between the Security Council and African regional and subregional organizations, put forward by the Council's newly established Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa.⁸ The Permanent Observer of the African Union believed that the partnership among the United Nations, regional and subregional organizations should be based on the principle of shared responsibility in peacekeeping operations.⁹

Meanwhile, the representative of Denmark, on behalf of the European Union, argued that an important prerequisite for consolidating regional peace, democracy and economic stability was the existence of a genuine political will to cooperate. If the Central African States expressed a genuine political will for cooperation then the United Nations should help to enhance the institutional capacities of the region.¹⁰ Moreover, the representative of the United States observed that regional cooperation required stable and healthy nation States, adding that effective international assistance could not be provided until each nation in the region was functioning and thriving.¹¹

A number of delegations expressed appreciation for the work of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa and its important role in reinvigorating ECCAS and in facilitating the establishment by ECCAS of a number of mechanisms, including the non-aggression pact among the States of ECCAS; the Council for Peace and Security in Central Africa; the Multinational Force for Central Africa; the early-warning mechanism for Central Africa; and a subregional centre for human rights and democracy in Central Africa. Meanwhile, a

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁹ S/PV.4630 (Resumption 1), p. 5.

¹⁰ S/PV.4630, p. 24.

¹¹ S/PV.4630 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

few speakers deplored the fact that those instruments had not yet become fully operational.¹²

At its 4640th meeting, on 31 October 2002, the Council again included in its agenda the letter dated 21 October 2002 from the representative of Cameroon addressed to the President of the Security Council.¹ The President (Cameroon) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹³ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed subregional efforts to promote conflict prevention, management and resolution in Central Africa;

Recognized the important role that regional and subregional organizations could play in preventing the illicit traffic of small arms and light weapons and affirmed the need to promote and strengthen the partnership between the United Nations system and Central African States in relation to the maintenance of peace and security;

Also reaffirmed the importance of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes in the process of conflict resolution in Central Africa;

Recommended the inclusion, where appropriate, of support for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration in the mandates of peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations and emphasized the importance of a comprehensive, integrated, resolute and concerted approach to the issues of peace, security and development in Central Africa.

¹² S/PV.4630, p. 20 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); and p. 23 (Equatorial Guinea).

¹³ S/PRST/2002/31.

19. Letter dated 29 November 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Initial proceedings

Deliberations of 9 December 2002 (4659th meeting)

By a letter dated 29 November 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Chad informed the Council that, further to his letter relating to the transmission of the document concerning the position of Chad on the Central African crisis, the Government of Chad wished to address the Security Council.¹

At its 4659th meeting, held in private on 9 December 2002, the Security Council considered the item entitled "Letter dated 29 November 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council". The members of the Council and the representative of Chad had a constructive discussion.

¹ S/2002/1317.

20. The situation in Côte d'Ivoire

Initial proceedings

Decision of 20 December 2002 (4680th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4680th meeting,¹ on 20 December 2002, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled "The situation in Côte d'Ivoire", and extended invitations to the representatives of Côte d'Ivoire and Senegal to participate in the discussion. The President (Colombia) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 19 December 2002 from the representative of Senegal,² in his capacity as representative of the Chairman of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), transmitting the text of the final communiqué of the extraordinary summit of ECOWAS on Côte d'Ivoire, adopted at Dakar on 18 December 2002. Referring to paragraph 18 of the communiqué, in which ECOWAS appealed to the Council to provide assistance in its efforts to find a solution to the Ivorian crisis, the representative of Senegal requested the Council to consider without delay the specific forms and modalities of United Nations support for the efforts of ECOWAS.

At the meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,³ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Expressed its grave concern at the situation in Côte d'Ivoire and its serious consequences for the population of the country and the region;

Stressed that the crisis in Côte d'Ivoire could be resolved only through a negotiated political solution;

Strongly supported the efforts of ECOWAS, currently chaired by Senegal, to promote a peaceful resolution of the conflict;

Expressed its full support for the deployment in Côte d'Ivoire of the ECOWAS Monitoring Group force, under Senegalese command, by 31 December 2002;

Expressed its deepest concern at reports of mass killings and grave violations of human rights in Côte d'Ivoire;

Called on all parties to ensure full respect for human rights and international humanitarian law;

Also expressed its concern at the humanitarian consequences of the crisis in Côte d'Ivoire;

Called upon the international community to provide urgent humanitarian assistance to those in need in all the countries of the subregion that were affected by the Ivorian crisis.

Decision of 4 February 2003 (4700th meeting): resolution 1464 (2003)

At its 4700th meeting, on 4 February 2003, in which the representative of Côte d'Ivoire was invited to participate, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 27 January 2003 from the representative of France, transmitting copies of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement signed by Ivorian political forces on 23 January 2003 and the Conclusions of the Conference of Heads of State on Côte d'Ivoire held in Paris on 25 and 26 January 2003.⁴

At the meeting, at which the Secretary-General was present, the President (Germany) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁵ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1464 (2003), by which the Council, determining that the situation in Côte d'Ivoire constituted a threat to international peace and security in the region, *inter alia*:

Endorsed the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement and called on all Ivorian political forces to implement it fully and without delay;

Called on all Ivorian political forces to work towards the establishment of a balanced and stable government; and noted the provisions in the Agreement for the establishment of a Monitoring Committee;

Requested the Secretary-General to submit recommendations to the Council on how the United Nations could support the implementation of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement;

¹ During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held one meeting in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire, pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B (4854th meeting, held on 7 November 2003).

² S/2002/1386.

³ S/PRST/2002/42.

⁴ S/2003/99.

⁵ S/2003/140.

Welcomed the intention of the Secretary-General to appoint a Special Representative for Côte d'Ivoire;

Condemned violations of human rights and international humanitarian law; requested ECOWAS to report to the Council periodically;

Called upon all States neighbouring Côte d'Ivoire to support the peace process by preventing any action that might undermine the security and territorial integrity of Côte d'Ivoire;

Welcomed the deployment of ECOWAS forces and French troops;

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, authorized ECOWAS forces and French forces supporting them to take necessary steps to guarantee the security and freedom of movement of their personnel and to ensure the protection of civilians, for a period of six months.

**Decision of 13 May 2003 (4754th meeting):
resolution 1479 (2003)**

At its 4746th meeting,⁶ on 29 April 2003, the Council heard statements by the Secretary-General, the members of an ECOWAS ministerial delegation comprising the Foreign Ministers of Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea and Nigeria, and the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS.⁷

In his opening remarks, the President (Mexico) noted that the Council favoured strengthening cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and ECOWAS in order to create a process leading to peace and stability in Côte d'Ivoire and in the West African region.⁸

The Secretary-General informed the Council that his Special Representative had taken up the role of chairing the follow-up committee established in

accordance with the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement and welcomed the progress that the Prime Minister, Seydou Diarra, had made in establishing the new Government of National Reconciliation. He noted that the various Ivorian parties had at last begun taking important steps to implement the Agreement and that ECOWAS had found it necessary to substantially increase the size of the ECOWAS force at this critical time. He appealed to the Council and the broader international community to quickly provide ECOWAS with the additional financial resources required to sustain the ECOWAS force in the next six months. Finally, the Secretary-General recalled that he had recommended the establishment of a small United Nations operation in Côte d'Ivoire, which would comprise military liaison components as well as human rights, civil affairs and media components, to complement the peacekeeping efforts launched by ECOWAS and France. It was his hope that the Council would shortly authorize that mission so that the United Nations could strengthen its role in the Ivorian peace process.⁹

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ghana and Chairman of ECOWAS noted that, since the outset of the Ivorian crisis, ECOWAS had assisted the concerned parties in negotiating a ceasefire and forming a new Government of National Reconciliation. Now that such a Government was in place and the country was apparently returning to the path of normalcy and peace, ECOWAS considered it essential to give the peace process the maximum amount of support. Mindful of that, the Defence and Security Commission of ECOWAS had decided to expand the ECOWAS force from a force of around 1,200 soldiers to one of some 3,200 soldiers. In addition to its original mandate of monitoring the ceasefire, the enlarged ECOWAS force would assume several other responsibilities, including protecting the new Government, patrolling the borders, demobilizing and disarming the various militias in the country and creating conditions conducive for the Government to have full control of the national territory. The Minister remarked that since the West African States lacked the necessary financial means to support an expanded ECOWAS force, ECOWAS had dispatched this ministerial delegation to visit the United Nations and certain major capitals to seek support. Stressing that Côte d'Ivoire was one of the most important States in West Africa, the Minister urged the international community to fully support the

⁶ At the 4747th meeting, held in private on 29 April 2003, the members of the Council, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ghana and Chairman of ECOWAS, the Minister of State and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Côte d'Ivoire, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guinea, the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria, the representative of Senegal and the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS had a constructive discussion. The Council members welcomed the action taken by ECOWAS with a view to resolving the crisis in Côte d'Ivoire. They strongly supported the appeal addressed by the ECOWAS ministerial delegation to Member States to provide logistical and financial support for the ECOWAS force deployed in Côte d'Ivoire.

⁷ The representative of Senegal was invited to participate in the meeting but did not make a statement.

⁸ S/PV.4746, p. 3.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

ongoing peace process initiated by the Ivorians themselves in order to create conditions that would allow Côte d'Ivoire to return to full normalcy and peace, and to be able to conduct free and fair elections in October 2005.¹⁰

The Minister of State and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Côte d'Ivoire held that the political developments in his country had been satisfactory since the signing of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement. The Government of National Reconciliation, whose members were drawn from all the political spheres, had been established and was functioning. While its first decisions focused on the restoration of security in the country, the Government had taken steps to revitalize trade and human exchanges with its neighbours in the region. Stating that it was determined to abide by all of its international commitments in order to regain the confidence of its people and its neighbours, the Minister held that the Government was especially concerned about the situation in the western part of the country where rebels from Liberia and Sierra Leone were operational. In that regard, he recalled that the recent meeting between the Presidents of Liberia and Côte d'Ivoire in Togo had resulted in a decision to deploy military forces, composed of contingents from Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia, the ECOWAS force and the French forces, to patrol along the long border between the two countries. At the same time, the Minister opined that the flow of small weapons in the subregion constituted a factor of destabilization, cautioning that what was occurring in Côte d'Ivoire could take place in any country if nothing was done to control the dissemination of such weapons. In conclusion, the Minister emphasized the critical role of ongoing assistance of the Council and the entire international community in order for Côte d'Ivoire to emerge from the serious situation and for peace and stability to be restored to Côte d'Ivoire and to the subregion. He stressed that the ECOWAS force needed to remain in Côte d'Ivoire until the holding of the elections in 2005.¹¹

The Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of Guinea noted that the peacekeeping and peacebuilding experience of ECOWAS in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea-Bissau and Côte d'Ivoire had shown that the required logistical and financial

resources were not always within reach of the West African States. However, he was convinced that with continued support from the Council, as well as assistance from bilateral and multilateral partners, the action that ECOWAS had undertaken in Côte d'Ivoire would be successful.¹²

The Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria underlined the need for the Council and the regional partners to take the issue of Côte d'Ivoire seriously, underlining that the international community could not stand by and watch the situation in Côte d'Ivoire deteriorate to the level of that in Sierra Leone before the intervention of the ECOWAS Monitoring Group and the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone. Noting that the various conflicts in the subregion should be tackled in a holistic manner, he believed that the settlement of the Ivorian crisis would contribute greatly to the resolution of all other problems in the subregion.¹³

For his part, the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS held that while ECOWAS had shown the political will to act and intervene in conflicts in West Africa, its capacity had been restricted due to the lack of financial wherewithal. In that respect, he encouraged the Council to find ways to support worthy subregional efforts to maintain peace and security. He stressed that the Council should encourage ECOWAS to continue to play a leading role in addressing the Ivorian conflict, while also creating the right synergy and collaborative working relationships with ECOWAS.¹⁴

On 26 March 2003, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on Côte d'Ivoire.¹⁵ In that report, the Secretary-General reflected on the root causes of instability in Côte d'Ivoire, notably the power struggle among the leadership and the controversies over nationality laws and eligibility conditions for national elections. Recalling the various international efforts aimed at restoring peace to Côte d'Ivoire, the Secretary-General held that the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement offered the best chance for the Ivorian people to peacefully resolve the conflict that threatened to plunge their country into a crisis of the proportions of those that had devastated Liberia and

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 4.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 4-5.

¹² Ibid., pp. 5-6.

¹³ Ibid., p. 6.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

¹⁵ S/2003/374 and Corr.1 and Add.1, submitted pursuant to resolution 1464 (2003).

Sierra Leone. In that respect, he urged the Ivorian parties to overcome their differences to allow the new Government of National Reconciliation to start functioning without further delay and to address the bigger challenge of implementing the work programme set out in the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement. The Secretary-General commended the French and ECOWAS forces for their partnership and invaluable work in preventing the escalation of the conflict and appealed to donor countries to redeem their pledges of assistance.

The Secretary-General, alarmed by the disturbing regional dimension of the Ivorian crisis, underlined the urgent need for the international community to pay more attention to the linkages between the conflict in Liberia and the developments in Côte d'Ivoire and Sierra Leone. Stressing the need for an integrated and common approach by the United Nations system, the Secretary-General noted that his Special Representative for Côte d'Ivoire would devise, in consultation with the humanitarian and development agencies, an appropriate coordination mechanism that would ensure an enhanced effectiveness of the United Nations system's response to the Ivorian crisis and linkages with regional dimensions. Finally, the Secretary-General recommended that the Council approve the proposed arrangements for United Nations support to the Ivorian peace process and that a United Nations mission in Côte d'Ivoire be established for that purpose.

At its 4754th meeting, on 13 May 2003, the Council included the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General in its agenda and extended an invitation to the representative of Côte d'Ivoire to participate in the discussion. The President (Pakistan) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁶ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1479 (2003), by which the Council, inter alia:

Decided to establish, for an initial period of six months, a United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (MINUCI), with a mandate to facilitate the implementation by the Ivorian parties of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement and including a military component;

Approved the establishment of a small staff to support the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on political, legal, civil affairs, civilian police, elections, media and public

¹⁶ S/2003/539.

relations, humanitarian and human rights issues, and the establishment of a military liaison group;

Requested that special attention be given to the gender component within the staff of MINUCI and to the situation of women and girls, consistent with resolution 1325 (2000);

Renewed its appeal to all Ivorian political forces to implement fully and without delay the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement and invited the Government of National Reconciliation to this end to develop a timetable for implementing the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement and to communicate this timetable to the Monitoring Committee;

Emphasized again the need to bring to justice those responsible for the serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law that had taken place in Côte d'Ivoire since 19 September 2002;

Stressed the importance of an early start to the process of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration;

Requested all Ivorian parties to cooperate with MINUCI in the execution of its mandate, to ensure the freedom of movement of its personnel throughout the country and the unimpeded and safe movement of the personnel of humanitarian agencies, and to support efforts to find safe and durable solutions for refugees and displaced persons.

Decision of 25 July 2003 (4793rd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4793rd meeting, on 25 July 2003, at which the Secretary-General was present, the Council heard a briefing by the Prime Minister of the Government of National Reconciliation of Côte d'Ivoire,¹⁷ following which all members of the Council made statements.

The Prime Minister of Côte d'Ivoire outlined the progress that had been made in the implementation of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement since the establishment of the Government of National Reconciliation. While the Ministers of Defence and Security remained to be appointed, their respective functions were being carried out and the Government as a whole was working normally. On the military front, the integral ceasefire agreement between the Forces armées nationales de Côte d'Ivoire (FANCI) and the Forces nouvelles had been signed and subsequently the ceasefire was extended westward to the border with Liberia. Meanwhile, a buffer zone between FANCI and the Forces nouvelles had been

¹⁷ At the request of the Prime Minister, his Special Adviser was also given the floor to provide a briefing on the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme in Côte d'Ivoire.

defined and the cantonment areas for the two forces had been designated. Recently, the two forces also issued a joint statement declaring the end of the war following which the Government adopted an amnesty bill and submitted it to the National Assembly for adoption. With regard to the relations with neighbouring countries, the Prime Minister referred to several high-level visits from Burkina Faso and Mali, resulting in the opening of safe transportation corridors between Côte d'Ivoire and its neighbours. As to the assistance from the international community, the Prime Minister stressed the need to finance the ECOWAS Mission in Côte d'Ivoire, the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme and the redeployment of State administration throughout the national territory. Moreover, the Prime Minister noted that his Government would seek United Nations support for the holding of fair, transparent and open elections by 2005 involving all Ivoirians, as well as financial help in health and education, humanitarian assistance and job training and creation for young people. The Prime Minister emphasized that for Côte d'Ivoire to return to peace and stability, the Liberian conflict must be settled in the subregional context and with the support of the international community. He further stressed that poverty in the subregion must be robustly addressed. Finally, the Prime Minister reiterated that the goal of his Government was to hold fair, transparent and open elections by 2005. To that end, the most important thing was to avoid exclusion by involving all Ivoirians, including non-winning minorities, in the electoral process.¹⁸

The Special Adviser to the Prime Minister provided a detailed overview of the national disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme in Côte d'Ivoire and elaborated on the plans for its full implementation, including a step-by-step agenda for action in the four phases of the process, namely grouping, disarmament, demobilization, cantonment and reintegration. He held that the process could be successfully implemented following the establishment of the Government of National Reconciliation and by reunifying the army to make it a force devoted to republican values.¹⁹

The Council members welcomed the progress that had been made in the Ivorian peace process, as

¹⁸ S/PV.4793, pp. 2-4, 6 and 18-21.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6.

evidently noted by the Prime Minister. Many attached particular importance to the joint statement of 4 July 2003 by FANCI and the Forces nouvelles declaring an end to the war, which constituted an important step forward towards national reconciliation.²⁰ They reiterated the importance of fully implementing the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement and expressed their support for the Prime Minister in that regard. At the same time, they underlined that much remained to be done, particularly with regard to the implementation of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme, the restoration of State administration throughout the country and the revival of the economy. In the light of those challenges, the Council members called on the international community and particularly donor countries to continue to provide generous support to the Government and people of Côte d'Ivoire in their search for lasting peace, as well as to assist ECOWAS in its efforts to restore peace to Côte d'Ivoire.

As a matter of priority, a number of members called for a prompt settlement of the issues concerning the appointment of the Ministers of Defence and Security and the adoption of the amnesty law by the National Assembly so as to make the Government of National Reconciliation fully operational and to promote national reconciliation.²¹ Meanwhile, many stressed the need for the Ivorian parties to carry out the national disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme without delay.²² Several drew attention to the regional dimension of the Ivorian crisis, with the representatives of Angola and Chile cautioning against the negative repercussions of the situation in Liberia for the stability of Côte d'Ivoire.²³ Finally, the representatives of China and Mexico noted that the proliferation of small arms and the rampant activities of mercenaries in the subregion must be curbed.²⁴

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (China); pp. 9-10 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 10 (Mexico); p. 12 (Angola); p. 13 (Guinea); p. 15 (Russian Federation); and p. 16 (Cameroon).

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 8 (China); p. 11 (Mexico); p. 12 (Angola); p. 15 (Russian Federation); p. 17 (United States); and p. 18 (Spain).

²² *Ibid.*, p. 6 (France); p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 9 (Germany); p. 11 (Mexico); p. 13 (Angola); p. 15 (Chile); and p. 16 (Russian Federation).

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (China); p. 10 (Mexico); p. 13 (Angola); p. 15 (Chile); and p. 17 (United States).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (China); and p. 11 (Mexico).

At the end of the meeting, the President (Spain) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁵ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reiterated the need for Ivorian political forces to implement fully and without delay all the provisions of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement, as well as those of the agreement signed in Accra on 8 March 2003, with a view to open, free and transparent elections being held in 2005;

Emphasized, however, that much remained to be done to achieve the full implementation of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement; endorsed the recommendations of its mission to West Africa;

Renewed its support and encouragement to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Côte d'Ivoire; asked him to keep the Council closely informed of developments towards the full implementation of the above objectives;

Stated that it was pleased that MINUCI was now operational and hoped it would soon be fully staffed, including in such crucial areas as the political and human rights components;

Reiterated its full support for the efforts of ECOWAS and France in contributing to a peaceful solution to the crisis;

Invited donor countries to contribute to the reconstruction of Côte d'Ivoire in compliance with their commitments;

Expressed its concern at the continued existence of regional factors of instability, particularly the use of mercenaries and child soldiers, and the spread of small arms and light weapons which prevented a lasting solution to the crisis in the region.

Decision of 4 August 2003 (4804th meeting): resolution 1498 (2003)

At its 4804th meeting, on 4 August 2003, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 26 March 2003²⁶ and invited the representative of Côte d'Ivoire to participate in the discussion. The President (Syrian Arab Republic) then drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution;²⁷ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1498 (2003), by which the Council, reaffirming its resolution 1464 (2003), *inter alia*:

Decided to renew for a period of six months the authorization given to Member States participating in ECOWAS forces together with French forces supporting them;

Requested ECOWAS, through the command of its force, and France to report to the Council periodically, through the Secretary-General, on all aspects of the implementation of their respective mandates; and decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

Decisions of 13 November 2003 (4857th meeting): resolution 1514 (2003) and statement by the President

On 4 November 2003, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council his second report on MINUCI.²⁸ In his report, the Secretary-General noted with concern that the Ivorian peace process had encountered serious difficulties since early August 2003. The country had plunged into a political stalemate, mainly due to the boycott by the Forces nouvelles of the Government of National Reconciliation, leaving the latter effectively unable to implement the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement. The Secretary-General particularly expressed concern at the outstanding differences among the Ivorian political actors over their interpretation of the power-sharing concept and the delay in the restructuring process of the Ivorian Defence and Security Forces as provided for in the Agreement. He held that the current difficult situation was further compounded by the activities of hardliners on both sides. While the "militarists" within the Forces nouvelles stressed that the crucial issues pertaining to nationality and article 35 of the Constitution concerning eligibility criteria for the Presidency must be resolved before they surrendered their weapons, some key figures in the ruling party, feeling that they had already made major concessions, questioned the sincerity of the Forces nouvelles' commitment to the peace process. In that context, the Secretary-General urged the Ivorian leaders to cooperate with the ongoing efforts of ECOWAS leaders to convene a meeting between President Gbagbo and the signatories to the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement, with a view to reaching agreement on a number of fundamental issues as well as on a calendar for addressing them. Those key benchmarks would include the following: (a) the acceptance by all parties of the Government of National Reconciliation as fully constituted after the appointment of the Defence and Security Ministers on 12 September 2003; (b) the immediate return of the Forces nouvelles to the

²⁵ S/PRST/2003/11.

²⁶ S/2003/374 and Corr.1 and Add.1.

²⁷ S/2003/783.

²⁸ S/2003/1069, submitted pursuant to resolution 1479 (2003). For the first report, dated 8 August 2003, see S/2003/801.

Government; (c) the immediate commencement of the disbanding of all militias; (d) the earliest and simultaneous cantonment of both the Forces nouvelles and FANCI, and the commencement of their disarmament; (e) the immediate restoration of State authority throughout the territory; and (f) the adoption by the National Assembly, before the end of 2003, of the Government's proposed programme for the implementation of provisions of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement relating to nationality, article 35 of the Constitution, electoral reforms, the media and human rights.

The Secretary-General fully shared the assessment of the recent mission of the International Organization of la Francophonie to Côte d'Ivoire that, without an early reunification of the country, the holding of elections in 2005 would not be possible. He was confident that the implementation of the above benchmarks would facilitate the reunification of Côte d'Ivoire. Once the current stalemate was resolved and the parties agreed on timelines for those benchmarks and opened up the country for free movement, the United Nations would be ready to dispatch an electoral assessment mission to Côte d'Ivoire to determine how best the Organization could support the elections of 2005, as requested by the Government. The Secretary-General urged the Council to support the efforts aimed at resolving the ongoing political stalemate and looked forward to an early decision by the Council on possible reinforcement of MINUCI. Meanwhile, he recommended that the mandate of MINUCI be extended for another six months. He implored the international community to provide the necessary logistical and financial support to the ECOWAS Mission, which was playing an indispensable role in stabilizing the situation on the ground. Finally, noting that the international community faced a unique opportunity to pursue an effective regional approach in its efforts to bring lasting stability to Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia and Sierra Leone, the Secretary-General urged all stakeholders to make the best use of the opportunity and avoid the dangers of failing to address adequately any one of the situations in the three countries.

At its 4857th meeting, on 13 November 2003, the Council included the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General in its agenda and invited the representative of Côte d'Ivoire to participate in the discussion. The President (Angola) drew the attention

of the members of the Council to a draft resolution;²⁹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1514 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided that the mandate of MINUCI should be extended until 4 February 2004;

Requested the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council by 10 January 2004 on the efforts of the Mission to facilitate peace and stability in Côte d'Ivoire, including how those efforts might be improved and in particular the possible reinforcement of the United Nations presence in Côte d'Ivoire.

After the adoption of resolution 1514 (2003), the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Urged all Ivorian political forces to implement fully, without delay or precondition, all the provisions of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement as well as those of the agreement reached in Accra on 8 March 2003 with a view to open, free and transparent elections being held in Côte d'Ivoire in 2005;

Emphasized the urgent need to begin reforming land law and electoral rules, restore public services and the authority of the State throughout the territory of Côte d'Ivoire, and end the use of mercenaries and the illicit purchase of weapons in violation of national laws;

Condemned firmly the grave human rights violations;

Further condemned the murder of a French journalist on 21 October in Abidjan;

Further condemned the hostile acts against United Nations personnel in Bouaké and Man on 24 and 25 October, and recalled that all the parties were obliged, by resolution 1479 (2003), to cooperate with MINUCI and to ensure freedom of movement of its personnel;

Reiterated its full support for the efforts of ECOWAS, France and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General with a view to stabilizing the country and seeking a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

**Decision of 4 December 2003 (4875th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4873rd meeting, on 24 November 2003, the Council heard a statement by the Secretary-General, as well as briefings by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ghana and the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS.

The Secretary-General voiced deep concern at the political stalemate created by the withdrawal of the

²⁹ S/2003/1083.

³⁰ S/PRST/2003/20.

Forces nouvelles from the Government of National Reconciliation on 23 September 2003. Unless urgent steps were taken to resolve the impasse, he cautioned, the tenuous security situation in the country could deteriorate still further. In that regard, he pointed to the increased tensions between FANCI and the Forces nouvelles, as well as to signs indicating that the situation in some parts of the territory controlled by the Forces nouvelles was degenerating into lawlessness. In view of those alarming developments, the Secretary-General was reassured by the recent meeting of ECOWAS leaders held in Accra on 11 November 2003 where the President and the Prime Minister of Côte d'Ivoire had worked closely together to ensure the effective implementation of the Government's work programme developed on the basis of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement. The Secretary-General reiterated his call on the Ivorian parties to swiftly address the fundamental issues behind the stalemate as identified in his report of 4 November 2003,³¹ and reaffirmed the commitment of the United Nations to work closely with ECOWAS in the pursuit of peace in Côte d'Ivoire. He noted his intention to send an assessment mission to Côte d'Ivoire soon to prepare recommendations on the United Nations role in facilitating the Ivorian peace process, including through the possible reinforcement of the United Nations presence in the country. He implored the Council and the international community to remain engaged in Côte d'Ivoire and to provide the necessary support to enable ECOMICI to continue its useful work in Côte d'Ivoire.³²

Speaking on behalf of the visiting ECOWAS ministerial delegation, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ghana and Chairman of ECOWAS noted that serious difficulties remained in the restoration of peace in Côte d'Ivoire, notably the suspension by the Forces nouvelles of their participation in the Government and the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme. To find a rapid solution to the deadlock, a summit was recently convened in Accra among the Heads of State and Government of some ECOWAS Member States. In addition to stressing the need for all Ivorian parties to work together towards lasting peace, the participating leaders had concluded that the presence of a robust peacekeeping force, capable of securing the entire territory of Côte d'Ivoire, would

contribute greatly to the implementation of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement. Since ECOWAS did not dispose of the means required to raise and maintain such a force, the leaders requested the Council to consider the possibility of establishing a full-fledged United Nations peacekeeping force in Côte d'Ivoire and of transforming the ECOWAS Mission into part of that force. The Minister noted that all the principal actors of the Ivorian crisis appeared to be supportive of such a decisive step aimed at restoring peace to their country. In the light of the allegations that the various parties were strengthening their positions militarily in the eventuality of a resumption of hostilities, he reiterated that insecurity remained the real threat to the peace process in Côte d'Ivoire and highlighted that all measures should be taken to secure the ceasefire and to implement the security provisions of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement. For its part, ECOWAS had continued to work closely with the French forces to secure the line of separation between the belligerents while deciding to augment the personal security of the Ministers of the Government.³³

Elaborating on the enormous impact of the Ivorian conflict on the overall economic conditions in West Africa, the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS underlined that the restoration of peace and stability to Côte d'Ivoire was a *sine qua non* for the stability and development of the rest of the subregion. However, despite the considerable efforts by ECOWAS, there were troubling signs of deterioration of the situation in Côte d'Ivoire. Of particular concern was the existence of bands of armed groups whose activities extended beyond the Ivorian borders and threatened the successful efforts of the international community to bring peace to Sierra Leone, Liberia and Côte d'Ivoire. The Executive Secretary therefore urged the international community to adopt a comprehensive regional approach to simultaneously tackle the conflicts in the three countries. To that end, he encouraged the Council to join ECOWAS in a concerted effort to restore peace and stability to Côte d'Ivoire, which would in turn consolidate the gains recently made in Sierra Leone and Liberia. In closing, he noted that to create an enabling environment for dialogue, national reconciliation and the speedy and full implementation of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement in Côte d'Ivoire, the international community should back political action by the

³¹ S/2003/1069.

³² S/PV.4873, pp. 2-3.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.

presence of a robust peacekeeping force in Côte d'Ivoire.³⁴

At the 4875th meeting,³⁵ on 4 December 2003, in which the representative of Côte d'Ivoire was invited to participate, the President (Bulgaria) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁶ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

³⁵ At the 4874th meeting, held in private on 24 November 2003, the members of the Council, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ghana, members of the ministerial delegation and the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS had a constructive exchange of views.

³⁶ S/PRST/2003/25.

Reiterated its full support for the ECOWAS and French forces;

Called on all parties to refrain from any act that might compromise the respect of the ceasefire and implementation of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement;

Reiterated urgent need for all parties to take all possible measures to accelerate implementation of the Agreement;

Reiterated also its intention to consider the Secretary-General's recommendations on the means of facilitating peace and stability in Côte d'Ivoire;

Welcomed commitments undertaken by President Laurent Gbagbo in his speech on 27 November 2003 and called on all parties in Côte d'Ivoire and countries of the region to guarantee safety and full access of humanitarian agencies personnel.

21. Letter dated 2 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Initial proceedings

Decision of 10 October 2003 (4839th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4839th meeting, on 10 October 2003, the Security Council included in its agenda a letter dated 2 October 2003 from the representative of the Sudan,¹ transmitting the text of the Framework Agreement on Security Arrangements during the Interim Period between the Government of the Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army, signed on 25 September 2003 in Naivasha, Kenya. The representative of the Sudan stated that the agreement on security arrangements was an important breakthrough and key step in reaching a comprehensive settlement.

The representative of the Sudan was invited to participate in the meeting. The President (United States) made a statement on behalf of the Council,² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the agreement on security arrangements reached in Naivasha (Kenya) between the Government of the Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army; reiterated its welcome for the signing of the Machakos Protocol which represented a viable basis for a resolution of the conflict in the Sudan;

Also welcomed the continuation of the ceasefire and the establishment of the Verification and Monitoring Team, the Joint Military Commission and the Civilian Protection Monitoring Team, and encouraged Member States in a position to do so to contribute financial and logistical resources.

¹ S/2003/934.

² S/PRST/2003/16.

22. Central African region

Initial proceedings

Deliberations of 24 November 2003 (4871st meeting)

At its 4871st meeting,¹ on 24 November 2003, the Security Council included in its agenda without objection the item entitled “Central African region” and a letter dated 10 November 2003 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council,² transmitting to the Council the interim report of the multidisciplinary assessment mission to the Central African subregion.

In the report, the multidisciplinary assessment mission, which had been authorized by the Secretary-General pursuant to the statement by the President of 31 October 2002,³ elaborated on the outcome of its visit to all 11 members of the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS)⁴ from 8 to 22 June 2003. The mission highlighted the discrepancy between the subregion’s potential richness and its low ranking on the human development indices and indicated that the recurrence of armed rebellions and conflicts as well as mismanagement and non-inclusive governance throughout the subregion had hampered its socio-economic development. At the same time, the mission pointed out a number of cross-border challenges, including ethnic tensions, refugee flows as well as cross-border movement of weapons, drugs and armed groups, which could only be solved through cooperation and coordination to establish an integrated, holistic subregional approach. The mission recommended that the international community should intensify its partnership with subregional organizations to address such transnational challenges and that the United Nations should strengthen its efforts to support the country-specific disarmament, demobilization and

reintegration programmes. Moreover, 10 of the 11 affected countries had called for the establishment of a United Nations political presence in the subregion, through an office in Central Africa. In the letter, the Secretary-General recalled that there were already a number of United Nations structures in the subregion, including three offices headed by Special Representatives, and proposed instead to appoint a Special Envoy who would be available to work on political issues with Governments in the subregion, and who would also interface with the United Nations entities involved in development and humanitarian activities in Central Africa.

At the same meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs and head of the multidisciplinary mission to Central Africa. Statements were made by all Council members as well as the representatives of Italy (on behalf of the European Union⁵), the Congo (on behalf of ECCAS), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, the Permanent Observer of the African Union and the Deputy Secretary-General for Political Affairs of ECCAS.

Introducing the report of the multidisciplinary assessment mission, the Assistant Secretary-General noted that, in line with its mandate, the mission had identified the priority needs and challenges in a number of areas, including peace and security, economic and social development, humanitarian affairs, human rights, HIV/AIDS, subregional institutions, United Nations activities and regional integration. He stressed the need for the United Nations to provide assistance to implement subregional policies to address the numerous cross-cutting challenges in the Central African region, and emphasized that the interlinkages between poverty and security required a holistic and integrated approach. Taking note of the Secretary-General’s agreement with the mission’s assessment, he reported that the Secretary-General had called for further examination of the root causes of the

¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. X, part IV, with regard to the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter.

² S/2003/1077.

³ S/PRST/2002/31.

⁴ The members of ECCAS are Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Rwanda and Sao Tome and Principe.

⁵ Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

conflicts in the subregion and requested a review of United Nations programmes.⁶

Most speakers concurred with the report's assessment concerning the primary challenges confronting the countries in Central Africa, and about the importance of a subregional approach to address the numerous cross-cutting challenges facing those countries. A number of speakers stressed the importance of strengthening existing subregional mechanisms and organizations, including ECCAS. Moreover, several speakers, while expressing concern about the continued fragility of the countries in Central Africa, welcomed recent progress in the peace process in a number of Central African countries.

Several delegations welcomed the Secretary-General's intention to appoint a Special Envoy for the region.⁷

The representative of Cameroon deplored that the report did not include a recommendation in line with the request, which he believed had been made by all, and not just most, Governments in Central Africa during the mission's visit, for a permanent United Nations presence in the subregion. In addition, he expressed regret that the Secretary-General's transmission letter appeared to indicate that the proliferation of national United Nations offices in the region constituted a problem for the request for a subregional presence, while similar numbers of offices had not prevented the Secretary-General from setting up other subregional offices in the past. He also questioned the need for a new study of the root causes of conflict in the region, as Central Africa had already carried out its own study and the Secretary-General had already published a report on the causes of conflict in Africa. Finally, he rejected the idea that the creation of the office should wait until after the international conference on the Great Lakes, since the Great Lakes conference did not concern ECCAS. The representative hoped that the Council would ask the Secretary-General to see how the request by the Governments in Central Africa could be accommodated swiftly and effectively within existing resources.⁸

The representative of France stated that the cross-border challenges confronting the countries in Central

Africa made it necessary for the States of the region and the international community to coordinate appropriate responses. At the same time, France believed that the proposal to appoint a Special Envoy should be considered in the context of the international conference on the Great Lakes region. He noted that while there was no precise equation between countries participating in the conference on the Great Lakes, there were more than four countries overlapping, and the conference would have an impact on cooperation between many of the countries in the region and on their relations with the United Nations.⁹

The representative of Germany stated that it was difficult to see how a mandate for an additional special envoy for Central Africa could avoid overlapping with the mandate of the Special Representative for the Great Lakes Region. His delegation therefore preferred for the United Nations missions in the Central African subregion to identify possible areas of cooperation aimed at effectively addressing cross-cutting issues.¹⁰

The representative of Spain agreed with the report that it was preferable to make effective and coordinated use of existing structures in the region before considering the possibility of establishing new ones.¹¹

The representative of the United Kingdom recognized the need for a comprehensive and concerted approach to the issues of peace, security and development in Central Africa, and stressed the importance of making effective operational linkages across the United Nations system and, where relevant, across borders. He stated that an integrated and holistic subregional approach was required to complement national solutions, but cautioned against imposing templates on different kinds of problems. In addition, he warned against cutting across or duplicating existing regional and subregional initiatives, noting that rather than creating a new level of bureaucracy, his delegation would prefer to build on existing structures. In that context, he urged the Central African subregional organizations to define their roles according to where they could best add value, and hoped that the proposed review of United Nations programmes would do the same.¹²

⁶ S/PV.4871, pp. 2-4 and 30.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Guinea); p. 8 (China); p. 11 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 14 (Russian Federation); and p. 25 (Chad).

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

The representative of the Russian Federation expressed concern that some African countries tended to appeal to the international community before fully exhausting national or regional possibilities. That applied to the “rather excessive approach for the establishment in Central Africa of a United Nations office”. Along the same lines were the requests relating to international commissions for investigating violations of human rights and international humanitarian law.¹³

The representative of the United States, noting that the international conference on the Great Lakes region might incorporate a number of the elements laid out in the report of the multidisciplinary mission, recommended that the decision on naming a Special Envoy be deferred until after the issuance of the results and recommendations of that conference. Moreover, he expressed concern about adding yet another layer of bureaucracy to the United Nations structures in the Central African region.¹⁴

The representative of Chile recommended heeding the concern of the Secretary-General regarding the proliferation of United Nations offices in the region. He stressed the importance of setting clear and achievable goals, drawing up a specific timetable and avoiding any duplication of functions.¹⁵

The representative of the Congo, speaking on behalf of the 11 States members of ECCAS, expressed his agreement with the statement by Cameroon. Noting the strong interest of the Central African leaders in strengthening cooperation with the United Nations, he said that the subregion wished to send the message that it wanted to emerge from the “infernal circle of violence and poverty”, but added that this would require substantial support from the international community. Drawing attention to a number of positive developments throughout the subregion since the mission’s visit, he reiterated the determination of the Central African leaders to face up to their responsibilities. At the same time, he underlined that it was imperative to have a subregional, coordinated approach, and for the subregion to have a United Nations interlocutor with a regional perspective.¹⁶

The representative of Equatorial Guinea stressed the special responsibility of the Security Council to address the crises in the region, and also expressed appreciation for the work of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa. He underlined that despite recent positive developments, the countries of the region remained fragile, and he stressed the need for a permanent political United Nations presence with a subregional scope.¹⁷

The Permanent Observer of the African Union indicated that the diagnosis and remedies recommended in the assessment mission’s report could be applied to all of Africa’s regions, and reiterated the paradox that Central Africa was one of the regions with most resources, while also one of the weakest performers with regard to socio-economic development. Pointing to the abundance of subregional, regional and international organizations present in Central Africa, he stressed the need to strengthen existing capacities, and hoped that a United Nations regional political presence could serve to enhance coordination among the various initiatives. As to what form the structure should take, he stated that the African Union relied on the flexibility shown by the countries in the subregion that were prepared to consider the issue further with the Special Envoy to be appointed by the Secretary-General. While supporting the request by the countries of the subregion, he emphasized that the form of coordination mattered less than its efficiency and effectiveness.¹⁸

The Deputy Secretary-General for Political Affairs of ECCAS, noting that progress was being made toward a collective security mechanism in the subregion, informed the Council that the Council for Peace and Security in Central Africa had become operational. He added that ECCAS was undertaking efforts to improve conflict prevention and management in the subregion, aimed at, inter alia, making the early warning mechanism for Central Africa operational. Noting the recent progress made towards consolidating peace and security in a number of countries in the region, he argued that a new dynamic was under way in Central Africa and reiterated the call for a permanent United Nations regional office.¹⁹

¹³ Ibid., pp. 13-14.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 15.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 18-21.

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 26-27.

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 27-28.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 28-29.

Americas

23. The question concerning Haiti

Decision of 15 March 2000: statement by the President

At its 4112th meeting, on 15 March 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti.¹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the transition from the United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (MIPONUH) to the International Civilian Support Mission in Haiti (MICAH) was under way, and that MIPONUH was expected to be liquidated by 30 June 2000. MICAH, established by the General Assembly on 18 February 2000,² was expected to consolidate the results achieved by MIPONUH and the International Civilian Mission in Haiti and previous United Nations missions in terms of respect for human rights, reinforcement of the effectiveness of the police and the judiciary and coordination of the international community's dialogue with political and social actors in Haiti, thus facilitating the passage from security to development priorities. The Secretary-General underlined that institutional, social and economic development must be addressed in an integrated manner in order to consolidate democracy and peace. In this regard, he encouraged Member States to continue to assist the transition process from peacekeeping to peacebuilding and contribute to the Trust Fund established for MICAH. With regard to the political situation, the Secretary-General observed that the political climate in Haiti had been dominated by pre-electoral activities and that despite many obstacles the evolution of the electoral process was encouraging and conditions seemed to be in place for the holding of presidential and legislative elections on schedule on 19 March 2000. Obstacles had included some electoral violence, logistical problems in the registration process and the blocking of the voter registration process in one province. The Secretary-General observed that all political leaders had an obligation to ensure that their supporters refrained from any violence that could put the holding and fairness of the elections at risk. With

regard to MIPONUH, he noted that the Mission had continued to deploy its civilian police elements throughout Haiti's nine departments and had made great progress in training the Haitian National Police, with an emphasis on community policing, the maintenance of law and order, the fight against capital crime and drug trafficking, and the reinforcement of police administration and logistics. The situation of the Haitian police had improved in the reporting period, as the number of capital crimes against police officers and the number of police officers accused of human rights violations had declined considerably and as several successful operations had been undertaken in the fight against delinquency and drug trafficking. He reported that the Government, the United Nations Development Programme and bilateral donors were collaborating to prepare the assistance to judicial reform in the context of MICAH.

The Council extended an invitation to the representative of Haiti to participate in the meeting. The President (Bangladesh) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Commended the Representative of the Secretary-General, the United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti, the International Civilian Mission in Haiti and all the previous missions deployed in Haiti for assisting the Haitian Government in supporting the professionalization of the Haitian National Police force, consolidating the system of justice and other national institutions of Haiti, and promoting human rights.

Commended the Secretary-General for ensuring a phased transition to the International Civilian Support Mission in Haiti, and recognized that economic rehabilitation and reconstruction constituted a major task facing the Government and people of Haiti and that significant international assistance was indispensable for the sustainable development of Haiti.

Welcomed the initiative of the Economic and Social Council to develop a strategic framework and a comprehensive approach for a long-term United Nations programme of support for Haiti, and underlined the vital link between national stability and economic and social development.

¹ S/2000/150, submitted pursuant to resolution 1277 (1999).

² Resolution 54/193.

³ S/PRST/2000/8.

Asia

24. The situation in Timor-Leste¹

Decision of 3 August 2000 (4182nd meeting): statement by the President

On 26 January 2000, the Secretary-General submitted a report on the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET),² covering its activities in the three months since its establishment by resolution 1272 (1999) of 25 October 1999. The Secretary-General noted that UNTAET had initiated its operations throughout East Timor, developed consultative mechanisms with East Timorese and established the basic elements of its administrative structure. He further observed that the first three months of the operation of UNTAET had seen strenuous efforts to make progress on a range of important and urgent issues, including security, governance and public administration, humanitarian assistance and public information.

The Secretary-General reported that while United Nations staff had done their best to ensure a smooth transition from the United Nations Mission in East Timor (UNAMET) to UNTAET, a complete vacuum of administrative authority and of policing and justice had ensued. The International Force in East Timor (INTERFET) had to fill the latter, while UNTAET, with minimal staff and functioning in appalling conditions, was not yet able to assume administrative authority effectively. East Timorese leaders had been keen to take charge and tackle the enormous problems. The National Council of Timorese Resistance (CNRT), a coalition of pro-independence groups, and the Armed Forces for the National Liberation of East Timor (FALINTIL) had moved into the authority vacuum and asserted a security role. The situation had improved with the return to East Timor of Mr. José Alexandre Gusmão, the head of CNRT, who had begun to play an effective leadership role. Based on contacts between the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Transitional Administrator in East Timor, Mr. Gusmão and other East Timorese personalities, the National Consultative Council of East Timor (NCC)

was established as the primary mechanism through which the representatives of the East Timorese people participated in the decision-making process. The Secretary-General noted that the inclusion of pro-autonomy groups in NCC was an important step on the path to reconciliation. With respect to the relations between East Timor and Indonesia, he reported that both the Government of Indonesia and CNRT had shown strong will to establish good relations.

Referring to the security situation in East Timor, the Secretary-General observed that while the arrival of INTERFET had largely normalized the internal security situation, the crime rate had increased, especially in Dili and other urban centres, owing particularly to the large numbers of unemployed and re-emergence of long-standing conflicts within the society. The Secretary-General recalled that following a number of incidents along the border between East Timor and West Timor (East Nusa Tenggara), United Nations military observers had deployed border liaison teams to West Timor for cross-border liaison and confidence-building. He recalled that a joint plan for the hand over from INTERFET to UNTAET had been signed in Dili on 8 January 2000, the transition being scheduled for completion by 28 February.

The Secretary-General also drew attention to the humanitarian situation in East Timor, where a large proportion of the population had been displaced from their homes and the majority of private and public building and essential utilities had been destroyed. An immediate and urgent task was to arrange for the return from West Timor of the estimated 250,000 refugees. Taking into account the urgent humanitarian needs and public services requirements, UNTAET had established the basic elements of an administrative structure and was actively coordinating humanitarian assistance efforts.

Noting that the Transitional Judicial Service Commission had been established on 5 January and that INTERFET subsequently had handed over its functions relating to arrest and detention to the United Nations civilian police and the East Timorese judiciary, he stressed the importance of training and capacity-building in the justice sector.

¹ As from the 4646th meeting, held on 14 November 2002, the item "The situation in East Timor" was revised to read "The situation in Timor-Leste".

² S/2000/53, submitted pursuant to resolution 1272 (1999).

At its 4097th meeting,³ on 3 February 2000, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General on UNTAET dated 26 January 2000.² The Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Transitional Administrator in East Timor. Statements were made by all Council members.

In his briefing, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General stated that the “devastating violence” of September 1999, following the United Nations-supervised referendum in which the majority of voters had spoken in favour of independence, had resulted in some 750,000 people, out of a population of 880,000, being either internally displaced, fleeing or being forced across the border to West Timor. Most properties had been destroyed and public services interrupted, and in the aftermath of the violence, criminality and disaffection had been growing and local rivalries might be resurfacing. Stressing first and foremost the need to ensure the physical security of all people of East Timor, as well as establishment of law and order, the Special Representative noted the importance of refugee repatriation and making resources available for shelter, health and sanitation needs during their integration. Cautioning that militias in the border areas continued to pose a threat, he assured Council members that the UNTAET peacekeeping force would be just as firm and determined as INTERFET, while regularly assessing the necessary military strength with a view to possible reductions. Noting that crime rates had increased due to widespread unemployment and disruptions in the social and educational systems, he pointed out that only 480 out of the 1,610 mandated United Nations civilian police had been deployed. Therefore, UNTAET was seeking to integrate local participation in police activities to fight crime, including former East Timorese police officers and unarmed former members of the FALINTIL to assist in crime-prevention. In terms of the political future and the related timetable, he deemed it premature to predict when the process of drafting a constitution should begin. On human rights, the Special Representative recalled that the International Commission of Inquiry on East Timor as well as the Indonesian Commission of Inquiry had submitted

³ During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held a number of meetings in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) and, subsequently, the United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISSET), pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B. The meetings were held on 25 October 2001 (4397th), 23 January 2002 (4456th), 6 May 2002 (4527th) and 16 May 2003 (4755th).

their reports, and that UNTAET had assumed the lead role in coordinating the investigative process.⁴

Council members stressed the importance of the tasks confronting UNTAET and expressed support for its efforts to establish an administrative structure, coordinate humanitarian efforts and restore basic public services. Several representatives welcomed the establishment of NCC and underlined its role in building local capacity for security and self-governance and fostering local ownership.⁵ Many Council members stressed that, as a decision-making body in which various groups, including pro-autonomy groups, were included, NCC could play an important role in fostering national reconciliation.⁶

Many speakers welcomed the progress made in ensuring a smooth transition from INTERFET to UNTAET and hoped that the transfer would be completed as scheduled. Meanwhile, the representative of Canada held that the operation in East Timor should have been a United Nations peacekeeping operation from the beginning. Had that been the case, the operation would have been structured in a politically more congenial manner and its significant costs would have been more equitably apportioned among States.⁷ Similarly, the representative of China remarked that his Government had always advocated the settlement of the question of East Timor within the framework of the United Nations.⁸

Several representatives expressed concern at the reported activities of pro-integrationist militias in the border areas.⁹ The representative of Namibia hoped that the memorandum between UNTAET, INTERFET and the Indonesian Armed Forces would prevent further incidents or, at least, enable the parties to effectively deal with the situation.¹⁰ While welcoming the improvements in the internal security situation in East Timor, speakers noted with concern the increased crime rate and took note of the interrelations between the rising crime rate and the poor socio-economic situation. In that connection, several

⁴ S/PV.4097, pp. 2-7.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Bangladesh); p. 11 (Canada); p. 12 (Jamaica); and p. 17 (China).

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (France); p. 12 (Jamaica); p. 13 (Russian Federation); p. 14 (Malaysia, Ukraine); p. 15 (Namibia); and p. 17 (China).

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 11 (Canada); p. 13 (Russian Federation); p. 14 (Ukraine); p. 16 (Namibia, Netherlands).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

representatives called for speedy deployment of United Nations civilian police.¹¹

Many speakers stressed the need to improve conditions for refugees and promote their return to East Timor, including by fostering national reconciliation and improving the socio-economic conditions. Council members also stressed the importance of human rights and welcomed the recent reports issued by the International Commission of Inquiry and the Indonesian Commission of Inquiry into Human Rights Violations in East Timor.

At its 4114th meeting, on 21 March 2000, the Council was briefed by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. Statements were made by a majority of Council members.¹²

In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General drew attention to economic and social and security concerns, reporting that pro-autonomy militias in West Timor had increased incursions into East Timor. According to information available to UNTAET, elements of the Indonesian armed forces continued to tolerate and even support the militias. Some important developments, he noted, included the formal handover of responsibility from INTERFET to the military component of UNTAET; the signing of an agreement between UNTAET and the World Bank concerning a large community empowerment project; and the passing by UNTAET of several pieces of legislation which had been approved by NCC. Despite incidents of violence, the return and reintegration of refugees was generally proceeding smoothly. He believed that flexibility would have to be exercised with regard to the deadline set by the Indonesian authorities for decisions regarding the return of refugees to East Timor or resettlement in Indonesia. He added that the visit by the President of Indonesia to East Timor had had positive results, including the reopening of cross-border trade and the resumption of commercial flights between Indonesia and East Timor. A joint border observation mechanism was in place, he added, in an effort to minimize cross-border incidents.¹³

Council members welcomed the smooth transfer from INTERFET to UNTAET, the improved relations between Indonesia and East Timor occasioned by the visit of the President of Indonesia, and the progress made with respect to the settlement of refugees, rule of law and rehabilitation of the infrastructure. At the same time, they voiced concern regarding the refugee and security situations, and stressed

the need for adequate resources to be made available for the short and long term economic development of East Timor. With respect to independence, the representative of Malaysia stressed the need to proceed cautiously in developing a timetable.¹⁴ The representative of Bangladesh was in favour of identifying specific benchmarks to chart the path to independence and setting a time-frame on that basis.¹⁵

Council members also deplored the increasing criminality and emphasized the need to restore and maintain law and order in East Timor. In that context, the representatives of Jamaica and Bangladesh stressed the need to speed up the deployment of the civilian police component of UNTAET.¹⁶

In addition, Council members expressed serious concern at continued reports of militia activity in East Timor and deplored the recent increase in border incidents. The representative of the United Kingdom stressed the need for UNTAET to press vigorously in Jakarta the matter of possible complicity of the Indonesian military with the militias and for the Council to make it clear that such behaviour was unacceptable.¹⁷ The representative of France questioned the ability of the authorities in Indonesia to effectively curb the activities of the pro-integrationist militias.¹⁸ The representative of the United States believed that the Indonesian Armed Forces had done little to address the recent militia attacks against United Nations personnel and East Timorese civilians and deplored the lack of progress of the Government of Indonesia in disarming and disbanding the militia groups.¹⁹

At its 4133rd meeting, on 27 April 2000, at which the Council was briefed by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, statements were made by a majority of the members of the Council.²⁰

The Assistant Secretary-General reported an improvement in the overall security situation and at the border with West Timor. In that regard, he drew attention to the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to East Timor, which included the signing on 11 April of a memorandum of understanding on tactical coordination in the border area between the UNTAET Force Commander and the Commander of the Indonesian Armed Forces in West Timor. Noting that about 7,000 refugees had returned to East Timor in the past month, he

¹¹ Ibid., p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 10 (Bangladesh); p. 12 (Jamaica); and p. 17 (China).

¹² The representatives of Tunisia and Ukraine did not make statements. The representative of Indonesia was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

¹³ S/PV.4114, pp. 2-4 and 14-16.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 10-11.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 11 (Jamaica); and p. 13 (Bangladesh).

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 6.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 5.

²⁰ The representative of Canada did not make a statement.

said that the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) had reported improved access to the refugee camps and that the Government of Indonesia had been flexible in its continuation of aid to them. According to the Indonesian authorities about 126,000 refugees remained in West Timor. Furthermore, UNTAET continued to work with local leaders in East Timor to ensure that returning refugees were received peacefully.

The Assistant Secretary-General further stressed that the economic and social conditions remained a primary concern and the people had shown impatience and disappointment when UNTAET seemed unable to respond at a faster pace to those problems. He detailed the Mission's efforts, which included the registration of 1,200 private businesses; the establishment of an investment promotion unit; the establishment of employment offices in Dili and Bacau to provide employment assistance; and quick impact projects scheme for the repair of local infrastructure.

The Assistant Secretary-General also drew attention to the legislative activity of NCC and to the developments in public administration and the judiciary, highlighting the memorandum of understanding concluded on 7 April between the Government of Indonesia and UNTAET concerning cooperation in legal, judicial and human rights matters. He further informed the Council that UNTAET had consulted closely with the East Timorese on the question of benchmarks to be achieved on the path to independence. He added that CNRT had begun advocating the establishment of an army, a change of policy that was very complex and sensitive.²¹

Council members welcomed the improvement in the security situation, as well as the memorandum of understanding of 7 April, which was hailed as a sign of renewed cooperation between the Government of Indonesia and the United Nations. They also expressed concern that so many refugees remained in the camps in West Timor, but were gratified that efforts were being made to ensure that they were able to return safely and peacefully. The representative of the United States, echoed by the representative of the United Kingdom, called on the Government of Indonesia to close down militia training camps, disarm the militia and halt the armed forces' collaboration with them.²²

With respect to the economic and social situation, Council members expressed concern at the expectations and tensions they had engendered, and voiced support for the efforts of UNTAET towards improvement. Regarding the refugees issue, Council members called for an end to

the disinformation being spread in the refugee camps and the creation of favourable conditions for return, including by improving the socio-economic conditions and ensuring that former pro-autonomy advocates could return safely.

Regarding establishing benchmarks for the transition to independence, the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom cautioned about the need to find the right timing for the independence, while the representative of France held that the issue should be decided in consultation with the people of East Timor.²³

At the 4147th meeting, on 25 May 2000, at which the Council received a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, statements were made by all Council members.

In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General reported considerable progress by UNTAET, particularly in the areas of institution and capacity-building and delivery of Government services. He highlighted improvements in the security situation, which had remained stable, including at the border with West Timor, where militia activity had declined, following steps taken to implement the memorandum of understanding on tactical coordination between the Indonesian Armed Forces and UNTAET. In that regard, he noted that UNTAET had initiated a reduction by some 500 troops in the eastern sector, which he regarded as the calmest area. He announced that the level of troops deployed of 8,396 troops would be reduced by October 2000 to 7,896. However, he expressed concern about law and order, with the crime rate still high. The number of refugees returning to East Timor had declined over the previous month to only 1,000. Meanwhile, UNHCR estimated that some 90,000 refugees remained in West Timor and would perform a census to determine their exact number.

The Assistant Secretary-General stressed that there had been an upturn in political activity, with political parties having opened offices and held meetings in the districts. UNTAET had intensified consultations with the East Timorese on all important policy questions and NCC had met regularly and held a number of public hearings to promote public debate on key policy questions. He emphasized that UNTAET had also continued to promote normalization of relations between Indonesia and East Timor.²⁴

Council members welcomed the work done by UNTAET and the fact that the total number of refugees that had returned to East Timor had reached 161,000. They, nevertheless, expressed concern about the conditions of the

²¹ S/PV.4133, pp. 2-4.

²² Ibid., p. 5 (United States); and p. 7 (United Kingdom).

²³ Ibid., p. 6 (United States); p. 7 (United Kingdom); and p. 8 (France).

²⁴ S/PV.4147, pp. 2-4.

refugees remaining in West Timor and enquired about the reasons preventing their return. The representatives of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands stressed the need to proceed expeditiously with the census to register the remaining refugees.²⁵ The representative of Canada welcomed the decision of the Government of Indonesia to establish a transitional period beyond the deadline for return of refugees and stressed the need for their early and voluntary return or permanent resettlement within Indonesia.²⁶

Several Council members welcomed the improved security situation and the enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and the authorities of Indonesia.²⁷ While welcoming the improvement in the security situation, the representative of Malaysia was alarmed by reports of religious violence and harassment of minorities in East Timor and called on UNTAET to prevent the recurrence of such violence.²⁸ While the representative of France welcomed the decision to begin reducing the troop levels of UNTAET, the representative of the Netherlands stressed that the Council should be given an opportunity to consider the whole military and security situation before the decision to downsize was made.²⁹ Several speakers stressed the need to speed up the deployment of the UNTAET civilian police as well as the training of an indigenous police force.³⁰ The representative of the United States noted that the civilian police in some areas of East Timor were armed and suggested that this practice might be considered throughout the territory.³¹

Council members remained concerned about the socio-economic situation and the financial gaps in international assistance to East Timor. The representative of China remarked that unemployment was the most pressing issue, having the potential to create security problems. He therefore called on UNTAET to create more employment opportunities and to allow the local population to participate more in administrative matters.³²

On the issue of independence, the representative of the United Kingdom reiterated the need to ensure that East Timor would have adequate capacity to cope with independence in the areas of governance, governmental services, security and democratic institutions, among

others.³³ The representative of Argentina wondered about the future of FALINTIL in connection with the establishment of armed forces for a future independent state.³⁴ The representative of the Netherlands recalled that concerns had been voiced about the involvement of the United Nations in the establishment of a military force in East Timor, and looked forward to receiving the independent experts' study under preparation on that issue. He argued that United Nations involvement would give the international community an opportunity to ensure that the armed forces of East Timor were up to international standards of civilian control, democratic accountability and human rights.³⁵ Welcoming efforts to map out an exit strategy, the representative of the United Kingdom stressed the need to develop timelines for the implementation of the tasks mandated to UNTAET.³⁶

Responding to comments, the Assistant Secretary-General stated that the security situation was linked to the high level of unemployment and the degree of social dislocation since the events of September 1999. Elaborating on the initial reduction of the military component of UNTAET by some 500 troops by October 2000 from the eastern sector, he announced that if the security situation remained stable, there could be a total reduction of 50 per cent of the troops in that sector by April 2001 and a further reduction by the summer of 2001. UNTAET would continue to review the situation and propose further reductions in other sectors depending on the security situation.³⁷

At its 4165th meeting, on 27 June 2000, the Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for East Timor. In addition to all Council members, the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union³⁸) and the Republic of Korea made statements.

In his briefing, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General stressed the uniqueness, magnitude and complexity of the governance mandate given to UNTAET, who had encountered a number of challenges in meeting the high expectations of the people of East Timor. He further elaborated on challenges on the ground, such as ensuring security during the transition period and facilitating the establishment of the needed mechanism to

²⁵ Ibid., p. 4 (United Kingdom); and p. 11 (Netherlands).

²⁶ Ibid., p. 8.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 6 (United States); p. 9 (Bangladesh, Argentina); p. 10 (Malaysia); and p. 15 (Ukraine).

²⁸ Ibid., p. 10.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 7 (France); and p. 12 (Netherlands).

³⁰ Ibid., p. 8 (France); p. 13 (Jamaica); and p. 15 (Mali).

³¹ Ibid., p. 7.

³² Ibid., p. 16.

³³ Ibid., p. 5.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 10.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 12.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 5.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 16-19.

³⁸ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

maintain security after independence; remedying the poverty of refugees in West Timor and helping them to repatriate in a free and orderly fashion; establishing a judiciary system that respected basic human rights and could maintain law and order; reconstructing the public services; establishing a financially viable administration by the Timorese; and ensuring political transition to independence, by the adoption of a Constitution and fully democratic elections. He indicated that, based on discussion with local political leaders, elections with regard to the future of East Timor would be held between 30 August and the beginning of December 2001.

Noting that the broader humanitarian question was the area in which the most progress had been made, the Special Representative elaborated on the justice system and related problems, the needs associated with reconstruction and the establishment of an East Timorese administration. He announced that efforts were made to establish a national reconciliation commission and that an independent study had been commissioned to assess the security needs of East Timor. Furthermore, he declared that capacity-building efforts were focusing on establishing a functioning educational system as well as a human resources development centre.

On the issue of slow disbursement of funds, he stated that there was no government procurement capacity in Dili and noted that the consolidated budget for 2000-2001 had been approved in Lisbon the previous week. He declared that the implementation of employment programmes would begin shortly and believed that recruitments into the new civil service would provide employment. He further announced that the reduction in the military capacity of UNTAET would take place gradually, the civilian police being scheduled to take over the maintenance of public order.³⁹

Speakers welcomed the positive developments reported by the Special Representative and the progress made as UNTAET shifted from emergency needs to longer-term programmes. They paid tribute to UNTAET for its progress in building the infrastructure and developing institutional capabilities. However, they remained concerned at the socio-economic situation and called for greater flexibility and measures to overcome the barriers to disbursements and improve cooperation among the main agencies operating in East Timor. They expressed particular satisfaction regarding the proposals for power sharing between the East Timorese leaders and UNTAET, and the recent donors conference in Lisbon, which had approved the World Bank and UNTAET Trust Fund work programmes for 2000-2001.

³⁹ S/PV.4165, pp. 2-7 and 32-35.

Representatives also expressed their concern regarding the security situation which had deteriorated recently, reversing a trend of gradual improvement. Several representatives deplored the recent suspension of UNHCR activities in three refugee camps in the Kupang area because of increasing militia violence and intimidation.⁴⁰ Reiterating his Government's commitment to security, the representative of Indonesia highlighted the frustration experienced by the refugees and the complexity of the tasks confronting Indonesia.⁴¹ Speakers also condemned in the strongest terms the recent militia attack on an UNTAET outpost in which one peacekeeper was injured.

Despite recent security incidents, the representatives of the United States and Australia noted an improvement in the security situation and expressed support for a gradual but steady decrease of UNTAET forces in the eastern sector.⁴² The representative of the United States urged that the process be implemented early and transparently, with built-in surge capacity to take into account the possibility of a resurgence of violence by the militias.⁴³ The representatives of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands held that any downsizing of UNTAET must take account of the continuing risks posed by militias.⁴⁴ The representative of Canada, echoed by the representative of the Netherlands, requested that the Council be briefed on the security situation in East Timor before final decisions were taken on downsizing the military component of UNTAET.⁴⁵ The representative of France remarked that the abrupt departure of UNTAET at the end of its mandate could be a major destabilizing factor for the newly independent country and stressed the need to plan and organize a downsizing of the force over time.⁴⁶

Many speakers were pleased about the broadening of participation in NCC with the inclusion of women, youth representatives and others. Several representatives highlighted the need for improved protection of ethnic minorities.⁴⁷ A number of representatives supported the "Timorization" of the transitional administration, and stressed that it was essential to involve the East Timorese,

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 9 (Canada); p. 11 (Netherlands); p. 13 (Malaysia); p. 15 (Namibia); p. 16 (Russian Federation); p. 17 (Jamaica); p. 19 (Argentina, Tunisia); p. 20 (Mali); p. 24 (Portugal on behalf of the European Union); p. 29 (Australia); and p. 31 (New Zealand).

⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 25-26.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 7-8 (United States); and p. 29 (Australia).

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 10 (United Kingdom); and p. 12 (Netherlands).

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 9 (Canada); and p. 12 (Netherlands).

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 21.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 14 (China); p. 16 (Bangladesh); and p. 17 (Jamaica).

in a broad representative manner, including women and youth, in the policymaking and administrative structure at a higher level during the transition period.⁴⁸

Many speakers expressed serious concern at the refugee situation and the security situation along the border with West Timor and called for further progress on the return of refugees and on promoting resettlement within Indonesia of those not wishing to return to East Timor. Speaking on behalf of the European Union, the representative of Portugal called on Indonesia to honour its commitment to assist those who wished to return and urged the immediate removal from the refugee camps of the military and the militia, the isolation of all militia leadership and assurances that those who obstructed repatriation operations would be held accountable.⁴⁹ Stressing the importance of national reconciliation to facilitate return and resettlement of refugees, several speakers welcomed the establishment of a national reconciliation commission.⁵⁰

The representative of the United Kingdom expressed support for the engagement by UNTAET on East Timorese strategic defence options and on the status of FALINTIL and looked forward to the outcome of an independent study on the subject, set to begin on 7 July. Supported by the representative of the Netherlands, he encouraged UNTAET to address the immediate humanitarian needs of FALINTIL.⁵¹ The representative of the Netherlands suggested the absorption of FALINTIL in a self-defence force as a way to prevent their frustration from aggravating.⁵¹ Considering the future security sector in East Timor, several speakers welcomed the increased deployment of United Nations police and training a local East Timorese police force.⁵²

Referring to a possible timetable for the transition, the representative of the United States expressed support for the timetable proposed at the donors' conference in Lisbon and stressed the importance of setting the date publicly, clearly and early. He further pointed out the need to continue transition activities and assistance to the people of East Timor after the elections, while noting that the United Nations should not prolong unnecessarily its role as "a governing power".⁵³ The representative of the

Netherlands wondered if independence would have to follow immediately after the holding of elections, while the representative of Malaysia stressed that independence should come only when the people of East Timor were ready and able to assume full responsibility.⁵⁴ The representative of Japan warned against setting the benchmarks for independence unrealistically high as nation-building was a long and slow process.⁵⁵ The representative of Australia stressed the importance of considering an exit strategy for UNTAET, including realistic benchmarks for East Timor to be able to function effectively as an independent State.⁵⁶

On 26 July 2000, the Secretary-General submitted a report on UNTAET,⁵⁷ by which he announced that, to facilitate broader participation in policy-making, the 15-member NCC was replaced with the National Council, composed of 33 East Timorese nationals, appointed by the Transitional Administrator. UNTAET had reorganized itself into eight portfolios to resemble more closely the future government and to increase the direct participation of the Timorese. Referring to the political activity in East Timor, the Secretary-General highlighted a number of disturbing cases of intimidation against groups not under the CNRT umbrella, as well as against ethnic and religious minorities. He added that the normalization of relations with Indonesia had progressed well, through a number of bilateral visits as well as the signing of the memorandum of understanding on legal, judicial and human rights matters. On the issue of refugees, he reported that an estimated 85,000 to 120,000 refugees remained in camps in West Timor, where militias opposed to independence continued to exercise influence in the camps and impede the efforts of UNHCR by intimidation and violence. The Secretary-General also detailed the efforts made to establish governance and public administration structures, providing an assessment of the civil service, public finance, economy, infrastructure, education, health, law and order, and civilian staffing. He indicated that the security situation had been generally stable. Meanwhile, FALINTIL remained cantoned under very difficult living conditions and was increasingly concerned at its current and future role in East Timor. While originally it had not been envisaged that East Timor would have armed forces, the Secretary-General reported that CNRT had changed its position and was advocating a national security force, initially based on members of FALINTIL. Such a force was seen by CNRT leaders as a necessary element in the transition to independence.

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 10-11 (United Kingdom); p. 12 (Malaysia); p. 22 (Japan); p. 24 (Portugal on behalf of the European Union); and p. 27 (Brazil).

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 24.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 13 (Malaysia); p. 14 (Namibia); p. 16 (Bangladesh); and p. 17 (Jamaica).

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 11 (United Kingdom, Netherlands).

⁵² Ibid., p. 8 (United States); p. 18 (Ukraine); p. 21 (France); and pp. 24-25 (Portugal).

⁵³ Ibid., p. 8.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 12 (Netherlands); and p. 13 (Malaysia).

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 22.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 28.

⁵⁷ S/2000/738, submitted pursuant to resolution 1272 (1999).

At its 4180th meeting, on 28 July 2000, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.⁵⁷ The Council was briefed by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. Statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Australia, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand and Portugal.

In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General noted that the humanitarian emergency had been largely overcome and that the focus had shifted to reconstruction and rehabilitation. The sharing of political decision-making had been extended through the creation of a transitional cabinet, enabling the Timorese to assume government responsibilities for the first time, and through the replacement of NCC by the National Council, broadening participation in the legislative consultation. He added that the CNRT conference scheduled for August would significantly advance the debate on the key issues of the new constitution and the timetable for political elections. He noted that while relations with the Government of Indonesia had advanced considerably, there were a number of key outstanding issues, including the situation of the refugees in West Timor, which required urgent action. In particular, the Government of Indonesia should be encouraged to ensure that the militia influence in the refugee camps and activities in the border area were brought to an immediate end. While taking note of the stable security situation throughout the rest of the country, he deplored that violent incidents and incursions continued to take place across the border. Moreover, a worrisome increase in thefts and violent crime had occurred, prompting a decision to make side arms available to the United Nations civilian police. As for the future defence requirements for East Timor, the Assistant Secretary-General noted that the study by King's College, London, had yet to be completed, but that it was assumed that the FALINTIL would be at the core of a new defence force, which would require significant international aid and training.⁵⁸

Speakers paid tribute to the progress made by UNTAET in building the administration of East Timor with the increased involvement of the Timorese people, as embodied in the establishment of a cabinet and the replacement of NCC by the National Council. They expressed dismay at the continuing cross-border incursions by militias in West Timor, which had culminated earlier that week in the murder of a New Zealand peacekeeper and urged that the perpetrators be brought to justice. Noting with concern that violent acts and intimidation by the militias had forced UNHCR to postpone its efforts to register and repatriate the refugees in West Timor, they called on the Government of Indonesia to redouble its

efforts to cooperate with UNTAET on the problem of cross-border incursions and to disarm and disband the militias. A number of representatives underlined the importance of an inclusive political debate in East Timor and expressed concern about recent signs of intolerance and incidents of harassment of minorities.⁵⁹

Speakers also reiterated their concerns regarding the situation of the refugees, the slow rate of return and the continued activities of pro-integrationist militias in the refugee camps in West Timor, as well as in the border region. Many speakers appealed to the Government of Indonesia to step up its efforts in accordance with previous agreements to ensure security in West Timor, including in the camps, and to disarm and disband the militias.⁶⁰ Several representatives emphasized the importance of improved security in West Timor for the return process as well as for the ability of UNHCR to complete the registration of refugees, which would allow for the identification of those who wished to return and those who would be resettled elsewhere in Indonesia.⁶¹ The representative of the United Kingdom recalled that UNHCR had set a deadline of 31 October for the Government of Indonesia to restore law and order in and around the camps and noted his expectations that the deadline would be met.⁶² Meanwhile, the representative of the United States stated that Indonesia had abrogated its responsibility to maintain law and order in West Timor and urged Jakarta to live up to its commitments, respect international agreements and pave the way for friendly relations with the future State.⁶³

The representatives of the United States and the Netherlands also expressed serious concern at the continuing violence in Moluccas, which had resulted in a humanitarian situation which had affected hundreds of thousands of people, and urged the Government of Indonesia to take steps to address the issue, restore law and order and allow unimpeded access for humanitarian aid workers.⁶⁴

Noting an improvement in the security situation, the representatives of Namibia and the United States welcomed the decision to begin a gradual downsizing in the troop

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (Bangladesh); p. 16 (Mali); and p. 17 (Jamaica).

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (Bangladesh); p. 10 (Canada); p. 12 (United States); p. 14 (Netherlands); p. 17 (Mali); p. 19 (New Zealand); p. 20 (Australia); and p. 21 (Japan).

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (United Kingdom); p. 16 (Ukraine); p. 17 (Jamaica); and p. 20 (Australia).

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 13 (United States); and p. 15 (Netherlands).

⁵⁸ S/PV.4180 and Corr.1, pp. 2-4.

level of UNTAET in the eastern sector.⁶⁵ Meanwhile, the representatives of Argentina and the Netherlands argued that, in view of the death of a peacekeeper, the question of troop reductions from the eastern sector should be considered very carefully.⁶⁶ The representative of Ukraine called for the Council to be given an opportunity to consider the whole military and security situation in East Timor, and to receive a special briefing on the issue.⁶⁷

On the future defence needs of East Timor, the representatives of Namibia and the Netherlands welcomed that FALINTIL would be at the core of a new defence force.⁶⁸ The representative of the Netherlands pointed out that the establishment of East Timorese armed forces could help improve the security situation and provide a horizon for the international presence there.⁶⁹

Regarding the transition to independence, several members expressed their support for the benchmarks contained in the Secretary-General's report.⁷⁰ The representative of Bangladesh stressed the need for consultations with the national leadership and regular feedback to the Security Council on those benchmarks.⁷¹ The representative of France held that the timetable for drawing up a constitution and preparing for elections could be shortened to allow United Nations assistance to take the form of traditional development aid.⁷² On the other hand, the representative of the Netherlands emphasized the need for the process of handing over responsibilities to the people of East Timor to correspond to the emergence of local capacities. He added that since elections would most likely be for a constituent assembly, which would debate and adopt a constitution, independence would not follow directly after the elections.⁷³

The representative of Indonesia drew attention to the satisfactory level of cooperation that had developed between his Government and UNTAET, as well as to efforts made to establish friendly and mutually beneficial relations between Indonesia and East Timor. He added that the authorities in Indonesia continued to assist in bringing the perpetrators of human rights violations to justice. Noting that the international community had a collective responsibility for the refugees, he stressed the need for

international assistance to address the concerns of the refugees.⁷⁴

At its 4182nd meeting, on 3 August 2000, the Council continued its consideration of the report of the Secretary-General on UNTAET.⁷⁵ At the same meeting, the President (Malaysia) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁷⁶ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Strongly supported the steps taken by UNTAET to strengthen the participation of the East Timorese people in the administration of their territory, in particular the establishment of the National Council that would set out the basis for the adoption of a constitution and hold democratic elections;

Condemned the murder on 24 July of a New Zealand soldier serving with UNTAET and expressed its sympathy to the Government and to the family of the peacekeeper;

Requested the Secretary-General to inform the Council on the outcome of his investigation into the incident;

Expressed serious concern at the continuing presence of large numbers of refugees from East Timor in camps in West Timor;

Also expressed particular concern at the level of intimidation of UNHCR staff by militias present in the camps;

Demanded that all parties respect the safety and security of refugees and international humanitarian personnel;

Acknowledged the cooperation made by the Government of Indonesia, manifested in the signing of important agreements, however, regretted that serious problems persisted in their implementation;

Took note of the Secretary-General's intention to reduce the size of the UNTAET military component in the eastern sector of East Timor to 500 by the end of January 2001 in the light of the situation on the ground;

Requested the Secretary-General to present in his next regular report detailed plans on the transition to independence for East Timor.

Decision of 8 September 2000 (4195th meeting): resolution 1319 (2000)

At its 4191st meeting, on 29 August 2000, the Council was briefed by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. Statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Indonesia, New Zealand and Norway.

In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General stated that militia groups had continued a pattern of violence, marked by an unprecedented degree of coordination and preparation, against the civilian population and UNTAET. A number of violent incidents had occurred, culminating in the death of a Nepalese peacekeeper and the wounding of

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 8 (Namibia); and p. 12 (United States).

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 7 (Argentina); and p. 14 (Netherlands).

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 16.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 8 (Namibia); and p. 14 (Netherlands).

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 14.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 5 (Bangladesh); p. 12 (United States); pp. 14-15 (Netherlands); and p. 18 (Jamaica).

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 5.

⁷² Ibid., p. 14.

⁷³ Ibid., pp. 14-15.

⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 21-23.

⁷⁵ S/2000/738.

⁷⁶ S/PRST/2000/26.

three others on 10 August. UNTAET had taken action to respond to the threat posed by the militia and had decided to delay implementation of the plan to downsize troops in Sector East. He added that UNTAET and the East Timorese leadership were closely studying the report on security force options and security sector reform for East Timor prepared by the King's College team. Noting that the situation of refugees in West Timor had deteriorated owing to militia activity in the camps and large parts of the border areas, he announced that the Special Representative of the Secretary-General had urged the Government of Indonesia to cooperate with the United Nations to address the situation and ensure the voluntary repatriation of the refugees within a period of three to six months. On the issue of governance and public administration, he noted that the East Timor Transitional Administration was well under way and that preparations for the establishment of the National Council were also well advanced. Since 1 July, he declared, the East Timor consolidated budget had been administered and executed separately from that of UNTAET.⁷⁷

Council members recalled the popular consultation process in 1999 by which the people of East Timor had overwhelmingly voted for independence, and the intervention by the international community that had followed the breakdown of law and order. In that connection, they stressed the significance of the first anniversary of the popular consultation on 30 August 2000 in the progress towards the independence of East Timor, and expressed concern at the deteriorating security situation as reported by the Assistant Secretary-General.

Speakers also condemned the upsurge in militia activity, referring to the death of the Nepalese peacekeeper, as well as the attack of 22 August on UNHCR personnel at a refugee camp in West Timor. Several representatives called on the Government of Indonesia to fulfil its obligation to bring the situation under control and disarm and disband the militia. They further stressed the need to separate former militias from genuine refugees in West Timor in preparation for the closure of the refugee camps, as announced by the Government.⁷⁸ Urging the Council to show determination and commitment, the representative of the United Kingdom stood ready to bring forward formal Council action to ensure that the militia violence did not jeopardize the work of UNTAET.⁷⁹

Several speakers reiterated their dissatisfaction with the situation in the refugee camps in West Timor, the security conditions in those camps as well as the halt in

⁷⁷ S/PV.4191, pp. 2-6.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 12 (Jamaica); p. 19 (Australia); and p. 21 (Brazil).

⁷⁹ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

further returns to East Timor in large part due to militia activities.⁸⁰ The representative of France, speaking on behalf of the European Union,⁸¹ urged the Government of Indonesia to fulfil its commitments to help those refugees who wished to be repatriated and to put an end to the campaigns of disinformation and intimidation.⁸² While describing the closure of refugee camps in West Timor as a step in the right direction, the representative of Australia said it was vital for repatriation to take place on a strictly voluntary basis. She further urged the Government and armed forces of Indonesia to redouble their efforts to disarm, disband and arrest militias operating from West Timor, to remove them from refugee camps and to bring to justice those responsible for human rights violations.⁸³ In pursuit of a "zero tolerance" policy towards the militia, the representative of Brazil held that the military component of UNTAET must be given the means to counter the threat posed by them.⁸⁴

Several speakers welcomed the recent initiative by Indonesia to resettle East Timorese refugees still inside West Timor,⁸⁵ while some called for concrete steps towards the implementation of that plan, including improvement of the security situation and completion of the registration process to separate former combatants from the refugees.⁸⁶ The representative of the Netherlands wondered if the plan for the repatriation and resettlement of refugees put forward by the Government of Indonesia was realistic, while the representative of the United States called for a "workable plan".⁸⁷

In view of the deterioration in the security situation, the representative of the United Kingdom welcomed the decision to suspend the downsizing of the military component of UNTAET.⁸⁸ On a future defence force, the representative of Malaysia underlined that an independent East Timor must be able to defend itself and welcomed that FALINTIL, upon receipt of indications that it would be at

⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 6 (United States); p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 8 (Bangladesh); p. 9 (Netherlands); p. 11 (Namibia); p. 13 (Canada); p. 15 (Tunisia, Ukraine); p. 16 (Malaysia); and p. 17 (France).

⁸¹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁸² S/PV.4191, p. 17.

⁸³ Ibid., p. 19.

⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 20-21.

⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 8 (Bangladesh); and p. 10 (Russian Federation).

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 8 (Bangladesh); p. 13 (Canada); p. 16 (Malaysia); and p. 17 (France).

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 6 (United States); and p. 9 (Netherlands).

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 7.

the core of a new defence force, had joined UNTAET in security operations along the border.⁸⁹

In response to allegations that support was being rendered to the militias by the Indonesian armed forces, the representative of Indonesia condemned all acts of violence and deplored the rejection by UNTAET of the military confidence-building measures proposed by his Government. While Indonesian armed forces had always barred militia from crossing the border to East Timor, he stated, reconciliation between and among the East Timorese had yet to be brought about. Pointing to the economic and financial consequences of the continued existence of refugee camps for the local population in West Timor, he reiterated his Government's plan of action to close the camps and relocate the refugees to transit camps in East and West Timor. Stressing that the decision by each refugee would be voluntary, he underlined that the decision of "each and every individual refugee" was to be respected, acknowledging the role of the United Nations in the registration process.⁹⁰

At the 4195th meeting,⁹¹ on 8 September 2000, the President (Mali) drew attention to a draft resolution;⁹² it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1319 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Insisted that the Government of Indonesia take immediate additional steps, in fulfilment of its responsibilities, to disarm and disband the militia immediately, restore law and order in the affected areas in West Timor, ensure safety and security in the refugee camps and for humanitarian workers, and prevent cross-border incursions into East Timor;

Stressed that those responsible for the attacks on international personnel in West and East Timor must be brought to justice;

Called on the Indonesian authorities to take immediate and effective measures to ensure the safe return of refugees who chose to go back to East Timor, and stressed the need for parallel programmes to resettle individuals who chose not to return;

Stressed that UNHCR workers could not return to West Timor until there was a credible security guarantee, including real progress towards disarming and disbanding the militias;

Underlined that UNTAET should respond robustly to the militia threat in East Timor, consistent with its resolution 1272 (1999) of 22 October 1999.

Decision of 6 December 2000 (4244th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4203rd meeting,⁹³ on 29 September 2000, the Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Transitional Administrator for East Timor. Statements were made by all Council members, as well as the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Indonesia, Japan, Mozambique and New Zealand.

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General reported on two opposing developments since his previous briefing to the Council: on the one hand the alarming deterioration of the security situation in West Timor, highlighted by the killing of three UNHCR staff members on 6 September; and, on the other, the significant progress made by UNTAET in administering East Timor in partnership with the East Timorese. He emphasized that the continuation and success of the latter was to a large extent dependent on addressing the former.

He stated that the many challenges facing East Timor and UNTAET could not be met successfully without tackling the root cause of the problem at hand, namely the militia. He stressed that it was the responsibility of the Government of Indonesia to "hunt down and break up the militias and bring their leaders to justice". However, referring to the disarmament ceremony in Atambua on 24 September, he noted with regret that the Government had so far been unable to deal with the problem effectively. He encouraged the Council to address the security situation in West Timor as a matter of urgency, reiterating his appeal for the dispatch of a Council mission to East Timor and Indonesia as a sign of encouragement and support for the East Timorese and UNTAET.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 22-24.

⁹¹ The Council acknowledged the presence of the East Timorese leaders Mr. Xanana Gusmão and Mr. José Ramos-Horta in the Council Chamber.

⁹² S/2000/853.

⁹³ At its 4198th meeting, held in private on 19 September 2000, the Council was briefed by the Special Envoy of the Government of Indonesia, the Coordinating Minister for Political, Social and Security Affairs. Council members and the Special Envoy had a frank and constructive discussion on the need for early and full implementation of resolution 1319 (2000).

Welcoming the political dialogue between East and West Timor, the Special Representative emphasized that all parties concerned should, as a prerequisite, renounce politically motivated violence and condemn the recent murders of United Nations staff members. He repudiated attempts to characterize the problem as a civil war between the East Timorese, adding that there had been no crossing by armed elements from East Timor into West Timor, and that the threat stemmed from militias acting with impunity in the west and launching armed interventions across the border. Commenting on political developments in East Timor, he cited the recent CNRT Congress as an example of open political party activity which could, in turn, lead to the commencement of party politics proper. With that in mind, he stated that UNTAET remained committed to holding national elections in the latter half of 2001 with a view to establishing a Constituent Assembly. Drawing attention to administrative steps taken by UNTAET, he reported that the Cabinet had agreed to establish a defence force for East Timor, which would be a contributing factor to the creation of a stable and effective administration. He emphasized the need for East Timor to maintain "relations of confidence and partnership" with Indonesia. He also noted that a communiqué had been issued as a result of a visit by the Prime Minister of Indonesia to Dili on 29 February, and an encompassing agreement had been signed in Denpasar on 14 September, providing, among others, for the establishment of a Joint Border Committee and a framework for the exploitation of natural resources. With respect to a contingency plan for a possible influx of refugees from West Timor, he reported that as many as 100,000 refugees could be received in East Timor owing to joint efforts by UNTAET and international humanitarian organizations.⁹⁴

Speakers commended the Special Representative and his team for their continuing work in East Timor and reaffirmed their outrage at the murders of three UNHCR workers and two peacekeepers. They also agreed that the main threat to the efforts of UNTAET derived from the lack of progress in the Government's efforts to disarm and disband the militia. Speakers also commended the progress made in the institutional and administrative spheres and the emphasis put by UNTAET on consultation, local ownership and reconciliation.

Expressing concern for the fate of the refugees in West Timor in the light of the withdrawal by UNHCR, several speakers shared the view of the Special

Representative that the comprehensive plan of action could not succeed until the militia holding the refugees through threat and misinformation were removed, and called on the Government of Indonesia to extend its full cooperation to UNTAET.⁹⁵ The representative of the Russian Federation expressed concern at new reports of 26 September regarding militia armed with automatic weapons and wearing Indonesian uniforms. His delegation, he stated, would like to receive reliable information from the Secretariat concerning the weapons hand over process, including information on the assessments on which that information was based.⁹⁶ Speaking on behalf of the European Union, the representative of France reiterated the request made by the Council members on 3 August 2000 for a special information meeting on the military situation in all its aspects.⁹⁷

Many speakers stressed the need for the Government of Indonesia to effectively implement resolution 1319 (2000), including by disbanding and disarming the militias. A number of representatives welcomed efforts to implement the resolution, including the launch of a disarmament process,⁹⁸ while others expressed regret that steps towards its implementation had been unsuccessful.⁹⁹ Several representatives reiterated the importance of a Council mission visiting the region as soon as possible to verify the implementation of resolution 1319 (2000).¹⁰⁰ While welcoming the operation launched to disarm the militias, the representative of Canada lamented that there had been no official contradiction of suggestions made by members of the Government of Indonesia that the recent murders had been committed by foreign agents or were inevitable due to the presence of the refugees. He

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 6 (United States); p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 9 (Bangladesh); p. 11 (Netherlands); p. 16 (Ukraine, Jamaica); and p. 19 (Japan).

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 12.

⁹⁷ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁹⁸ S/PV.4203, p. 9 (Bangladesh); p. 12 (Russian Federation); p. 14 (Tunisia); p. 16 (Ukraine); p. 19 (France); p. 20 (Japan); p. 22 (Mozambique); and p. 23 (Australia).

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 10 (Argentina); p. 12 (Russian Federation); and p. 16 (Jamaica).

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 8 (United Kingdom); p. 9 (Bangladesh); p. 10 (Argentina); p. 16 (Ukraine, Jamaica); p. 19 (France on behalf of the European Union); p. 20 (Japan); and p. 22 (New Zealand).

⁹⁴ S/PV.4203, pp. 2-6 and 27-30.

therefore called for neutral international monitoring of the disarmament process.¹⁰¹

The representative of Malaysia noted that, owing to the precarious security situation, the earlier plan to downsize UNTAET should be considered with circumspection. He further welcomed the recent decision by the transitional Cabinet to support the establishment of a national defence force.¹⁰² Touching on the issue of the future defence needs of an independent East Timor, the representatives of Namibia and the Netherlands argued that the increased militia activity demonstrated the urgency of the establishment of an East Timorese national defence force.¹⁰³ The representative of the United Kingdom noted that preparatory work should begin on proposals made in that regard in the recent King's College study.¹⁰⁴

The representative of Indonesia reiterated his Government's commitment to and support for progress in East Timor and deplored the recent killing of UNHCR staff in the Atambua refugee camp. Stressing the need for a comprehensive solution to the problem of the refugees, he called for bold action on four main issues: (1) an investigation into the Atambua incident in order to bring the perpetrators to justice; (2) disarming of the militias; (3) reaching a comprehensive solution to the refugee problem; and (4) promoting reconciliation among the people of East Timor. As for the first point, he noted that investigations were under way and that a suspect had been arrested. As for disarmament of the militias, the representative recalled that his Government had launched a two-step approach, consisting of a process of voluntary handover, followed by a sweeping operation, which had commenced a few days ago. Detailing the number and kinds of weapons and ammunition collected during the handover phase, he noted that any shortcomings of the process should not detract from the large quantity of weapons which had been surrendered. Turning to the issue of refugees, the representative said that their presence was becoming more of a financial burden with each day passing and urged the international community to assist in alleviating the plight of the refugees. He underscored the urgent need for reconciliation of the people of East Timor and expressed the hope that UNTAET would promote an all-inclusive reconciliation process. In that context, he stated that while calls for disarmament were, justifiably,

made to the pro-integration side, they should be equally applicable to FALINTIL if a process of genuine reconciliation were to begin.¹⁰⁵

At its 4236th meeting,¹⁰⁶ on 28 November 2000, at which all Council members made statements, the Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Transitional Administrator for East Timor.

The President (Netherlands) drew attention to the report of the Security Council mission to East Timor and Indonesia¹⁰⁷ and to a letter dated 27 November 2000 from the representative of Indonesia, containing his Government's response to the Council mission.¹⁰⁸

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General noted that the repatriation of 410 refugees made up of predominantly former militarized civil defence elements had successfully occurred the week before. He welcomed the recommendation contained in the Security Council mission's report that consideration be given to increased flexibility in the use of assessed resources for missions such as UNTAET. On the justice sector, he declared that a comprehensive strategy had been developed to investigate serious crimes and complete the investigations of all documented cases by December 2001. He underlined the need for Indonesia to begin trials as soon as possible. Referring to the state of the infrastructure, he stressed that the extent of the destruction in East Timor meant that reconstruction would remain an urgent need well beyond independence. He also asked the Council to favour allowing UNTAET assets to remain in East Timor after the end of the

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 24-26.

¹⁰⁶ At its 4206th meeting, held in private on 12 October 2000, the Council was briefed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia. Council members and the Minister recalled the letter of the Security Council President to the Secretary-General of 8 September 2000, setting out their agreement to dispatch a mission to Indonesia and East Timor; and welcomed the invitation by the Government of Indonesia to a mission to Indonesia in the week of 13 November 2000. At its 4228th meeting, held in private on 20 November 2000, the Council was briefed by the representative of Namibia and Head of the Council mission to East Timor and Indonesia, who introduced the mission's report (S/2000/1105). Representatives of the troop-contributing countries to UNTAET were invited to be present at the meeting. Council members had a preliminary discussion of the report.

¹⁰⁷ S/2000/1105.

¹⁰⁸ S/2000/1125.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Namibia); and p. 12 (Netherlands).

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

Mission, with a view to providing the Transitional Administration with needed computers, radio equipment, vehicles and other essential hardware.

The Special Representative further noted that the East Timor Defence Force was not expected to be at full strength until the end of 2003. Consequently, a United Nations peacekeeping presence would be required in some form until at least that date. On the political transition, he stressed that the creation of the Transitional Cabinet and the appointment of the Timorese National Council represented a new phase where power was increasingly shared between the Transitional Administrator and broadly selected representatives of East Timorese society. The political calendar for the final phase of the transition leading to the democratic election of a Government of East Timor had not been finalized, he noted, but it appeared that East Timor would declare independence at the tail end of 2001. In closing, he stressed that the pace of “Timorization” of the Administration was closely linked with the United Nations effort to build the capacities of that administration and underlined that the role of the United Nations in East Timor would not end with the last date of the mandate of UNTAET.¹⁰⁹

Council members generally concurred with the conclusions of the Security Council mission regarding implementation of resolution 1272 (1999) and endorsed its recommendations for steps to be taken to accelerate the implementation of resolution 1319 (2000). They shared the view of the Transitional Administrator on the need for continued involvement by the international community in the transition prior to and following the independence of East Timor, observing that the reconstruction demands of East Timor would be considerable.

Council members also welcomed the setting of a date for the meeting of the Joint Border Commission and emphasized the importance of fostering good relations between Indonesia and East Timor. In that context, the representative of the United Kingdom particularly underlined the interdependency of the two countries.¹¹⁰

Council members remained concerned about the presence of militias in West Timor and underlined the need for the Government of Indonesia to fully implement its responsibilities to disband and disarm them.¹¹¹ Speakers

also expressed concern about the need for United Nations humanitarian agencies to return to the refugee camps with a view to providing a neutral, secure environment for refugees to decide whether they wished to return to East Timor or integrate into Indonesia. The representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom expressed the hope that the United Nations security staff review in West Timor would take place and thus facilitate the return of the aid agencies.¹¹² The representative of China stressed the importance of Indonesia’s acceptance of the dispatch of security experts to West Timor and urged UNTAET to further enhance communication with the Government of Indonesia.¹¹³ Underlining the need for Indonesia to prosecute those guilty of the 1999 crimes and of the killing of United Nations staff in 2000, the representative of the United States maintained that it was urgent for the ad hoc tribunals to begin their work in Jakarta.¹¹⁴

Council members stressed the importance of beginning the planning for the transition to independence in East Timor and to consider the United Nations presence after independence. The representative of the United Kingdom called for a “workable” strategy and timetable for the transition with clear ownership by the people of East Timor.¹¹⁵ In that context, Council members welcomed ongoing preparations for elections, as well as progress in the establishment of a defence force. Moreover, they expressed support for an international presence in East Timor upon independence. The representative of the United States recalled that the term “UNTAET light” had been used during the Council’s mission and emphasized the need to define the kinds of assistance that East Timor would require in the future.¹¹⁶

At its 4244th meeting, on 6 December 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report on the Council mission to East Timor and Indonesia, dated 21 November 2000.¹¹⁷

The report included observations on the implementation of Council resolutions 1272 (1999) and 1319 (2000). With respect to security and law and order, the mission reported that while the overall security situation in East Timor was relatively stable and deployment of civilian police had begun, more needed to be done to expedite the training of civilian police; build local capacity and resources for the judicial system; and ensure sufficient military capacity to address the continuing threat posed by the militias. In that context, the mission

¹⁰⁹ S/PV.4236, pp. 2-6.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8 (United States); p. 10 (United Kingdom); pp. 11-12 (Ukraine); p. 13 (Bangladesh); p. 14 (Argentina); p. 17 (Russian Federation); p. 18 (Tunisia); p. 20 (Mali); and p. 21 (France).

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 8 (United States); and p. 10 (United Kingdom).

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 21 (France); and p. 15 (China).

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹¹⁷ S/2000/1105.

noted that a continued international police and military presence would likely be needed for some time after independence. While noting progress in the humanitarian situation, the mission stressed the need for UNTAET to maintain its readiness to cope with a significant refugee influx as a component of its refugee return strategy. On the establishment of an effective administration in East Timor, the mission welcomed efforts to accelerate “Timorization” of the administration and emphasized the need for continued capacity-building among the East Timorese. While welcoming improvements in the infrastructure, particularly in Dili, the mission stressed the need for a more even rate of progress throughout the country and recommended greater flexibility in the use of resources from the assessed budget. The need for a strong international commitment to East Timor after independence was highlighted.

The mission also deplored the lack of progress in resolving the refugee issue and called on the authorities in Indonesia to take immediate and effective measures to ensure the safe return, relocation or repatriation of the East Timorese refugees remaining in West Timor. The mission underlined that a credible, impartial and apolitical registration process must be undertaken and commended the intention of the Government of Indonesia to consider arrangements for United Nations security experts to assess the situation on the ground in West Timor. While welcoming efforts by the Government of Indonesia to address the threat posed by the militias, the mission expressed the hope that those efforts would be stepped up and that further progress would be made in investigating and bringing to justice the perpetrators of violent attacks, including on United Nations peacekeepers and UNHCR staff. It also expressed concern at the slow pace of the process in Indonesia to bring to justice the perpetrators and organizers of the 1999 campaign of violence and welcomed steps taken by the Attorney-General in that regard.

At the meeting, the President (Russian Federation) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹¹⁸ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the report of the Security Council mission to East Timor and Indonesia of 21 November 2000, and endorsed the recommendations that it contained;

Noted the view of the mission that a strong international presence would be required in East Timor after independence, *inter alia* for the provision of financial, technical and security assistance, and agreed that planning for such a presence should begin as soon as possible;

Paid tribute to the work of UNTAET;

Welcomed the creation of the National Council in East Timor, and stressed the importance of further work on the transition to

independence, including a timetable and mechanisms for a constitution and elections;

Emphasized that urgent action was necessary to resolve the problem of the East Timorese refugees in West Timor;

Emphasized the need for measures to address shortcomings in the implementation of justice in East Timor;

Underlined the need to bring to justice those responsible for violent attacks in East and West Timor, including attacks on United Nations personnel;

Highlighted the importance of the bilateral relationship between UNTAET and the Government of Indonesia;

Underlined the need to resolve the outstanding issues of payment of pensions to former civil servants and the proposed transit arrangements between the Oecussi enclave and the remainder of East Timor.

**Decision of 31 January 2001 (4268th meeting):
resolution 1338 (2001)**

On 16 January 2001, the Secretary-General submitted a report on UNTAET,¹¹⁹ outlining the progress made in establishing the East Timor Transitional Authority and transferring authority to the people of East Timor. He stressed that while the United Nations would retain overall responsibility, in accordance with resolution 1272 (1999), there would be a progressive delegation of authority to the people of East Timor culminating in the full “Timorization” of the Authority by the time of independence. Cautioning that the proposed political calendar could still be affected by the security situation, technical or political difficulties, he anticipated that elections would be held in the summer of 2001 and that independence would be declared by the end of the year. UNTAET would be fully responsible for the conduct of the elections, while also ensuring capacity-building and sustainability in all aspects of the electoral planning.

On the security situation, the Secretary-General noted that militias continued to intimidate the refugees in West Timor and echoed the calls on Indonesia to fulfil its obligations under resolution 1319 (2000) to disarm and disband the militias and to ensure safety and security for the refugees. He added that an agreement had not been reached on dispatching United Nations security experts to assess the situation in West Timor in preparation for the return of humanitarian agencies. The Secretary-General reported that some divisions had occurred within the pro-autonomy umbrella, with some militia leaders announcing their readiness to return to East Timor to face justice. He also reported on progress

¹¹⁸ S/PRST/2000/39.

¹¹⁹ S/2001/42, submitted pursuant to resolution 1272 (1999).

in other sectors of the East Timor Transitional Authority, including the police, foreign affairs, defence, justice, infrastructure and education, but noted that the lack of decisions regarding land rights was hampering both local and foreign investments. He stressed that after independence East Timor would still require substantial international support, especially with regard to defence, police and the judicial sector. He proposed the establishment of an integrated mission, mandated by the Security Council and funded from assessed contributions. In the meantime, he encouraged the Security Council to extend the mandate of UNTAET until the end of the year.

At its 4265th meeting, on 26 January 2001, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General on UNTAET.¹¹⁹ The Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for East Timor and Transitional Administrator of East Timor; the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); the Country Director for East Timor, Papua New Guinea and Pacific Islands of the World Bank; the Adviser from the Asian Pacific Department of the International Monetary Fund (IMF); and the President of the General Assembly. In addition to all Council members, statements were made by the representatives of Australia, Brazil, New Zealand, Chile, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Mozambique, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union¹²⁰), as well as by Mr. José Ramos-Horta, member of the Transitional Cabinet of East Timor responsible for foreign affairs.

The President (Singapore) drew attention to a letter dated 25 January 2001 from the representative of Portugal to the President of the Council, containing information on his country's support to UNTAET and the transition of East Timor to independence.¹²¹

Introducing the Secretary-General's report, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General noted that many of the key tasks laid out in resolution 1272 (1999) now fell on the new governmental structures of East Timor to perform, rather than on UNTAET as originally conceived. He cautioned that the government could not be expected to perform those tasks adequately on its present "cruel budget" without being able to tap into the larger resources of UNTAET. Noting that a consensus was forming on having elections to the

Constituent Assembly on 30 August 2001, he announced that key decisions were about to be made regarding the details of the political steps which would lead to independence. He added that the East Timor Defence Force would not reach its full strength for another two to three years and stressed that international personnel would be needed well beyond independence to provide technical assistance, capacity-building and security.¹²²

The Administrator of UNDP reported that United Nations agencies and programmes had, in collaboration with development partners, including non-governmental organizations, begun the work of building the "critical bridge" between emergency work and longer-term rehabilitation and development in East Timor. He noted that adequate resources were not being made available for that critical area and stressed the need to look beyond the present recurrent needs towards a viable funding and programming strategy.¹²³

The representative of the World Bank emphasized the need for a clear and structured plan for the transition and post-independence mandate of East Timor to be developed as a result of a collaborative effort among all the development partners. Noting that such a plan needed to be in place as soon as possible to enable the mobilization of the right resources, he emphasized the importance of integrated political, administrative and economic planning, as well as the critical nature of private sector recovery and growth with a view to providing the people of East Timor with economic independence.¹²⁴

Elaborating on the role of IMF in East Timor, the IMF Adviser, stated that the Fund had focused on developing a macroeconomic framework to guide economic decision-making, as well as on building capacity among the East Timorese. He argued that although the Special Representative had held that the budget was "cruel", he believed it was realistic within the context of the current and future economic prospects of East Timor and the essential need for it to be sustainable.¹²⁵

The President of the General Assembly drew attention to the gap between the expectations of the local population and the reality of the "complex and delicate task" of nation building. He cautioned against a premature exit of the United Nations from East Timor,

¹²⁰ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹²¹ S/2001/83.

¹²² S/PV.4265, pp. 3-8.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-12.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-15.

expressed support for the Council's request for increased flexibility in the use of assessed resources allocated to complex peacekeeping operations such as UNTAET, and pledged to draw, once again, the attention of the relevant General Assembly bodies to that request.¹²⁶

Mr. Ramos-Horta described the progress that had been made since the establishment of UNTAET and highlighted the increasing participation of Timorese in the East Timor Transitional Authority. Touching on aspects of internal and external security and the continuing process of healing and normalization of relations with Indonesia, he noted that a number of decisions remained to be made with a view to attaining the goal of independence, including the holding of elections for a Constituent Assembly and organizing a constitutional conference which would debate and prepare the first draft Constitution. He held that the performance of the United Nations civilian police could be improved by reorganizing along the lines of nationality to avoid mixing different cultures, forms of professional training and security doctrines. He urged the United Nations to sustain its partnership with the people of East Timor, including by maintaining a peacekeeping presence after the transition period.¹²⁷

Speakers welcomed the assessment contained in the Secretary-General's report that there was a growing consensus among the Timorese people to seek independence by the end of 2001, and expressed support for his recommendation that the Council extend the mandate of UNTAET until 31 December 2001. On reconstruction efforts, they underscored the importance of effective cooperation between UNTAET, the World Bank, UNDP, IMF, civil society and the East Timorese people. Several speakers reiterated their support for increased flexibility in the use of resources in the assessed budget for UNTAET.¹²⁸

Most speakers welcomed the progress in the electoral preparations and stressed the need for free, fair and inclusive elections. The representatives of Colombia and Japan deplored the recent violent incidents in connection with political campaigning.¹²⁹ Several representatives called for an acceleration of the rate of return of the refugees and noted the importance of nation-building in East Timor being as inclusive as

possible.¹³⁰ The representatives of the United Kingdom and France voiced concern about the implications for elections, should the refugees in West Timor remain disenfranchised.¹³¹

With respect to the security situation, most speakers voiced concern regarding the continued activities of militias in West Timor and the threat which they posed to refugees. They stressed the need to improve the security environment to enable the registration and return of refugees, the resumption of humanitarian efforts and a safe and calm execution of the elections. Several speakers called on Indonesia to step up its efforts to fully implement resolution 1319 (2000),¹³² while the representative of China urged the international community to assist Indonesia in its efforts to implement that resolution.¹³³ Several representatives called for justice and reconciliation and welcomed the steps taken by both Indonesia and East Timor to bring the perpetrators of serious crimes to justice.¹³⁴

Most speakers voiced support for the Secretary-General's recommendation to extend the mandate of UNTAET for 12 months and advocated consideration of modalities for a post-independence integrated mission in order to ensure a smooth transition and a well-planned exit strategy for UNTAET. The representative of Japan underlined that upon independence, the transfer of authority should be complete, giving the international community a purely advisory role, while the representative of France observed that independence would mean the definitive transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding and called for a clear exit strategy for UNTAET.¹³⁵

Speakers generally concurred that an international presence would be required in East Timor well beyond independence and include development and capacity-building as well as defence and police responsibilities, which should be handed over gradually. While

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-17.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-23.

¹²⁸ S/PV.4265 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Tunisia); p. 14 (United States); p. 22 (Australia); p. 33 (Republic of Korea); and p. 35 (Mozambique).

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Colombia); and p. 24 (Japan).

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Jamaica); p. 17 (Mauritius); p. 24 (Japan); and p. 27 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union).

¹³¹ S/PV.4265, p. 25 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4265 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (France).

¹³² S/PV.4265, p. 25 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4265 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Ireland); p. 15 (Norway); and p. 27 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union).

¹³³ S/PV.4265 (Resumption 1), p. 8.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Colombia); p. 10 (Ireland); p. 11 (Mali); p. 13 (United States); p. 22 (Australia); p. 23 (New Zealand); and p. 26 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union).

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (France); and p. 24 (Japan).

welcoming progress in creating the East Timor Defence Force, many speakers cautioned against the premature withdrawal of international troops.¹³⁶ Several representatives believed that any post-independence United Nations security component should take the form of Blue Helmets, authorized by the Security Council.¹³⁷

The representative of Indonesia elaborated on his Government's efforts towards resolving the outstanding issues related to East Timor, including the question of refugees, reconciliation and disarming of the militias, and expressed the hope that UNTAET, during the period of its extended mandate, would focus on meeting the challenges of the future in a positive, balanced and comprehensive manner.¹³⁸

At its 4268th meeting, on 31 January 2001, the Council continued its consideration of the report of the Secretary-General dated 16 January 2001.¹³⁹ The President (Singapore) drew attention to a draft resolution;¹⁴⁰ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1338 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the current mandate of UNTAET until 31 January 2002, bearing in mind the possible need for adjustments related to the independence timetable;

Requested the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to continue to take steps to delegate progressively further authority within the East Timor Transitional Authority to the East Timorese people until authority was fully transferred to the government of an independent State of East Timor;

Encouraged UNTAET to continue to support fully the transition to independence, including through development and training for the East Timorese people;

Urged the international community to provide financial and technical assistance to the creation of an East Timor Defence Force;

Underlined that UNTAET should respond robustly to the militia threat in East Timor;

Emphasized the need for measures to address shortcomings in the administration of justice in East Timor;

¹³⁶ S/PV.4265, p. 24 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4265 (Resumption 1), p. 13 (United States); p. 15 (Norway); pp. 20-21 (Australia); pp. 23 (New Zealand); p. 27 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union); p. 29 (Chile); p. 30 (Brazil); and p. 34 (Philippines).

¹³⁷ S/PV.4265 (Resumption 1), p. 21 (Australia); p. 23 (New Zealand); p. 33 (Republic of Korea); and p. 34 (Philippines).

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 36-38.

¹³⁹ S/2001/42.

¹⁴⁰ S/2001/92.

Requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Security Council by 30 April 2001 a report on the implementation of the mandate of UNTAET, which should include in particular military and political assessments of the situation on the ground and their implications for the size, structure and deployment of UNTAET;

Stressed the need for a substantial international presence in East Timor after independence.

Decision of 10 September 2001 (4368th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4308th meeting,¹⁴¹ on 5 April 2001, the Council was briefed by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. Statements were made by all Council members.

Providing an update on the situation since the adoption of resolution 1338 (2001), the Assistant Secretary-General noted that enormous progress had been made but that there was still much more to be achieved. He maintained that with the ongoing assistance of the international community, the East Timorese should be able to realize their aspiration for a democratic and sustainable independence. He informed members that a regulation on the establishment of a Constituent Assembly had been adopted on 13 March and that the date for elections had been set for 30 August 2001, subject to the completion of electoral registration by 24 June 2001. In that connection, he reported that the regulation on the establishment of the Central Civil Registry for East Timor had also been adopted, providing the basis for preparation of the electoral roll. He noted that, to be eligible to vote, refugees in West Timor would have to register before 24 June 2001, and be present in East Timor on polling day. Noting that the Constituent Assembly, once established, would have 90 days to prepare East Timor's Constitution, he stated that consideration of a date for independence would only be possible once the Constituent Assembly had begun its work. He further informed the Council that Mr. Xanana Gusmão, Speaker of the National Council, had resigned following the Council's rejection of a draft regulation on the establishment of a mechanism allowing for broad-based consultation on the Constitution.

On military matters, he reported that on 1 February a ceremony had been held to mark the disbanding of the former fighters of FALINTIL and the establishment of the East Timor Defence Force that would comprise 1,500 regulars and 1,500 reservists. While welcoming

¹⁴¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. III, part II, sect. B, case 9, with regard to limitations on participation.

recent increases in refugee returns, the Assistant Secretary-General noted that an estimated 100,000 refugees remained in the camps in West Timor, and that reports of intimidation and lack of access to information about the conditions in East Timor continued. With respect to the proposal made by Indonesia on conducting a security assessment in West Timor with a view to downgrading the phase V security level (evacuation level), which would enable the return of United Nations agencies, he said that the Security Coordinator had expressed concern over the likely negative outcome of such an assessment.

With regard to security and law and order in East Timor, he declared that the situation along the border with West Timor had been tense over the last several days, characterized by multiple incidents. Similarly, he noted that though the crime rate in East Timor was generally low, there had been a series of violent incidents recently in several districts. Upon reflection during a series of community meetings in those districts, the need to create employment opportunities had been identified as key to reducing the risk of violence recurring. He maintained that progress in the maintenance of law and order could only be effective if there was commensurate development of the day-to-day functioning of the judiciary.

Turning to post-UNTAET planning, the Assistant Secretary-General informed the Council that a Working Group to that effect had been established, which, in consultation with the East Timor leadership, would make recommendations on estimated international staffing levels; the duration of those positions; technical assistance requirements and strategies for training required to support the government post independence. He also noted that United Nations Headquarters was currently exploring the possibility of setting up a mission task force to consider specific recommendations on the complete international presence post-independence.¹⁴²

The discussion among Council members focused on the 30 August 2001 elections and the participation of refugees still in West Timor; the security situation, particularly at the border with Indonesia in the run-up to the elections; and the role of the United Nations role in East Timor following independence. Representatives looked forward to the forthcoming reports, requested in pursuance of resolution 1338 (2001), on the implementation of the mandate of UNTAET and on recommendations with respect to the need for a

substantial international presence in East Timor after independence.

Concerning the preparations for the elections of 30 August 2001, Council members underlined the importance of an inclusive preparatory process, involving all political parties and the population in East Timor, including some 100,000 refugees in West Timor, towards the holding of free and fair elections for the Constituent Assembly. Several representatives expressed the hope that the refugees remaining in West Timor would return to East Timor by the registration deadline of 24 June 2001.¹⁴³ The representative of Bangladesh expressed regret that there would be no quotas for female candidates, while the representative of Norway hoped that the preambular paragraph in the regulation pertaining to the election encouraging equal participation of women and men would have the intended impact.¹⁴⁴ The representative of the Russian Federation held that the problem of the fate of the refugees had to be resolved by UNTAET and the Government of Indonesia, working in close cooperation. He also expressed the hope that the move to elections had not been based merely on the symbolic force of the date, but rather on a realistic assessment of the situation in the territory.¹⁴⁵ In response, the Assistant Secretary-General reported that the National Council had decided that those Timorese wishing to vote would have to return to East Timor. He added that it had been hoped that that decision might induce some of the refugees to return.¹⁴⁶

With respect to the security situation, Council members voiced concern at the recent acts of violence in East Timor, and particularly those on the border, and called for UNTAET to provide a robust response to any future instability. They also reiterated concern regarding the threats posed by militia groups in West Timor. Several representatives underlined the importance of the United Nations Security Coordinator dispatching a security assessment team to West Timor with a view to facilitating the return of humanitarian agencies.¹⁴⁷ The Assistant Secretary-General noted that it was the view of the Security Coordinator that an assessment mission

¹⁴² S/PV.4308 and Corr.1, pp. 2-6.

¹⁴³ Ibid., p. 7 (Norway); p. 13 (Ireland); p. 13 (Mauritius); p. 14 (France); p. 15 (China); and p. 20 (United Kingdom).

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 6-7 (Norway); and p. 18 (Bangladesh).

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 19.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 8 (Tunisia); p. 9 (Ukraine); p. 11 (Jamaica, Colombia); p. 15 (China); and p. 18 (Bangladesh).

would conclude that the current Phase V should be maintained. He recalled that an advance security team had travelled to the area and had not been able to proceed to a militia stronghold in West Timor.¹⁴⁸

The representatives of the United States and Mauritius expressed concern with regard to the Government of Indonesia's handling of suspects in relation to the murder of an UNTAET private in July 2000 and the murder of three UNHCR personnel.¹⁴⁹ The representative of the United Kingdom held that the question of extradition should be pursued further.¹⁵⁰

Most speakers were looking forward to the Secretary-General's report with recommendations for the future engagement by the United Nations. The representative of France held that the UNTAET military personnel should be gradually withdrawn following the elections and as the date of independence approached.¹⁵¹ The representative of Singapore suggested that the Council should tie UNTAET troop withdrawals to independence rather than to the election.¹⁵² The Assistant Secretary-General observed that despite a very professional border operation by UNTAET, there continued to be problems and that it was likely that in the run-up to elections more incidents would occur as some groups might wish to destabilize the situation. As a result, there was a very strong feeling on the ground that the United Nations should not tamper with force levels, particularly prior to the elections.¹⁵³

On 2 May 2001, the Secretary-General submitted a report on UNTAET,¹⁵⁴ in which he noted that, while East Timor continued to make progress on the path to independence, a great deal remained to be done until that objective was reached. On the positive side, the Secretary-General noted the promulgation, on 16 March, of the regulation on the election of the Constituent Assembly, adding that the registration of residents must be completed by 20 June to allow sufficient time for review, challenge and appeal of the electoral roll before the 30 August ballot. While the economy had grown by an estimated 15 per cent, unemployment remained substantial and was expected to increase as the number

of international personnel decreased. With respect to the unresolved issue of the refugees in West Timor, the Secretary-General announced that refugees had been informed of the Indonesian plans for a one-day registration exercise, scheduled for 21 May, during which they would be offered a choice between repatriation and permanent settlement in Indonesia. He further welcomed that Indonesia would establish an ad hoc tribunal to deal with gross violations of human rights, but deplored that the tribunal's jurisdiction was limited to acts committed after the 30 August 1999 ballot.

Recalling that security phase V remained in place in West Timor and that Indonesia had yet to fully implement resolution 1319 (2000), he reported that the Security Coordinator had decided to organize and lead an inter-agency security assessment mission in West Timor in May 2001. The Secretary-General noted that the militias remained a force to be reckoned with, continuing to advocate armed struggle to bring East Timor back into Indonesia and becoming increasingly involved in illegal cross-border trade. He stressed the need to retain both the military and civilian police components of UNTAET until the local defence and police force had reached the capacity and capability to allow a gradual withdrawal of United Nations troops. He also stressed the need to maintain a significant civilian presence in East Timor. In that context, he pointed out that the Working Group on Post-UNTAET Planning had initiated a review of the estimated level and skills of international staff required and was considering a comprehensive schedule of consultation with the people of East Timor.

At its 4321st meeting, on 18 May 2001, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.¹⁵⁴ The Council was briefed by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. Statements were made by all Council members, the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Canada, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal, the Republic of Korea and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union¹⁵⁵), and by Mr. Xanana Gusmão, President of CNRT, and Mr. José Ramos-Horta, member of the Transitional Cabinet of East Timor responsible for foreign affairs.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 15-16.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 7 (United States); and p. 13 (Mauritius).

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 20.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁵² Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁵³ Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁵⁴ S/2001/436, submitted pursuant to resolution 1338 (2001).

¹⁵⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

The Assistant Secretary-General reported that UNTAET had registered some 390,000 East Timorese and was working to complete the registration exercise by the 20 June deadline to enable the ballot to occur on 30 August. He also expressed regret that there had been no tangible progress since the report's issuance on the situation of the refugees. Concerning the issue of justice, he underlined that the decision of 4 May of the Jakarta court, which had handed down sentences of 10 to 20 months to six men in connection with the killings on 6 September 2000 of three UNHCR staff in West Timor, had been received by the international community with shock and disbelief. He further noted that the Secretary-General's report identified risks, both internal and external, to the security of East Timor and concluded that it would be prudent to maintain the military component essentially in its present form.¹⁵⁶

Mr. Gusmão observed that justice and reconciliation were two components of a process that must proceed side by side and that the international community and East Timor shared equal responsibility for that process. The international community should take prime responsibility for bringing about justice while the Timorese would bear responsibility for reconciliation. He expressed dissatisfaction with Indonesia's performance concerning justice, drawing attention to the "appalling" verdicts given to the confessed murderers of the three UNHCR staff. He described the forthcoming elections and the establishment of democratic institutions as a turning point in the process leading to the assumption by East Timorese of full responsibility for their country. He further urged the Council to keep the peacekeeping mission in East Timor after independence was declared. He also noted that, with the support of the World Bank, a group would soon be set up to work full-time on strategic development, and pledged to be personally involved in that process.¹⁵⁷

Mr. Ramos-Horta stated that CNRT would be dissolved in June and replaced by a National Pact, now being drafted, that would enable the participation of all political parties in the 30 August elections. He said that negotiations with Australia over a new revenue-sharing agreement were expected to yield an accord within two months and called for an increase in the process of "Timorization" and capacity-building. He further urged that the Serious Crimes Unit of UNTAET be strengthened and that the Indonesian authorities should

not forget their pledge to bring to book those who committed war crimes in East Timor.¹⁵⁸

Many speakers echoed several of the views contained in the Secretary-General's interim report, namely, his view that it would be prudent to maintain the military component essentially in its present form until the Government of East Timor had established itself; and the decisions to establish a working group on post-UNTAET planning and an Integrated Mission Task Force at Headquarters to support the working group.

Several representatives welcomed the announced intention of the Security Coordinator to organize and lead an inter-agency security assessment mission to West Timor in May 2001 and looked forward to the prospect that international staff would return to West Timor.¹⁵⁹

On the elections scheduled for 30 August 2001, many speakers welcomed the news that over 40 per cent of the East Timorese population had been registered for the polls and called for continued efforts prior to the close of registration on 20 June. They also noted that continued vigilance by UNTAET was necessary because of a widely shared fear among the population that the political process might not remain peaceful and the expectation of the Timorese that UNTAET would protect them from political violence.

Expressing concern about the impact of the continuing problem of the refugees in West Timor on the election, several speakers urged Indonesia to expedite the registration process to enable the refugees to return to East Timor in time for the voter registration.¹⁶⁰ The representatives of France and the Russian Federation indicated that the postponement of the one-day registration made it impossible for all remaining refugees to return in time for the election.¹⁶¹

While welcoming the steps taken by Indonesia to bring perpetrators of the 1999 abuses to justice and to establish an ad hoc tribunal to deal with gross violations

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., pp. 6-8.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 9 (United Kingdom); p. 10 (Singapore); p. 11 (China); p. 15 (Colombia); p. 17 (Jamaica); p. 20 (Tunisia); and p. 22 (Norway); S/PV.4321 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Japan).

¹⁶⁰ S/PV.4321, p. 8 (United Kingdom); p. 10 (Singapore); p. 14 (Ireland); p. 15 (Colombia); p. 22 (Norway); p. 25 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union); and p. 26 (Australia); S/PV.4321 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (New Zealand); and p. 8 (Republic of Korea).

¹⁶¹ S/PV.4321, p. 12 (France); and p. 13 (Russian Federation).

¹⁵⁶ S/PV.4321, pp. 2-4.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., pp. 4-6.

of human rights, many speakers strongly deplored the light sentences given to the confessed perpetrators of the killings of three UNHCR staff members.¹⁶² Several speakers welcomed the decision by the Attorney General in Indonesia to appeal the verdicts.¹⁶³ Echoed by the representative of Norway, the representative of Canada stated that the mild sentences reduced the international system's confidence in the justice system in Indonesia and stressed that, should the Indonesian system prove unable to enforce internationally accepted legal norms, the international community must pursue other means to ensure that justice was served.¹⁶⁴ Meanwhile, the representatives of Singapore and the Russian Federation cautioned against interfering in the judicial processes of a sovereign State.¹⁶⁵

While concurring that a significant international presence would be required in East Timor well beyond independence, several speakers stressed the need to plan for an exit strategy.¹⁶⁶ The representative of France was of the view that the military component of UNTAET might be downsized after the elections, and suggested that the next report of the Secretary-General should contain new recommendations regarding the composition of UNTAET.¹⁶⁷ The representative of the Republic of Korea cautioned that the debate about exit strategies might send the wrong signal to "security-threatening elements".¹⁶⁸ The representative of Australia stressed that any drawdown must be part of an overall exit strategy and not be undertaken with a view to cutting costs.¹⁶⁹ The representative of Canada also

cautioned against any premature drawdown, while calling for "reasonable budget restraint".¹⁷⁰ The representative of the United Kingdom stressed the need to be "cost-conscious", including by improving budget management and making progress in cost recovery.¹⁷¹

Speaking on behalf of the European Union, the representative of Sweden expressed concern at the slow pace of "Timorization" and called for recruitment and capacity-building efforts to be strengthened in all governance areas.¹⁷²

The representative of Indonesia reiterated his Government's "unswerving commitment" to bringing to justice those responsible for human rights violations. In that regard, he stated that the trial of those accused of killing the three UNHCR workers in September 2000 had not been concluded, as that case had been appealed by the Prosecutor, and called for all concerned parties to refrain from hasty judgements until a final decision was taken. He cautioned that reconciliation and retribution did not go together, stressing that for reconciliation to be successful, vast differences needed to be bridged. He also called for reports of the United Nations concerning East Timor to be impartial, balanced and objective.¹⁷³

On 24 July 2001, the Secretary-General submitted a progress report on UNTAET.¹⁷⁴ In the report, the Secretary-General observed that the National Council had been dissolved to allow for a six-week election campaign; 16 parties had registered for the election; 737,811 residents of East Timor had been registered; and nearly 10 per cent of the electorate had participated in public hearings on the Constitution. Only two minor parties had refused to sign the pact of national unity, while two political groups remained outside the election process due to their opposition to the ballot. The Secretary-General detailed the progress made by the East Timor Transitional Authority on a series of benchmarks and pointed out that, while the leadership in East Timor had stepped up efforts to promote reconciliation, the authorities in Indonesia remained reluctant to implement parts of the memorandum of understanding on cooperation in legal, judicial and human rights matters. He reported that the preliminary results of the refugee registration on 6 and 7 June 2001

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 9 (United Kingdom); p. 10 (Singapore); p. 14 (Ireland); p. 22 (Norway); p. 23 (Ukraine); p. 24 (United States); p. 25 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union); and p. 27 (Australia); S/PV.4321(Resumption 1), p. 3 (Canada); pp. 4-5 (Brazil); and p. 6 (Japan).

¹⁶³ S/PV.4321, p. 9 (United Kingdom); p. 10 (Singapore); p. 12 (France); p. 17 (Jamaica); p. 22 (Norway); p. 24 (United States); and p. 25 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union); S/PV.4321 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Canada); and p. 7 (New Zealand).

¹⁶⁴ S/PV.4321, p. 22 (Norway); S/PV.4321 (Resumption 1), pp. 3-4 (Canada).

¹⁶⁵ S/PV.4321, p. 10 (Singapore); and p. 13 (Russian Federation).

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (United Kingdom); p. 10 (Singapore); pp. 18-19 (Mauritius); p. 24 (United States); and p. 26 (Australia); S/PV.4321 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Portugal); and p. 9 (Republic of Korea).

¹⁶⁷ S/PV.4321, p. 12.

¹⁶⁸ S/PV.4321 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

¹⁶⁹ S/PV.4321, pp. 26-27.

¹⁷⁰ S/PV.4321 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

¹⁷¹ S/PV.4321, p. 8.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 25.

¹⁷³ S/PV.4321 (Resumption 1), pp. 9-11.

¹⁷⁴ S/2001/719, submitted pursuant to resolution 1338 (2001).

indicated that 98 per cent had opted to remain in Indonesia. However, he cautioned that this result might not reflect the refugees' long-term intentions. At the same time, he noted that the findings of the security assessment mission to West Timor were being analysed. The Secretary-General cautioned that, while the overall security situation remained stable, the light sentences given for the UNHCR killings and to a well-known militia leader might have encouraged some hard-line militia members to plan a resumption of offensive operations in the lead-up to the elections. He also expressed concern about the continued ability of militias to operate and train and to access modern weaponry. On the preparations for a successor mission to UNTAET, the Secretary-General stated that the Working Group on Post-UNTAET Planning in East Timor and the Integrated Mission Task Force in New York were still working on a plan, which would include a substantial reduction in the overall United Nations presence, while retaining civilian, police and military components until a gradual, sustainable handover to the people of East Timor could be completed.

At its 4351st meeting, on 30 July 2001, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned progress report of the Secretary-General.¹⁷⁴ The Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for East Timor. Statements were made by all members of the Council, the representatives of Australia, Belgium (on behalf of the European Union¹⁷⁵), Brazil, Canada, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Korea and Thailand, and by Mr. Ramos-Horta, member of the Transitional Cabinet of East Timor responsible for foreign affairs.

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General stated that, while UNTAET had come a long way towards preparing East Timor for independence, four major objectives needed to be met if it was to complete the mandate given to it by the Council, namely, (1) to consolidate a secure and stable environment; (2) to steer East Timor through the creation of democratic institutions and successful, peaceful elections; (3) to put in place the building blocks for the management of public finances and policy-making; and (4) to establish the framework for a sustainable and effective government administration. After the elections, he intended to appoint an

expanded, all-Timorese Cabinet to head a reorganized Transitional Administration, which would be downsized and more closely reflect the anticipated portfolio responsibilities of a future independent Government. Meanwhile, he underlined that the United Nations presence in East Timor must be continued, not only to ensure an effective police, military and judiciary, but to continue capacity-building and transfer of skills. Arguing that a new mission should be funded by assessed contributions to ensure predictability, he said that the recommendations to be submitted in October would be a strategic, sensible and modest assessment of what would be required in East Timor.¹⁷⁶

Mr. Ramos-Horta held that while the overall trend in security was towards decreasing levels of militia attacks, the United Nations military presence in East Timor would continue to be of crucial importance in maintaining a secure environment beyond the elections. Recognizing the need for good-neighbourly relations to that end, he noted that progress had been made in building positive relations with Indonesia and informed the Council of his participation in the recent ministerial meeting of the Association of South-east Asian Nations (ASEAN). While maintaining that the downsizing of the military and civilian component of UNTAET was indeed in the interest of the people of East Timor, he underlined the challenges involved in building a sustainable nation state, and stressed the need for continuous support from the international community.¹⁷⁷

Speakers took positive note of arrangements regarding the holding of democratic elections for the Constituent Assembly on 30 August 2001 and noted the Pact of National Unity, signed by 14 of the 16 East Timorese political parties on 20 June 2001, that called for a peaceful political campaign and acceptance of the outcome of the elections.

Speakers recognized that, while the election represented an important milestone in the mandate of UNTAET, experience had shown that the period following elections could often be extremely volatile and that the Council should view that period with vigilance, rather than as an opportunity for an early exit from East Timor. They underlined the need for a continued, albeit reduced, United Nations presence following independence, noting that areas such as defence, public safety, justice and governance were

¹⁷⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁷⁶ S/PV.4351, pp. 2-8.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-11.

critical, requiring longer term international support. In that context, they welcomed the progress made in developing the details of a successor mission, taking into account the situation as it evolved on the ground, and looked forward to the forthcoming report of the Secretary-General in which such particularities would be further elucidated. The representative of Colombia stressed that an exit strategy should be based solely on the conditions on the ground and the needs and requirements of the people of East Timor, and not on political or economic considerations at United Nations Headquarters.¹⁷⁸ The representative of Singapore warned against confusing exit strategies with exit deadlines.¹⁷⁹ The representative of Norway insisted that resolution 1272 (1999) should be used as guidance in setting benchmarks for mission completion.¹⁸⁰ Several speakers stressed that the credibility of the United Nations was at stake in ensuring the transition of East Timor to independence.¹⁸¹

Speakers appealed to the Government of Indonesia to disarm and disband militias in West Timor and to ensure a secure environment along its border with East Timor. They expressed the hope that the situation in West Timor would improve so that a United Nations presence could be re-established there, and looked forward to the outcome of the inter-agency security assessment mission's findings. The representative of Indonesia, however, found it unacceptable that the report justified the need to maintain a United Nations robust presence in the border areas and in East Timor as a result of the inaction of the Government of Indonesia in disbanding militia groups.¹⁸² The representative of Canada expressed reservations at the high number of East Timorese police officers scheduled to be trained, maintaining that the focus on the training of a "large quasi paramilitary force" was an unnecessary distraction from democratic principles based on a community-policing model.¹⁸³

Speakers also took note of the steps taken by the Government of Indonesia to address the issue of refugees and displaced persons from East Timor residing in West Timor, and encouraged the United Nations to

continue to work closely with the Indonesian authorities to resolve the situation.

Stressing the importance of reconciliation for the attainment of stability in East Timor, several speakers commended East Timor for the establishment of the Commission for Reception, Truth and Reconciliation, intended to help intercommunal reconciliation.¹⁸⁴ Calling for discussions with the militias, the representative of France said that further progress in reconciliation required early attainment of political power by the people of East Timor.¹⁸⁵

Most speakers underlined the importance of good-neighbourly relations between East Timor and Indonesia and called on the new Indonesian administration to fully implement the memorandum of understanding on cooperation in legal, judicial and human rights matters, of 6 April 2000, and to establish a special human rights tribunal in Indonesia that would enable the prosecution of serious crimes. Several representatives called on Jakarta to pursue the appeal of the light sentences handed down on 6 September 2000 to the persons responsible for the killing of three UNCHR workers in Atambua, as well as to implement the measures outlined in resolution 1319 (2000).¹⁸⁶ The representative of Ireland urged full cooperation in investigating allegations that women were being held in West Timor in sexual slavery.¹⁸⁷

Noting that East Timor would most likely become a member of ASEAN, several speakers underlined the key role ASEAN could play in maintaining the sovereignty and territorial integrity of East Timor.¹⁸⁸

The representative of Indonesia emphasized that his new Government remained fully committed to its obligations regarding international agreements on East Timor and would continue efforts to resolve outstanding issues and build good relations with the leaders of East Timor. At the same time, he criticized the Secretary-General's report for having justified the need to maintain

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁸⁰ S/PV.4351 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 2.

¹⁸¹ S/PV.4351, pp. 18-19 (Russian Federation); S/PV.4351 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 7 (Portugal); p. 9 (Australia); and p. 19 (New Zealand).

¹⁸² S/PV.4351 (Resumption 1) and Corr. 1, p. 19.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹⁸⁴ S/PV.4351, p. 14 (United Kingdom); p. 19 (Jamaica); and p. 21 (France).

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 14 (United Kingdom); p. 20 (Jamaica); p. 21 (France); S/PV.4351 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, pp. 3-4 (Ireland); pp. 10-11 (Australia); p. 12 (Belgium on behalf of the European Union); and p. 18 (New Zealand).

¹⁸⁷ S/PV.4351 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 4.

¹⁸⁸ S/PV.4351, p. 13 (Singapore); p. 16 (Bangladesh); and p. 21 (France).

a robust presence in East Timor by claiming inaction by the Government of Indonesia; not recognizing that the success of the disarmament process was reflected in the lack of serious incidents with heavy casualties; and making unsubstantiated assertions regarding militia activity. He reiterated his Government's commitment to justice and reconciliation as well as its openness to any suggestion for a viable United Nations presence after independence in East Timor.¹⁸⁹

At the 4367th meeting,¹⁹⁰ on 10 September 2001, at which the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Australia, Belgium (on behalf of the European Union¹⁹¹), Japan, New Zealand and Portugal.¹⁹²

The Under-Secretary-General reported that the elections for the Constituent Assembly had been conducted in an orderly and peaceful manner, meeting the criteria for free and fair elections, according to the Independent Electoral Commission. He added that 91 per cent of the electorate had participated in the poll, and concerns of voter intimidation had not been realized. The Under-Secretary-General pointed out that the certified results showed that Fretilin¹⁹³ had won 55 of the 88 seats (57.4 per cent), five short of a controlling

majority; 12 of the 16 registered parties would be represented in the Assembly; and women would make up 27 per cent of the members. Indicating that some refugees had deferred returning to East Timor out of fear of electoral violence, he reported that arrangements were under way to facilitate further returns. He noted that the inter-agency security assessment mission had concluded that the security phase could be lowered from V to IV in all but one districts in West Timor following the conclusion of a memorandum of understanding between the Government of Indonesia and the United Nations to specify the security for United Nations personnel.¹⁹⁴

Speakers welcomed the peaceful, free and fair conduct of the elections and the high voter turnout. They expressed hope that the electoral outcome would be respected and that the parties would abide by their obligations under the pact of national unity and work together to draft a new Constitution for East Timor. The representative of the United States, echoed by the representatives of Colombia and Portugal, applauded the Fretilin leaders for having committed themselves to an inclusive and consensual approach to drafting a modern Constitution.¹⁹⁵ The representative of Norway encouraged UNTAET to adjust its routines to be able to respond to the democratically elected Assembly.¹⁹⁶ Similarly, the representative of Ukraine believed that UNTAET should pay special attention to providing relevant assistance to the newly elected Assembly members, preparing them for good governance.¹⁹⁷

Speakers also stressed the importance of good-neighbourly relations between Indonesia and East Timor. In that context, many representatives welcomed the cooperation extended by the Government of Indonesia during the electoral period.¹⁹⁸ The representative of the United States hoped that the peaceful holding of the elections would encourage further refugee returns from West Timor.¹⁹⁹

Speakers also reiterated their support for a substantial international presence in East Timor after independence, stressed the need to begin planning for the successor mission, and looked forward to the

¹⁸⁹ S/PV.4351 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, pp. 19-20.

¹⁹⁰ At the 4358th meeting, held in private on 23 August 2001, the Council was briefed by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, who provided details on the election arrangements. The representatives of Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, the Republic of Korea and Sweden were invited to participate. Council members, as well as the representative of Belgium, emphasized the importance of the peaceful conduct of the elections to be held on 30 August. They believed that a peaceful, democratic process would be a major first step towards East Timor's independence in a complex process of stabilization in East Timor. Speakers encouraged a spirit of peace, democracy and tolerance throughout the electoral process and beyond, and joined the Secretary-General in supporting the heroic efforts of the East Timorese people and in urging a large voter turn-out.

¹⁹¹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁹² The representatives of Indonesia and Chile were invited to participate but did not make statements.

¹⁹³ Revolutionary Front for an Independent East Timor.

¹⁹⁴ S/PV.4367, pp. 2-5.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (United States); p. 10 (Colombia); and p. 16 (Portugal).

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Russian Federation); p. 7 (Ireland); p. 8 (Tunisia); p. 9 (Bangladesh); p. 10 (Mali); p. 11 (Mauritius); p. 12 (Ukraine, China); and p. 13 (France).

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

Secretary-General's report on arrangements for that mission. The representative of the United Kingdom underlined that the planning should be done properly, inclusively and in the spirit of the Brahimi report.²⁰⁰

At the 4368th meeting, on 10 September 2001, the President (France) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁰¹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Warmly welcomed the successful staging on 30 August 2001 of the elections for the first Constituent Assembly of East Timor, in particular the orderly and peaceful conduct of the elections and the very high voter turnout, which had demonstrated the wish of the East Timorese people to establish a full participatory democracy;

Expressed its appreciation of UNTAET for facilitating a smooth and representative election process;

Reiterated the importance of a substantial international presence in East Timor post-independence;

Looked forward to receiving the October report of the Secretary-General focusing on the transition and post-independence periods.

**Decision of 31 October 2001 (4404th meeting):
statement by the President**

On 18 October 2001, the Secretary-General submitted a report on UNTAET,²⁰² in which he provided an assessment of the progress made in the implementation of the mandate of UNTAET and made recommendations for a successor mission to UNTAET, upon independence. He reported that the Constituent Assembly had begun drafting the Constitution and the Second Transitional Government had been appointed. He outlined the progress made in creating a functioning public administration in East Timor, as well as in the development of a sustainable economy and infrastructure. He observed that while militia activity was declining, illegal cross-border trade and theft were on the rise and reports of misinformation and intimidation in the refugee camps persisted. To address the cross-border security issues, UNTAET and the Indonesian Armed Forces had signed a Military Technical Arrangement to promote information-sharing and coordination.

The Secretary-General observed that while East Timor was making progress in the areas of justice and reconciliation, Indonesia had yet to implement the

memorandum of understanding on cooperation in legal, judicial and human rights related matters. Although the jurisdiction of the Ad Hoc Human Rights Tribunal had been expanded, in his view, it remained too restrictive.

On the configuration of the United Nations mission, the Secretary-General reported that in the months leading up to independence, reductions would be implemented in the military, police and civilian components of UNTAET. Following independence, UNTAET would be succeeded by an integrated peacekeeping mission, composed of a military, a civilian police and a civilian component. The mission would focus on providing security; training and advising East Timorese civil servants and police officers; and performing key functions in the administration and government structures, until sufficient local capacities and human resources developed. The Secretary-General emphasized that there should be a progressive transfer of responsibility to the people of East Timor over a period of two years following independence.

At its 4403rd meeting, on 31 October 2001, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.²⁰² The Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for East Timor; the Chief Minister of the Second Transitional Government of East Timor; the Vice President for External Affairs and United Nations Affairs at the World Bank; and the Associate Administrator of UNDP. In addition to all Council members,²⁰³ statements were made by the representatives of Australia, Belgium (on behalf of the European Union²⁰⁴), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Mozambique, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Korea and Thailand.

The President (Ireland) drew attention to a letter dated 30 October 2001 from the Secretary-General, transmitting a letter from the speaker of the Constituent Assembly of East Timor.²⁰⁵

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General stated that, following the establishment of the Constituent Assembly, UNTAET had become a mission

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 5. For the Brahimi report (report of the Panel of United Nations Peace Operations), see S/2000/809.

²⁰¹ S/PRST/2001/23.

²⁰² S/2001/983 and Corr.1, submitted pursuant to resolution 1338 (2001).

²⁰³ Ireland was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

²⁰⁴ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁰⁵ Not issued as a document of the Council.

in support of the Government. He expressed hope that the Council would endorse 20 May 2002 as the independence date of East Timor. The 200 days leading up to that date were, in his opinion, crucial in preparing for independence. Ensuring a smooth budgetary transition to a national budget that differed substantially from that maintained under UNTAET was a key task. Moreover, he noted that while substantial progress had been made in the process of transferring governmental functions to the East Timorese, further assistance would be necessary beyond independence to complete that process. With that in view, he focused his briefing on detailing the financial, security, military and civilian components of the proposed successor mission to UNTAET, post independence, stressing that one key component of the successor mission would be the security of the new nation. He observed that, upon independence, the maintenance of internal security would continue to be the primary responsibility of the international civilian police, reduced in size by 25 per cent by the time of independence. As the capacity of the national police service grew, the size of the international component would be reduced. He announced the intention to reduce the military component of UNTAET by 44 per cent, while continuing to ensure effective border security, pending the full establishment and training of the East Timor Defence Force.

Turning to the proposed civilian component of the successor mission, he noted that it would include a human rights presence as well as a Serious Crimes Unit, intended to deal with the crimes committed in 1999. As specified in the report, he referred to the Government's efforts, with the support of UNDP to identify its human resource needs across all ministries. That process had indicated that up to 300 positions would be needed, particularly in areas related to human development and poverty reduction. Of the 300, approximately 100 core functions had been identified as critical to the viability and political stability of the Government as a whole and would be dependent on international expertise in the areas of finance, legal and justice systems infrastructure, and basic regulatory, administrative, and central logistical systems. Given that those functions were essential, he underlined the need for them to be funded for a specific period of time through the assessed budget.²⁰⁶

The Chief Minister of the Second Transitional Government of East Timor stressed that despite the achievements of UNTAET, its mandate would not be

²⁰⁶ S/PV.4403, pp. 3-8.

fully realized by the date of independence. The priority for East Timor was to continue the process of institution-building in order for UNTAET to effectively and systematically transfer its administrative functions to the independent Government. He requested the Council to continue to support that transition up to and beyond independence. He held that, in view of the experience of other countries in similar positions, such assistance to the successor mission should be guaranteed through mandatory assessed contributions. The Government would also continue to pursue assistance in meeting its needs from bilateral, multilateral and other United Nations specialized agencies.²⁰⁷

The Vice President for External Affairs and United Nations Affairs at the World Bank stressed that institutional and human capacity-building would require a strategic approach and coordination of multiple donor organizations. He further noted that a large number of the civilian positions proposed in the successor mission fell within the finance sector and were critical to avoiding the risk of a collapse of state services in the period immediately after independence. Nonetheless, the UNTAET-administered consolidated fund for East Timor and the Trust Fund for East Timor of the International Development Association currently had a substantial funding gap and financing difficulties would extend beyond independence, until the Timor Sea hydrocarbon revenues became more substantial. The next donors' meeting, scheduled for December 2001 in Oslo, would seek to provide a platform to initiate donor discussions on the medium-term programme of support for a post-independent East Timor.²⁰⁸

The Associate Administrator of UNDP elaborated on the technical study undertaken by UNDP of the human resource needs in the short to medium term. He stated that the United Nations agencies, funds and programmes had only limited financial resources of their own and that East Timor would therefore have to rely on additional contributions from bilateral and other donors. Expressing the hope that the Council would find the means to guarantee that the United Nations could complete its task in East Timor, he reiterated the commitment of UNDP to complement those efforts through the implementation of programmes for developing the fledgling civil service and for long-term capacity-building.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-12.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-15.

Speakers endorsed the report and recommendations of the Secretary-General. While applauding the progress made by UNTAET during the past two years, they concurred that the role of UNTAET, as mandated by resolution 1272 (1999), would not have been completed upon independence. Consequently, they stressed the need for an international presence in East Timor well beyond the transition of political authority. Most speakers cautioned against premature withdrawal and called for an exit strategy to be contingent on the development of local capacity in the fields of security, law and order, justice, governance and public service.

Most speakers expressed support for the recommendations contained in the report, suggesting the establishment of a United Nations successor mission to take the form of an integrated peacekeeping operation, mandated by the Council. Several representatives held that the Council's clear endorsement of the Secretary-General's recommendations was important for ensuring a smooth transition to independence.²¹⁰ The representative of the Russian Federation underlined that the report provided a good first step, but called for more detailed, substantive recommendations.²¹¹ Similarly, the representative of Japan had hoped for a more detailed plan for the future mission, and urged the Council to provide an early and clear indication regarding the continued United Nations presence.²¹²

On the civilian component of the successor mission, the majority of speakers supported the recommendation that the 100 core functions be funded through assessed contributions. The representative of the United Kingdom expressed hope that the correct use of assessed contributions for those key posts would not discourage others from coming forward with voluntary contributions to the post-independence Timor. He held it was in the interest of all to move to more conventional methods of development assistance as soon as was sustainable and not before.²¹³

Many speakers stressed the need for continued support to the judiciary and human rights issues in the successor mission. They also welcomed the establishment of the Commission for Reception, Truth and Reconciliation, as well as the decision by the Government of Indonesia to expand the jurisdiction of the Ad Hoc Human Rights Tribunal. Several

representatives highlighted the need to prosecute perpetrators of war crimes and other heinous acts in order to maintain law and order, fight impunity and promote reconciliation.²¹⁴ The representative of Norway urged the Council to renew its commitment to bringing to justice those responsible for the 1999 serious crimes.²¹⁵ The representatives of Jamaica and Belgium, the latter speaking on behalf of the European Union, hoped that the Indonesian Supreme Court would soon undertake a review of the verdicts for the killing of three UNHCR staff members.²¹⁶

Stressing the importance of good relations between East Timor and Indonesia, speakers welcomed the informal high-level contacts between the two neighbours. They also expressed concern at reports of militia activities in West Timor, but welcomed the number of refugees returning to East Timor. Several representatives underlined the importance of a swift conclusion of a memorandum of understanding between the United Nations and the Government of Indonesia, which would allow for the return of humanitarian agencies to West Timor.²¹⁷

The representative of Indonesia underlined the importance of strengthening relations with East Timor and looked forward to holding a bilateral meeting in the near future on ways to resolve outstanding issues and establishing a sound basis for future relations. One positive development, he noted, had been the recent signing of a bilateral agreement on the demilitarization of their respective borders. He also referred to his Government's efforts to repatriate refugees, expand the jurisdiction of the Ad Hoc Human Rights Tribunal, and resolve other outstanding issues.²¹⁸

The majority of speakers stressed the need for simultaneous involvement of and close coordination among multilateral and bilateral donors to allow for effective and coherent support for East Timor, as the focus of the work in East Timor shifted even more from peacekeeping to peacebuilding, and to prepare for a

²¹⁰ S/PV.4403 (Resumption 1), p. 11 (Australia); p. 15 (Brazil); p. 19 (Malaysia); and p. 25 (New Zealand).

²¹¹ S/PV.4403, p. 22.

²¹² S/PV.4403 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

²¹³ S/PV.4403, p. 25.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 19 (Jamaica); pp. 25-26 (United Kingdom); and p. 29 (Colombia); and S/PV.4403 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Belgium on behalf of the European Union); and pp. 8-9 (Portugal).

²¹⁵ S/PV.4403, p. 28.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 19 (Jamaica); and S/PV.4403 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Belgium on behalf of the European Union).

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 18 (Jamaica); S/PV.4403 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Belgium on behalf of the European Union); p. 15 (Brazil); and p. 17 (Republic of Korea).

²¹⁸ S/PV.4403 (Resumption 1), pp. 21-22.

smooth transition to more traditional development assistance. The representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States underlined the uniqueness of the case of East Timor as a reason for temporary funding through assessed contributions.²¹⁹

At the 4404th meeting, on 31 October 2001, at which the Council continued its consideration of the Secretary-General's report on UNTAET dated 18 October 2001,²²⁰ the President (Ireland)²²¹ made a statement on behalf of the Council,²²² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the political progress achieved to date towards establishing an independent East Timorese state and endorsed the Constituent Assembly's recommendation that independence be declared on 20 May 2002;

Agreed with the Secretary-General's assessment that the United Nations should remain engaged and that UNTAET be extended until independence;

Endorsed the recommendations of the Secretary-General for a continued and reduced United Nations integrated mission in the post-independence period, headed by a Special Representative and comprising a military component, a civilian police and a civilian component;

Looked forward to receiving information on financial implications and a detailed assessment of shared responsibilities on the follow-on mission.

**Decision of 31 January 2002 (4463rd meeting):
resolution 1392 (2002)**

On 17 January 2002, the Secretary-General submitted a report on UNTAET,²²³ by which he informed the Council of the progress made in establishing a public administration, improving the security situation and implementing policies designed to promote economic and social development. Noting that the process of reviewing the draft Constitution had been extended by five weeks beyond the initial 90-day deadline, he indicated that the text would provide for the establishment of a unitary democratic state, with representative organs elected through direct and universal suffrage. The presidential election would be held in April 2002 and, despite calls for new legislative elections, the Constituent Assembly was considering

transforming itself into a legislative body, as envisaged. Progress also continued to be made in the bilateral relations between East Timor and Indonesia and formal steps had been taken towards the accession of East Timor to ASEAN, upon independence. While noting that militia sightings had been few, the Secretary-General cautioned that hard-line militias might still pose a long-term threat to East Timor. Furthermore, the illegal markets operating near the border were of increasing concern. He reported that, despite continued misinformation and intimidation in the refugee camps, the rate of refugee returns had accelerated. While efforts were made to promote reconciliation and justice in East Timor, he indicated that the Indonesian authorities had yet to provide a positive response to requests made under the memorandum of understanding on judicial, legal and human rights related matters.

The Secretary-General reiterated that the achievement of the objectives set by the Council required the continued presence of a peacekeeping operation beyond independence. In his view, a smooth transition would require a phased drawdown of international staff; incorporation of essential common services within the Government and a transfer of United Nations assets; transfer of some residual functions of government from UNTAET; development of essential legislative and procedural machinery; and recruitment of civilian advisers for the post-independence Government. He noted that the reduction of troops and civilian staff was under way and that planning for the successor mission was continuing. In the meantime, he recommended that the Council extend the current mandate of UNTAET until the date of independence.

At its 4462nd meeting, on 30 January 2002, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.²²³ The Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for East Timor. Statements were made by all Council members,²²⁴ the representatives of Australia,²²⁵ Bangladesh, Brazil, Fiji, Japan, Indonesia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Korea and Spain (on behalf of the European Union²²⁶), and the Senior Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of East Timor, Mr. José Ramos-Horta.

²¹⁹ S/PV.4403, p. 25 (United Kingdom); and p. 26 (United States).

²²⁰ S/2001/983 and Corr.1.

²²¹ Ireland was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

²²² S/PRST/2001/32.

²²³ S/2002/80 and Corr.1, submitted pursuant to resolution 1338 (2001).

²²⁴ Ireland was represented by its Minister of State for Foreign Affairs.

²²⁵ Australia was represented by its Prime Minister.

²²⁶ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

Providing an update on the preparations for Independence Day in East Timor, to be held on 20 May 2002, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General highlighted the progress made by the Constituent Assembly in reviewing and approving most of the draft constitution. He informed the Council of his decision to approve a request to extend the consultation process until 9 March. He also noted that, on 14 April, the people of East Timor would go to the polls to elect their first President in elections that would be run predominantly by the East Timorese. The newly elected President would be inaugurated on Independence Day.

Turning to East Timor's relations with regional neighbours, he drew attention to positive progress in cementing relations between East Timor and Indonesia and in resolving outstanding issues. He stated that, at the end of February 2002, East Timor and Indonesia would hold high-level talks, to be followed by trilateral talks when those two countries were joined by Australia.

He further noted that the security situation remained stable: the East Timor police service had been developing well under the guidance of the United Nations civilian police and progress had also been made in the establishment of an East Timor Defence Force. Nonetheless, until substantial progress had been made in the development of both institutions, an international civilian police and military presence would be required.

On the matter of national reconciliation, the Special Representative reported that he had recently sworn into office seven National Commissioners of the Commission for Reception, Truth and Reconciliation. He called attention to the fragility of the nascent justice system and the underlying need for sustained international support toward its development beyond independence. He also reported on developments in Indonesia in that regard, relating to the Ad Hoc Human Rights Tribunal, the Supreme Court, and progress in several investigations. Elaborating on progress in the number of refugee returns and efforts under way to encourage up to 60,000 refugees remaining in West Timor to return prior to independence, he noted that among the obstacles to their return fear of intimidation and various economic factors remained significant deterrents.

The Special Representative expressed hope that the Council would consider and approve the framework for a successor mission, contained in the Secretary-General's report.²²⁷ He indicated that the mission's

civilian activities would focus on core functions in public administration, and provide assistance to serious crimes investigations and human rights mainstreaming. As for the police component, the international police commissioner would unprecedentedly have the overall command of the East Timorese police and the United Nations civilian police, as a means to ensure a coordinated police response in the field. The expectation was, he said, that a gradual handover of police activities to the East Timor Police Service would be completed by January 2004. Similarly, there would be a timely handover of responsibilities from the military component to the East Timor Defence Force, and efforts were under way to reach an agreement on the relationship between the two. He added that the military component, responsible for external security and territorial integrity would be reduced as national border control regimes were put in place. At the same time, he informed of an ongoing process towards reducing the size of UNTAET by 75 per cent prior to independence, but stressed the need to minimize the trauma to East Timor caused by the replacement of UNTAET by a much smaller mission. In closing, he expressed the hope that the Council would approve the Secretary-General's proposal to extend the mandate of UNTAET until 20 May 2002.²²⁸

Speakers commended the work of the Constituent Assembly in drafting the Constitution for an independent East Timor and expressed the hope that the final Constitution would be based on the broadest possible popular consultations. They also welcomed the announcement regarding the date of the presidential elections, as well as the role that would be assumed by the East Timorese. They urged all parties to conduct the election campaign in a peaceful and transparent manner. Drawing attention to incidents of political violence, the representative of Spain, speaking on behalf of the European Union, stressed the importance of appropriate channels for expressing political dissent.²²⁹

Many representatives expressed the hope that Indonesia and East Timor would work to improve links and to resolve outstanding bilateral issues, including the delineation of the border and cooperation on bringing to justice those responsible for serious crimes. The representative of Indonesia reaffirmed his Government's commitment and support for East Timor and its

²²⁸ S/PV.4462, pp. 2-9.

²²⁹ S/PV.4462 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

²²⁷ S/2002/80 and Corr.1, annex.

willingness to explore ways to resolve the outstanding and wider issues of interest to both parties.²³⁰

Mindful of the number of refugees still remaining in West Timor, the representative of the United Kingdom, joined by the representative of Cameroon, called on Indonesia and East Timor to finalize the memorandum of understanding to enable international agencies to return to East Timor and facilitate the resettlement of the remaining refugees.²³¹ Speaking on behalf of the European Union, the representative of Spain held that efforts should continue to be made to promote cross-border contacts, increase mutual confidence and resolve the problem of the payment of pensions.²³²

Several speakers noted the continuing risk of instability and stressed the need to promote reconciliation and justice and welcomed the progress in establishing the Commission for Reception, Truth and Reconciliation.²³³ Several representatives welcomed the establishment of the Ad Hoc Human Rights Tribunal in Indonesia and expressed the hope that the trials would begin shortly.²³⁴ The representative of Spain reiterated a call by the European Union for Indonesia to urgently make the court operational and fully mandated in line with international standards and with jurisdiction over all human rights violations.²³⁵

The representative of Indonesia stressed the importance of reconciliation and welcomed dialogue sessions among the different groups of East Timorese as well as the closer coordination between the Indonesian military and the peacekeeping forces. He reiterated his Government's assurances that justice would be upheld, pointing to the appointment of judges for the Ad Hoc Human Rights Tribunal, which was expected to commence its work the following month. While expressing respect for the independence of his country's judicial system, he also welcomed the revised

sentencing by the Supreme Court in connection with the killings of three UNHCR staff members.²³⁶

While characterizing the achievements in East Timor as a United Nations success story, most speakers concurred that it was critical that the United Nations stay the course, solidifying its successes through the creation of a competent and self-reliant East Timor. The cumulative attainment of that goal over a defined period of time would provide the United Nations with a viable exit strategy. To that end, they expressed support for the Secretary-General's recommendations to extend the mandate of UNTAET until 20 May 2002 and endorsed the proposed framework for the successor mission. Speakers looked forward to more specific proposals, so that the Council could consider the mandate of the new mission well in advance of independence. The representative of the Russian Federation, however, voiced his concern that the Council had not been given a "unified, comprehensive concept of future international assistance".²³⁷

Referring to the issue of post-independence assistance to East Timor, several speakers noted the importance of involving a broad spectrum of organizations and agencies from within the United Nations system, as well as regional structures, international financial institutions and individual donor countries.²³⁸

The representative of the United States stressed the need for the downsizing of the United Nations presence to stay on track in order to reach the goal of zero peacekeeping finance support by mid-2004 and expressed support for plans to gradually downsize UNTAET military and police components in the time leading up to independence.²³⁹ The representative of Mexico, echoed by the representative of France, underlined the importance of consulting troop-contributing countries on the reconfiguration of UNTAET, before and after independence.²⁴⁰ Similarly, the representative of the Russian Federation held the view that the scale, configuration and time frame for the future international presence should be determined by analysing the real needs of East Timor, the pace of

²³⁰ Ibid., p. 14.

²³¹ S/PV.4462, p. 11 (United Kingdom); and p. 21 (Cameroon).

²³² S/PV.4462 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

²³³ S/PV.4462, p. 13 (Ireland); p. 17 (Norway); p. 22 (Guinea); and p. 27 (Mauritius); S/PV.4462 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Spain on behalf of the European Union).

²³⁴ S/PV.4462, p. 18 (Mexico); p. 26 (Mauritius); S/PV.4462 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Spain on behalf of the European Union).

²³⁵ S/PV.4462 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

²³⁶ Ibid., pp. 13-15.

²³⁷ S/PV.4462, p. 20.

²³⁸ Ibid., pp. 18-19 (Mexico); and p. 25 (France); S/PV.4462 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Republic of Korea).

²³⁹ S/PV.4462, pp. 14-15.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 18 (Mexico); and p. 25 (France).

developments on the ground, and by taking full account of the position of the Government of that country.²⁴¹

Mr. Ramos-Horta drew attention to the many positive developments in East Timor including the low level of crime, preparations of the East Timorese Police Service and Defence Force, refugee returns, bilateral relations with Indonesia and the wider region, justice and reconciliation, negotiations on the Constitution and preparations for the presidential elections. At the same time, while welcoming the downsizing of UNTAET over the coming months, he expressed concern at the ability of some former militia elements to destabilise the country. He therefore welcomed the Secretary-General's proposals for the successor mission and expressed the hope that the Council would endorse that proposal.²⁴²

At its 4463rd meeting, on 31 January 2002, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 17 January 2002.²⁴³ The President (Mauritius) drew attention to a draft resolution;²⁴⁴ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1392 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*, decided to extend the current mandate of UNTAET until 20 May 2002 and to remain seized of the matter.

**Decision of 17 May 2002 (4534th meeting):
resolution 1410 (2002)**

On 17 April 2002, the Secretary-General submitted a report on UNTAET,²⁴⁵ detailing the progress made towards the independence of East Timor, as well as the challenges to the short- and long-term security and stability of the new State. The Secretary-General observed that on 22 March 2002 the Constituent Assembly had signed the text of the Constitution of the Democratic Republic of East Timor, which would come into force on 20 May 2002. He added that the presidential election had been held on 14 April in a peaceful and orderly manner. Outlining the continued progress in establishing the public administration for an independent East Timor, the Secretary-General reported that recruitment, training and capacity-building had taken longer than anticipated and continued to create obstacles to the effective functioning of the bureaucracy, including the judiciary. Detailing the progress in

establishing the East Timor Police Service and Defence Force, he noted concerns that the Constitution made provision for the coexistence of police and "other security groups" and promised that the presence of such groups, primarily made up of disenfranchised former FALINTIL fighters, would be kept under close review. While stating that good cooperation between UNTAET and the Indonesian Armed Forces had contributed to a decline in militia activity, he warned that hard-core militia elements remained a potential threat and that illegal markets continued to operate on the borders. The Secretary-General observed that Indonesia had resumed food aid to the most vulnerable groups following reports of malnutrition and agreed to make back payments of pensions to former employees of the Indonesian civil service, police and armed forces in East Timor. Noting that the Ad Hoc Human Rights Tribunal had begun its first trials, he expressed regret that the Government of Indonesia had not expanded the jurisdiction of the tribunal beyond the period from April to September 1999 and the districts of Liquica, Dili and Cova Lima.

The Secretary-General outlined his plan for a continued, though reduced United Nations peacekeeping operation, which would be built on a milestone-based approach, allowing for gradual withdrawal over a two-year period. He proposed the establishment of a United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISSET) to be based on three pillars, namely, (1) stability, democracy and justice, including support for the post-independence public administration and assistance for serious crimes investigations and proceedings; (2) internal security and law enforcement, consisting of both executive policing and support for the development of the East Timor Police Service; and (3) external security and border control, including support for external security and territorial integrity and assistance to the development of border security and control. All functions would be gradually handed over to the appropriate domestic authorities as local capabilities were developed.

At its 4522nd meeting,²⁴⁶ on 26 and 29 April 2002, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.²⁴⁵ The Council was briefed by the Secretary-General and the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. Statements were made by all Council members, the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Chile, Egypt, Fiji,

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 27-30.

²⁴³ S/2002/80 and Corr.1.

²⁴⁴ S/2002/130.

²⁴⁵ S/2002/432 and Add.1, submitted pursuant to resolution 1392 (2002).

²⁴⁶ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. I, part V, case 7, with regard to special cases concerning the application of rules 27-36 of the provisional rules of procedure.

Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Spain (on behalf of the European Union²⁴⁷), Thailand and Ukraine, and Mr. Xanana Gusmão, President-Elect of East Timor, and Mr. Mari Alkatiri, Chief Minister of East Timor.

In his introductory statement, the Secretary-General, *inter alia*, appealed to Member States to support the follow-on peacekeeping presence in East Timor and to continue to provide budgetary assistance and investments for sustainable growth. He also called on the Government of East Timor to maintain close cooperation with Indonesia, particularly in order to ensure timely agreement on the delimitation of the border, on the situation of the remaining refugees in West Timor, and on cooperation in prosecuting those accused of serious crimes committed in 1999.²⁴⁸

Introducing the Secretary-General's report, the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations elaborated on the plans for the successor mission to East Timor, UNMISSET. He noted that the mission would render support in public administration, law and order, and external security, and pointed out that the report had defined specific benchmarks that would allow a progressive reduction of the United Nations presence.²⁴⁹

The President-Elect of East Timor outlined the challenges that would face the nascent state of East Timor and appealed to the international community for financial support and expertise. He highlighted the need to consolidate the core democratic institutions of the country, enhance the capacity and transparency of political institutions and the administrative apparatus and achieve appropriate developments in the areas of law and order.²⁵⁰

The Chief Minister of East Timor stressed that the Government's priorities, as identified in the National Development Plan, would concentrate on: education and the eradication of illiteracy; health; housing; and the development of agriculture. He appealed to the international community for support, especially in the next three years before the first revenues could be expected from the gas and petroleum developments in the Timor Sea. He also emphasized the importance of a

continued peacekeeping presence and of fostering good relations with neighbouring States as a means to improve the security of the country.²⁵¹

Speakers applauded the recent positive developments in East Timor as outlined in the Secretary-General's report, including the adoption of the constitution, the 14 April election of Mr. Gusmão and the rehabilitation of infrastructure. They also recognized the need for further international assistance to the new administration to consolidate the gains already made, particularly in the areas of security and administrative services. Speakers stressed that continued donor support would be essential in that regard, and many recognized the need to ensure coordination among the different agencies and bilateral donors.

Speakers expressed support for the Secretary-General's recommendations for the establishment of UNMISSET, commending the proposed focus on public administration, law and order and security as well as the establishment of clear benchmarks for a gradual withdrawal of the mission. A number of speakers stressed that the timetable of UNMISSET should be determined by realities on the ground.²⁵² The representatives of Portugal and Australia cautioned that East Timor would continue to face significant security and social risks as the international presence was reduced.²⁵³

Many representatives stressed the importance of developing the East Timor Police Service and Defence Force. They also expressed concern about the slow development of the judiciary and called for capacity-building to ensure progress in the provision of justice and accountability.

Welcoming the envisaged close relationship between UNMISSET and the wider United Nations system in East Timor, many speakers stressed the need for continuing multilateral and bilateral development assistance and expressed the hope for sustained donor engagement. Many representatives noted that additional donor support could hasten the achievement of benchmarks and hence the withdrawal of UNMISSET. While welcoming the improved relations between East Timor and Indonesia and the increase in refugee returns, several speakers stressed the need to address outstanding

²⁴⁷ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁴⁸ S/PV.4522, pp. 2-3.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-6.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

²⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 17 (Singapore); p. 20 (France); p. 25 (Ireland); pp. 28-29 (Portugal); p. 30 (Spain on behalf of the European Union); and p. 32 (Australia); S/PV.4522 (Resumption 1), pp. 4-5 (Brazil).

²⁵³ S/PV.4522, p. 29 (Portugal); and p. 32 (Australia).

bilateral problems, including border demarcation; judicial cooperation; prosecution for serious crimes; and improvement of the refugee situation.²⁵⁴

Calling for a comprehensive solution to the issue of refugees, the representative of Indonesia called for a positive response from the international community to the joint Indonesia/United Nations appeal on solutions for East Timorese refugees. He said the use of the term “militias” in the Secretary-General’s report gave an inaccurate impression that lawlessness existed at the border and questioned the report’s depiction of criminal activity absent of any concrete evidence. He was of the opinion that border agreements should not be tied to security issues, or to the downsizing of UNMISSET, and reaffirmed his Government’s readiness to work in a spirit of cooperation and amity toward building a peaceful and sustainable society in East Timor.²⁵⁵

At its 4534th meeting, on 17 May 2002, the Council continued its consideration of the report of the Secretary-General dated 17 April 2002.²⁵⁶ The President (Singapore) drew attention to a draft resolution;²⁵⁷ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1410 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to establish, as of 20 May 2002 and for an initial period of 12 months, a United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor;

Decided also that the mandate of the Mission should consist of the following elements: (a) to provide assistance to core administrative structures critical to the viability and political stability of East Timor; (b) to provide interim law enforcement and public security and to assist in the development of a new law enforcement agency in East Timor, the East Timor Police Service; (c) to contribute to the maintenance of the external and internal security of East Timor;

Decided that UNMISSET would be headed by a Special Representative of the Secretary-General and would consist of a civilian component comprising an office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General with focal points for gender and HIV/AIDS, a civilian support group of up to 100 personnel filling core functions, a serious crimes unit and a human rights unit; a civilian police component initially comprising 1,250 officers; and a military component with an initial strength of up to 5,000 troops, including 120 military observers;

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15 (Bulgaria); p. 18 (Mexico); p. 21 (Norway); pp. 25-26 (Ireland); and pp. 30-31 (Spain on behalf of the European Union).

²⁵⁵ S/PV.4522 (Resumption 1), pp. 12-13.

²⁵⁶ S/2002/432 and Add.1.

²⁵⁷ S/2002/539.

Decided that internationally accepted human rights principles should form an integral part of training and capacity-building carried out by UNMISSET under paragraph 2 of the resolution;

Authorized UNMISSET, under Chapter VII of the Charter of United Nations, to take the necessary actions, for the duration of its mandate, to fulfil its mandate, and decided to review this issue and all other aspects of the mandate of UNMISSET after 12 months;

Decided that progress towards achievement of the milestones of the mandate implementation plan should be kept under review and that downsizing of UNMISSET should proceed as quickly as possible, after careful assessment of the situation on the ground;

Decided further that UNMISSET would, over a period of two years, fully devolve all operational responsibilities to the East Timorese authorities.

Decision of 20 May 2002 (4537th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4537th meeting,²⁵⁸ held on 20 May 2002 to celebrate the independence of East Timor, the Council again included in its agenda report of the Secretary-General, dated 17 April 2002.²⁵⁹ The Council was briefed by the Deputy Secretary-General. Statements were made by all Council members,²⁶⁰ and the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Rio Group), Cuba, Indonesia, Jamaica (on behalf of the Caribbean Community), Japan, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Spain (on behalf of the European Union²⁶¹), Thailand, Ukraine and Venezuela.

The Deputy Secretary-General extended congratulations to the people of East Timor and noted that the international community would work with its leaders to strengthen the democratic institutions that had been established and to promote the social and economic development of the country. She paid tribute to Indonesia and Portugal in the signing of the Agreement of 5 May, welcomed the attendance of the President of Indonesia, Megawati Sukarnoputri, at the independence

²⁵⁸ For more information on the discussion at the meeting, see chap. XII, part I, sect. A, case 1, with regard to Article (2) of the Charter.

²⁵⁹ S/2002/432 and Add.1.

²⁶⁰ Singapore was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

²⁶¹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

ceremonies in Dili, and stressed that East Timor's cooperation with its neighbours would be crucial to its long-term stability and prosperity. She further urged the international community to remain generously committed to East Timor in the future and maintained that the Council's decision to authorize a multidimensional follow-on operation, UNMISET, was a clear demonstration of its conviction that there must be "no exit without strategy". In closing, she reported that the Secretary-General had received from the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of East Timor an application for membership in the United Nations. That request would be presented to the Council, in accordance with the established procedure, for its consideration.²⁶²

Speakers welcomed the declaration of independence and congratulated the people and Government of East Timor on the result of their struggle for self-determination as well as the international community, particularly the United Nations, for its successful state- and nation-building in East Timor. Many speakers highlighted the cooperation extended by Indonesia and applauded the presence of the President of Indonesia at the independence ceremony in Dili. Most representatives commended the peaceful and democratic means by which East Timor had achieved independence and were looking forward to East Timor joining the United Nations. At the same time, they cautioned that major challenges remained ahead for East Timor. Welcoming the authorization of UNMISET, members emphasized the need for sustained bilateral and multilateral assistance to East Timor in the years ahead to safeguard and further build on progress already made. In addition to calls for assistance for capacity-building and sustainable development, many representatives stressed the need to continue to make progress on reconciliation and justice and welcomed the improved relations between East Timor and Indonesia. The representatives of Portugal and Costa Rica stressed the need to prioritize the promotion of democratic practices and respect for human rights, the latter encouraging East Timor to abolish its Defence Force and reallocate the resources to social and economic development.²⁶³

Many representatives characterized the situation in East Timor as a success story for the United Nations and commended the successive United Nations missions in East Timor and the Security Council for having demonstrated the abilities of the organization. The

representatives of Australia and the Philippines pointed out that in East Timor the United Nations had implemented new approaches to peacekeeping and peacebuilding, including the establishment of clear, credible and achievable mandates, clear exit-strategies and coordination with the wider United Nations family.²⁶⁴

At the same meeting, the President (Singapore) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁶⁵ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the attainment of independence by East Timor on 20 May 2002;

Affirmed its commitment to the sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and national unity of East Timor within its internationally recognized boundaries;

Expressed its strong support for the leadership of East Timor as it assumed authority for governing the new, sovereign State of East Timor; and its concern that challenges to the security and stability of East Timor remained after independence;

Expressed its confidence that UNMISET, established by resolution 1410 (2002), would help to consolidate and strengthen a stable environment in East Timor;

Appealed to Member States to respond positively to the urgent appeal of the Secretary-General to fill vacancies in the Civilian Support Group;

Also urged Member States and other actors to respond positively to the appeals for assistance in the development of the East Timor defence force, police service and justice sector, and in supporting social and economic development and poverty reduction;

Looked forward to the day in the near future when East Timor would become a Member of the United Nations.

**Decision of 4 April 2003 (4735th meeting):
resolution 1473 (2003)**

At its 4646th meeting,²⁶⁶ on 14 November 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMISET dated 6 November 2002.²⁶⁷ The Secretary-General noted that, on

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (Australia); and p. 13 (Philippines).

²⁶⁵ S/PRST/2002/13.

²⁶⁶ At the 4598th meeting, held in private on 13 August 2002, the Council was briefed by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. The Assistant Secretary-General, Council members and the representatives of Brazil, India, Indonesia, Japan and Portugal had a constructive exchange of views.

²⁶⁷ S/2002/1223, submitted pursuant to resolution 1410 (2002).

²⁶² S/PV.4537, pp. 2-3.

²⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Portugal); and pp. 10-11 (Costa Rica).

27 September 2002, Timor-Leste (former East Timor) had been admitted to membership in the United Nations by the General Assembly.²⁶⁸ He indicated that, since independence, the leaders of Timor-Leste had sought to promote a broad-based democracy. However, the country's emerging institutions remained fragile and would require international assistance. While some unrest had ensued due to rising dissatisfaction by former combatants and veterans, the Government was seeking to address the issues through dialogue. As for relations with Indonesia, he highlighted the creation of the Joint Ministerial Commission for Bilateral Cooperation to address issues of mutual concern. Stressing the importance of justice and accountability, he recalled that the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights had expressed concern at the proceedings of Ad Hoc Human Rights Tribunal set up by the Government of Indonesia. Outlining the progress made by UNMISSET in its mandate implementation plan, he noted that, while the civilian support group was addressing gaps in key areas, the justice sector continued to lack behind. As for internal security, the transfer of policing responsibilities and the downsizing plan for the UNMISSET police was proceeding according to the schedule. Furthermore, while the overall external security and border control situation continued to improve, the refugee problem and the situation with regard to border demarcation and control remained of concern. The Secretary-General stressed the need for donor assistance in key areas to enable the completion of the mandate implementation plan and the smooth transition to traditional development assistance.

At the meeting, the Council was briefed by the new Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Timor-Leste. Statements were made by all Council members, and the representatives of Australia, Chile, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union²⁶⁹), Fiji (on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum), India, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, Timor-Leste and Ukraine.

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General elaborated on the Secretary-General's report, drawing attention to the many challenges facing Timor-Leste, concerning, *inter alia*, the rule of law, social and

economic development, and institution building. He stressed that UNMISSET played a crucial role in nation building, while at the same time carrying out its mandate with regard to external and internal security and public administration. Its goal was to enable Timor-Leste to emerge as a state in full possession of all attributes of sovereignty, stability and prosperity, he said. In that regard, and in order for UNMISSET to achieve the objectives outlined by resolution 1410 (2002), and remain on schedule according to the drawn-down schedule, he reiterated the Secretary-General's appeal for sustained international assistance, particularly in the key areas of public administration, justice, corrections, police, border control and defence. In closing, he noted that the shadow of terrorism had fallen over the region and had added to the security challenge already facing Timor-Leste. To meet that challenge, external expertise had to be made available.²⁷⁰

Welcoming the progress achieved in Timor-Leste and paying tribute to the new Government, the Special Representative and UNMISSET in that regard, speakers drew attention to the remaining challenges for Timor-Leste and made an emphatic call on the international community for sustained and increased financial and technical support and assistance.

As for the first pillar of the mandate of UNMISSET — stability, democracy and justice — most speakers welcomed the progress made in capacity-building and the handing over of administrative responsibilities to the authorities of Timor-Leste, and applauded the Government for its inclusive political approach and emphasis on dialogue and human rights. A number of representatives remained concerned about dissatisfaction among former freedom fighters and veterans, and stressed the need to address their grievances.²⁷¹

Speakers took note of concerns expressed in the Secretary-General's report concerning the development of the justice system, human rights and the rule of law. They commended the work of the Commission for Reception, Truth and Reconciliation and underlined the need to bring those responsible for the 1999 violence to justice. They expressed serious concern at shortcomings in the judicial system and stressed the importance of ensuring an independent judiciary and addressing the problems in the prison system, particularly the detention of prisoners without trial. The representatives of the United States and Singapore drew attention to the lack

²⁶⁸ For information on the action of the Council with regard to the admission of Timor-Leste to membership in the United Nations, see chapter VII.

²⁶⁹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁷⁰ S/PV.4646, pp. 2-5.

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16 (Singapore); and p. 18 (Colombia).

of clarity regarding the separation of powers among the judiciary.²⁷²

Regarding the second pillar — internal security and law enforcement — speakers welcomed reports that a number of districts were now under the control of the new Timor-Leste Police Service, which boded well for the scheduled transfer of such responsibilities to the Timorese by January 2004. Taking note of the Secretary-General's recommendation for more resources for the Timor-Leste police force, the representative of New Zealand emphasized the importance of confidence in law enforcement and in the judicial system for a safe and stable environment, and the representative of Australia stressed the need for a more strategic and coordinated approach to strengthening the police.²⁷³

Concerning external security, the third pillar, many speakers emphasized the positive developments as a result of the work of the Government of Timor-Leste, UNMISSET and the Indonesian armed forces. Cooperation among the three structures had made it possible to improve and ensure a climate of stability and security with West Timor. They encouraged Indonesia and Timor-Leste to continue to make progress towards the delineation of their common border, expressing the hope that such progress would enable UNMISSET to reduce its presence within a reasonable time period, as called for by the Council. The representative of Indonesia reiterated his Government's commitment to resolving the border issue and elaborated on the work of the Joint Ministerial Commission for Bilateral Cooperation.²⁷⁴ Speakers also welcomed Timor-Leste's efforts to establish diplomatic relations with almost all States members of ASEAN, and its new membership of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries among other forums.

Many representatives reiterated their concerns about the refugees. Several speakers expressed concern at the slow rate of refugee return since the end of June 2002, maintaining that such return was a prerequisite for the long-term stability of the country.²⁷⁵ The representative of Indonesia noted that his Government had provided additional incentives for refugees who

wanted to return by the end of the year, expressing the hope that a comprehensive solution would be found by that time. Regarding the low level of return, he noted that the lack of financial support had been a major impediment and reiterated the importance of the international community meeting its financial commitments to the joint appeal.²⁷⁶

The representative of Timor-Leste, in his first appearance before the Council representing a Member of the United Nations, said that his Government stood ready to face the many challenges ahead on the basis of the principles promoted by the United Nations. At the same time, he stressed that Timor-Leste was a young country whose transition from decades of violence and deprivation was yet to be completed. Building a self-sufficient and prosperous nation would require the Council's continued support and partnership, as well as that of the international community at large. He drew attention to the many challenges raised by other speakers, while underlining progress in the area of political developments within and outside Timor-Leste, related, *inter alia*, to the reconciliation process, relations with Indonesia and Australia and the international community, and preparations for his country's ratification of several important international instruments. In closing, he noted that Timor-Leste remained fully committed to the global fight against terrorism, although it required the sustained support of the international community.²⁷⁷

At its 4715th meeting, on 10 March 2003, the Council included in its agenda the special report of the Secretary-General on UNMISSET dated 3 March 2003.²⁷⁸

In the report, the Secretary-General observed a sharp increase in the frequency and magnitude of security-related incidents, including riots in Dili and attacks in a number of villages, and indicated that the increased activity of armed groups might be generated by both politically motivated elements and criminals. Recalling that the mandate implementation and mission downsizing plans had been prepared in a time of optimism, he stressed the need to adjust the downsizing plan for UNMISSET to reflect the changed circumstances. The Secretary-General recommended a series of revisions to both the military and the policing strategies in Timor-Leste, including the reconfiguration

²⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 9 (United States); and p. 16 (Singapore).

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 25 (New Zealand); S/PV.4646 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Australia).

²⁷⁴ S/PV.4646, p. 27.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 11 (Mauritius); p. 14 (Mexico); p. 15 (Norway); p. 19 (Colombia); and p. 24 (Chile); S/PV.4646 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Australia).

²⁷⁶ S/PV.4646, p. 27.

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-22.

²⁷⁸ S/2003/243, submitted pursuant to resolution 1410 (2002).

of the military component and the adoption of a revised phased approach to its mandate to better reflect the existing threats; and the enhancement of the operational ability and training capacity of the international police component. He recalled that the plan for downsizing UNMISSET had always been predicated on the need to keep the situation on the ground under constant review. Nevertheless, he emphasized that the development rate in the nascent State remained extraordinarily rapid.

At the meeting, the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. In addition to all Council members, the representatives of Australia, Indonesia, Japan, Portugal and Timor-Leste made statements.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General stated that the focus of the report, rather than relaying the successes achieved, was an attempt to sound a warning bell at a critical time, to indicate to the Council a number of worrisome developments, and to recommend, in good time, what the Secretariat perceived as realistic and prudent adjustments of the downsizing plans for UNMISSET, so as to reflect changed realities and safeguard all that had been gained thus far. He pointed out that the report noted two types of developments in the security environment that appeared to threaten the situation in Timor-Leste: threats of civil disturbance and a rise in armed groups in rural areas, particularly in the west. He also recalled that the Secretary-General's special report thus included two kinds of recommendations: enhancing the ability of UNMISSET to support the development of the Timorese police; and delaying the downsizing of the military component, and its reconfiguration in key areas, including increasing mobility. While the report did not propose deferring the operation's withdrawal date, he stressed that the premature downsizing of the Mission could imperil the overall strategy in Timor-Leste.²⁷⁹

Speakers stressed the importance of stability for socio-economic development and expressed serious concern at the increase in security incidents and armed attacks. They also emphasized the need to make progress on destabilizing factors such as border demarcation and the return of the remaining estimated 28,000 refugees in West Timor.

Many speakers agreed that the increased activities by former militia members had somewhat changed the security outlook in Timor-Leste. The representatives of Bulgaria and Guinea stressed the need for an investigation into the background and

²⁷⁹ S/PV.4715, pp. 2-4.

motivation of recent incidents and called for the perpetrators to be brought to justice.²⁸⁰ In that context, the representative of Mexico called for clarification on whether recent acts were motivated by political consideration as part of an orchestrated campaign.²⁸¹

The representative of the Russian Federation stressed the need to investigate the information that former combatants were creating bases and setting up clandestine arms caches to destabilize Timor-Leste.²⁸²

The representative of Indonesia deplored references in the Secretary-General's report to the involvement of "supported militias", adding that the blame should go to UNMISSET for its "deliberate ignorance" in the way that it sought to protect the people of Timor-Leste from criminal elements.²⁸³

Pointing out that the police, and not peacekeepers, had the primary responsibility for handling internal security incidents, the representative of the United States did not see a compelling case for putting the peacekeeping drawdown plan on pause. He had difficulty seeing why a peacekeeping force of 2,780, the force level by July 2003, would be incapable of helping the police to handle small numbers of bandits or ex-militia members. If a compelling case were made, he could be open to a "more modest adjustment" in that area.²⁸⁴ Similarly, a number of representatives were not convinced that the security problems in Timor-Leste warranted the proposed adjustment to the drawdown plans of the Mission's military component, but supported the reorientation of the force and the revision of the policing strategy, including a freeze on the downsizing of UNMISSET police.²⁸⁵ Noting the difference in views regarding the recommendations for the military component, the representative of Japan pointed out that any changes to the downsizing plans would require difficult adjustments by troop contributors and the international community in general.²⁸⁶

The representative of Timor-Leste pointed out that the proposed adjustments in the Secretary-General's report regarding downsizing did not alter the Mission's broad concept of operations, its withdrawal date, nor its ultimate goal of aiding the viability and adequacy of Timor-Leste's security capability. In his view, the

²⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 6 (Bulgaria); and p. 16 (Guinea).

²⁸¹ Ibid., p. 9.

²⁸² Ibid., p. 12.

²⁸³ Ibid., pp. 21-22.

²⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 10-11.

²⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 8 (United Kingdom); pp. 11-12 (Germany); pp. 13-14 (France); and p. 20 (Australia).

²⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 22.

proposed adjustments would maximize the effectiveness of UNMISSET in helping Timor-Leste face the very serious ongoing security threats. With that in mind, his Government wholeheartedly endorsed and supported the reassessment, recommendations and proposals contained in the report. He also noted that the strengthening of relations with neighbouring countries remained a priority, and welcomed the continued cooperation and goodwill of Indonesia.²⁸⁷

At its 4735th meeting,²⁸⁸ on 4 April 2003, the Council again included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.²⁸⁹ The President (Mexico) drew attention to a draft resolution;²⁹⁰ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1473 (2003), by which the Council, inter alia:

Decided that the composition and strength of the police component of UNMISSET and the schedule for its downsizing would be adjusted in line with paragraphs 33 and 35 of the special report of the Secretary-General;

Decided that the schedule for the downsizing of the military component of UNMISSET for the period up until December 2003 would be adjusted in line with the letter of 28 March 2003 from the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations to the members of the Security Council; and, accordingly, that two battalions would be retained within regions adjoining the Tactical Coordination Line during this period, together with associated force elements, including mobility; and that the number of military peacekeepers would be reduced to 1,750 more gradually than was foreseen in resolution 1410 (2002);

Requested the Secretary-General to provide by 20 May 2003 for the approval of the Security Council a detailed military strategy for the revised schedule for the downsizing of the military component of UNMISSET;

Requested the Secretary-General to keep the Council closely and regularly informed of developments on the ground and on implementation of the revised military and police strategies;

Requested the Government of Timor-Leste to continue to work closely with UNMISSET, including in the implementation of the revised police and military strategies.

**Decision of 19 May 2003 (4758th meeting):
resolution 1480 (2003)**

At its 4744th meeting, on 28 April 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMISSET dated 21 April

2003.²⁹¹ Referring to the latest political developments in Timor-Leste, the Secretary-General noted that the National Parliament had ratified core human rights treaties and the leadership of Timor-Leste continued its efforts to engage a wide variety of Timorese sectors in political dialogue. In spite of progress in the relationship between Indonesia and Timor-Leste, including a meeting on border demarcation, at which it was suggested that approximately 80 per cent of the boundary could be agreed upon relatively easily, it was doubtful that an agreement would be reached by 30 June 2003. Outlining the progress made in all three parts of the mandate implementation plan, the Secretary-General observed that further bilateral efforts would be necessary alongside and after the contribution of UNMISSET, in such areas as specific sectors of civilian administration; judicial process to deal with the 1999 crimes and other human rights capacity-building initiatives; the continuing development of a non-political, professional police force; and defence and security cooperation. Outlining the role played by the civilian, police and military components of the Mission, the Secretary-General recommended the extension of the mandate of UNMISSET for one year.

At the meeting, the Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Timor-Leste. Statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal and Timor-Leste.

Emphasizing the crucial importance of the strengthening of the civilian police component of UNMISSET and a more gradual drawdown of the military component pursuant to resolution 1473 (2003) in addressing emerging threats in Timor-Leste, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General reported that the Mission had initiated and supported actions by the Government of Timor-Leste to strengthen the national police, while strengthening its advisory presence to ensure a smooth transition until all responsibility was transferred by mid-2004. He also noted the satisfactory progress in the development of a professional public administration, noting that UNMISSET had begun to identify areas where continuing support would be required after its departure. Progress had also been achieved, with the Mission's support, in the work of the Serious Crimes Unit and the Special Panels for Serious Crimes. He observed, in that connection, that, along with public administration and policing, the mandate to

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-19.

²⁸⁸ The representative of Timor-Leste was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

²⁸⁹ S/2003/243.

²⁹⁰ S/2003/401.

²⁹¹ S/2003/449, submitted pursuant to resolution 1410 (2002).

bring to justice the perpetrators of serious crimes committed in 1999 would require deliberation as to the appropriate post-UNMISSET arrangement, since the judicial process could not be completed by mid-2004.

The Special Representative observed that, while the economic situation in Timor-Leste was slow to improve, the means for achieving medium-term economic objectives were encouraging. In addition to the Timor Sea Treaty, further prospects of public revenues had been identified and resources explored. Timor-Leste had also formally applied for recognition as a least developed country. Meanwhile, development strategies towards the fulfilment of the National Development Plan were being pursued, and the Government was committed to registering advances in key social indicators. He concluded that the Council would, in due course, have to take a view on the optimal form of association for the United Nations in Timor-Leste upon the conclusion of UNMISSET. The international community's engagement in peacebuilding and institution-building would need to continue, and UNMISSET would review possible options by which such continuing needs could be met.²⁹²

Speakers agreed that, while progress in Timor-Leste was significant and encouraging, much remained to be done and the continued assistance of the international community continued to be crucial, particularly in the strengthening of the country's public administration and police force, the development of its judicial system, judicial process and human rights, the strengthening of the country's defence and security sectors, as well as in the area of economic reconstruction and development.

Stressing the importance of justice for reconciliation and social progress, several representatives called for progress in the criminal proceedings regarding the 1999 serious crimes.²⁹³

While speakers generally welcomed the improved relations between Timor-Leste and Indonesia, they also called on the parties to increase their efforts to reach an agreement on border delineation by the target date. The representative of Indonesia expressed concern at "prejudices" expressed in the report on certain issues, particularly concerning security at the border and justice and noted that its steadily growing relationship with Timor-Leste was far too important to allow any issue to

disrupt it.²⁹⁴ Speakers expressed the hope that the revised programme and timetable for the drawdown of the Mission's police component and a revised schedule for the downsizing of the military component would allow for a full transfer of responsibilities to the national army and police. Many representatives expressed support for the Secretary-General's recommendation in the report that the UNMISSET mandate be extended for a further year, until 20 May 2004. The representative of the United States characterized it as "the final 12-month extension".²⁹⁵ While the representative of Fiji stressed the need for a cautious approach to the drawdown of UNMISSET, the representative of Indonesia called for a more progressive transfer of operational responsibilities to the people of Timor-Leste and for UNMISSET to honour its exit strategy.²⁹⁶

The representative of Timor-Leste thanked Council members for resolution 1472 (2003) and argued that the firm and transparent response by the United Nations and the Government of Timor-Leste had reasserted confidence and stability in his country. Reiterating his Government's commitment to a robust and independent judiciary, he noted that the justice sector continued to require international support. In addition, efforts were under way to address the basic needs of the people of Timor-Leste both in terms of investments in human resources and in the areas of agriculture, fisheries and tourism. Stressing the commitment of Timor-Leste to international engagement, he looked forward to completion of the discussions on international sea and land borders by 30 June 2003.²⁹⁷

At its 4758th meeting,²⁹⁸ on 19 May 2003, the Council again included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.²⁹⁹ The President (Pakistan) drew attention to a draft resolution;³⁰⁰ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1480 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*, decided to extend the mandate of UNMISSET until 20 May 2004 and to remain actively seized of the matter.

²⁹² S/PV.4744, pp. 2-6.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Cameroon); p. 13 (France); p. 21 (Portugal); and p. 23 (New Zealand).

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

²⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 24 (Fiji); and p. 25 (Indonesia).

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 18-20.

²⁹⁸ The representative of Timor-Leste was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

²⁹⁹ S/2003/449.

³⁰⁰ S/2003/545.

**Deliberations of 15 October 2003
(4843rd meeting)**

At its 4843rd meeting, on 15 October 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMISSET dated 6 October 2003.³⁰¹ In the report, the Secretary-General observed the remarkable progress made by Timor-Leste in laying the foundations for a functioning civil service and police force. The security situation had improved and relations with other countries, particularly Indonesia, had continued to grow stronger. The two neighbours had reiterated their commitment to finalize the agreement on the international land border by 30 November 2003 and subsequently to address other aspects of border management and to encourage return and resettlement of refugees. The Secretary-General outlined continued progress in each of the three programmes under the mandate implementation plan, including development of the public administration and justice sector, police training and law enforcement as well as development of the armed forces and provision of security and border control. Meanwhile, he stressed that some requirements would remain outstanding after the conclusion of the UNMISSET mandate and that continued international assistance would be indispensable in areas such as civil administration, justice and policing, human rights training and border security, as well as the serious crimes process. In conclusion, he encouraged the international community to begin consideration of ways to continue to support Timor-Leste after the withdrawal of UNMISSET.

At the meeting, the Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Timor-Leste. Statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Australia, India, Italy (on behalf of the European Union³⁰²), Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Portugal, Singapore and Timor-Leste.

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General noted that in the 17 months since the establishment of UNMISSET, Timor-Leste had made “a determined start” in various aspects of governance, open leadership, enactment of legislation, rehabilitation of infrastructure, responsible development planning and

budgetary discipline, cooperation with Indonesia to finalize agreement on their land border, promotion of the country’s regional and global integration, and commitment to democratic norms and personal freedoms. A supportive role had been played by UNMISSET, United Nations agencies and bilateral and multilateral partners in strengthening the institutions of state, advancing economic and social objectives and enhancing state security.

He indicated that despite achievements in training and in the broader deployment of the national police, there existed potential threats to stability in both rural and urban areas, including the continued presence of ex-militia elements in the border area. He anticipated that the Council would give close scrutiny to issues of security and governance in preparing for the handover of defence responsibility to the Government of Timor-Leste on 20 May 2004 upon the expiry of the Mission’s mandate. Specifically, he suggested that until Timorese security agencies were fully trained and equipped to perform the tasks undertaken by the military component of UNMISSET, “international assistance in some form” might be necessary, particularly to provide psychological support to a population not yet prepared for complete withdrawal of the reassuring international presence. Following recent needs assessments undertaken jointly by the Government, UNMISSET and UNDP, the Government had identified some critical administrative and judiciary functions which would also require continued international support. In addition, a continued human rights presence in the post-UNMISSET period would be necessary.³⁰³

Speakers voiced appreciation for the support given by UNMISSET to the transitional process in Timor-Leste and commended the country’s leadership for its achievements. They noted with satisfaction that the foundations had been laid for a democratic and independent state with functioning political institutions. They also voiced appreciation for the stabilization of the overall security environment. Representatives welcomed the strengthening of Timor-Leste’s regional and international relations, noting in particular the bilateral agreement on border delimitation with Indonesia and the progress made in the establishment of maritime borders with Australia.

Speakers agreed, however, that serious challenges remained, which would leave Timor-Leste dependent

³⁰¹ S/2003/944, submitted pursuant to resolution 1410 (2002).

³⁰² Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³⁰³ S/PV.4843, pp. 2-7.

on international assistance well beyond the expiration of the UNMISSET mandate. They also noted that the emerging state institutions remained rather fragile, and that further administrative support was necessary. Further strengthening of the army and capacity-building in the police and justice sectors were seen to be essential. In the face of Timor-Leste's difficult economic situation, delegations shared the view that the promotion of economic and social development through enhanced donor support was an issue of utmost importance.

Representatives welcomed the stabilization of the security situation since the adoption of the revised drawdown plan for UNMISSET. At the same time, many speakers expressed support for the ongoing endeavours to train and build the capacities of both the police and the Defence Force in Timor-Leste, but recognized that this would require long-term efforts. In that regard, the representative of Guinea encouraged reinforcement of institutional and operational capacities of the National Police Force of Timor-Leste.³⁰⁴ The representative of Angola stressed the need for the rapid deployment police unit to be present for as long as necessary and called for stepping up the cooperation between the United Nations military component and the Timorese armed forces.³⁰⁵

While welcoming improvements to the justice system, many speakers stressed the importance of establishing the rule of law, respecting human rights and bringing the perpetrators of past serious crimes to justice. In that context, the representative of Spain was disappointed at the conduct of the trials in the Ad Hoc Human Rights Tribunal and urged the judicial authorities in Indonesia to guarantee that the appeals process be transparent and in accordance with international norms of justice.³⁰⁶ The representative of Mexico echoed the Secretary-General's appeal that those accused of serious crimes, many of whom were currently outside of Timor-Leste, be made available to the judiciary.³⁰⁷

Addressing the post-UNMISSET period, many speakers concurred with the Secretary-General's assessment that the country would not be able to achieve self-sufficiency in certain key areas of the United Nations mandate before May 2004. In order to consolidate all that had been achieved to date, the role and responsibility of the United Nations should not end with the withdrawal

of UNMISSET. Therefore, as part of an orderly exit strategy, several representatives affirmed the need for a smaller successor mission mandated by the Security Council.³⁰⁸ In the view of the representative of Timor-Leste such a post-UNMISSET United Nations presence should be credible and strong.³⁰⁹ The representative of Australia informed the Council that after discussions with the Government of Timor-Leste and other partners, his Government had put forward a model for a post-UNMISSET mission to be established by Security Council mandate for a one-year period. The proposed mission would be different from its predecessors in several ways: the Timorese themselves would be "in the driver's seat"; and the role of the United Nations would not be one of traditional peacekeeping, but of providing back-up support and advice to enable the local institutions to evolve and stand with confidence. Furthermore, the mission would be small, limited in scope, focused on specific needs, and have a clear end point.³¹⁰

Many speakers asserted that, in particular, the Timorese judicial system, finance and economic planning, and defence and security would need United Nations support after May 2004, and they looked forward to the Secretary-General's forthcoming proposals. The representative of the United Kingdom, while noting that peacekeeping and peacebuilding were two sides of the same coin, stressed that post-UNMISSET assistance would be crucial to ensure the success of the ongoing peacekeeping efforts. Underlining the importance of a smooth transition to peacebuilding, he said that it would be essential for the United Nations to play a part in future arrangements for the international engagement.³¹¹ The representative of France stressed the importance of a clear distinction between UNMISSET and the subsequent United Nations presence and called for the latter to be even more focused on development of Timorese capacities in critical sectors. Echoed by the representative of Mexico, the representative of France added that assistance should be provided as coordinated action by the various parts of the United Nations system and be given a complete and definitive exit strategy.³¹²

³⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 13.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 12.

³⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 10.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 18.

³⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 9 (Spain); p. 21 (Portugal); p. 23 (Australia); p. 26 (Singapore); pp. 28-29 (Malaysia); and p. 30 (New Zealand).

³⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 20.

³¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 23-24.

³¹¹ Ibid., p. 15.

³¹² Ibid., p. 10 (France); and p. 18 (Mexico).

The representative of Timor-Leste outlined progress in implementation of the National Development Plan, including in the sectors of agriculture, health care and education, adding that negotiations with Australia over the maritime boundaries would commence shortly. Highlighting the cooperation established with Indonesia in key areas, he noted that efforts were made to encourage the resettlement and facilitate the return of

the approximately 26,000 refugees remaining in the camps in West Timor. He concurred with the Secretary-General that Timor-Leste would not be able to achieve self-sufficiency in certain key areas by 20 May 2004, and welcomed the discussion about a credible and strong future United Nations presence.³¹³

³¹³ Ibid., pp. 19-21.

25. The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border

Decision of 21 March 2000 (4116th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4115th meeting, on 21 March 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the interim report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Tajikistan.¹ The Secretary-General observed, inter alia, that the peace process that the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT) was set up to support was coming to an end with the holding of the first multi-party parliamentary elections in Tajikistan. He commended the inclusion of former warring parties and others in the electoral process, yet warned that much remained to be done, especially concerning disarmament, reintegration, and democratization. He observed that despite these shortcomings, the parliamentary elections marked the final act in the transition period foreseen under the General Agreement on the Establishment of Peace and National Accord in Tajikistan. Accordingly, he concluded that UNMOT had been a significant achievement and stated his intention to terminate UNMOT once its mandate expired on 15 May 2000. The Secretary-General also noted that he was currently consulting with the Government of Tajikistan about the establishment of a small United Nations office to facilitate post-conflict peacebuilding and consolidation.

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, following which statements were made by most members of the Council,² as well as the representative of Tajikistan.

¹ S/2000/214, submitted pursuant to resolution 1274 (1999).

² The representatives of Canada and Mali did not make statements.

In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General elaborated on the successful parliamentary elections, but noted some particular shortcomings such as the failure to ensure the independence of the election administration commission, and the fact that the transparency of the electoral process had not met minimum standards.³

In their statements following the briefing, most speakers commended the holding of the first multi-party elections in an atmosphere free of violence, but also noted the deficiencies in the electoral process.

At the 4116th meeting, on 21 March 2000, the President (Bangladesh) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁴ by which the Council, inter alia:

Welcomed the holding on 27 February 2000 of the first multi-party and pluralistic parliamentary election in Tajikistan, and urged the Government and the Parliament of Tajikistan to work towards elections in the future that would meet acceptable standards as a means to consolidate peace;

Supported the intention of the Secretary-General to withdraw UNMOT when its mandate expired on 15 May 2000.

Decision of 12 May 2000 (4141st meeting): statement by the President

At its 4140th meeting, on 12 May 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Tajikistan.⁵ The Secretary-General attributed the positive outcome of the peace process in Tajikistan to four main factors: first, the involvement of the United Nations from the very beginning of the hostilities in the country;

³ S/PV.4115, p. 2.

⁴ S/PRST/2000/9.

⁵ S/2000/387, submitted pursuant to resolution 1274 (1999).

secondly, the strong support of neighbouring States; thirdly, cooperation with other organizations, particularly the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe; and fourthly, the political will of the two Tajik parties and their leaders to resolve differences through dialogue. Despite classifying UNMOT as a success story of United Nations peacekeeping, he noted the persistence of several problems in Tajikistan: the high amount of people in arms; the fact that the country was used as a transit route for drug-trafficking to Europe; and the precarious situation on the Afghan border. The Secretary-General stated his intention to write to the Council shortly on the possible establishment of a post-conflict peacebuilding office in Tajikistan, with the function of addressing institutional, social and economic development in an integrated manner, in order to consolidate peace and promote democracy.

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the Mission in Tajikistan, following which statements were made by most members of the Council and Austria (on behalf of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe), the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union⁶), Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.⁷

In his briefing, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the Mission in Tajikistan elaborated on the report of the Secretary-General. The Special Representative emphasized the need for international economic assistance, without which the viability of the political achievements in Tajikistan could be endangered.⁸

Most speakers welcomed the achievements in the political process in Tajikistan and the successful conclusion of the mandate of UNMOT. While all speakers supported some sort of United Nations role in post-conflict Tajikistan, the representative of the Russian Federation argued that in addition to the

general aim of promoting the post-conflict social and economic rehabilitation of Tajikistan, the mandate of the new office needed to include measures to facilitate the process of reintegrating former combatants into society, demobilization, disarmament, and the return of the remaining refugees.⁹ The representatives of the United Kingdom, Canada and Portugal (on behalf of the European Union) stressed that the office should include a strong human rights capability.¹⁰

The representative of Tajikistan provided a summary of the United Nations involvement in Tajikistan and concluded with the observation that the United Nations could rightfully describe its assistance to Tajikistan in achieving a political settlement to the armed conflict and resolving the humanitarian and socio-economic problems of the country as a peacekeeping success.¹¹

At the 4141st meeting, on 12 May 2000, the President (China) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Acknowledged the significant achievement of the Tajik parties, which had managed to overcome many obstacles and to put their country on the path to peace, national reconciliation and democracy;

Joined the Secretary-General in hoping that those achievements would be consolidated in the further strengthening of the institutions in the country with a view to the democratic, economic and social development of Tajik society;

Highly appreciated the efforts of UNMOT, supported by the Contact Group of Guarantor States and International Organizations, the Mission of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the collective peacekeeping forces of the Commonwealth of Independent States, in assisting the parties in the implementation of the General Agreement;

Reiterated its support for the intention of the Secretary-General to withdraw UNMOT when its mandate expired on 15 May 2000;

Expressed its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his intention to inform the Council about modalities of the establishment and functioning of a post-conflict peacebuilding office of the United Nations in Tajikistan, in order to consolidate peace and promote democracy.

⁶ Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

⁷ The representatives of France and the Netherlands did not make statements.

⁸ S/PV.4140, pp. 2-3.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 8 (Canada); and p. 15 (Portugal).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-14.

¹² S/PRST/2000/9.

26. The situation in Afghanistan

Decision of 7 April 2000 (4125th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4124th meeting, on 7 April 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security dated 10 March 2000.¹ In his report, the Secretary-General noted that although recent fighting between the United Front and the Taliban had been confined to specific areas of the country, the apparent targeting of civilians and their assets had worsened the living conditions of the Afghan population. He observed that not only was the fighting likely to continue, but that a major offensive was being prepared for the spring, suggesting that military supplies continued to be received from neighbouring countries. In view of these circumstances, the Secretary-General had asked his Personal Representative to concentrate his efforts to persuade the parties to enter into a process of dialogue aimed at a stable and verifiable ceasefire. He indicated that, if coordinated and pursued in an altruistic spirit, the peace initiatives of non-combatant Afghans such as the Rome and Cyprus processes might prove to be a useful complement to the overall efforts to bring about a negotiated settlement.

At the same meeting, the President (Canada) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 4 April 2000 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999),² and to copies of the report of the United Nations Interagency Gender Mission to Afghanistan, which had been conducted from 12 to 24 November 1997.³ The Council then heard briefings by the Officer-in-Charge of the Asia and the Pacific Division of the Department of Political Affairs, on the political, military, humanitarian and human rights situations, as well as by the Assistant Secretary-General and Special

Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, on the situation of women and girls in Afghanistan. Statements were made by most Council members as well as by the representative of Afghanistan.⁴

The Officer-in-Charge of the Asia and the Pacific Division of the Department of Political Affairs noted the positive political developments, such as the talks between the Taliban and the United Front sponsored by the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the initiatives of non-combatant Afghan groups and the activities of the “six plus two” group.⁵ He stated, however, that it was not possible to be optimistic about an early ceasefire between the warring factions, let alone negotiations leading to the formation of a broad-based government, as demanded by the Council. On the military front, he drew the Council’s attention to the possible start of a major spring offensive, as there was “every indication” that preparations for organized, large-scale offensives were now under way on both sides. At this juncture, he recalled the repeated assessment of the Secretary-General that external interference was one of the biggest impediments to peace, as it provided the essential means for the continuous civil war in Afghanistan. He expressed concern with the “reported involvement of non-Afghan fighters in the conflict, mainly on the side of the Taliban”. Such reports, he said, indicated that in some cases non-Afghan fighters were openly recruited through religious schools in Pakistan and sent into Afghanistan by convoys of buses and trucks.⁶

Several delegations blamed the Taliban for violating the Council’s resolutions and escalating the tension, and called on the group to halt preparations for the resumption of a large-scale offensive and begin serious talks with other Afghan parties. All speakers reiterated the need for the warring factions to seek a political settlement, which remained the only realistic way toward sustainable peace and stability in the

¹ S/2000/205, submitted in response to requests by the Council for regular information on the main developments in Afghanistan, including those in the humanitarian and human rights fields.

² S/2000/282, transmitting a list of 50 States which had responded to paragraph 10 of resolution 1267 (1999), in which all States were requested to report to the Committee within 30 days of the coming into force of the measures imposed by the resolution.

³ Not issued as a document of the Council.

⁴ The representative of Tunisia did not make a statement.

⁵ S/PV.4124, pp. 3-6. The “six plus two” group comprises Afghanistan’s neighbours (China, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan) and the Russian Federation and the United States.

⁶ S/PV.4124, pp. 3-4.

country. They remained concerned about the suffering of the Afghan people, particularly women and girls.

The representative of Argentina explained the work of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) and its latest report.⁷ The representatives of the Russian Federation, France and the United Kingdom expressed concern with the increase in outside interference in the conflict, particularly by the direct involvement in fighting on the Taliban side of thousands of foreign fighters.⁸ The representative of the United States called on the Taliban to comply with the demand of resolution 1267 (1999) that Osama bin Laden be turned over to authorities in a country where he would be brought to justice, warning that so long as he enjoyed safe haven in Afghanistan the international community was at risk.⁹ In this context, the representative of the Russian Federation stated that the failure to turn over Bin Laden offered serious ground for considering the possibility of tightening the sanctions regime against the Taliban.¹⁰ The representative of Canada was disturbed by the Taliban's "systematic pattern of violation of human rights of half the population — women and girls — a violation which the Taliban misrepresents as having a religious foundation".¹¹

The representative of Afghanistan noted the involvement of mercenary combatants in Afghanistan that had come from religious schools in Pakistan. He maintained that, in Pakistan, Afghanistan affairs remained in the hands of the army, especially the military intelligence agency, the Inter-Services Intelligence. He stated that Pakistan was still hoping for a military solution in Afghanistan, which was why it was providing the Taliban with logistical support, including arms and ammunition. He also stressed that the "military regime" continued to use extremist religious groups for its "political purposes in the region and beyond". He expressed the readiness of the Islamic State of Afghanistan to agree to a cessation of armed conflict and expected the resolution of the Afghan problem to be based on the establishment of a

representative, broad-based Government which represented all the major ethnic groups.¹²

At the end of the meeting, the Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women responded to questions and comments posed by the previous speakers, including those on the participation of women in civil society, projects that had involved men and women in decision-making, electoral education, and the rights of women and girls. While acknowledging that further progress could be made with continued international pressure on the Afghan parties, she stressed the need for a "political settlement that [was] firmly grounded in human rights and gender".¹³

At its 4125th meeting, on 7 April 2000, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 10 March 2000.¹⁴ At the same meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁵ by which the Council, inter alia:

Expressed its deep concern at the reports that both parties to the conflict were preparing for renewed large-scale fighting, and recalled its repeated demands that the Afghan parties cease fighting;

Recalled its demand that the parties, in particular the Taliban, resume negotiations under United Nations auspices without delay and preconditions in full compliance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Council;

Strongly condemned the Taliban for the repeated forced entries on 26, 27 and 29 March 2000 by its armed groups into, and searches of, the United Nations premises in Kandahar and for the intimidation of United Nations personnel;

Stressed its grave concern at the human rights situation in Afghanistan, which was unacceptable;

Called upon all States to take resolute measures to prohibit their military personnel from planning and participating in combat operations in Afghanistan;

Welcomed the appointment of a new Personal Representative of the Secretary-General and the activities of the United Nations Special Mission to Afghanistan to facilitate a political process aimed at achieving a lasting political settlement to the conflict and supported the phased deployment of the Civil Affairs Unit of the Mission inside Afghanistan, as the security conditions permit;

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9. For more information on the Committee, see chapter V.

⁸ S/PV.4124, p. 9 (Russian Federation); p. 10 (France); and p. 17 (United Kingdom).

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-13.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-28.

¹⁴ S/2000/205.

¹⁵ S/PRST/2000/12.

Stressed the need for prompt and effective implementation by all Member States of the measures imposed by its resolution 1267 (1999).

**Decision of 19 December 2000 (4251st meeting):
resolution 1333 (2000)**

At its 4251st meeting,¹⁶ on 19 December 2000, the Council heard statements by the representatives of Canada, China, France, Malaysia, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation, Ukraine, the United Kingdom and the United States, as well as by the representative of Afghanistan.¹⁷ The President drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by India, Kyrgyzstan, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan and the United States of America.¹⁸

At the outset, the representative of Afghanistan noted that, in response to the fact that the “Pakistan/Taliban/Bin Laden alliance” had categorically refused to put an end to the training and haven it provided to international terrorists, the Council was considering the imposition of new measures. However, he noted with concern that the draft resolution was silent on “Pakistan’s well-known aggression in Afghanistan” and only addressed the terrorism originating from the part of Afghan territory that was under military occupation by the “Pakistan/Taliban/Bin Laden alliance”. He maintained that the Council should address the problem of Afghanistan in its entirety. He declared that the acts of Pakistan constituted flagrant violations of the Charter, and that the Council needed to immediately be seized of the question of armed aggression against Afghanistan, which fell under Chapter VII, Articles 39 to 42. He also argued that the Pakistani intelligence agency needed to be recognized as a criminal organization responsible for the war of aggression, for crimes against humanity and for war crimes. Finally, he demanded that the Council appoint a commission of inquiry to investigate the issue of military aggression in Afghanistan and present its conclusions to the Council.¹⁹

The representative of Malaysia stated that his delegation had difficulty in supporting the additional measures being contemplated against the Taliban on both procedural and substantive grounds. He noted that resolution 1267 (1999) had tasked the Afghan sanctions committee to undertake periodic impact assessments of the sanctions²⁰ and maintained that only through such assessments would the Council be able to evaluate the effectiveness of the sanctions and their effects on the population of Afghanistan. Regrettably, no such periodic assessments had been carried out and, instead, only a joint impact assessment had been made by the “two most interested members of the Council”, which did not satisfy, procedurally or substantively, the specific requirements of resolution 1267 (1999). He asserted that the high levels of vulnerability of the people of Afghanistan were likely to exacerbate the impact of what would otherwise be fairly insignificant effects of the sanctions regime. The additional measures might also lead to the deterioration of the humanitarian operational environment in the Taliban-controlled areas, especially if the Taliban were to withhold cooperation with international humanitarian agencies. He noted that his delegation was concerned at the negative impact of such measures on the peace process. The one-sided arms embargo on the Taliban was a measure that compromised the “essential neutrality of the Council”. Under those circumstances, he noted that his delegation would abstain in the voting.²¹

The representatives of France and the Ukraine expressed satisfaction with the fact that the sanctions were established for a limited time period, although they were renewable; and with the fact that there was provision for an exception for flights organized by humanitarian organizations that were duly registered.²²

The representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States stressed the need for additional targeted sanctions against the Taliban in the light of its continued support for international terrorism and its refusal to hand over Osama bin Laden. They also stressed that the sanctions were carefully targeted to ensure that the measures would not have an adverse impact on ordinary Afghans.²³ While supporting the

¹⁶ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter; and part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41.

¹⁷ The representatives of India, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan were invited to participate but did not make statements.

¹⁸ S/2000/1202.

¹⁹ S/PV.4251, pp. 2-4.

²⁰ Resolution 1267 (1999), para. 6 (c).

²¹ S/PV.4251, pp. 4-5.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 6 (France); and p. 7 (Ukraine).

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (United Kingdom); and pp. 7-8 (United States).

draft resolution, the representatives of the Netherlands and Canada called on the Council to continue to weigh the possible humanitarian impacts of its sanctions against the Council's wider political objectives.²⁴

The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted, by 13 votes in favour, with 2 abstentions (China, Malaysia), as resolution 1333 (2000), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided that all States should (a) prevent the direct or indirect supply, sale and transfer to the territory of Afghanistan under Taliban control as designated by the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) of arms and related materiel of all types including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles and equipment, paramilitary equipment, and spare parts for the aforementioned; (b) prevent the direct or indirect sale, supply and transfer to the territory of Afghanistan under Taliban control of technical advice, assistance, or training related to the military activities of the armed personnel under the control of the Taliban; (c) withdraw any of their officials, agents, advisers, and military personnel employed by contract or other arrangement present in Afghanistan to advise the Taliban on military or related security matters, and urged other nationals in this context to leave the country;

Requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Committee: (a) to appoint a committee of experts to make recommendations to the Council within 60 days of the adoption of the resolution regarding how the arms embargo and the closure of terrorist training camps can be monitored; (b) to consult with relevant Member States to put into effect the measures imposed by the resolution and resolution 1267 (1999) and report the results of such consultations to the Council; (c) to report on the implementation of the existing measures; (d) to review the humanitarian implications of the measures imposed by the resolution and resolution 1267 (1999), and to report back to the Council within 90 days of the adoption of the resolution with an assessment and recommendations, to report at regular intervals thereafter on any humanitarian implications and to present a comprehensive report on this issue and any recommendations no later than 30 days prior to the expiration of those measures.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of China maintained that the direct impact of the current sanctions on the humanitarian situation in Afghanistan was obvious, and that a new round of sanctions would undoubtedly make the situation even worse. Noting that the belligerent parties in Afghanistan were prepared to resume peace talks, a new round of

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6 (Netherlands); and p. 9 (Canada).

sanctions and a unilateral arms embargo would have a negative impact on the peace process.²⁵

The representative of the Russian Federation responded to the arguments made that the arms embargo was one-sided by saying that the one-sided nature of the embargo was fully justified. He noted that the Taliban had continued to bank on military means to resolve the Afghan problem, and had used their territory for the protection of terrorists. Therefore the weapons that ended up in the hands of the Taliban were not just used for the civil war, but also in order to support international terrorism. On arguments that the resolution might have a negative impact on the peace process, he stated that despite the many promises the Taliban had made to begin the negotiating process, they continued to refuse to respond to the numerous appeals regarding the proposed agenda for a political dialogue. Thus they were continuing to boycott the political process. Finally, regarding the humanitarian implications of the sanctions, he noted that the resolution contained all the necessary humanitarian exemptions and were targeted. As for fears that the Taliban might expel humanitarian personnel, he stressed that if the Council took such threats into account, its members would be the "direct victims of blackmail".²⁶

**Decision of 30 July 2001 (4352nd meeting):
resolution 1363 (2001)**

At its 4325th meeting,²⁷ on 5 June 2001, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 21 May 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council,²⁸ enclosing the report of the Committee of Experts appointed pursuant to resolution 1333 (2000), regarding monitoring of the arms embargo against the Taliban and the closure of terrorist training camps in the Taliban-held areas of Afghanistan. The Committee recommended that the arms embargo and the closure of training camps be monitored by making use of the mechanisms which each of the neighbours of Afghanistan had in place and by enhancing those countries' efforts with the establishment of sanctions enforcement support teams

²⁵ S/PV.4251, pp. 8-9.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

²⁷ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41 of the Charter.

²⁸ S/2001/511.

in each country. Those teams would form the basis of a United Nations office for sanctions monitoring and coordination. The office would support the work of the teams in the field, as well as task the teams to verify and report to the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) on allegations of sanctions-busting and progress being made to improve the effectiveness of their border control and counter-terrorism services.

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Committee of Experts. In addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Afghanistan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan and Uzbekistan.

The Chairman of the Committee of Experts explained the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee on ways to monitor the arms embargo against the Taliban and the closure of terrorist training camps in the Taliban-held areas, and urged the Council to take a decision on those recommendations as expeditiously as possible. He agreed with the view expressed in the report that the participation and commitment of Afghanistan's neighbouring countries were essential to the efficacy of the sanctions.²⁹

Many speakers supported the recommendations of the Committee, in particular the establishment of an office for sanctions monitoring and coordination and sanctions enforcement support teams, and reiterated that the Taliban must comply with the Council's demands, as stipulated in resolution 1333 (2000). A number of speakers stressed that the Council needed to take care not to institute measures that would impede the ability of humanitarian agencies to bring aid and relief to the Afghan population.

Several speakers also stressed the importance of carefully considering and respecting the opinions of the neighbouring countries before arriving at a decision.³⁰

The representative of China stressed the importance of the monitoring mechanism receiving sufficient resources. Noting that the report made certain allegations without specifying its sources, he stressed that "allegations should not be used to prove a point" and that great efforts needed to be made in that

regard.³¹ The representative of the Russian Federation noted with concern that the Taliban had not taken the "least step" to extradite Osama bin Laden or to close those terrorist training camps. He stressed that initially the work of the monitoring mechanism needed to focus on the key requirements of ensuring compliance with the arms embargo and closing the terrorist training camps, and that other recommendations, including those expanding the list of embargoed goods, could be considered at subsequent stages. He stressed that most serious attention should be given to retaining the targeted nature of the sanctions.³² Similarly, the representative of the United States demanded that the Taliban cease their support for terrorism and expressed his delegation's support for the conclusion of the Committee of Experts that the proposed monitoring mechanism should augment the ability and efforts of the States neighbouring Afghanistan to enforce the Council's resolutions.³³ The representative of Afghanistan argued that the Council should determine the extent of Pakistan's "aggression" in Afghanistan and decide the measures to be taken to maintain peace and security, and demanded that all foreign fighters leave his country immediately.³⁴

The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran welcomed the report of the Committee which exposed, to a great extent, the ways in which the Taliban procured military means, financed their military machine and organized unlawful activities, including turning their territory into a safe haven for terrorists. He noted that the report also dismissed the claim that the Taliban military machine survived on former stocks.³⁵ On the other hand, the representative of Pakistan categorically rejected "some baseless allegations" contained in the report, and reiterated that Pakistan was adhering to the Council's resolutions on Afghanistan "even though we are not in favour of sanctions as a matter of principle". He stressed the need to engage the Taliban by bringing them back from the "position of insulation and intransigence". He also argued that a "one-sided" arms embargo was not the solution, and recommended that the Council impose a comprehensive arms embargo, under Chapter VII, on

²⁹ S/PV.4325, pp. 3-4.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 5 (China); p. 6 (Tunisia); p. 7 (Russian Federation); and p. 14 (Singapore).

³¹ Ibid., p. 5.

³² Ibid., pp. 6-7.

³³ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 15-18.

³⁵ S/PV.4325 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3.

all parties, which would give both sides the same incentive to return to the negotiating table.³⁶

At the end of the meeting, the Chairman of the Committee of Experts responded to questions and comments raised by the previous speakers, including the need to consult the neighbouring countries, concern about the inclusion of military-use fuels, and the location of the monitoring support teams.³⁷

At its 4352nd meeting, on 30 July 2001, the Council again included the above-mentioned letter in its agenda. The President (China) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by Colombia;³⁸ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1363 (2001), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, inter alia:

Requested the Secretary-General to establish within 30 days a mechanism: (a) to monitor the implementation of the measures imposed by resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000); (b) to offer assistance to States bordering Afghanistan under Taliban control to increase their capacity regarding sanctions implementation; and (c) to collate, assess, verify, report and make recommendations on information regarding violations of the measures imposed by resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000);

Decided that the monitoring mechanism should be composed of (a) a Monitoring Group in New York of up to five members; and (b) a sanctions enforcement support team of up to 15 experts; requested the Monitoring Group to report to the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) and also requested the Committee to report to the Council at regular intervals on the implementation of the resolution;

Requested the Secretary-General to support the work of the monitoring mechanism and to establish a United Nations trust fund for this purpose; and further requested the Secretary-General to keep the Committee informed of the financial arrangements supporting the mechanism.

**Decision of 14 November 2001
(4415th meeting): resolution 1378 (2001)**

At its 4414th meeting,³⁹ on 13 November 2001, the Council heard briefings by the Secretary-General and the Special Representative of the Secretary-

General for Afghanistan. In addition to Council members, statements were made by the representatives of Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Egypt, Germany, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

The Secretary-General noted that the attacks of 11 September 2001 and the consequent military action in Afghanistan had created a new environment, which presented daunting challenges as well as new opportunities, and stressed the need to focus on the challenge “in a post-Taliban period” so as to avoid a political and security vacuum. He stressed that there was now “a real opportunity to create the sort of broad-based, fully representative government” which the United Nations had long been trying to help the Afghan people achieve. However, that would require the end of interference in the affairs of Afghanistan by neighbouring countries.⁴⁰

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan underlined the urgent need to help establish a representative government which enjoyed internal and external legitimacy, and maintained that it was essential to bring together the various Afghan initiatives into a single process. Based on the ideas discussed widely by the Afghans themselves in various forums, he suggested that the approach might follow a five-step sequence. First, the United Nations would convene a meeting, at a venue to be determined, of representatives of the Northern Alliance and existing processes to agree on a framework for the process of political transition. Second, the meeting would suggest concrete steps for the convening of a provisional council. Third, the provisional council would propose the composition of a transitional administration and a programme of action for the period of political transition. Fourth, an emergency Loya Jirga would be convened to approve the transitional administration, and to authorize it to prepare a constitution. Finally, the transitional phase would result in the convening of a second Loya Jirga to approve the constitution and create the Government of Afghanistan. However, he noted the need for the introduction of a robust security force, able to deter and if possible defeat challenges to its authority. There were three options for such a force: an all-Afghan

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-7.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.

³⁸ S/2001/741.

³⁹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter; part IV, sect. B, with regard to Article 42; and part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51.

⁴⁰ S/PV.4414, pp. 2-3.

force; a multinational force or a United Nations peacekeeping force. He did not recommend a United Nations peacekeeping force, and while the all-Afghan force was the preferred option it was unlikely to be able to be constituted in the near term. Therefore, serious consideration needed to be given to the deployment of a multinational force. He urged the international community to show the patience and determination required to see this process through to its full conclusion.⁴¹

Speakers expressed their support for the efforts of the Secretary-General and the Special Representative to put in place a United Nations-initiated peace process aimed at establishing a representative government, and agreed on the urgent need to proceed with that peace process in order to avoid political and security vacuum following the military action launched against the Taliban. They called for urgent humanitarian assistance to alleviate the suffering of the Afghan people before the arrival of winter. Many speakers stressed the importance of cooperation with the neighbours of Afghanistan and the contributions of the “six plus two” group and regional organizations. Several delegations stressed the importance of eliminating Al-Qaida and fighting international terrorism.

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that the news from that morning of the retreat of the Taliban from the capital, Kabul, was justification itself for the “military strategy which ha[d] been pursued.” He urged the United Nations to get its presence on the ground in Kabul as soon as possible to provide the eyes and ears of the international community and to start the process of creating a civil administration.⁴² Similarly, the representative of France agreed that the United Nations needed to move as quickly as possible into Kabul and other liberated cities as security conditions allowed.⁴³ The representative of Norway noted that the Taliban’s refusal to comply with Security Council resolutions, even after it had become clear that terrorists based and trained in Afghanistan were behind the attacks of 11 September, had left no alternative but to use military force in accordance with the right to self-defence.⁴⁴ The representative of Italy echoed this noting that the military actions, which were fully legitimate under the Charter and relevant Security

Council resolutions, were targeted at bringing to justice the perpetrators of the terrorist attacks and eradicating the Al-Qaida network and those who harboured and provided assistance to terrorists.⁴⁵

In the light of the “collapse of the Taliban in much of Afghanistan”, the representative of the United States stressed the need to support the Special Representative in his urgent efforts to bring together, as soon as possible, Afghans to form an interim authority in the liberated areas. He also called for an international presence to be established as soon as possible and for restraint on the part of the Afghan liberation forces.⁴⁶ The representative of the Russian Federation emphasized that the Taliban had no place in the future power structures in Afghanistan, but added that a “clear distinction” needed to be drawn between the Taliban on the one hand and the Pashtuns and the traditional Afghan clergy on the other.⁴⁷

The representative of Pakistan agreed on the need to avoid a political vacuum following the withdrawal of the Taliban from Kabul, and noted with concern that despite restrictions, over 80,000 new Afghan refugees had crossed into Pakistan in the past two months. He stressed that unless the United States was able to put together a political dispensation which was representative of all segments of the Afghan population, conflict and turmoil would continue to afflict the country. He maintained that a multinational force needed to be created to provide security with the coalition providing back-up support.⁴⁸ The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, noting that in response to terrorist threats, a military operation had been staged, stressed that military actions were not the solution and that the Afghan people needed to be offered other alternatives. He maintained that, in the light of the “liberation” of Kabul and other provinces, the time had come to advance with vigour the process of forming a broad-based government, with the United Nations taking a central role.⁴⁹ The representative of Malaysia noted that while the use of military force was “a legitimate course of action as an act of self-defence”, it was not the only course of action, or the most effective or politically wise one. He expressed concern at the “high margin of targeting error” in the

⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 3-8.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 8-10.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 20.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 13.

⁴⁵ S/PV.4414 (Resumption 1), p. 8.

⁴⁶ S/PV.4414, pp. 20-21.

⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 23-25.

⁴⁸ S/PV.4411 (Resumption 1), pp. 5-7.

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 8-10.

military campaign, which had led to the “reportedly high death toll among civilians”. He therefore appealed for an end to the bombing so as to spare the people of Afghanistan further hardship and to allow them to return to their homes for the winter season and Ramadan.⁵⁰ The representative of Afghanistan confirmed that the forces of the Islamic State of Afghanistan had entered into Kabul to meet the “pressing needs and expectations of the people” and to fill the political and administrative vacuum created by the hasty flight of the Taliban. He reaffirmed his delegation’s full support for the United Nations effort to establish a multi-ethnic, broad-based government. He called for an end to both direct and indirect foreign intervention in Afghanistan.⁵¹

At the 4415th meeting, on 14 November 2001, the President (Jamaica) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁵² it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1378 (2001), by which the Council, inter alia:

Expressed its strong support for the efforts of the Afghan people to establish a new and transitional administration leading to the formation of a government, both of which should be broad-based, multi-ethnic and fully representative of all the Afghan people and committed to peace with Afghanistan’s neighbours, should respect the human rights of all Afghan people, regardless of gender, ethnicity or religion, should respect Afghanistan’s international obligations, including by cooperating fully in international efforts to combat terrorism and illicit drug trafficking within and from Afghanistan, and should facilitate the urgent delivery of humanitarian assistance and the orderly return of refugees and internally displaced persons, when the situation permitted;

Affirmed that the United Nations should play a central role in supporting the efforts of the Afghan people to establish urgently such a new and transitional administration leading to the formation of a new government.

**Decision of 6 December 2001 (4434th meeting):
resolution 1383 (2001)**

At its 4434th meeting, on 6 December 2001, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 5 December 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁵³ transmitting the text of the Agreement on Provisional

Arrangements in Afghanistan Pending the Re-establishment of Permanent Government Institutions signed in Bonn by the delegations participating in the United Nations talks on Afghanistan.

At the meeting, the President (Mali) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁵⁴ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1383 (2001), by which the Council, inter alia:

Endorsed the Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan Pending the Re-establishment of Permanent Government Institutions as reported in the letter from the Secretary-General’s dated 5 December 2001;

Called on all Afghan groups to implement that Agreement in full, in particular through full cooperation with the Interim Authority which was due to take office on 22 December 2001;

Reaffirmed its full support for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and endorsed the missions entrusted to him in annex II to the above-mentioned Agreement;

Declared its willingness to take further action, on the basis of a report by the Secretary-General, to support the interim institutions established by the above-mentioned Agreement and, in due course, to support the implementation of the Agreement and its annexes.

**Decision of 20 December 2001 (4443rd
meeting): resolution 1386 (2001)**

At the 4443rd meeting, on 20 December 2001, the President informed the Council that he had reviewed a letter from the representative of Afghanistan, in which he requested to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council’s agenda. In acceding to that request, the President stated that the Council recalled that the Interim Authority in Afghanistan would be established on 22 December 2001 and, according to paragraph 3 of the Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan Pending the Re-establishment of Permanent Government Institutions, the Interim Authority would occupy the seat of Afghanistan at the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The President drew the Council’s attention to a letter dated 19 December 2001 from the representative of Afghanistan,⁵⁵ informing the Council that, taking into account all relevant considerations, an international security force could be deployed under Chapter VI or

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 20.

⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 28-30.

⁵² S/2001/1075.

⁵³ S/2001/1154.

⁵⁴ S/2001/1153.

⁵⁵ S/2001/1223.

VII of the Charter, and to a letter of the same date from the representative of the United Kingdom,⁵⁶ informing the Secretary-General that the United Kingdom was willing to become the initial lead nation for the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) for Kabul and its surrounding area under the terms of annex I to the Bonn Agreement.

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁵⁷ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1386 (2001), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Authorized the establishment for six months of the International Security Assistance Force to assist the Afghan Interim Authority;

Called upon Member States to contribute personnel, equipment and other resources;

Authorized the Member States participating in the Force to take all necessary measures to fulfil its mandate;

Called upon the Force to work in close consultation with the Interim Authority as well as the Special Representative of the Secretary-General;

Called on all Afghans to cooperate with the Force and all relevant organizations and welcomed their commitment to ensure the security of United Nations personnel;

Requested the Secretary-General to establish a trust fund and encourages Member States to contribute to such fund;

Requested the leadership of the Force to provide periodic reports on progress towards the implementation of its mandate.

**Decision of 15 January 2002 (4449th meeting):
resolution 1388 (2002)**

At the 4449th meeting, on 15 January 2002, the President (Mauritius) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁵⁸ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1388 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided that the provisions of paragraphs 4 (a) and (b) of resolution 1267 (1999) did not apply to the Ariana Afghan Airlines aircraft or its funds and other financial resources; and decided to terminate the measure provided for by paragraph 8 (b) of resolution 1333 (2000).

⁵⁶ S/2001/1217.

⁵⁷ S/2001/1228.

⁵⁸ S/2002/54.

**Decision of 16 January 2002 (4452nd meeting):
resolution 1390 (2002)**

At the 4452nd meeting, on 16 January 2002, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁵⁹ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1390 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided to continue the measures imposed by paragraph 8 (c) of resolution 1333 (2000) and to terminate those in paragraph 4 (a) of resolution 1267 (1999); decided that all States should take the following measures with respect to Osama bin Laden, Al-Qaida members, the Taliban and other individuals, groups, undertakings and entities associated with them: (a) freeze their funds and other financial assets or economic resources; (b) prevent the entry into or the transit through their territories of those individuals; (c) prevent the direct or indirect supply, sale and transfer from their territories to those individuals of arms and related materiel of all types or technical advice, assistance, or training related to military activities; decided to review these measures in 12 months;

Requested the Committee to undertake the following tasks: (a) to update regularly the list of the aforementioned individuals; (b) to seek from all States information regarding the action taken by them to implement effectively the measures referred to in paragraph 2 of the resolution; (c) to make periodic reports on information submitted to the Committee regarding the implementation of the resolution; (d) to promulgate expeditiously such guidelines and criteria to facilitate the implementation of the measures referred to in paragraph 2; (e) to make information it considered relevant publicly available through appropriate media; (f) to cooperate with other Security Council committees;

Requested all States to report to the Committee in 90 days on steps taken to implement the resolution; requested the Secretary-General to assign the Monitoring Group, whose mandate would expire on 19 January 2002, to monitor, for 12 months, the implementation of the measures imposed by the resolution and to report to the Committee by 31 March 2002 and thereafter every four months.

**Deliberations of 30 January 2002 to
13 March 2002 (4461st, 4469th, 4479th and
4490th meetings)**

At its 4461st meeting, on 30 January 2002, at which no statements were made, the Council heard a briefing from Mr. Hamid Karzai, Chairman of the Interim Administration of Afghanistan. The Chairman reassured the Council that the Interim Administration would strive to build a government that responded to

⁵⁹ S/2002/72.

the wishes of the people and behaved as a responsible member of the international community. He stated that a Loya Jirga, or grand national assembly, would be held by 22 June 2002 to select a head of State and a transitional government, which would prepare a new constitution for ratification by a constitutional Loya Jirga to be held later. Underlining the importance of security, he hoped that the Council would authorize an extension and expansion of the mandate of ISAF beyond Kabul.⁶⁰ Speaking on behalf of the members of the Council, the President welcomed Mr. Karzai and his delegation to the Council and reaffirmed its commitment to supporting the Interim Authority and the transitional process.⁶¹

At its 4469th meeting, on 6 February 2002, at which no statements were made, the Council heard briefings by the Secretary-General and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan. The Secretary-General briefed the Council on his visits to Japan, Pakistan, Afghanistan, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Qatar, including his participation in the International Conference on Reconstruction Assistance to Afghanistan held in Tokyo.⁶² On Afghanistan, he underlined the importance of security, without which reconstruction would not be possible and donors would not be able to disburse the money they had so generously pledged in Tokyo. The Special Representative reported that, since the transfer of power on 22 December, progress had been made in establishing the Interim Administration as the central government in Afghanistan as well as in preparing for the emergency Loya Jirga in five months. Despite many obstacles, most ministries were starting to carry out their responsibilities, and salaries for their civil servants had been paid for the first time for many years. On security, the Special Representative underlined that peace in Afghanistan was still fragile and called for urgent consideration by the Council to expand ISAF to the rest of the country. On the structure of the further mission, he stated that it would be an integrated mission with a “light footprint”, keeping the international United Nations presence to the minimum required, while Afghans were given as much of a role as possible.⁶³

⁶⁰ S/PV.4461, pp. 2-3.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

⁶² S/PV.4469, pp. 2-3.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-6.

At its 4479th and 4490th meetings, on 27 February and 13 March 2002, respectively, at which no statements were made, the Council heard briefings by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, on the “rudiments of the political order emerging in Afghanistan”, including the initial activities of the Special Independent Commission for the Convening of the Emergency Loya Jirga as well as the establishment of the judicial and human rights commissions. On security, he noted with concern that ISAF remained limited to Kabul, while the main threats to the Interim Authority emanated from the provinces. He thus alerted the Council to a “continuing danger” that the existing security apparatus, both Afghan and international, did not adequately address the security threats that were currently discernible, and warned that the manner in which it was addressed might well determine in the very near future whether or not the Bonn process succeeded. He reported some progress achieved in the areas of the training of a new national army, the establishment of a new police, disarmament, and the promotion of education and human rights. However, he voiced concern at the “festering tensions beneath the surface”, with the power of armed groups growing and disarmament programmes in some areas amounting to “commanders disarming their enemies and rearming themselves”. Finally, he noted that the United Nations system was putting the final touches on its plan for the new mission, which would be called the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan.⁶⁴

**Decision of 28 March 2002 (4501st meeting):
resolution 1401 (2002)**

On 18 March 2002, the Secretary-General submitted a report on the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security.⁶⁵ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that in less than three months the Interim Administration had established sufficient international credibility and legitimacy that donors, United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations were following its lead in helping provide assistance, restoring basic services around the country and formulating a national development framework. A critical turning point in the

⁶⁴ S/PV.4479, pp. 2-5; and S/PV.4490, pp. 2-5.

⁶⁵ S/2002/278, submitted pursuant to resolution 1383 (2001) and as a follow-up to the letter from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council dated 5 December 2001 (S/2001/1154).

peace process would be the convening of the emergency Loya Jirga, which had to occur before 22 June 2002, according to the provisions of the Bonn Agreement. He maintained that if the emergency Loya Jirga could be successfully convened as scheduled, and if the Transitional Administration selected by the Loya Jirga could be peacefully installed and domestically accepted thereafter, then the risk of a resumption of war should be greatly reduced. However, security remained the essential requirement for the protection of the peace process. In that context, he noted that the Chairman of the Interim Administration had repeatedly called for the expansion of ISAF to other parts of the country. Afghans were confident that such a geographic expansion to a number of major urban centres would significantly minimize the likelihood of large-scale hostilities erupting again between existing armed factions. Regarding the proposed United Nations mission in Afghanistan, he stated that it was intended to ensure that all forms of United Nations assistance, political, human rights and rule of law, gender, relief, recovery and reconstruction, were channelled towards supporting the implementation of the peace process by the Afghan people.

At its 4497th meeting, on 26 March 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Deputy Secretary-General and a statement by the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs. In addition to Council members, statements were made by the representatives of Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Kazakhstan, New Zealand, Pakistan, Spain (on behalf of the European Union⁶⁶), Tajikistan and Turkey.

The President (Norway) drew the attention of the Council to the report of the Secretary-General of 18 March 2002.⁶⁵ He also drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 14 March 2002 from the representative of the United Kingdom addressed to the President of the Council⁶⁷ and to a letter from the representatives of Afghanistan and the Russian Federation.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁶⁷ S/2002/274, transmitting a report on the activities of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan.

⁶⁸ S/2002/283, transmitting the text of a joint Russian-Afghan statement of 12 March 2002.

The Deputy Secretary-General updated the Council on new developments since the issuance of the Secretary-General's report, including the progress made by the Special Commission for the Convening of the Emergency Loya Jirga and the establishment of a working group on the demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants. She then explained the envisaged structure of the new mission, which was to be composed of two pillars: pillar I for political affairs and pillar II for relief, recovery and reconstruction activities. She said that the mission, which was an "imaginative and constructive response" to the operational challenges on the ground, would have a light expatriate footprint with the aim of ensuring that Afghans took the lead in the post-conflict recovery phase and that the foreign aid pledged actually went to the Afghans.⁶⁹

Speakers expressed unanimous support for the establishment of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA), with a light expatriate footprint and heavy reliance on the Afghans. They reaffirmed their commitment to supporting the political transition of Afghanistan as well as the country's recovery, reconstruction and development, including the promotion of human rights and gender equality. They also agreed on the need for continued, long-term commitment by the United Nations to ensure that Afghanistan remained firmly on the path to peace and reconciliation. Many speakers stressed the importance of the rapid development of a unified Afghan police force and army in order to provide security throughout the country.

Several speakers spoke in support of the proposal to expand ISAF beyond the area of Kabul to provide security until the Afghan army could be effectively deployed.⁷⁰

The representative of France noted that the major contributors to ISAF were not in favour of expanding the force beyond Kabul, as it might necessitate it to be involved in settling conflicts, which fell under the purview of Afghan authority.⁷¹ Similarly, the representative of the United States stated that, given the present security situation and the range and variety

⁶⁹ S/PV.4497, pp. 2-6.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 7 (Colombia); p. 10 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 14 (China); p. 15 (Cameroon); p. 23 (Mauritius); p. 31 (Japan); and p. 33 (India).

⁷¹ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

of assistance already available or under way, this delegation did not see the need to expand the area of activity of ISAF.⁷² The representative of Bulgaria noted that a careful approach was necessary with regard to the territorial expansion of ISAF beyond Kabul, and that such expansion needed to take place in tandem with the process of establishing an Afghan national army and police force.⁷³ On the other hand, despite the reservations expressed by some delegations, the representative of the United Kingdom accepted the importance of spreading the ISAF effect outside Kabul, as the future stability and reconstruction of Afghanistan and the return of refugees would depend on adequate security.⁷⁴ The representative of the Russian Federation noted with concern the remnants of the Taliban and Al-Qaida, especially the presence of a “large number of foreign mercenaries, including Chechens”, among those terrorist groups. Regarding ISAF, he maintained that if its mandate needed to be prolonged or expanded, the Council needed to be willing to consider doing so, bearing in mind the requests of the acting authorities in Afghanistan.⁷⁵ The representative of Pakistan, noting that the Bonn Agreement stipulated the establishment of a United Nations-mandated force for the maintenance of security in Kabul and other areas of the country, stressed that the size and scope of ISAF needed to be expanded and extended to all of the country, especially the major urban centres. ISAF, in the absence of a proper Afghan security force, was the only option, and restricting it to Kabul would defeat the very purpose for which it was established.⁷⁶ The representative of Australia stated that while, the idea of expanding and extending ISAF was “to be encouraged”, planning had to be based on realistic expectations.⁷⁷

The representative of Spain stated that the European Union supported the proposed mandate of UNAMA, which provided for an integrated structure under the authority of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and appealed for a strong and effective coordination in the field.⁷⁸ The representative of Canada believed that the preparations for the emergency Loya Jirga in June would be the key to

installing a broadly representative government and urged the Special Commission to ensure that the preparations for the Loya Jirga remained equitable and transparent.⁷⁹ The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran stated that, while his delegation understood that an appropriate dose of international assistance was necessary to help maintain peace on the ground, it was in the interest of lasting peace in Afghanistan that, given the sensitivities of the Afghans, it was in the interest of lasting peace that the foreign presence in that country remain as minimal and as brief as possible.⁸⁰ The representative of New Zealand expressed hope that in the event that decision was made to extend the mandate of ISAF beyond Kabul, additional countries would join in the security operation. The representative of Afghanistan expressed appreciation to the efforts of the United Nations and reiterated that the Interim Administration remained committed to the implementation of the Bonn Agreement. With regard to the extension of ISAF beyond the capital, his delegation considered it imperative that the views of the Interim Administration be sought.⁸¹

On behalf of the Secretary-General, the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs expressed gratitude for the support by delegations for the mandate and structure of the envisaged integrated mission in Afghanistan, whose central idea was to have a coherent mission structure in which all aspects were carefully integrated with each other.⁸² Underlining the importance of security, he “wholeheartedly” agreed with the United Kingdom’s call for an expansion of the ISAF effect beyond Kabul, and stated that he looked forward to further suggestions and specific ideas in this regard.

At its 4501st meeting, on 28 March 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 18 March 2002.⁸³ The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁸⁴ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1401 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-27.

⁷⁹ S/PV.4497 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

⁸³ S/2002/278; see also footnote 65.

⁸⁴ S/2002/320.

Endorsed the establishment, for an initial period of 12 months from the date of adoption of the resolution, of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan, with the mandate and structure laid out in the report of the Secretary-General of 18 March 2002;

Stressed that the provision of focused recovery and reconstruction assistance could greatly assist in implementation of the Bonn Agreement;

Urged bilateral and multilateral donors, in particular through Afghanistan Support Group and the Implementation Group, to coordinate closely with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, the Afghan Interim Administration and its successors;

Stressed also that recovery and reconstruction assistance ought to be provided and implemented effectively, where local authorities contributed to maintenance of a secure environment and demonstrated respect for human rights; and called upon all Afghan parties to cooperate with the Mission in the implementation of its mandate and to ensure security and freedom of movement of its staff throughout the country.

Deliberations of 25 April 2002 (4521st meeting)

At its 4521st meeting, on 25 April 2002, at which no statements were made, the Council heard a briefing by the Vice-Chairman of the Interim Administration of Afghanistan and Minister for Women as well as a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs.

While reporting “great progress” made in the political transition, the Vice-Chairman of the Interim Administration of Afghanistan and Minister for Women called for the immediate expansion of ISAF and requested the leaders of all nations to consider carefully their responsibilities and to weigh the political and economic costs of expanding the force against the “great risk” of not taking action and not strengthening security. “Let us not leave the job of restoring peace in Afghanistan half finished”, she stated, reiterating that the international community must renew its commitment to come together collectively and decisively to root out the elements of instability and give sustained support to rebuilding peace in Afghanistan.⁸⁵ The Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs reported that preparations for the emergency Loya Jirga, to be held in June 2002 under the Bonn Agreement, were on track with the first phase of selecting representatives already under way, and he remained hopeful that the Loya Jirga would be held on

⁸⁵ S/PV.4521, pp. 2-3.

schedule and would lead to a smooth transition to the next phase of the Bonn process. On the areas of recovery and development, he reported that UNAMA was leading efforts to design and implement a series of integrated area development programmes in ten priority regions of the country. However, he warned that the security remained a major challenge in many parts of the country and substantial financial assistance was going to be required, and appealed to the international community to speed up the delivery of its assistance and to broaden its scope to include still unmet needs related to security.⁸⁶

Decision of 23 May 2002 (4541st meeting): resolution 1413 (2002)

At its 4541st meeting, on 23 May 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs. In addition to Council members, statements were made by the representatives of Afghanistan, Canada, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, New Zealand, Pakistan, Spain (on behalf of the European Union⁸⁷) and Turkey.

The Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs stressed that the emergency Loya Jirga, which was to be held in less than three weeks, constituted a pivotal test for the Bonn process. UNAMA had been focusing most of its resources on ensuring that the Loya Jirga was held on time and under as free and fair conditions as circumstances allowed. Phase I of the Loya Jirga process required holding of about 380 district assemblies, which would select electoral colleges of between 20 to 60 members. In phase II, those colleges would elect by secret ballot representatives to the Loya Jirga. In phase III, the emergency Loya Jirga would be held with about 1,000 elected representatives and 500 selected representatives. He stated that phase I, which had been completed in 300 of 380 districts, had so far not been perfect but had, nevertheless, been better than expected in many ways. He believed that the process thus far had demonstrated the capacity for reconciliation and compromise among Afghans, as they realized the importance of not losing this opportunity for peace and reconstruction. He noted with concern

⁸⁶ Ibid., pp. 3-6.

⁸⁷ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

that the security situation in Afghanistan, in particular outside Kabul, remained a major concern.⁸⁸

Most speakers welcomed the progress made in preparing for the emergency Loya Jirga, which was the key to the successful implementation of the Bonn process, and reaffirmed their support for the leading role of the United Nations in implementing the process. They agreed on the urgent need to train a new national army and police force in order to restore and maintain security throughout the country. Several delegations welcomed the willingness of Turkey to take over the command of ISAF from the United Kingdom on 20 June, and stated that his country would be responsible for training two battalions of a new Afghan army.

The representative of the United States reported that his country's efforts to train the Afghan army were well under way, with 140 Special Forces troops arriving in Afghanistan at the end of April. He believed that the United States and coalition efforts to address the security imperatives beyond Kabul had been successful to date and that they continued to envision potential security concerns outside Kabul being addressed as necessary by the forces of the coalition and Operation Enduring Freedom.⁸⁹

The representative of the Russian Federation reiterated the need to exclude the Taliban and their followers from participation in the future organs of State power.⁹⁰

The representative of Singapore cautioned that the successful convening of the Loya Jirga itself would not guarantee the long-term stability in the country, as much more needed to be done in areas relating to humanitarian relief, recovery and reconstruction as well as to the security situation.⁹¹ The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran believed that while the security situation remained fragile and unpredictable, the presence of foreign forces in Afghanistan should remain as minimal and as brief as possible "in the light of Afghan sensitivities and past experience".⁹²

The representative of Afghanistan expressed the belief that the establishment of the new Afghan

security force, the details of which had been explained at Geneva by the Afghan Interim Minister for Foreign Affairs, could greatly contribute to security and stability throughout the country.⁹³ The representative of Turkey reaffirmed his country's determination to take over the command of ISAF, with the understanding that the mandate and the areas of operation of the multinational force would be maintained as stipulated by resolution 1386 (2001).⁹⁴

The President (Singapore) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁹⁵ it was adopted unanimously as resolution 1413 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the authorization, for a period of six months beyond 20 June 2002, of the International Security Assistance Force, as defined in resolution 1386 (2001);

Authorized Member States participating in the Force to take all necessary measures to fulfil the mandate of the Force;

Called upon Member States to contribute personnel, equipment and other resources to the Force, and to make contributions to the Trust Fund established pursuant to resolution 1386 (2001).

**Decision of 26 June 2002 (4560th meeting):
resolution 1419 (2002)**

At its 4557th meeting,⁹⁶ on 21 June 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, who reported on the successful convening of the emergency Loya Jirga on 11 June with the participation of 1,656 voting delegates from all over the country and abroad. On 13 June, the Loya Jirga elected Mr. Hamid Karzai as the Head of State, who would announce the final composition of the Cabinet within a few days. He urged other Afghan leaders to support the Transitional Authority, as there should always be another future occasion to compete for power. He stated that a vast amount of work lay ahead for each ministry, and hoped that the Cabinet would focus on its administrative and governance functions. He noted that there had been a deterioration of the security situation in some parts of Afghanistan and urged the international community to assist the

⁸⁸ S/PV.4541, pp. 2-4.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁹⁵ S/2002/569.

⁹⁶ The representative of Afghanistan was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

Government of Afghanistan in bringing its authority to bear on insecure areas of the country. He stated that, given the importance of peace and security in the transitional period, the contributing nations to ISAF and the Council might wish again to consider the possibility of a limited expansion of ISAF to areas outside Kabul, particularly those where there was a clear pattern of emerging insecurity that, if left to evolve without countervailing pressure, could seriously threaten the further implementation of the Bonn process. He concluded by urging the international community to continue to assist the Afghans and the United Nations in meeting the new challenges in the implementation of the process.⁹⁷

At the 4560th meeting, on 26 June 2002, the representative of Afghanistan was invited to participate. The President (Syrian Arab Republic) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁹⁸ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1419 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reiterated its strong support for the Transitional Authority in the full implementation of the Bonn Agreement, including the establishment of a constitutional commission, and in strengthening the central government, building a national army and police force, implementing demobilization/reintegration activities and improving the security situation throughout Afghanistan, combating illicit drug trafficking, ensuring respect for human rights, implementing judicial sector reform, establishing the basis for a sound economy and reconstructing productive capacity and infrastructure;

Urged the Transitional Authority to build on efforts of the Interim Administration to eradicate the annual poppy crop;

Urged also the Transitional Authority to build further on efforts of the Interim Administration to promote the welfare and interests of Afghan women and children and to provide education to boys and girls;

Stressed once again the importance of continued international support to complete the process according to the Bonn Agreement;

Decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

Deliberations of 19 July to 30 October 2002 (4579th, 4611th and 4638th meetings)

At its 4579th meeting, on 19 July 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the

⁹⁷ S/PV.4557, pp. 2-5.

⁹⁸ S/2002/703.

Secretary-General on the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security.⁹⁹ In his report, the Secretary-General described the progress in implementing the Bonn Agreement, including the successful conclusion of the emergency Loya Jirga held from 11 to 19 June 2002. Despite some imperfections in the nomination and selection of delegates and incidents of intimidation during the assembly, he considered that it was noteworthy that such an enormous logistical undertaking was carried out within a very tight schedule and accomplished the tasks of electing the Head of State and approving the structures and appointment of the Transitional Authority. He stated that the main tasks ahead would be the establishment of a constitutional commission for the drafting of a new constitution; the convening, within 18 months, of a Constitutional Loya Jirga; and preparations for general elections. He observed that in the absence of a functional national army and an ISAF presence outside of Kabul, the climate of insecurity would be difficult to eliminate. Therefore, he continued to strongly advocate a limited expansion of ISAF beyond Kabul.

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan, following which, in addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Afghanistan, Canada, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union¹⁰⁰), India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Tajikistan, Turkey and Ukraine, as well as the representative of the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

The Special Representative stated that the peace process was so far on track and pointed to a few factors which gave cause for cautious optimism, including that the people were truly tired of fighting after 23 years of a long and bitter conflict and that all the deadlines set out in the process had been met on time. He noted that while the Loya Jirga was not designed to be a perfect democratic or representative process, it did incorporate significant and innovative democratic elements. On the question of security, he reiterated that the real key to

⁹⁹ S/2002/737, submitted pursuant to resolution 1401 (2002).

¹⁰⁰ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

the restoration of security lay in the creation of a national army and police force, along with a strong demobilization programme. Equally important would be the proposed reform of the National Directorate for Security, he said, maintaining that it was not acceptable to the people to feel threatened by the intelligence and other securities services in their country. Furthermore, he remained convinced that the expansion of ISAF would have an enormous impact on security and that it could be achieved with relatively few troops, at relatively little cost and with little danger to those troops. He stressed that the Transitional authority needed to also proceed quickly to establish a constitutional commission to undertake the sensitive task of drafting the country's new constitution. On the structure of UNAMA, he stated that the underlying philosophy of the Mission remained the same: on the one hand, integration, so that political activities were linked to and informed by those in the relief, recovery and reconstruction sectors, and linked as well to the four cross-cutting areas — that was, gender, human rights, the rule of law and demobilization. On the other hand, the Mission was to have a light expatriate footprint and strive to build Afghan capacities so that Afghans could take over as many of the functions that outsiders were not performing as soon as possible.¹⁰¹

Most speakers welcomed the progress made so far in implementing the Bonn process, in particular the successful convening of the emergency Loya Jirga, and reaffirmed their commitment to assisting the Transitional Authority in meeting further challenges and difficulties in the months to come. They expressed support for UNAMA, which would continue to play the leading role in helping the Transitional Authority to implement the process. A number of speakers also stressed the importance of combating drug production. Several speakers also stressed the need to strengthen security and stability throughout the country, facilitate return of refugees, ensure a minimum of economic and social developments, and strengthen popular participation in the context of the democratic transformation in the Afghan society.

The representative of the United States reaffirmed that the United States efforts in Afghanistan had continued to be centred on the conduct of the war on terror, with roughly 8,000 coalition troops focusing on destroying the remains of Al-Qaida. He maintained that

¹⁰¹ S/PV.4579, pp. 3-6.

the backbone of Afghanistan's security apparatus must ultimately be the Afghan national army, adding that more than 250 United States and French military trainers had been working closely with the Afghans to train the army.¹⁰²

The representative of the Russian Federation stated that as it did not seem possible to expand ISAF, it was necessary to speed up the establishment of an effective Afghan national army.¹⁰³ Similarly, the representative of the United Kingdom attached early and particular importance to progress on security sector reform, within the framework of a coherent overall strategy. He underlined the importance of ensuring consistency between the ongoing army training and the programmes for demobilization of private militias.¹⁰⁴

The representative of Afghanistan expressed appreciation for the international assistance in implementing the Bonn process, which could be considered a "paramount success of United Nations peacemaking efforts at the beginning of the twenty-first century". However, despite the series of positive developments, he acknowledged that much remained to be done. In order to establish its full authority throughout the country, he said, the Transitional Authority had made the formation of an ethnically and regionally balanced national army one of its main objectives.¹⁰⁵ The representatives of India and the Islamic Republic of Iran noted with concern that the continued regrouping of Al-Qaida and Taliban cadres along Afghanistan's southern and south-eastern borders heavily impinged on the security situation in Afghanistan as well as on the rest of the region.¹⁰⁶ The representative of Pakistan emphasized that despite casualties and some anticipated domestic difficulties, the Government of Pakistan had not flinched or faltered in supporting the campaign to root out Al-Qaida and other terrorist elements from Afghanistan and entire region.¹⁰⁷

At its 4611th meeting,¹⁰⁸ on 19 September 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Special

¹⁰² Ibid., pp. 10-11.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., pp. 23-24.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 24-26.

¹⁰⁶ S/PV.4579 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (India); and p. 11 (Islamic Republic of Iran).

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁰⁸ The representative of Afghanistan was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan. Explaining the developments since his last briefing, the Special Representative stated that Afghanistan had come a long way in its implementation of the Bonn process. He reported that the United Nations was committed to supporting the Transitional Authority in the development of the national development framework and the national budget in the coming months, and that UNAMA was working together with the authority to accelerate the development of the government, to decentralize assistance and develop subregional programmes tailored to the needs of individual provinces, and to develop a more integrated and cost-effective United Nations response. In the absence of the expansion of ISAF, which disappointed the people in Afghanistan and neighbouring countries, the Special Representative expressed hope that focused discussion would soon take place in Kabul on the issue of security, with the participation of Afghan authorities, the United Nations and key members of the international community. Before the end of the year, he said, Afghanistan should have a credible and achievable agenda to build a national army and a national police that would progressively take over from the present factional and de facto forces all over the country.¹⁰⁹

At its 4638th meeting,¹¹⁰ on 30 October 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan. The Special Representative noted with concern that security remained a priority for the people of Afghanistan, with sporadic fighting erupting from time to time, particularly in the north, the north-east and, to a lesser extent, the west. He noted that the Government did not yet have the means to deal in an effective manner with the underlying problems, and reiterated that there would be no long-term solution to the security problems unless and until a well-trained, well-equipped and regularly paid national police and a national army were in place. He reported that a drafting committee, which was to submit a draft new constitution by the end of 2003, had been formed and started its work, with UNAMA providing support as mandated by the Bonn Agreement. The Special Representative expressed concern that the human rights situation remained worrisome in many respects and cited as underlying causes the lack of security and the

weakness of the central government, warlordism, persistent factional conflicts and a dysfunctional justice system. He also reported that the Government had taken an important step to reform the country's finances through the introduction of a new currency, which was aimed to revitalize the financial and banking systems throughout the country and deprive other groups of their ability to print currency.¹¹¹

Decision of 27 November 2002 (4651st meeting): resolution 1444 (2002)

At the 4651st meeting, on 27 November 2002, the representative of Afghanistan was invited to participate in the discussion. The President of the Council (China) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution.¹¹² The President also drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 21 October 2002 from the representative of Turkey,¹¹³ as well as a letter dated 25 November 2002 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council, transmitting a joint letter from the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Germany and the Netherlands, in which the two Governments expressed their willingness to assume the lead nation status for ISAF for a period of six months following an extension of its mandate by the Council.¹¹⁴

The Council then, unanimously and without debate, adopted the draft resolution as resolution 1444 (2002), by which it, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the authorization, for a period of one year beyond 20 December 2002, of the Force, as defined in resolution 1386 (2001);

Authorized the Member States participating in the Force to take all necessary measures to fulfil the mandate of the Force;

Called upon Member States to contribute personnel, equipment and other resources to the Force, and to make contributions to the Trust Fund established pursuant to resolution 1386 (2001);

Requested the leadership of the Force to provide quarterly reports on implementation of its mandate, through the Secretary-General;

Decided to remain seized of the matter.

¹⁰⁹ S/PV.4611, pp. 2-5.

¹¹⁰ The representative of Afghanistan was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

¹¹¹ S/PV.4638, pp. 2-6.

¹¹² S/2002/1278.

¹¹³ S/2002/1196, transmitting the third report on the work of ISAF, covering the period from 1 to 30 September 2002.

¹¹⁴ S/2002/1296.

**Deliberations of 13 December 2002
(4664th meeting)**

At its 4664th meeting,¹¹⁵ on 13 December 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. The Assistant Secretary-General updated the Council on main developments in Afghanistan, including the holding of the anniversary meeting of the Bonn Conference in Germany on 2 December, which was to review the progress made so far and reaffirm their commitment to the peace process. The participants of the meeting had identified a number of specific challenges, such as the importance of building a national army and police that were effective and ethnically balanced and the need for the Government of Afghanistan and the international community to establish clear benchmarks and timelines to ensure the full implementation of the Bonn Agreement. He welcomed the agreement reached between Afghanistan and its neighbours to sign on good-neighbourly relations, mutual cooperation and non-interference in their respective internal affairs. He also stressed that a key part of the Government's strategy to assert its authority depended on its ability to raise domestic revenue, including transfer of public income from provinces to the national treasury and reform of Customs houses. He reported that a new judicial commission had been formed, and that the constitutional drafting committee, which had been inaugurated on 3 November 2002, would be guided by the 1964 Constitution in preparing the new constitution. He stated that while the progress made so far was "encouraging", the achievements so far and future progress depended on continued improvement in the security situation.¹¹⁶

**Decision of 24 December 2002 (4682nd
meeting): resolution 1453 (2002)**

At the 4682nd meeting, on 24 December 2002, the representative of Afghanistan was invited to participate in the discussion. The President drew the attention of the Council to the Kabul Declaration on Good-Neighbourly Relations.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ The representative of Afghanistan was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

¹¹⁶ S/PV.4664, pp. 2-6.

¹¹⁷ S/2002/1416, annex.

The President (Colombia) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹¹⁸ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1453 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed and endorsed the Kabul Declaration on Good-Neighbourly Relations signed by the Transitional Administration of Afghanistan and the Governments of States neighbouring Afghanistan in Kabul on 22 December 2002;

Called on all States to respect the Declaration and to support the implementation of its provisions;

Requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council as appropriate on the implementation of the Declaration, in the context of his regular reporting on Afghanistan, including information provided by the signatories.

**Deliberations of 31 January to 24 February
2003 (4699th and 4711th meetings)**

At its 4699th meeting,¹¹⁹ on 31 January 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan. Looking back on the first year of the Bonn process, the Special Representative stated that the Afghanistan had made progress on many fronts, with major political milestones reached on time, including the holding of the emergency Loya Jirga and the establishment of the Transitional Administration led by President Karzai. However, he believed that the peace process needed to progress much further before it became irreversible, and that in 2003 the country would have to focus on three main areas: first, solidifying the key institutions of the State; second, pursuing national reconciliation; and thirdly, showing tangible results on reconstruction projects throughout the country. The Special Representative also updated the Council on the details of the security sector reform, including training of the new army and police force; demobilization of former combatants; judicial reform and the restoration of the rule of law; the drafting of a new constitution; preparations for national elections scheduled for June 2004; and protection of human rights.¹²⁰

At its 4711th meeting, on 24 February 2003, the Council heard briefings by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, the Ambassador of Japan in charge of Afghan aid coordination, and the

¹¹⁸ S/2002/1415.

¹¹⁹ The representative of Afghanistan was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

¹²⁰ S/PV.4699, pp. 2-6.

Special Representative of the Government of Germany for the training of the Afghan police force, following which statements were made by most Council members, as well as the representative of Afghanistan.¹²¹

The Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations observed that while the Bonn process had so far successfully averted full-scale fighting between major factions, Afghans continued to suffer from the insecurity created by the conjunction of weak national institutions and strong local commanders. He noted that security sector reform was made all the more urgent by the complex political activities planned for the next 16 months, as the security sector must be able to provide minimal conditions of stability to ensure that the Constitutional Loya Jirga and the national elections were meaningful and credible. He argued that in the months ahead, the political underpinnings of security sector reform must be strengthened by the deeds and words of the Transitional Administration. He noted in this context that the police, army and intelligence serviced were “still viewed by too many Afghans as politically biased”. The chances of successfully reforming the security sector would be much enhanced if the statements of Afghan authorities on national reconciliation were demonstrably upheld.¹²²

The Ambassador of Japan in charge of Afghan aid coordination briefed the Council on the envisaged disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process. He reported that a solid foundation for the process was being laid and would soon commence. Nevertheless, he anticipated that disarmament, demobilization and reintegration in Afghanistan would be difficult in view of the heavy legacy of factional rivalries. The fact that a new national army must be built in parallel with disarmament, demobilization and reintegration added to the complexity of the undertaking. He stated that challenges to the process included the question of determining the number of soldiers to be released from armed formation, development of a mechanism for the collection of light and heavy weapons, and confidence-building among all parties. In view of the general elections scheduled for June 2004, he stated that once

¹²¹ The representative of Germany did not make a statement.

¹²² S/PV.4711, pp. 3-6.

it began, the disarmament process would take one year.¹²³

The Special Representative of the Government of Germany for the training of the Afghan police force reported that the reorganization of the police and the Ministry of the Interior was making good progress. Stressing that 2003 would be decisive, he expressed the hope that it would see the consolidation of work of the re-established central police institutions in Kabul; the further development of the training system and the inclusion in it of the country’s patrolmen; the build-up of a professional border police and, above all, the transfer of results achieved in Kabul to other parts of the country. He anticipated that the level of development and achievement would depend on positive developments in the general security situation and the participation of the international community.¹²⁴

All representatives expressed their appreciation for the briefings, and asked a number of technical questions related to the programmes they had described, including, inter alia, on the possibility of NATO involvement in the reconstruction of the interior ministry; what mechanisms had been envisaged to coordinate efforts to create a national police force with the establishment of provincial police forces; and whether the design of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process would include measures to curb the smuggling of arms outside of Afghanistan. The Ambassador of Japan in charge of Afghan aid coordination, the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations and the Special Representative of the Government of Germany for the training of the Afghan police force then responded to the questions and comments raised by the delegations.

**Decision of 28 March 2003 (4730th meeting):
resolution 1471 (2003)**

At its 4727th meeting,¹²⁵ on 27 March 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Afghanistan and

¹²³ Ibid., pp. 6-8.

¹²⁴ Ibid., pp. 9-11.

¹²⁵ At its 4712th meeting, held in private on 24 February 2003, the Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Government of Germany for the training of the Afghan police force, with the participation of the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations.

its implications for international peace and security.¹²⁶ In his report, the Secretary-General described the ongoing implementation of the Bonn Agreement by the Afghan Transitional Administration, supported by UNAMA. He explained the key political processes to further the transition towards a multi-ethnic, gender-sensitive, and fully representative Government of Afghanistan, including the Afghan-led constitutional process and the preparation of national elections to be held in June 2004. He noted with concern that security remained the most serious challenge facing the peace process. Re-establishment of the rule of law, elimination of human rights abuses, reconstruction and political transformation were all impeded by the uncertain security situation. He also proposed adjustments to the UNAMA structure, including small additions to the military and police adviser's units, and the establishment of an electoral section headed by a senior expert and supported by an appropriately sized team.

At the meeting,¹²⁷ the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations.

The Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations stated that UNAMA would continue to focus on assisting the Government of Afghanistan with consolidating its authority throughout the country and implement national policies that reached the entire nation. This effort would build upon progress made last year in establishing the essential structures of Government and in proving that these structures could work at a basic level. The Assistant Secretary-General stated that one of the most pressing challenges ahead for the Government of Afghanistan was to strengthen the links between Kabul and the provinces and to strengthen the capacity of the provincial and local governments themselves. For this to occur, however, security outside Kabul needed to significantly improve. He maintained that administrative development and security sector reform should be coupled with a political transformation process that ensured that the Government was representative and accountable to all segments of the population. In this regard, he stressed, the drafting and

approving of a new constitution and preparations for general elections in 2004 would be key tasks.¹²⁸

At its 4730th meeting, on 28 March 2003, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security.¹²⁶ The representative of Afghanistan was invited to participate.

The President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹²⁹ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1471 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend UNAMA for an additional period of 12 months from the date of adoption of the resolution;

Stressed that the continued provision of focused recovery and reconstruction assistance can contribute significantly to the implementation of the Bonn Agreement;

Stressed also that, while humanitarian assistance should be provided wherever there was a need, recovery or reconstruction assistance ought to be provided, through the Transitional Administration, and implemented effectively, where local authorities demonstrated a commitment to maintaining a secure environment, respecting human rights and countering narcotics;

Requested UNAMA, with the support of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, to continue to assist the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission in the full implementation of the human rights provisions of the Bonn Agreement and the National Human Rights Programme for Afghanistan, in order to support the protection and development of human rights in Afghanistan;

Requested the International Security Assistance Force, in implementing its mandate in accordance with resolution 1444 (2002), to continue to work in close consultation with the Secretary-General and his Special Representative.

Deliberations of 6 May 2003 (4750th meeting)

At the 4750th meeting, on 6 May 2003, the representative of Afghanistan was invited to participate. The Council then heard a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan.

The Special Representative reported on the progress made by UNAMA in supporting the Transitional Administration, including the establishment of the Constitutional Commission and the Judicial

¹²⁶ S/2003/333 submitted pursuant to resolution 1401 (2002).

¹²⁷ The representative of Afghanistan was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

¹²⁸ S/PV.4727, pp. 2-6.

¹²⁹ S/2003/380.

Reform Commission and the activities of the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission, as well as the creation of an electoral unit within UNAMA. However, despite such progress, he noted with concern that the security situation remained unstable and insufficient in much of Afghanistan and cast a long shadow over the whole peace process. Rivalries among factions and local commanders, impunity with regard to human rights violations and daily harassment of ordinary Afghan citizens by both commanders and local security forces were all too common. Furthermore, forces believed to be associated with the Taliban, with Al-Qaida and with Gulbuddin Hekmatyar had been stepping up operations against the coalition as well as against Afghan military and non-military targets in the south, south-east and the east of the country. He also stated that Afghanistan's neighbours played a crucial role in helping to ensure that the country's security was maintained, and pointed to "worrying reports" of hostile elements crossing into Afghanistan over the eastern and southern borders. While the focus for the first year had been on Kabul, he stressed that the rest of the country needed to experience increased security lest support for the Government and the Bonn process eroded dangerously. In view of this, he asked the Council once again to carefully consider what international measures were available to help ensure the security needed for the Bonn process to effectively process, adding that he still believed that expansion of ISAF beyond Kabul remained an option. He also thought that the provincial reconstruction teams deployed by the coalition could play an important part in addressing the problems of security.¹³⁰

**Decision of 17 June 2003 (4774th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4774th meeting,¹³¹ on 17 June 2003, the Council heard briefings by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations and the Director General of the United Nations Office at Vienna and Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. In addition to Council members, statements were made by the representatives of Afghanistan, Colombia, Greece (on behalf of the

European Union¹³²), India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Kazakhstan, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

The Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations welcomed the Council's focus on the problem of drugs, given the importance of the issue to the immediate and long-term stability of the country and the region. He reported on the positive developments over the past month, including President Karzai's action aimed at expanding his Government's authority in the provinces, the commencement of public consultations on the new Constitution, and planning for the electoral process which was in its final stage. However, he noted with concern that the security situation had remained a serious impediment to progress and was a major risk to the entire process. For instance, he pointed out that the majority of provincial authorities continued to act with an autonomy that denied the Transitional Administration the means to implement its national development plan. The overall human rights situation continued to be negatively affected by extortion by local commanders, arbitrary detentions and the general lack of the rule of law. This remained a source of instability and diminished the credibility of the Government. He reported that the Constitutional Commission had formally started public consultations on 6 June, with teams of three Commissioners leading the consultations with elders, local shuras and ordinary citizens in all 32 provinces as well as with the refugee community in the Islamic Republic of Iran and Pakistan.¹³³

The Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime informed the Council to the forecast that, despite current counter-narcotics efforts, Afghanistan would continue to be the world's largest opium producer in the coming years. To rid the country of its dependence on illegal activities, he underlined the need to create ample and easily accessible opportunities for alternative, licit sources of income for Afghan farmers. This task, he stated, required much greater political, security and financial capital than was presently available to assist the rural areas affected by opium production and above all, to improve the ability

¹³⁰ S/PV.4750, pp. 2-8.

¹³¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, section B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter.

¹³² Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹³³ S/PV.4774, pp. 3-6.

of the central Government to implement its opium production ban. He stated that it was essential to help farmers decide in favour of licit crops; to replace local narco-users with microcredit programmes; to provide jobs and education to women and children; to turn bazaars into modern trading places; and to neutralize warlords and their efforts to keep the drug trade alive. Moreover, he called on the international community to develop a comprehensive approach, including promotion of concrete measures against drug trafficking, stockpiling, clandestine laboratories and supply of precursors in Afghanistan and its neighbours.¹³⁴

Most representatives shared the concern about unabated production of opium in Afghanistan and welcomed the initiative of the Russian Federation in convening the meeting on this subject. They expressed support for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, which needed to lead the international effort to counter production and trafficking of narcotics. To address the root causes of the drug problem, they agreed on the need to ensure security throughout the country and help strengthen the capacity of the Transitional Administration.

The representative of France reported that the representatives of 55 countries affected by the trafficking of opium and heroin produced in Afghanistan had met in Paris on 22 May and adopted a declaration, in which they agreed to coordinate their efforts in this regard.¹³⁵ The representative of the United Kingdom urged the Council to put its weight behind the implementation of the national drug control strategy adopted by the Transitional Administration.¹³⁶ The representative of Germany argued that the success of counter-narcotics efforts depended not only on credible enforcement measures but, at the same time, on the availability of alternative sources of livelihood.¹³⁷

The representative of the United States reaffirmed his Government's commitment to working with Pakistan and Afghanistan's Central Asian neighbours to strengthen legal and institutional capacities to confront the drug trafficking that posed as much of a threat to

their own integrity as it did to that of Afghanistan.¹³⁸ The representative of Pakistan noted with concern that, before the conflict had begun in Afghanistan, the number of drug addicts in Pakistan had been negligible, while there were now nearly 3.5 million of them.¹³⁹

The representative of the Russian Federation noted that, being located on the historic crossroads of world trade routes, his country had now become a transit bridge for smuggling Afghan drugs. He called for an effective and comprehensive strategy of international action, whereby internal Afghan measures were organically supplemented by efforts around and beyond Afghanistan.¹⁴⁰

The representative of Afghanistan reported that his Government had adopted the Afghan national drug control strategy, which encompassed programmes for alternative livelihoods, the enhancement of the capacity of law enforcement agencies and the improvement of national legislation.¹⁴¹

The representative of Kazakhstan stressed the importance of the Kabul Declaration of Good-Neighbourly Relations signed in 2002 by Afghanistan and its six neighbouring countries, wherein the seven signatories reaffirmed their determination to defeat terrorism, extremism and drug trafficking.¹⁴² The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran maintained that insecurity and drug trafficking in Afghanistan were mutually reinforcing, and both contributed in turn to terrorism and other forms of transitional crime. The recognition of this, he said, should compel Governments to begin revamping their strategy for the war on both terrorism and drug trafficking.¹⁴³

At the meeting, the President (Russian Federation) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁴⁴ by which the Council, inter alia:

Stressed that security remained a serious challenge facing Afghanistan;

¹³⁴ Ibid., pp. 6-8.

¹³⁵ Ibid., p. 9.

¹³⁶ Ibid., p. 17.

¹³⁷ Ibid., p. 20.

¹³⁸ Ibid., pp. 20-21.

¹³⁹ Ibid., p. 24.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 26.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 28-30.

¹⁴² S/PV.4774 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3.

¹⁴³ Ibid., pp. 5-7.

¹⁴⁴ S/PRST/2003/7.

Stressed that security would be enhanced by continued coordinated efforts to combat the production of illicit drugs in Afghanistan;

Stressed the need to promote the effective realization of anti-drug projects for Afghanistan;

Urged the international community, in collaboration with the Office on Drugs and Crime and in accordance with the drugs strategy of the Afghan Transitional Administration, to provide assistance to the Administration;

Urged the international community, in collaboration with UNAMA and the Office on Drugs and Crime, to encourage cooperation among affected countries assisting the flow of information between and among security and law enforcement agencies, combating groups involved in illicit drug trafficking, carrying out interdiction activities, encouraging demand reduction and coordinating information and intelligence to maximize effectiveness of all measures taken in Afghanistan and beyond its borders.

Decision of 13 October 2003 (4840th meeting): resolution 1510 (2003)

At its 4840th meeting, on 13 October 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 7 October 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council.¹⁴⁵ The President (United States) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 10 October 2003 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan.¹⁴⁶

The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁴⁷ it was adopted unanimously as resolution 1510 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, inter alia:

Authorized expansion of the mandate of the International Security Assistance Force to support the Afghan Transitional

Authority in the maintenance of security in areas outside of Kabul;

Decided to extend the authorization of the Force, as defined in resolution 1386 (2001) and the present resolution for a period of 12 months;

Authorized the Member States participating in the Force to take all necessary measures to fulfil its mandate;

Requested the leadership of the Force to provide quarterly reports on implementation of its mandate, through the Secretary-General;

Decided to remain seized of the matter.

Speaking after the adoption of the resolution, the representative of France stated that he considered that the extension of the ISAF mandate did not entail a commitment of its forces outside Kabul and that France did not plan to involve itself in missions beyond those that it was currently fulfilling. He noted that the resolution authorized ISAF to protect international civil personnel involved, in particular, in reconstruction efforts and humanitarian assistance. He understood in this context that the protection provided by ISAF related “above all to the civilian personnel of the provincial reconstruction teams”.¹⁴⁸

Deliberations of 24 October 2003 (4848th meeting)

At its 4848th meeting,¹⁴⁹ on 24 October 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. The Under-Secretary-General stated that the past few weeks were a reminder that, as the final and most important stages of the peace process moved ahead, many of the fundamental and structural causes of insecurity remained unsolved. While sporadic tribal and inter-factional conflicts contributed to insecurity, he said that the primary sources of insecurity remained the risk of terrorist attacks and continued and sizeable cross-border infiltration by suspected Taliban, Al-Qaida and Hezb-i-Islami elements. Attacks against Government, military and humanitarian personnel were steadily increasing, seriously limiting the ability to effectively conduct reconstruction and to support political activities. He reported some progress in addressing the causes of insecurity, including reform of the senior level of the Ministry of Defence which was a

¹⁴⁵ S/2003/970, transmitting letters dated 2 and 6 October 2003 from the Secretary-General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The letter of 2 October enclosed the text of the NATO long-term strategy in its ISAF role in Afghanistan, and the letter of 6 October enclosed preliminary decisions of the North Atlantic Council on a possible expansion of the ISAF mission.

¹⁴⁶ Subsequently circulated by a letter dated 13 October 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/986). In its letter, the Government of Afghanistan requested the Council to consider expanding the mandate of ISAF in Afghanistan, as proposed by the Secretary-General of NATO in his letters dated 2 and 6 October 2003.

¹⁴⁷ S/2003/984.

¹⁴⁸ S/PV.4840, pp. 2-3.

¹⁴⁹ The representative of Afghanistan was invited to participate in the meeting but did not make a statement.

step in the right direction to permit the pilot disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme to proceed in Kunduz.

The Under-Secretary-General noted that President Karzai had postponed the Constitutional Loya Jirga until the end of Ramadan, between the end of November and early December. The revised schedule, which was still within the timetable set by Bonn, had provided the Constitutional Commission with more time for finalizing the draft constitution. Five hundred delegates would participate in the Constitutional Loya Jirga, of whom 344 would be elected on a provincial basis by the district representatives of the emergency Loya Jirga of 2002, who made up the electorate that would vote for the elected Constitutional Loya Jirga delegates. The registration of that electorate had begun in all provinces. The Constitutional Loya Jirga would adopt a new constitution, which would provide the basis for national elections. He said that the legal and institutional structures necessary for the national elections were gradually being put in place, including the deployment of the voter registration teams. He reiterated that the success of the disarmament,

demobilization and reintegration process and the electoral registration exercise would be dependent upon sufficient improvement in security conditions to allow deployment of staff beyond major urban centres. "Indeed, if it were held today, the electoral process would not succeed", he warned, adding that some 60 per cent of the south and some 20 per cent of the south-east and east were at any one time not freely accessible. In this context, he welcomed the unanimous adoption by the Council of a resolution approving expansion of ISAF beyond Kabul. He stressed that, as the Bonn process entered its final stage, the Government of Afghanistan and the international community would embark upon their most challenging and far-reaching political undertakings. There were still significant obstacles standing in the way, not least the lack of security. Maintaining the forward momentum would require the determination of the Afghan people and the will of the international community. He said that the expansion of security assistance provided a critical element of this equation.¹⁵⁰

¹⁵⁰ S/PV.4848, pp. 2-6.

27. Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Deliberations of 21 November 2002 to 15 December 2003 (4647th, 4728th, 4805th and 4881st meetings)

At its 4647th meeting, on 21 November 2002, the Security Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs on the activities of the Political Office in Bougainville, Papua New Guinea, following which, in addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Australia, Fiji,¹ New Zealand and Papua New Guinea.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General reported that there had been delays in the completion of stage II of the weapons disposal plan, which had been scheduled to be implemented by September 2002. As a result of the slowed momentum, the Under-

Secretary-General noted that the entire peace process had come under some strain. He explained that the reasons for the setbacks had been twofold: first, the refusal by some ex-combatants to participate in the weapons disposal process due to problems related to the disbursement of funds for reintegration and rehabilitation and the erroneous perception that ex-combatants would be paid for turning in their weapons; and secondly, the impact of a deliberate campaign of misrepresentation regarding the peace process carried out by followers of Mr. Francis Ona, the main Bougainvillian leader who had remained outside of the peace process. Despite those developments, the Under-Secretary-General expressed encouragement at the results of a meeting of the Peace Process Consultative Committee on 30 October 2002, chaired by the United Nations Political Office in Bougainville (UNPOB), at which a decision had been taken by former combatants to complete stage II of the

¹ On behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum.

weapons disposal plan by 24 December 2002. At that meeting, a number of decisions had been adopted designed to make weapon containers more secure and to foster more positive attitudes to weapons containment, thereby placing the weapons collection back on track. Also, decisions had been taken to address problems related to the usage of the funds for reintegration and rehabilitation. As a follow-up to the meeting of the Peace Process Consultative Committee, the two Bougainville faction leaders had convened an extraordinary session in Arwa at the beginning of November 2002 with an extended participation that included the provincial Administration. The session had adopted a joint ex-combatants resolution that, inter alia, called for the political leadership to enter into dialogue with the Me'ekamui Defence Force of Mr. Francis Ona. Following those two meetings, direct contact with the military commander of Mr. Francis Ona had been initiated by the political leadership of the ex-combatants. At both meetings, UNPOB had sent out a very clear message to the ex-combatants that the credibility of the weapons disposal and, perhaps, of the entire peace process would be at stake if the deadline of 24 December was not met. The Mission had also re-emphasized that progress towards the autonomy of Bougainville depended on the completion of stage II of the weapons disposal plan and on its verification.

During the reporting period, UNPOB had held a series of meetings with civil society groups throughout the island aimed at promoting maximum community participation in the weapons disposal plan. Also, for all of the activities of UNPOB related to weapons collection, the Under-Secretary-General underlined the close and fruitful working relationship with the Peace Monitoring Group (comprising the Governments of Australia, Fiji, New Zealand and Vanuatu). Regarding the Bougainville Constitutional Commission, the Under-Secretary-General reported that it had been consulting with the people of the various districts of the island ascertaining their views on what should be the content of the Bougainville Constitution. The first draft Constitution had been scheduled to be completed by 1 January 2003. It would then be considered by the Constituent Assembly which was expected to be established by February 2003. The Under-Secretary-General noted that the actual commencement of the work of the Commission would depend on the verification by UNPOB of the satisfactory completion of stage II of the weapons disposal plan. Stressing the critical tasks ahead for UNPOB in order to complete

stages II and III (final decision on the fate of the weapons) of the weapons disposal plan and noting that as both the Peace Process Consultative Committee and the Government of Papua New Guinea had requested the presence of UNPOB beyond elections, the Under-Secretary-General recommended that the Security Council favourably consider an extension of the mandate of UNPOB for a further 12 months as all parties had confirmed that the continued presence of UNPOB was essential for the successful completion of the peace process.²

Most speakers reiterated their support for the peace process, acknowledging the considerable progress that had been made in the implementation of the Bougainville Peace Agreement since its signing on 30 August 2001, and welcomed the continued efforts of UNPOB and the Peace Monitoring Group towards that end.

A few speakers expressed concern about the delays and obstacles to the process in Bougainville, notably with regard to the complete implementation of the weapons disposal plan,³ while the representatives of Singapore and Ireland noted that it was important not to insist on fitting the implementation of the peace process into a too rigid time frame.⁴ Several speakers underlined the link between progress in the weapons disposal and the establishment of the autonomous Bougainville government by a legal device which made the provision on autonomy and referendum in the new part of the national Constitution conditional upon verification and certification by UNPOB that stage II of the agreed weapons disposal plan had been achieved.⁵

With regard to the recommendation of the Secretary-General, the majority of the speakers supported extending the mandate of UNPOB until the end of 2003 in order to allow it to oversee the implementation of the pending components of the Peace Agreement and thereby to contribute to the final sealing of the peace process. However, the representative of the United States opined that the delay in the implementation of stage II of the weapons disposal plan did not justify another 12-month

² S/PV.4647, pp. 2-4.

³ Ibid., p. 4 (Mexico); and p. 9 (Russian Federation).

⁴ Ibid., p. 9 (Singapore); and p. 11 (Ireland).

⁵ Ibid., p. 5 (Mauritius); p. 6 (Norway); and p. 10 (Guinea).

extension of the mandate of UNPOB. Noting that progress towards greater autonomy and a referendum could not be made until UNPOB had certified the completion of stage II of the weapons disposal plan, the representative underlined the need for a more clear and measured indication from the Secretariat of the “end-game” for weapons disposal and the exit strategy for the UNPOB mission as a whole. In that regard, he noted the preliminary view of his delegation that a six-month extension of the mandate of UNPOB would be adequate.⁶ While acknowledging the need to consider an exit strategy of UNPOB, the representatives of the United Kingdom and Cameroon cautioned against jeopardizing the success in Bougainville by a precipitate end to the contribution of the United Nations.⁷

The representative of Papua New Guinea noted that despite the delays, the proposed timetable set out in the aide-mémoire of August 2002 still stood and definite milestones outlined in that aide-mémoire ensured a proper exit by the parties.⁸

The representative of Singapore highlighted that the Bougainville “file” had for some time been a source of encouragement for the Security Council as it had demonstrated that the efforts of the Council could, and often did, produce the desired results.⁹

At its 4728th meeting, on 28 March 2003, at which, in addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Australia, Fiji,¹⁰ Japan, New Zealand and Papua New Guinea, the Council had before it the report of the Secretary-General on the Political Office in Bougainville, dated 20 March 2003.¹¹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, inter alia, that the Security Council had endorsed a final extension of UNPOB until 31 December 2003.¹² He noted that the deadline for completion of stage II of the weapons disposal plan by 24 December 2002 had not been met. An Action Plan for the Completion of Weapons Collection had been adopted by political and former combatant leaders in Buka on 17 February 2003. However, a major obstacle to the completion of the weapons disposal

plan had remained the non-involvement of Mr. Francis Ona and his Me'ekamui Defence Force, despite efforts to appeal for his commitment not to impede the implementation of the peace process. Noting that the work of the Bougainville Constitutional Commission had been progressing well, the Secretary-General, in his report, informed that an official draft had been released on 1 February 2003 for island-wide consultations. He observed that, depending on the completion of stage II of the weapons disposal plan, elections could be held at the end of 2003. As a result of a visit of the National Government on 18 and 19 February 2003, a memorandum of understanding was signed between the Government and the Bougainville parties that had established a mechanism for consultation between them on all aspects of the implementation of the autonomy arrangements, including the transfer of powers, functions and resources, and the settlement of disputes. Noting that the Peace Monitoring Group would withdraw by 30 June, the Secretary-General expressed the view of UNPOB that prior to the withdrawal of the Monitoring Group it would be helpful if the parties to the Agreement reviewed the progress of the weapons disposal plan, and if necessary considered replacing the Peace Monitoring Group with an alternative arrangement to assist UNPOB to fulfil its mandate and start withdrawing by the end of 2003.

At that same meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs based on the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General. In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General noted that the implementation of the Action Plan seemed to be proceeding well. With regard to the refusal of Mr. Francis Ona to enter into dialogue, he emphasized the importance of the continued efforts of the Government of Papua New Guinea and other actors in the field to encourage the participation of Mr. Francis Ona in the peace process.¹³

Most speakers commended the efforts of UNPOB and the Peace Monitoring Group in moving stage II of the weapons disposal plan significantly forward. Welcoming the Action Plan, many speakers urged the parties to take practical action to fulfil their commitments to the Plan. Speakers also expressed satisfaction on the progress made by the Bougainville Constitutional Commission and underlined the

⁶ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

⁷ Ibid., p. 13 (United Kingdom); and p. 12 (Cameroon).

⁸ Ibid., p. 15.

⁹ Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁰ On behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum.

¹¹ S/2003/345.

¹² By an exchange of letters (see chap. V).

¹³ S/PV.4728, pp. 2-4.

importance of continued assistance after UNPOB by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the specialized agencies in the process of post-conflict rehabilitation and peace-building in Bougainville.

The representative of Germany held that contingency plans should be initiated, in cooperation with the Secretariat, if stage II of the weapons disposal plan did not reach its deadline prior to the withdrawal of the Peace Monitoring Group.¹⁴ On the other hand, the representative of the United States maintained that the time to achieve the completion of stage II was not unlimited as both the Peace Monitoring Group and UNPOB would be departing at definite times and progress towards autonomy was far too important to be further delayed.¹⁵ The representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and the United States of America both stated that they would have liked to see a more detailed outline of the exit strategy of UNPOB in the report of the Secretary-General.¹⁶ Several speakers stressed the need to address stage III of the weapons disposal plan, when a decision would be taken on the final fate of the weapons.¹⁷

The representative of Australia stated that his Government would remain engaged in Bougainville beyond the withdrawal of the Peace Monitoring Group and focus on economic development support, service delivery and the establishment and functioning of the administration and autonomous government in Bougainville.¹⁸

At its 4805th meeting, on 6 August 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Head of UNPOB, following which, in addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Australia, Fiji,¹⁹ Japan, New Zealand and Papua New Guinea.

In his briefing, the Head of UNPOB stated that the implementation of the Bougainville Peace Agreement had taken some dramatic steps forward, the most significant of those being the completion of

stage II of the weapons disposal plan. Owing to the absence of a numerical criterion to determine that completion, UNPOB had decided to base the verification of the completion of stage II on an island-wide process of consultations, in which it ascertained that the people of the island were feeling a level of confidence and security that they had never felt at any time since the crisis ended. Although all weapons still held by, inter alia, former combatants and supporters of Mr. Francis Ona could not be accounted for, the people of the island did not consider that those factors should delay implementation of the Peace Agreement. On 30 July 2003, UNPOB had made the verification and certification to the National Government. The Head of UNPOB noted that when the constitutional amendments would come into effect, the holding of elections for a Bougainville autonomous government could proceed. Preparations for autonomy, focused on the drafting of the Bougainville Constitution, had been ongoing through consultations between the National Government and the Bougainville Administration. With regard to the lack of participation in the peace process of Mr. Francis Ona, the Head of the Mission noted the import of intensified efforts by all concerned, including UNPOB, to bring him on board, or at the very least to ensure he would not obstruct the process. The newly established Bougainville Transition Team (comprising Australia, Fiji, New Zealand and Vanuatu), the successor to the Peace Monitoring Group, had been cooperating with UNPOB with regard to, inter alia, the checking and recording of the weapons collected. Finally, the Head of UNPOB noted that the Security Council might wish to turn its attention to ways in which it could support the people of Bougainville in consolidating and sustaining their peace in the wake of the Mission.²⁰

Most speakers encouraged the parties to direct their efforts towards setting a date for the organization of elections in Bougainville, the effective holding of those elections and the establishment of an autonomous government. Welcoming the establishment of the Bougainville Transition Team, many speakers encouraged the continued engagement to monitor commitments that had been assumed in the Action Plan and also expressed their support for the assistance of UNDP and other agencies in the post-conflict rehabilitation period.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 8 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 11 (United States).

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 16 (Papua New Guinea); p. 17 (New Zealand); and p. 19 (Australia).

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 19.

¹⁹ On behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum.

²⁰ S/PV.4805, pp. 2-4.

The representative of Australia noted that the decision to deploy the Bougainville Transition Team had once again demonstrated the capacity of the South Pacific community to work together to meet challenges to peace and security in that region.²¹

While several speakers called for the involvement of Mr. Francis Ona in the peace process,²² the representative of New Zealand stressed that although his Government did support efforts towards that end, the peace process could not wait for Mr. Francis Ona or be derailed due to his absence.²³

At its 4881st meeting, on 15 December 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, following which, in addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Australia, Japan, New Zealand and Papua New Guinea.

In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General explained that the final Bougainville Constitution was to be adopted around May 2004 and endorsed by the National Government by August 2004, following which the Constitution would enter immediately into force and a six-month period would be needed to complete preparations for elections. On 30 November 2003, the Bougainville Revolutionary Army and the Bougainville Resistance Force had adopted a resolution which declared that the final fate of the contained weapons would be their destruction. According to the resolution, the destruction should be carried out as soon as the essential components of the peace process had been finalized, including, *inter alia*, the entry into force of the Bougainville Constitution. The Assistant Secretary-General noted that Mr. Francis Ona had continued to refuse to contain the weapons of the Me'ekamui Defence Force, and that his position on that issue might affect the pace and timing of the implementation of stage III of the weapons disposal plan. Finally, in the light of the planned withdrawal of the Bougainville Transition Team by the end of 2003

and due to the fact that the peace process would not have reached its conclusion by the end of December 2003, the Secretary-General had recommended the establishment of a United Nations Observer Mission in Bougainville limited to the first six months of 2004. The Mission would be a downsized version of UNPOB and offer a continued political presence by the United Nations contributing to building confidence among the parties in the process and consolidating the peace that had to that date been achieved by the respective parties involved.²⁴

Most speakers agreed with the proposal of the Secretary-General that a continued United Nations presence in Bougainville would help to facilitate and consolidate efforts that had been made in advancing the peace process. In that regard, several speakers held that the extended United Nations presence in Bougainville should have a clear exit strategy.²⁵ The representative of Mexico stated that his Government would study the proposal of the Secretary-General to preserve a United Nations presence in Bougainville for an additional six-month period, bearing in mind the financial implications for Member States and the best way that the United Nations could continue to support the strengthening of the political process in Bougainville.²⁶

The representative of Australia referred to the future commitment of his Government which would focus on good governance and helping the parties to establish a viable and affordable autonomous administration for Bougainville. Assistance and capacity-building would also be provided within the security sector of Bougainville in close cooperation with New Zealand.²⁷

The representative of Papua New Guinea expressed appreciation with regard to the efforts of UNPOB, and noted that the faith, confidence and trust that the parties to the conflict had in the Mission was also a strong expression of confidence in the United Nations.²⁸

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Papua New Guinea); p. 8 (France); and p. 9 (Germany, United Kingdom).

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

²⁴ S/PV.4881, pp. 2-4.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Germany, France).

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

**28. Letter dated 10 November 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i.
of the Permanent Mission of Solomon Islands
to the United Nations addressed to the President
of the Security Council**

Initial proceedings

Decision of 16 November 2000 (4224th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4224th meeting, on 16 November 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda, without objection, the item entitled "Letter dated 10 November 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Solomon Islands to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/1088)". By that letter, the representative of Solomon Islands transmitted a copy of the Townsville Peace Agreement, concluded on 15 October 2000 in Townsville, Australia, for the cessation of hostilities between the warring factions on Solomon Islands and the Government of Solomon Islands.

At that meeting, in which the representative of Solomon Islands was invited to participate, the President (Netherlands) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹ by which the Council, inter alia:

Strongly supported the Townsville Peace Agreement, concluded on 15 October 2000, for the cessation of hostilities between the Malaita Eagle Force and the Isatabu Freedom Movement and for the restoration of peace and ethnic harmony in Solomon Islands;

Welcomed the establishment, as outlined in the Townsville Peace Agreement, of the International Peace Monitoring Team composed of unarmed military personnel and civilian police from Australia and New Zealand, the mandate of which is based on annex II to the said Agreement and agreed by the parties;

Encouraged other nations, in particular those in the region, to participate and assist in the implementation of the Agreement.

¹ S/PRST/2000/33.

Index by Articles of the Charter and rules of procedure

I. ARTICLES OF THE CHARTER

CHAPTER I (Purposes and Principles)

Article 1, 654, 779, 898, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1045
 Article 2, 432, 654, 655, 670, 691, 713, 779,
 792, 837, 896, 1023, 1028, 1029, 1032,
 1038, 1040, 1041, 1043, 1044, 1045

CHAPTER II (Membership)

Article 4, 223, 255, 261, 837
 Article 5, 223, 255
 Article 6, 223, 255

CHAPTER IV (The General Assembly)

Article 10, 216, 218, 1050
 Article 11, 216, 218, 846, 848, 856, 1050
 Article 12, 216, 221, 222
 Article 14, 1050
 Article 15, 224

CHAPTER V (The Security Council)

Article 23, 216, 217
 Article 24, 224, 362, 556, 648, 654, 786, 1023,
 1046, 1047, 1048, 1050, 1053, 1054, 1055,
 1056, 1067
 Article 25, 1023, 1056, 1057, 1058
 Article 27, 135, 138, 139, 829
 Article 28, 5, 791
 Article 29, 165, 811
 Article 30, 3
 Article 31, 57, 65, 589
 Article 32, 57, 64, 589

CHAPTER VI (Pacific Settlement of Disputes)

Article 33, 837, 845, 846, 860, 863, 881, 894,
 901, 902, 907, 911, 1066
 Article 34, 845, 846, 856, 863, 894, 904, 905,
 906
 Article 35, 57, 738, 845, 846, 848, 850, 863,
 894, 906, 907
 Article 36, 829, 845, 847, 860, 863, 894, 907
 Article 37, 845, 847, 848, 860, 863
 Article 38, 845, 847, 860, 863

CHAPTER VII (Action with respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression)

Article 39, 384, 513, 909, 918, 919, 924,
 926, 929
 Article 40, 384, 513, 918, 924, 937, 941
 Article 41, 165, 167, 168, 304, 384, 513, 786,
 787, 918, 924, 942, 950, 951, 964, 995, 997,
 998, 1040, 1041
 Article 42, 384, 513, 918, 924, 969, 971, 974,
 975, 977, 995, 997, 998, 999, 1040
 Article 43, 918, 982, 984, 988, 990, 992

Article 44, 918, 982, 984, 990, 991, 992

Article 45, 216, 918, 983, 984

Article 46, 216, 918, 983, 984, 993

Article 47, 216, 250, 251, 918, 983, 984, 993,
 994

Article 48, 918, 994, 995

Article 49, 918, 998, 1004

Article 50, 219, 797, 798, 918, 1000, 1001,
 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005

Article 51, 278, 359, 691, 784, 787, 788, 918,
 1006, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012,
 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019,
 1039, 1040

CHAPTER VIII (Regional Agreements)

Article 52, 893, 1023, 1059, 1060, 1064, 1066,
 1067

Article 53, 792, 1023, 1059, 1060, 1063, 1064,
 1067, 1079

Article 54, 27, 1023, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1064,
 1079

CHAPTER IX (International Economic and Social Co-operation)

Article 55, 654

CHAPTER X (The Economic and Social Council)

Article 65, 231, 232, 233, 236, 238, 240, 241,
 439, 791

CHAPTER XII (International Trusteeship System)

Article 77, 791

Article 82, 791

Article 83, 241

CHAPTER XIII (The Trusteeship Council)

Article 87, 241

Article 88, 241

CHAPTER XIV (The International Court of Justice)

Article 93, 223

Article 94, 243, 244, 245

Article 96, 243, 791

CHAPTER XV (The Secretariat)

Article 97, 223, 224

Article 98, 15, 245

Article 99, 220, 245, 249, 250, 792, 793, 846,
 847, 848, 855, 880, 881, 894, 898, 908, 909,
 910, 911, 912, 929

CHAPTER XVI (Miscellaneous Provisions)

Article 103, 1023, 1080, 1081

II. PROVISIONAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

CHAPTER I (Meetings)

- Rule 1, 4, 5
- Rule 2, 4, 5, 6, 644
- Rule 3, 4, 6
- Rule 4, 4, 5, 6
- Rule 5, 4, 5

CHAPTER II (Agenda)

- Rule 6, 4, 27
- Rule 7, 4, 27
- Rule 8, 4, 27
- Rule 9, 4, 28
- Rule 10, 4, 30
- Rule 11, 4, 30, 31, 222
- Rule 12, 4, 27

CHAPTER III (Representation and Credentials)

- Rule 13, 4, 12
- Rule 14, 4, 12
- Rule 15, 4, 12
- Rule 16, 4
- Rule 17, 4

CHAPTER IV (Presidency)

- Rule 18, 4, 12
- Rule 19, 4, 12, 13
- Rule 20, 4, 12

CHAPTER V (Secretariat)

- Rule 21, 4, 15
- Rule 22, 4, 15
- Rule 23, 4, 15
- Rule 24, 4, 15
- Rule 25, 4, 15
- Rule 26, 4, 15

CHAPTER VI (Conduct of Business)

- Rule 27, 4, 15, 16
- Rule 28, 4, 15, 131, 165, 167, 180, 275, 739
- Rule 29, 4, 15
- Rule 30, 4, 15
- Rule 31, 4, 15
- Rule 32, 4, 15

Rule 33, 4, 15, 16, 21, 30, 333

Rule 34, 4, 15

Rule 35, 4, 15

Rule 36, 4, 15

Rule 37, 4, 15, 17, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 67, 269, 589

Rule 39, 4, 15, 17, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 66, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 99, 101, 102, 103, 113, 115, 117, 128, 129, 131, 269, 589

CHAPTER VII (Voting)

Rule 40, 4, 242

CHAPTER VIII (Languages)

Rule 41, 4, 21

Rule 42, 4, 21

Rule 43, 4, 21

Rule 44, 4, 22

Rule 45, 4, 21

Rule 46, 4, 21

Rule 47, 4, 21

CHAPTER IX (Publicity of Meetings, Records)

Rule 48, 4, 23, 224

Rule 49, 4, 23

Rule 50, 4, 23

Rule 51, 4, 23

Rule 52, 4, 23

Rule 53, 4, 23

Rule 54, 4, 23

Rule 55, 4, 23, 224, 1068

Rule 56, 4, 23

Rule 57, 4, 23

CHAPTER X (Admission of New Members)

Rule 58, 4, 255

Rule 59, 4, 166, 255, 260, 261

Rule 60, 4, 223, 226, 255, 258, 260

CHAPTER XI (Relations with other United Nations Organs)

Rule 61, 4, 242

SUBJECT INDEX

- Abkhazia situation.** *See* Georgia situation
- Abstention**
- admission of new Member States, 139
 - Afghanistan situation, 139
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 139, 140
 - generally, 138
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 140, 141
 - Liberia situation, 141
 - Lockerbie bombing, 141
 - Middle East situation, 139, 140, 141
 - Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, 140
 - obligatory abstention, 138
 - peacekeeping operations, 140
 - Sierra Leone situation, 139
 - voluntary abstention, 139
 - Western Sahara situation, 139
- Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Burundi,** 240
- Ad hoc commissions.** *See also specific entity or situation*
- generally, 206
- Ad hoc criminal tribunals.** *See also specific entity or situation*
- generally, 207
- Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa**
- Africa situation
 - briefings on, 423, 1052
 - statements on, 238
 - establishment, 183
 - Guinea-Bissau situation
 - briefings on, 239
 - statements on, 239
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 105, 106, 107
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 38
 - President, decisions recorded in notes, 153, 154
- Ad hoc working groups,** 182
- Admission of new Member States**
- abstention, 139
 - adoption of resolutions or decisions without vote, 144
 - applications recommended by Security Council, 256
 - discussion of question in Security Council, 256
 - General Assembly, practice in relation to recommendations by Security Council, 223
 - pending applications, 257
 - practices relating to applicability of Article 4 of Charter, 261
 - presentation of applications, 260
 - President, decisions announced in statements, 144, 145, 148, 149
 - procedures within Security Council, 260
 - referral of applications to Committee on the Admission of New Members, 260
 - Resolution 1290 (2000), 139, 258
 - Resolution 1326 (2000), 144, 258
 - Resolution 1414 (2002), 144, 259, 1025
 - Resolution 1426 (2002), 144, 259
 - Switzerland, 45, 256, 259
 - Timor-Leste, 45, 256, 259, 1025, 1163
 - Tuvalu, 45, 256, 257, 258, 261
 - Yugoslavia, 45, 256, 258
- Afghanistan**
- Afghanistan situation
 - briefings on, 519, 523
 - letter dated 14 September 2001, 848, 850
 - letter dated 19 December 2001, 518
 - letter dated 10 October 2003, 533
 - letter regarding, 521
 - statements on, 512, 513, 515, 518, 522, 524, 526, 532, 924
 - terrorism, letter dated 14 September 2001, 738
- Afghanistan situation**
- abstention, 139
 - Afghanistan
 - briefings by, 519, 523
 - letter dated 14 September 2001, 848, 850
 - letter dated 19 December 2001, 518
 - letter dated 10 October 2003, 533
 - letter regarding, 521
 - statements by, 512, 513, 515, 518, 522, 524, 526, 532, 924
 - Angola, statements by, 924
 - Argentina, statements by, 512, 972
 - Asia and the Pacific Division of the Department of Political Affairs, briefings by, 511
 - Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 528, 530
 - Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, statements by, 522
 - Australia
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements by, 522
 - Belgium, letter dated 20 November 2001, 1008

- Bulgaria, statements by, 522
- Canada
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements by, 512, 522, 951
- Chile
 - letter dated 16 November 2001, 1008
 - statements by, 972
- China, statements by, 514, 515, 951, 952, 971
- Colombia, statements by, 968
- Deputy Secretary-General, briefings by, 521
- determinations of threats to the peace, 921, 924
- domestic affairs, non-intervention in, 1030
- Egypt, statements by, 1007
- European Union, letter dated 8 and 17 October 2001, 1007
- food and security and, 822
- France
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements by, 512, 513, 517, 521, 532, 533, 924, 952
- Germany
 - briefings by, 529
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements by, 529, 532, 972
- India, statements by, 526, 924
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 69, 76, 78, 85, 89, 94, 98, 105, 111, 113, 116, 118, 121, 122, 125, 127, 131, 132, 525, 527, 528, 530
- Iran, statements by, 515, 517, 522, 524, 526, 532, 924, 972
- Italy, statements by, 517, 972
- Japan
 - briefings by, 529
 - statements by, 529
- Kazakhstan, statements by, 532, 972
- Malaysia, statements by, 513, 517, 951, 1008
- Mali, statements by, 952
- Mauritius, statements by, 952
- measures involving use of armed force, 969, 971, 984
- measures not involving use of armed force, 942, 951
- NATO, letter dated 2 and 6 October 2003, 533
- Netherlands
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements by, 951, 971
- new Security Council action, 42
- New Zealand
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements by, 522
- Norway, statements by, 517, 971, 1007
- obligations of Member States, 995, 996, 997, 999
- pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 873, 888
- Pakistan, statements by, 515, 517, 522, 526, 952, 972
- Poland, letter regarding, 1007
- President
 - decisions announced in statements, 145, 150
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 157, 158, 160, 161
 - decisions recorded in notes, 153
 - statements by, 512, 532, 873, 888, 921, 940, 1030
- provisional measures, 940
- regional arrangements, 1077, 1078
- Resolution 1333 (2000), 139, 514, 888, 921, 924, 941, 942, 951, 1077
- Resolution 1363 (2001), 516, 943
- Resolution 1378 (2001), 518, 889
- Resolution 1383 (2001), 518, 873, 889
- Resolution 1386 (2001), 519, 969, 984, 997, 999, 1042, 1078
- Resolution 1388 (2002), 519, 943
- Resolution 1390 (2002), 519, 943, 1077
- Resolution 1401 (2002), 522, 889
- Resolution 1413 (2002), 524, 1078
- Resolution 1419 (2002), 525
- Resolution 1444 (2002), 527, 1078
- Resolution 1453 (2002), 528, 873
- Resolution 1471 (2003), 530
- Resolution 1510 (2003), 143, 533, 1078, 1079
- Russian Federation
 - letter regarding, 521
 - statements by, 512, 514, 515, 517, 522, 524, 526, 532, 952
- sanctions, 943
- Secretary-General
 - briefings by, 516, 520
 - letter dated 21 May 2001, 514, 516
 - letter dated 5 December 2001, 518
 - letter dated 25 November 2002, 527
 - letter dated 7 October 2003, 533, 1078
 - letter dated 13 October 2003, 533
 - relations of Security Council with, 247
 - reports by, 511, 512, 520, 521, 522, 525, 529, 530, 889
- Security Council Committees
 - briefings by, 515
 - letter dated 4 April 2000, 511

- reports by, 514, 952
- statements by, 516
- Security Council Missions, 11, 122, 832, 835, 857
- self-defence, 1007
- Singapore, statements by, 524, 952, 968, 1016
- Spain, statements by, 522
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan
 - briefings by, 516, 520, 525, 526, 527, 528, 530
 - statements by, 971
- Tunisia, statements by, 952
- Turkey
 - letter dated 21 October 2002, 527
 - statements by, 524
- Ukraine, statements by, 513, 952
- UN Office on Drugs and Crime, briefings by, 531
- Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations
 - briefings by, 529, 531, 533
 - statements by, 529
- Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs,
 - briefings by, 520, 523, 524
- United Kingdom
 - letter dated 19 December 2001, 518
 - letter dated 14 March 2002, 521
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements by, 512, 513, 517, 522, 526, 532
- United States
 - letter dated 7 October 2001, 1007
 - statements by, 512, 513, 515, 517, 521, 524, 526, 532, 924, 952, 971
- Uzbekistan, statements by, 952
- Africa Day**
 - President, decisions recorded in notes, 153
- Africa situation.** *See also specific country*
 - Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa
 - briefings by, 423, 1052
 - statements by, 238
 - Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs,
 - statements by, 424
 - Cameroon, statements by, 1067
 - China, statements by, 966
 - Colombia, statements by, 966
 - Cuba, statements by, 1052
 - Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator,
 - statements by, 426
 - Deputy Secretary-General
 - briefings by, 421
 - statements by, 420
 - ECOSOC
 - briefings by, 421
 - statements by, 237, 238, 424
 - ECOWAS, briefings by, 427
 - food and security and, 823
 - General Assembly, recommendations to Security Council, 219
 - Guinea, statements by, 425, 966
 - India, statements by, 1052, 1067
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 63, 67, 78, 108, 113, 114, 115, 116, 234
 - Ireland, statements by, 966
 - Mauritius
 - letter dated 10 January 2002, 420
 - statements by, 966
 - measures not involving use of armed force, 966
 - Mexico, statements by, 966, 1067
 - new Security Council action, 43
 - Norway, statements by, 966
 - Organization of African Unity
 - briefings by, 421
 - statements by, 424
 - pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 888
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 148
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 156, 157, 158, 160, 162
 - decisions recorded in notes, 153
 - note dated 1 March 2002, 423
 - statements by, 233, 238, 419, 423, 425, 888, 1066
 - regional arrangements, 1066
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 1067
 - Secretary-General, briefings by, 419, 425
 - Security Council Committees, statements by, 426
 - Sierra Leone, statements by, 425
 - South Africa, statements by, 1067
 - Tunisia, statements by, 1067
 - UN Development Programme, briefings by, 419, 427
 - Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, statements by, 426
 - Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs,
 - briefings by, 427
 - United Kingdom, letter dated 15 July 2002, 426
 - United States, statements by, 426
 - World Bank, briefings by, 419
- African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty**
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 51

African Union. *See also* Organization of African Unity (OAU)

Central African region, statements on, 452, 465, 903

Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 360

regional organizations, statements on, 827

small arms, briefings on, 788

Agenda

adoption of

generally, 28

phrasing of items, 29

postponement of consideration of items, 29

scope of items in relation to scope of discussion, 28

Canada, statements by, 28

Colombia, statements by, 28

Egypt, statements by, 29

Japan, statements by, 29

matters of which Security Council seized

addition, retention and deletion of items, 31

generally, 30

practice regarding retention and deletion, 31

President, statements by, 27

provisional agenda

circulation of communications, 27

communication of, 27

generally, 27

preparation of, 27

United Kingdom, statements by, 28

Yugoslavia, statements by, 28

Agenda for Peace

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49, 50

AIDS. *See* HIV/AIDS

Albania

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 655, 663, 672

Kosovo situation, statements on, 579, 1026

Albania situation

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 52

Algeria

Central African Republic situation, letter regarding, 412

Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 368

Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute

letter dated 12 May 2000, 428

letter dated 19 June 2000, 430

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 978, 1058, 1075

Middle East situation, statements on, 608, 612, 632

Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, letter dated 1 June 2000, 962

post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 710, 711, 1065

Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 980, 988

Western Sahara situation, letters regarding, 273, 274

Al-Qaida and Taliban. *See also* Terrorism

Monitoring Group, reports by, 174

President, decisions recorded in notes, 153

Resolution 1333 (2000), 173, 174, 1080

Resolution 1363 (2001), 174

Resolution 1390 (2002), 174, 943

Resolution 1452 (2002), 943

Resolution 1455 (2003), 173, 174, 943

sanctions, 943

Security Council Committees

establishment, 173

mandate implementation, 173

monitoring and reporting, 173

reports by, 174

special economic problems, 1006

Angola (elected member of Security Council 2003)

Afghanistan situation, statements on, 924

Angola situation, statements on, 297, 299, 303, 305, 308, 311, 313, 315, 954, 1082

Burundi situation, statements on, 331, 1072

civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 782

Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 363, 379, 394

Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 458

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 664, 679, 976

peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815

regional organizations, statements on, 1064

Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 508

Angola situation

Angola, statements by, 297, 299, 303, 305, 308, 311, 313, 315, 954, 1082

Argentina, statements by, 302, 307

assistance from Member States, 1041

Bangladesh, statements by, 953, 1082

Belgium

letter regarding, 302

statements by, 300, 303, 953

Brazil, statements by, 953

Bulgaria

notes verbales regarding, 302

statements by, 300, 303, 953

- Burkina Faso
 letter regarding, 302
 statements by, 300, 303, 308
- Canada, statements by, 303, 307, 311, 954
- Cape Verde, statements by, 954
- China, statements by, 299
- Colombia, statements by, 307, 313, 953
- determinations of threats to the peace, 919
- European Union, statements on behalf of, 953
- France, statements by, 299, 307, 953
- Gabon
 letter regarding, 302
 statements by, 303
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 63, 67, 68, 73, 79, 90, 94, 98, 105, 106, 107, 111, 112, 301
- Ireland, statements by, 309, 311
- Jamaica, statements by, 299, 303
- Malawi, statements by, 311, 953
- Malaysia, statements by, 298, 302
- Mali, statements by, 307, 953
- matters of which Security Council seized, 38
- Mauritius, statements by, 307, 311, 953, 954
- measures not involving use of armed force, 944, 952
- Monitoring Mechanism on Sanctions against UNITA, reports by, 306, 308, 310, 317, 952, 1082
- Morocco, statements by, 299
- Mozambique, statements by, 307, 953
- Namibia, statements by, 297, 299, 311, 954
- Netherlands, statements by, 297, 298, 302
- new Security Council action, 41
- Norway, statements by, 307, 313
- obligations of Member States, 995
- peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 861, 864, 882
- Panel of Experts, reports by, 170, 297, 298
- Portugal
 letter dated 26 April 2002, 315
 letter regarding, 302
 statements by, 313
- President
 decisions announced in statements, 147, 148
 decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159
 decisions recorded in notes, 152
 notes regarding, 306, 308
 statements by, 309, 311, 313, 864, 865, 882, 1041
- Resolution 1294 (2000), 301, 882
- Resolution 1295 (2000), 167, 170, 304, 919, 944, 1001, 1041, 1082
- Resolution 1336 (2001), 306
- Resolution 1348 (2001), 309
- Resolution 1374 (2001), 310
- Resolution 1404 (2002), 314
- Resolution 1412 (2002), 315, 865, 944
- Resolution 1432 (2002), 316
- Resolution 1433 (2002), 317, 865, 883
- Resolution 1439 (2002), 317, 944
- Resolution 1448 (2002), 171, 318, 944
- Russian Federation, letter dated 26 April 2002, 315
- Rwanda
 letter regarding, 302
 statements by, 300, 304, 308
- sanctions, 944
- Secretary-General
 relations of Security Council with, 247
 reports by, 296, 301, 304, 316, 318
- Security Council Committees
 briefings by, 296, 298, 306
 establishment, 170
 letter dated 21 December 2000, 306
 letter dated 12 October 2001, 310
 letter dated 14 October 2002, 317
 letter dated 10 March 2000, 297, 301
 mandate implementation, 170
 monitoring and reporting, 170
 statements by, 301, 302
 termination of mandate, 171, 211
- Singapore, statements by, 311
- South Africa, statements by, 299
- special economic problems, 1001
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Angola, briefings by, 318
- Togo
 letter regarding, 302
 statements by, 300, 303, 308, 953
- Tunisia, statements by, 299, 954
- Uganda
 letter regarding, 298, 302
 statements by, 300
- Ukraine, statements by, 303, 311, 953, 954, 1082
- Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa
 briefings by, 310, 312, 314, 953, 954
 statements by, 305

- Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief, briefings by, 315
- Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 296
- United Kingdom, statements by, 297, 298, 302
- United States
 - letter dated 26 April 2002, 315
 - statements by, 306, 312
- Zimbabwe, statements by, 304, 311
- Anniversary of 11 September 2001**
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 37
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 149
 - statements by, 37, 764
 - Secretary-General, statements by, 764
 - United States, statements by, 764
- Argentina (elected member of Security Council 2000)**
 - Afghanistan situation, statements on, 512, 972
 - Angola situation, statements on, 302, 307
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 365, 373, 1008, 1033
 - ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 721, 723
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, statements on, 432
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 438, 439, 440
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 65
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 643, 671, 975, 1038
 - no exit without strategy, statements on, 809
 - prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 896, 898
 - Rwanda situation, statements on, 320
 - sanctions, statements on, 963
 - Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 337, 339, 960, 982, 989
 - Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 471, 475
 - troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with
 - letter regarding, 812
 - statements on, 810, 993
 - Western Sahara situation, statements on, 272
- Armenia**
 - pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 1016
- Asia and the Pacific Division of the Department of Political Affairs**
 - Afghanistan situation, briefings on, 511
- Assessments of work of Security Council**
 - generally, 14
 - Military Staff Committee, relations of Security Council with other UN organs, 251
- Assistance from Member States**
 - Angola situation, 1041
 - Article 41, under, 1041
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 1040
 - generally, 1040
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1041
 - Liberia situation, 1041
 - multinational forces, 1042
 - peacekeeping operations, 1042
 - regional arrangements, 1042
 - Somalia situation, 1041
- Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women**
 - women and peace and security, briefings on, 802, 804
- Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations**
 - Afghanistan situation, briefings on, 528, 530
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, briefings on, 543, 552
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, briefings on, 386
 - Kosovo situation, briefings on, 566, 568, 576, 577, 580, 583, 584, 586
 - Sierra Leone situation, briefings on, 337
 - Tajikistan situation, briefings on, 509
 - Timor-Leste situation
 - briefings on, 469, 470, 471, 474, 476, 486, 488, 492, 501, 504
 - statements on, 472, 487
- Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs**
 - Afghanistan situation, statements on, 522
 - Africa situation, statements on, 424
 - Bougainville situation, briefings on, 536, 538
 - Central African region, briefings on, 451, 463, 902
 - Guinea situation, briefings on, 447
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, briefings on, 442
 - Middle East situation
 - briefings on, 630
 - statements on, 1014
 - sanctions, statements on, 799, 800, 965
 - West Africa region, briefings on, 449
- Australia**
 - Afghanistan situation
 - letter regarding, 1007

- statements on, 522
 Bougainville situation, statements on, 537, 538
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773
 conduct of business, statements on, 18
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 655, 663, 927, 1039
 Middle East situation, statements on, 632
 sanctions, statements on, 963, 964
 terrorism, statements on, 746
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 473, 474, 477, 490, 502, 504, 505, 508
 women and peace and security, statements on, 936
- Austria**
 children and armed conflict, statements on, 734
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 911
- Azerbaijan**
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 781, 782
 terrorism, letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
- Bahrain**
 Middle East situation
 letter dated 11 June 2002, 625, 852
 statements on, 930
 terrorism, statements on, 757
- Bangladesh (elected member of Security Council 2000-2001)**
 Angola situation, statements on, 953, 1082
 children and armed conflict, statements on, 966
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 368, 376, 380, 385, 394, 954, 972
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 723, 724, 990
 Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 438
 Liberia situation, statements on, 277
 Middle East situation, statements on, 613, 616, 622
 no exit without strategy, statements on, 808
 Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 981, 988
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 469, 476, 487
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 992
 women and peace and security, statements on, 803
- Belarus**
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 967
 humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 713, 933
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 958
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 908
 Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 590
- Belgium**
 Afghanistan situation, letter dated 20 November 2001, 1008
 Angola situation
 letter regarding, 302
 statements on, 300, 303, 953
 Burundi situation, letter dated 15 October 2001, 325
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 letter dated 17 August 2001, 386
 statements on, 389, 393, 402, 955
 letter dated 5 March 1992, deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 48
 Liberia situation, statements on, 278
 Middle East situation, letter dated 8 and 10 August 2001, 614
- Benin**
 small arms, statements on, 790
- Bihac**
 deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49
- BONUCA.** *See* UN Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic (BONUCA)
- Bosnia and Herzegovina**
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation
 briefings on, 558
 letter dated 6 February 2001, 849, 855
 statements on, 543, 547, 548, 549, 553, 557
 International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 697, 700
- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation**
 abstention, 139, 140
 Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 543, 552
 Bosnia and Herzegovina
 briefings by, 558
 letter dated 6 February 2001, 849, 855
 statements by, 543, 547, 548, 549, 553, 557
 Brazil, statements by, 1081
 Bulgaria, statements by, 554, 556

- Canada
letter dated 3 July 2002, 555, 1052, 1081
statements by, 544, 546, 556, 1053
- China, statements by, 546
- Croatia, statements by, 549
- determinations of threats to the peace, 922, 924
- draft resolutions, 141, 554
- European Union, statements on behalf of, 553
- Fiji, statements by, 1053
- France, statements by, 544, 552, 555, 557, 560
- Germany, statements by, 560
- High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina
briefings by, 547, 549, 551, 552, 558, 559
reports by, 544, 547, 551, 552, 557, 559
- India, statements by, 557
- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, briefings by, 560
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 69, 75, 81, 87, 90, 92, 97, 101, 111, 115, 116, 130, 546, 550, 553, 555, 557, 559
- Iran, statements by, 556, 1053, 1054
- Jordan, statements by, 556, 1053, 1054
- Liechtenstein, statements by, 1054
- measures involving use of armed force, 969, 984
- Mongolia, statements by, 1053, 1081
- Netherlands, statements by, 543, 548
- new Security Council action, 41
- New Zealand, statements by, 1053, 1054
- Nigeria, statements by, 1054
- obligations of Member States, 998, 1000, 1081
- pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 875, 890
- Pakistan, statements by, 1054
- Portugal
letter dated 23 May 2000, 544
letter dated 14 June 2000, 545
- President
decisions announced in statements, 146, 149
decisions recorded in letters, 154, 159
statements by, 544, 545, 546, 549, 559, 891
- provisional measures, 941
- regional arrangements, 1074
- Resolution 1305 (2000), 139, 201, 545, 875, 890, 922, 941, 969, 984, 998, 1000
- Resolution 1357 (2001), 201, 550
- Resolution 1396 (2002), 553
- Resolution 1418 (2002), 201, 553
- Resolution 1420 (2002), 201, 555
- Resolution 1421 (2002), 201, 555
- Resolution 1422 (2002), 201
- Resolution 1423 (2002), 201, 557, 1074
- Resolution 1491 (2003), 559, 1074
- Russian Federation, statements by, 543, 545, 546, 547, 551, 552, 558, 560, 1074
- Secretary-General
briefings by, 558
letter dated 4 May 2000, 544
letter dated 18 October 2000, 547
letter dated 14 September 2001, 551
letter dated 26 February 2002, 552
letter dated 18 October 2002, 557
letter dated 25 September 2003, 559
reports by, 543, 544, 545, 548, 550, 551, 553, 554, 555, 558
statements by, 552, 554
- Singapore, statements by, 1081
- South Africa, statements by, 1053, 1054
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of UN Operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina
briefings by, 544, 548, 550, 553, 558
statements by, 550, 1074
- Sweden, letter dated 26 February and 8 March 2001, 549
- Ukraine, statements by, 1081
- Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 546, 547
- United Kingdom, statements by, 546, 560, 1074
- United States, statements by, 546, 548, 554, 556, 924, 1053, 1081, 1082
- vetoes of draft resolutions, 554
- voting, non-procedural matters, 137
- Yugoslavia, statements by, 547, 550
- Bougainville situation**
Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 536, 538
- Australia, statements by, 537, 538
- Cameroon, statements by, 536
- Germany, statements by, 537
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 71, 82, 86, 113, 119, 122, 539
- matters of which Security Council seized, 33
- Mexico, statements by, 538
- new Security Council action, 44
- New Zealand, statements by, 538
- pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 875, 890
- Papua New Guinea, statements by, 536, 538

- President
 decisions announced in statements, 145
 decisions recorded in letters, 157, 158, 160, 162
 letter dated 23 December 2003, 890
 statements by, 33, 539, 875
- Secretary-General, reports by, 536
- Singapore, statements by, 536
- Solomon Islands, letter dated 10 November 2000, 33, 71, 145, 539, 875
- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 537
- Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 534
- United Kingdom, statements by, 536
- United States, statements by, 535, 537
- Brazil**
 Angola situation, statements on, 953
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1081
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 725
 humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 933, 1048
 invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 66
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 958
 Middle East situation, statements on, 931, 1013
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 910, 912
 small arms, statements on, 968, 1051
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 477
- Briefings.** *See also specific entity or situation generally,* 840
- Bulgaria (elected member of Security Council 2002-2003)**
 Afghanistan situation, statements on, 522
 Angola situation
 notes verbales regarding, 302
 statements on, 300, 303, 953
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 554, 556
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 776, 778
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 955
 food and security, statements on, 823, 824, 825
 Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 660, 664, 668, 958, 1003, 1004
 Kosovo situation, statements on, 581, 584
 Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 334
 Middle East situation, statements on, 630, 632, 633
 mine action, statements on, 817
 pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 901, 907
 peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
 sanctions, statements on, 800, 801
 terrorism, statements on, 751, 761
- Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery**
 Central African region, briefings on, 452
- Burkina Faso**
 Angola situation
 letter regarding, 302
 statements on, 300, 303, 308
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 779
 Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 347
 small arms, statements on, 790
 terrorism, statements on, 754
- Burundi**
 Burundi situation
 letter dated 14 March 2001, 849, 855
 statements on, 323, 328
 children and armed conflict, statements on, 734
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 letter dated 1 May 2001, 378
 letter dated 13 December 2001, 392
 statements on, 379, 382, 393
 Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 358, 359, 365
 letter dated 11 May 2001, 1016
- Burundi situation**
 Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Burundi, 240
 Angola, statements by, 331, 1072
 Belgium, letter dated 15 October 2001, 325
 Burundi
 letter dated 14 March 2001, 849, 855
 statements by, 323, 328
 Cameroon, statements by, 331
 China, statements by, 331
 Colombia, statements by, 329
 ECOSOC
 briefings by, 240, 331
 letter dated 25 August 2003, 240
 Facilitator of Burundi Peace Process
 briefings by, 322, 324
 statements by, 1071
 France, statements by, 329, 331, 1071
 Germany, statements by, 331

- Guinea, statements by, 331
investigations and fact-finding, 327
invitations to participate in proceedings, 67, 74,
79, 86, 93, 98, 101, 102, 103, 128, 129, 234,
324, 325, 326, 328, 329, 330
Ireland, statements by, 1071
Malaysia, statements by, 323
Netherlands, statements by, 323
new Security Council action, 42
pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
regarding, 865, 883
President
decisions announced in statements, 145, 146,
147, 148, 150, 151
decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158,
159, 161
statements by, 42, 233, 324, 325, 327, 328,
329, 330, 332, 865, 866, 883, 1071
regional arrangements, 1071
Regional Peace Initiative for Burundi, briefings
by, 327
Resolution 1286 (2000), 323, 865
Resolution 1375 (2001), 143, 326, 883, 1071
Russian Federation, statements by, 323
Secretary-General
briefings by, 322, 324
reports by, 327, 329, 332
self-defence, invocation of right, 1016
South Africa
briefings by, 329, 330
letter dated 25 October 2001, 325
Special Representative of the Secretary-General
for the Great Lakes region, briefings by, 326
Uganda, briefings by, 327
United Kingdom, statements by, 323, 326, 331
United States, statements by, 329
- Cambodia situation**
deleted from matters of which Security Council
seized, 52
- Cameroon (elected member of Security Council
2002-2003)**
Africa situation, statements on, 1067
Bougainville situation, statements on, 536
Burundi situation, statements on, 331
Central African region
letter dated 21 October 2002, 451, 453
statements on, 464, 902
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 408, 955
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 659, 664,
668, 678, 679, 958, 975
justice and rule of law, statements on, 837
Middle East situation, statements on, 622
pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 907
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 894
regional organizations, statements on, 1064
small arms, statements on, 934
terrorism, statements on, 760, 762
Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 499
- Canada (elected member of Security Council 2000)**
Afghanistan situation
letter regarding, 1007
statements on, 512, 522, 951
Agenda, statements on, 28
Angola situation, statements on, 303, 307, 311,
954
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation
letter dated 3 July 2002, 555, 1052, 1081
statements on, 544, 546, 556, 1053
children and armed conflict, statements on, 734
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773,
774, 779, 781, 911, 967, 968
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 363, 365, 368, 372, 373, 402,
972
ensuring effective role of Security Council in
maintenance of peace and security, statements
on, 722, 723, 725, 1062
HIV/AIDS, statements on, 716
humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and
security, statements on, 1047
International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia,
statements on, 702
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 643, 647,
663, 666, 978, 1003, 1055
justice and rule of law, statements on, 839
Middle East situation, statements on, 1012
no exit without strategy, statements on, 808, 809
peacekeeping operations, letter dated 6 June
2003, 813
post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 711
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 1063
refugees, statements on, 768
responsibility of Security Council in maintenance
of peace and security, statements on, 708
Rwanda situation, statements on, 321
sanctions, statements on, 963, 964
Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 341, 348,
349, 960, 980, 988

small arms, statements on, 787
 Tajikistan situation, statements on, 510
 terrorism, statements on, 744
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 468, 471,
 473, 480, 489, 490, 492
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening
 cooperation with
 letter regarding, 812
 statements on, 811, 993

Cape Verde

Angola situation, statements on, 954

Central African region

African Union, statements by, 452, 465, 903
 Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs,
 briefings by, 451, 463, 902
 Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery,
 briefings by, 452
 Cameroon
 letter dated 21 October 2002, 451, 453
 statements by, 464, 902
 Chad, letter dated 29 November 2002, 38, 83,
 453, 852
 Chile, statements by, 465, 903
 Congo, Democratic Republic of, statements by,
 465, 833, 903
 determinations of threats to the peace, 936
 ECCAS, statements by, 465, 903
 ECOSOC, briefings by, 452
 Egypt, statements by, 1065
 Equatorial Guinea, statements by, 465, 903
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 452
 France
 briefings by, 832
 statements by, 464, 902
 Germany, statements by, 464, 903
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 82, 83,
 88, 105, 114, 115, 116, 119, 122, 129, 234
 Japan, statements by, 452
 matters of which Security Council seized, 37, 38,
 40
 Mauritius, statements by, 1065
 Mexico
 briefings by, 834
 statements by, 1065
 pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
 regarding, 861
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 149
 statements by, 11, 37, 453, 835
 referral of disputes to Security Council, 852
 regional arrangements, 1065

Russian Federation, statements by, 465, 903, 936,
 1065

Rwanda, statements by, 833

Secretary-General

letter dated 10 November 2003, 463

reports by, 463

Security Council Missions, 11, 122, 831, 832,
 857, 902

Spain, statements by, 464, 903

Tanzania, statements by, 833

United Kingdom

briefings by, 834

statements by, 464, 903

United States, statements by, 452, 465, 903

World Bank, briefings by, 451

Central African Republic

Central African Republic situation, statements on,
 414

Central African Republic situation

Algeria, letter regarding, 412

Central African Republic, statements by, 414

France, statements by, 417

International Organization of la Francophonie,
 statements by, 414

invitations to participate in proceedings, 72, 82,
 97, 100, 101, 417, 418

Jamaica, statements by, 416

new Security Council action, 43

Organization of African Unity, letter regarding,
 412

pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
 regarding, 883

President

decisions announced in statements, 144, 146,
 147, 149

decisions recorded in letters, 155, 159, 161
 statements by, 413, 414, 415, 417, 418, 883

Regional Bureau for Africa, briefings by, 414

Russian Federation, statements by, 417

Secretary-General, reports by, 412, 413, 414, 415

Singapore, statements by, 417

Special Representative of the Secretary-General
 for Central African Republic, briefings by, 413,
 416

United Kingdom, statements by, 417

United States, statements by, 417

World Bank, briefings by, 414, 416

Central America situation

deleted from matters of which Security Council
 seized, 52

Chad

Central African region, letter dated 29 November 2002, 38, 83, 453, 852

Chad-Libya dispute

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 48

Children and armed conflict

Austria, statements by, 734
Bangladesh, statements by, 966
Burundi, statements by, 734
Canada, statements by, 734
Colombia, statements by, 728
Congo, Democratic Republic of, statements by, 734
Costa Rica, statements by, 906, 911
Deputy Secretary-General, briefings by, 726
determinations of threats to the peace, 923, 932
France, statements by, 932, 966
India, statements by, 728, 932
Indonesia, statements by, 967
invitations to participate in proceedings, 62, 70, 76, 83, 90, 91, 93, 98, 100, 111, 114, 117, 125, 128
Iraq, statements by, 728, 966, 967
Japan, statements by, 733
Korea, Republic of, statements by, 967
Malaysia, statements by, 966, 967
measures not involving use of armed force, 950, 966
Mexico, statements by, 734
Myanmar, statements by, 734
new Security Council action, 44
Pakistan, statements by, 734
President
decisions announced in statements, 148
statements by, 731, 732
Resolution 1314 (2000), 728, 923, 950, 1046
Resolution 1379 (2001), 250, 731, 911, 1046
Resolution 1460 (2003), 44, 735
Russian Federation, statements by, 734, 735
Secretary-General
briefings by, 730, 731, 733
relations of Security Council with, 250
reports by, 125, 128, 726, 728, 729, 731, 732, 735, 911, 932
South Africa, statements by, 730
Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children in Armed Conflict
briefings by, 727, 730, 731, 733, 747
statements by, 966

Tunisia, statements by, 966

Ukraine, statements by, 966

UNICEF, briefings by, 727, 730, 732, 733, 741

United Kingdom, statements by, 730, 733, 734

Chile (elected member of Security Council 2003)

Afghanistan situation
letter dated 16 November 2001, 1008
statements on, 972
Central African region, statements on, 465, 903
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 935, 968
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 973
Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 458
Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441, 443
HIV/AIDS, statements on, 720
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 664, 667, 974
Middle East situation, statements on, 930
regional organizations, statements on, 828, 1064
sanctions, statements on, 801, 965
small arms, statements on, 785
terrorism, statements on, 747, 760, 765

China (permanent member of Security Council)

Afghanistan situation, statements on, 514, 515, 951, 952, 971
Africa situation, statements on, 966
Angola situation, statements on, 299
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 546
Burundi situation, statements on, 331
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 770, 934, 967, 1044
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 363, 375, 380, 385, 388, 389, 393, 955, 973
Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 458
ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 721, 1061
Guinea situation, statements on, 445
humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 713, 1048
International Tribunal for Rwanda, statements on, 697
International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 693, 695, 697
invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 64
Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 690

- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 638, 641, 642, 643, 647, 653, 657, 658, 667, 681, 976, 977, 979
- Kosovo situation, statements on, 565, 566, 567, 570, 1026
- Liberia situation, statements on, 277
- Middle East situation, statements on, 610, 633
- no exit without strategy, statements on, 993
- pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 901
- peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 792, 896, 898, 904
- protection of UN personnel, statements on, 795
- regional organizations, statements on, 828
- responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 708
- sanctions, statements on, 800, 801, 963
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339, 341, 349, 981
- small arms, statements on, 784, 787
- Somalia situation, statements on, 286
- terrorism
- letter dated 27 September 2001, 738
 - statements on, 737, 740, 749, 761
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 468, 471, 481, 485
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 811
- Tuvalu, admission of, statements on, 261
- Western Sahara situation, statements on, 271
- Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 588, 590
- Civilian police in peacekeeping operations**
- deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 53
- Civilians in armed conflict**
- Angola, statements by, 782
 - Australia, statements by, 773
 - Austria, statements by, 911
 - Azerbaijan, statements by, 781, 782
 - Bangladesh, statements by, 773
 - Bulgaria, statements by, 776, 778
 - Burkina Faso, statements by, 779
 - Canada, statements by, 773, 774, 779, 781, 911, 967, 968
 - Chile, statements by, 935, 968
 - China, statements by, 770, 934, 967, 1044
 - Colombia, statements by, 934
 - Deputy Secretary-General
 - briefings by, 771, 934
 - statements by, 906 - determinations of threats to the peace, 923, 934
 - domestic affairs, non-intervention in, 1044
 - Egypt, statements by, 779, 781, 782, 905, 1044
 - European Union, statements on behalf of, 782, 905
 - France, statements by, 1051
 - generally, 1051
 - Germany, statements by, 968
 - Guinea, statements by, 776
 - High Commissioner for Refugees, briefings by, 772, 906
 - India, statements by, 772, 773
 - Indonesia, statements by, 773, 906
 - International Committee of the Red Cross, briefings by, 769, 778
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 75, 83, 88, 94, 99, 100, 101, 112, 117, 127
 - Iraq, statements by, 967
 - Ireland, statements by, 774, 776, 779
 - Jamaica, statements by, 770, 773, 774, 967
 - Japan, statements by, 782
 - Jordan, statements by, 773
 - Korea, Republic of, statements by, 967
 - measures not involving use of armed force, 967
 - Mexico, statements by, 780, 910
 - Netherlands, statements by, 770
 - new Security Council action, 45
 - Norway, statements by, 774, 781
 - Pakistan, statements by, 773, 780, 967
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 148, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 157
 - letter dated 14 February 2001, 227
 - letter dated 21 June 2001, 774
 - statements by, 771, 776, 779, 782, 1052 - Resolution 1296 (2000), 227, 770, 923, 934, 1044, 1046
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 782, 911, 934, 935, 1052
 - Secretary-General
 - briefings by, 769, 777
 - reports by, 768, 771, 776, 779, 905, 906, 910 - Sierra Leone, statements by, 782, 967
 - Singapore, statements by, 773, 774, 775, 776, 779
 - Switzerland, statements by, 967
 - Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 1052
 - Tunisia, statements by, 1044
 - Ukraine, statements by, 906

- Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator briefings by, 772, 774, 775, 777, 780, 781 statements by, 776
- United Kingdom, statements by, 770, 776, 779, 780, 906, 911
- United States, statements by, 770, 776, 1052
- Yemen, statements by, 934
- Colombia (elected member of Security Council 2001-2002)**
- Afghanistan situation, statements on, 968
- Africa situation, statements on, 966
- Agenda, statements on, 28
- Angola situation, statements on, 307, 313, 953
- Burundi situation, statements on, 329
- children and armed conflict, statements on, 728
- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 934
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 389, 954, 955
- Guinea situation, statements on, 445
- humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 1048
- invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 66
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 974, 979
- post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 1050, 1062
- reports by Secretary-General, statements on, 224
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 348
- small arms, letter dated 25 July 2001, 783, 785, 935
- Somalia situation, statements on, 291
- terrorism, statements on, 737, 741, 744, 749, 752, 760, 761
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 484, 491, 493
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 251, 994
- Combating terrorism**
- General Assembly, recommendations to Security Council, 221
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 120
- matters of which Security Council seized, 38
- President, statements by, 1079
- Resolution 1373 (2001), 180, 181, 1079
- Resolution 1377 (2001), 181, 1080
- Resolution 1456 (2003), 181
- Security Council Committees
- composition, 181
- establishment, 180
- letter dated 14 February 2003, 181
- mandate implementation, 181
- reports by, 181
- Committee on the Admission of New Members, 260**
- Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People**
- Middle East situation
- letter dated 24 March 2000, 229
- letter dated 2 October 2000, 229
- letter dated 7 March 2001, 229
- letter dated 24 March 2001, 229
- letter dated 5 April 2001, 229
- letter dated 19 April 2001, 230
- letter dated 22 August 2001, 230
- letter dated 28 September 2001, 230
- letter dated 23 October 2001, 230
- letter dated 4 December 2001, 230
- letter dated 5 March 2002, 230
- letter dated 23 April 2002, 230
- letter dated 14 August 2002, 230
- letter dated 21 April 2003, 231
- letter dated 17 July 2003, 231
- statements on, 627
- relations of Security Council with, 227
- Committees. See specific entity or situation**
- Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries**
- Guinea-Bissau situation
- briefings on, 442
- statements on, 440
- Conduct of business**
- Australia, statements by, 18
- Mali, statements by, 17
- Mauritius, statements by, 17
- President, statements by, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21
- provisional rules of procedure regarding application of Rules 27–36, 16
- generally, 15
- Singapore, statements by, 16, 17, 18
- Ukraine, statements by, 17
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation**
- Algeria, statements by, 368
- Angola, statements by, 363, 379, 394
- Argentina, statements by, 365, 373, 1008, 1033
- assistance from Member States, 1040
- Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 386
- Bangladesh, statements by, 368, 376, 380, 385, 394, 954, 972
- Belgium
- letter dated 17 August 2001, 386
- statements by, 389, 393, 402, 955

- Bulgaria, statements by, 955
- Burundi
 letter dated 1 May 2001, 378
 letter dated 13 December 2001, 392
 statements by, 379, 382, 393
- Cameroon, statements by, 408, 955
- Canada, statements by, 363, 365, 368, 372, 373, 402, 972
- Chile, statements by, 973
- China, statements by, 363, 375, 380, 385, 388, 389, 393, 955, 973
- Colombia, statements by, 389, 954, 955
- Congo, Democratic Republic of
 briefings by, 375
 letter dated 28 January and 11 February 2000, 364
 letter dated 26 April 2000, 178
 letter dated 1 June 2000, 178
 letter dated 13 July 2001, 1035
 letter dated 18 July 2001, 1009
 letter dated 1 August 2001, 386, 849, 853, 855
 letter dated 23 October 2001, 388
 letter dated 3 December 2001, 392
 letter dated 5 December 2001, 392
 letter dated 6 December 2001, 392
 letter dated 25 February 2002, 1009
 letter dated 28 February 2002, 1009
 letter dated 18 March 2002, 395, 849, 853, 855, 1009
 statements by, 362, 363, 365, 368, 370, 374, 379, 382, 383, 384, 385, 388, 393, 394, 398, 400, 405, 409, 410, 1008, 1009, 1032, 1035, 1036
 determinations of threats to the peace, 919
- Egypt, statements by, 382
- Emergency Relief Coordinator
 briefings by, 372
 statements by, 373
- European Union
 briefings by, 409
 statements on behalf of, 382, 390, 973
- force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032
- France, statements by, 365, 373, 375, 379, 386, 387, 388, 389, 402, 973
- Germany, statements by, 408, 409, 956
- High Commissioner for Human Rights
 briefings by, 404, 407
 reports by, 405
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 67, 73, 77, 83, 89, 93, 94, 98, 101, 102, 103, 126, 127, 130, 132, 395, 396, 397, 399, 406, 411, 412
- Ireland, statements by, 383, 393, 402, 954
- Italy, letter dated 14 July 2003, 408
- Jamaica, statements by, 368, 393, 954
- Japan, statements by, 410, 955, 973
- Malaysia, statements by, 368
- Mali, statements by, 373, 375, 382
- Mauritius, statements by, 375, 382, 394, 402
- measures involving use of armed force, 970, 972, 985
- measures not involving use of armed force, 944, 954
- Mexico, statements by, 405, 973
- Mozambique, statements by, 388, 972
- Namibia, statements by, 365, 368, 373, 379, 380, 383, 386, 388, 394, 972, 1032
- Nepal, statements by, 974
- Netherlands, statements by, 365
- new Security Council action, 43
- Nigeria, statements by, 393, 394, 954
- Norway, statements by, 402
- obligations of Member States, 995, 997, 1000
- Organization of African Unity, statements by, 362, 1033
- peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions
 regarding, 861, 866, 884
- Pakistan, statements by, 368, 956, 973
- Panel of Experts
 briefings by, 379, 392, 400
 establishment, 178
 mandate implementation, 178
 reports by, 180, 378, 391, 399, 412, 954, 955
 statements by, 402
 termination of mandate, 180
- Philippines, statements by, 973
- Political Committee on the Implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement
 briefings by, 377
 statements by, 369, 370, 377, 390
- President
 decisions announced in statements, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160
 decisions recorded in notes, 153
 letter dated 24 April 2000, 178
 letter dated 12 July 2002, 179

- statements by, 29, 43, 178, 179, 180, 364, 366, 368, 369, 371, 375, 376, 380, 385, 387, 389, 390, 394, 395, 396, 397, 399, 406, 412, 857, 867, 884, 1030, 1035, 1037, 1072
 - provisional measures, 938
 - regional arrangements, 1072
 - Resolution 1291 (2000), 178, 366, 866, 884, 919, 938, 970, 985, 1034, 1046
 - Resolution 1304 (2000), 370, 866, 920, 938, 1030, 1034, 1046
 - Resolution 1316 (2000), 371
 - Resolution 1323 (2000), 372
 - Resolution 1332 (2000), 192, 374, 866, 985, 1034, 1072
 - Resolution 1341 (2001), 377, 938, 1046
 - Resolution 1355 (2001), 10, 383, 938, 985, 1046
 - Resolution 1376 (2001), 391, 1036
 - Resolution 1399 (2002), 396, 939
 - Resolution 1417 (2002), 397, 985, 1036
 - Resolution 1445 (2002), 403, 867, 885, 939, 1037
 - Resolution 1457 (2003), 179, 403
 - Resolution 1468 (2003), 405, 861, 939, 1031
 - Resolution 1484 (2003), 406, 856, 920, 970, 997, 1000, 1038
 - Resolution 1489 (2003), 407
 - Resolution 1493 (2003), 410, 939, 944, 970, 985, 1032
 - Resolution 1499 (2003), 180, 411
 - Resolution 1501 (2003), 411, 1042
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 362, 365, 368, 373, 376, 383, 384, 389, 394, 402, 955, 973, 1033
 - Rwanda
 - letter dated 13 December 2000, 374
 - letter dated 18 February 2001, 376
 - letter dated 24 April 2001, 378
 - letter dated 1 May 2001, 378
 - letter dated 19 July 2001, 1035
 - letter dated 1 August 2001, 386
 - letter dated 8 August 2001, 386
 - letter dated 23 November and 7 December 2001, 392
 - letter dated 10 December 2001, 392
 - letter dated 18 March 2002, 395
 - letter dated 15 April 2002, 1009
 - letter dated 23 October 2002, 401
 - letter dated 28 October 2002, 401
 - statements by, 379, 382, 398, 401, 402, 405, 1033, 1036
- Secretary-General
- briefings by, 361, 375, 376, 384, 390, 398, 409, 1032
 - letter dated 31 January 2000, 178
 - letter dated 18 April 2000, 178
 - letter dated 14 August 2000, 371
 - letter dated 12 April 2001, 178, 378, 380
 - letter dated 24 April 2001, 380
 - letter dated 25 June 2001, 179
 - letter dated 10 November 2001, 179, 391, 394
 - letter dated 15 May 2002, 855
 - letter dated 9 July 2002, 179
 - letter dated 15 October 2002, 179, 399, 401, 403, 411
 - letter dated 26 February 2003, 180
 - letter dated 25 June 2003, 407
 - letter dated 14 August 2003, 411
 - letter dated 23 October 2003, 411
 - relations of Security Council with, 246, 247
 - reports by, 364, 366, 371, 374, 376, 377, 380, 383, 387, 389, 395, 396, 403, 405, 406, 410, 985
 - statements by, 410, 1034
- Security Council Missions, 10, 830, 857
- self-defence, 1008
- Singapore, statements by, 383, 385, 386, 388, 402
- South Africa
 - letter dated 9 August 2000, 193
 - letter dated 25 October 2002, 401
 - note verbale dated 31 January 2000, 364
 - statements by, 362, 398, 401, 973
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children in Armed Conflict, briefings by, 381
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, briefings by, 384, 388, 409
- Sudan, letter dated 20 November 2001, 392
- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 401
- Tanzania, statements by, 379
- Tunisia, statements by, 365, 370, 380, 386, 389
- Uganda
 - letter dated 26 January and 3 February 2000, 364
 - letter dated 20 February 2001, 376
 - letter dated 16 April 2001, 378
 - letter dated 14 November 2001, 392
 - letter dated 21 November and 10 December 2001, 392
 - letter dated 25 October 2002, 401

- letter dated 4 November 2002, 401
 statements by, 363, 379, 383, 393, 394, 401, 955, 972, 1033
- Ukraine, statements by, 368, 1034
- Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 381, 404, 407, 408
- United Kingdom, statements by, 363, 372, 376, 377, 386, 402, 973
- United States, statements by, 365, 369, 372, 373, 375, 384, 385, 387, 393, 394, 955, 1008, 1034
- Zambia, statements by, 362, 393
- Zimbabwe, statements by, 362, 379, 384, 393, 394, 401, 402, 955, 972, 1008, 1032
- Congo (Democratic Republic) — Uganda dispute**
 ICJ proceedings, 244
 Resolution 1304 (2000), 244
- Congo (Republic) situation**
 deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 53
- Congo, Democratic Republic of**
 Central African region, statements on, 465, 833, 903
 children and armed conflict, statements on, 734
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 briefings on, 375
 letter dated 28 January and 11 February 2000, 364
 letter dated 26 April 2000, 178
 letter dated 1 June 2000, 178
 letter dated 13 July 2001, 1035
 letter dated 18 July 2001, 1009
 letter dated 1 August 2001, 386, 849, 853, 855
 letter dated 23 October 2001, 388
 letter dated 3 December 2001, 392
 letter dated 5 December 2001, 392
 letter dated 6 December 2001, 392
 letter dated 25 February 2002, 1009
 letter dated 28 February 2002, 1009
 letter dated 18 March 2002, 395, 849, 853, 855, 1009
 statements on, 362, 363, 365, 368, 370, 374, 379, 382, 383, 384, 385, 388, 393, 394, 398, 400, 405, 409, 410, 1008, 1009, 1032, 1035, 1036
 Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 357, 359
 terrorism, statements on, 754
- Constitutional discussion bearing on pacific settlement of disputes**
 generally, 893
- prevention of armed conflict, 894
- Convention for the Elimination of Mercenarism in Africa**, 790
- Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction**, 818
- Convention on the Rights of the Child**, 730, 733
- Costa Rica**
 children and armed conflict, statements on, 906, 911
 HIV/AIDS, statements on, 1049
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 904
 small arms, statements on, 784, 936, 968
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 503
- Côte d'Ivoire**
 Côte d'Ivoire situation
 briefings on, 457
 statements on, 456
 letter dated 28 April 2003, 1016
 small arms, statements on, 790
- Côte d'Ivoire situation**
 Angola, statements by, 458
 Chile, statements by, 458
 China, statements by, 458
 Côte d'Ivoire
 briefings by, 457
 statements by, 456
 determinations of threats to the peace, 919
 domestic affairs, non-intervention in, 1030
 ECOWAS
 briefings by, 461
 letter dated 19 December 2002, 454, 855, 859
 statements by, 456, 1068
 France, letter dated 27 January 2003, 454
 Ghana, statements by, 455
 Guinea, statements by, 456
 investigations and fact-finding, 857, 859
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 83, 85, 130, 454, 457, 459, 460, 462
 matters of which Security Council seized, 38
 measures involving use of armed force, 970, 984
 Mexico, statements by, 458
 Nigeria, statements by, 456
 obligations of Member States, 998
 pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 866, 884
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 150, 151
 decisions recorded in letters, 160, 161

- statements by, 38, 454, 455, 459, 462, 860, 884, 937, 1030, 1042, 1068, 1069
 - provisional measures, 937
 - regional arrangements, 1068, 1078
 - Resolution 1464 (2003), 454, 866, 884, 919, 970, 984, 1030, 1060, 1068, 1078, 1079
 - Resolution 1479 (2003), 457, 866, 884, 937, 1068
 - Resolution 1498 (2003), 459, 970, 985, 1078
 - Resolution 1514 (2003), 460, 1069
 - Secretary-General
 - relations of Security Council with, 246
 - reports by, 456, 459
 - statements by, 455, 460
 - self-defence, invocation of right, 1016
 - Counter-Terrorism Committee**
 - briefings by, 742, 745, 748, 750, 756, 758, 760, 762
 - letter dated 2 January 2002, 1057
 - letter dated 15 July 2003, 759
 - letter dated 22 December 2003, 1047
 - President, decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153, 154
 - statements by, 746, 749, 751, 753, 765
 - Croatia**
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 549
 - Croatia situation
 - letter dated 10 January 2000, 561
 - letter dated 5 January 2001, 561
 - letter dated 9 July 2001, 561
 - letter dated 7 January 2002, 561
 - letter dated 10 April 2002, 561
 - letter dated 10 December 2002, 562
 - International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 701
 - post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 710
 - Croatia situation**
 - Croatia
 - letter dated 10 January 2000, 561
 - letter dated 5 January 2001, 561
 - letter dated 9 July 2001, 561
 - letter dated 7 January 2002, 561
 - letter dated 10 April 2002, 561
 - letter dated 10 December 2002, 562
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 67, 75, 113, 560, 562
 - new Security Council action, 42
 - peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 876
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 149
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155
 - statements by, 42, 562, 876
 - Resolution 1285 (2000), 560, 876
 - Resolution 1307 (2000), 560
 - Resolution 1335 (2001), 560, 876
 - Resolution 1362 (2001), 560
 - Resolution 1387 (2002), 560, 876
 - Resolution 1424 (2002), 560, 561
 - Resolution 1437 (2002), 560, 561, 876
 - Secretary-General, reports by, 561, 562
 - Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 562
- Yugoslavia**
 - letter dated 24 December 1999, 561
 - letter dated 22 December 2000, 561
 - letter dated 3 July 2001, 561
 - letter dated 28 December 2001, 561
 - letter dated 10 April 2002, 561
- Cuba**
 - Africa situation, statements on, 1052
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 652, 672, 1011
 - Middle East situation, statements on, 608, 616, 1012
 - sanctions, statements on, 963
 - terrorism, statements on, 757
 - Cuba aircraft incident**
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 52
 - Cyprus**
 - force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, letters on, 1028
 - regional arrangements, letter dated 14 February 2001, 1061
 - Cyprus situation**
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 126
 - new Security Council action, 41
 - peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 861, 876, 891
 - President
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 162
 - statements by, 540, 542
 - Resolution 1303 (2000), 540
 - Resolution 1331 (2000), 540
 - Resolution 1354 (2001), 540

- Resolution 1384 (2001), 540
 Resolution 1416 (2002), 540
 Resolution 1442 (2002), 540
 Resolution 1475 (2003), 542, 876, 891
 Resolution 1486 (2003), 542
 Resolution 1517 (2003), 41, 542
 Russian Federation, statements by, 542
 Secretary-General
 relations of Security Council with, 246
 reports by, 540, 542, 891
 Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on
 Cyprus, briefings by, 541
- Democratic Republic of Congo.** *See* Congo,
 Democratic Republic of
- Denmark**
 no exit without strategy, statements on, 809
- Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator**
 Africa situation, statements on, 426
 Guinea situation, briefings on, 446
- Deputy Secretary-General**
 Afghanistan situation, briefings on, 521
 Africa situation
 briefings on, 421
 statements on, 420
 children and armed conflict, briefings on, 726
 civilians in armed conflict
 briefings on, 771, 934
 statements on, 906
 Iraq humanitarian situation, briefings on, 688
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 651, 1055
 prevention of armed conflict
 reports by, 237
 statements on, 793
 protection of UN personnel, briefings on, 794
 Timor-Leste situation
 briefings on, 503
 statements on, 1025
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening
 cooperation with, briefings on, 810
- Determinations of threats to the peace**
 Afghanistan situation, 921, 924
 Angola situation, 919
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 922, 924
 Central African region, 936
 children and armed conflict, 923, 932
 civilians in armed conflict, 923, 934
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 919
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, 919
 decisions under Article 39, 919
 discussion relating to Article 39, 924
- Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 920
 food and security, 932
 generally, 919
 HIV/AIDS, 923, 931, 932
 humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and
 security, 933
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 922, 925
 justice and rule of law, 932
 Liberia situation, 920
 Macedonia situation, 922
 Middle East situation, 930
 peacekeeping operations, 936
 prevention of armed conflict, 923, 935
 Sierra Leone situation, 921
 small arms, 934, 935
 Somalia situation, 921
 terrorism, 923
 Timor-Leste situation, 922
 women and peace and security, 936
- Djibouti**
 Somalia situation
 briefings on, 287
 statements on, 285
 Sudan situation, letter dated 5 April 2000, 1060
- Domestic affairs, non-intervention in**
 affirmation of principle, 1030
 Afghanistan situation, 1030
 civilians in armed conflict, 1044
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, 1030
 generally, 1043
 humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and
 security, 1044
 Iraq, letter dated 26 May 2001 and 20 December
 2002, 1043
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1045
 Somalia situation, 1030
 Yugoslavia, letter dated 5 October 2000, 1043
- Draft report of Security Council**
 new Security Council action, 46
 President, decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153,
 154
- Draft resolutions**
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 141, 554
 Middle East situation, 142, 212, 222, 611, 613,
 617, 630, 632, 634
- DRC.** *See* Congo, Democratic Republic of
- East Timor situation.** *See* Timor-Leste situation
- ECCAS.** *See* Economic Community of Central African
 States (ECCAS)

Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)

- Africa situation
 - briefings on, 421
 - statements on, 237, 238, 424
- Burundi situation
 - briefings on, 240, 331
 - letter dated 25 August 2003, 240
- Central African region, briefings on, 452
- Guinea-Bissau situation
 - briefings on, 441
 - letter dated 5 February 2003, 239
- relations of Security Council with constitutional discussion, 233
 - generally, 231
 - requests or references, 231

Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS)

- Central African region, statements on, 465, 903

Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)

- Africa situation, briefings on, 427
- Côte d'Ivoire situation
 - briefings on, 461
 - letter dated 19 December 2002, 454, 855, 859
 - statements on, 456, 1068
- Liberia situation
 - briefings on, 283, 959
 - statements on, 1070
- regional organizations, statements on, 827
- small arms, briefings on, 788

ECOSOC. *See* Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)

Egypt

- Afghanistan situation, statements on, 1007
- Agenda, statements on, 29
- Central African region, statements on, 1065
- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 779, 781, 782, 905, 1044
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 382
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 725, 967
- humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 713, 1048
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 - letter dated 17 April 2000, 1003
 - statements on, 957
- Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 1015

maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 1005

Middle East situation

- letter dated 13 December 2001, 854
- Middle East situation, statements on, 607, 609, 612, 617, 628, 858, 1055
- no exit without strategy, statements on, 808, 809
- post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 820, 1050
- protection of UN personnel, statements on, 795
- small arms, statements on, 786, 787
- Somalia situation, statements on, 289
- terrorism, statements on, 753, 1016
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 992
- women and peace and security, statements on, 936

El Salvador

- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 978

Emergency Relief Coordinator

- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 - briefings on, 372
 - statements on, 373

Ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security

- Argentina, statements by, 721, 723
- Bangladesh, statements by, 723, 724, 990
- Belarus, statements by, 967
- Brazil, statements by, 725
- Canada, statements by, 722, 723, 725, 1062
- China, statements by, 721, 1061
- Egypt, statements by, 725, 967
- European Union, statements on behalf of, 725
- France, statements by, 721, 725, 1061, 1062
- investigations and fact-finding, 857
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 74
- Jamaica, statements by, 721, 724
- Japan, statements by, 725
- Malaysia, statements by, 722
- Mali, statements by, 724, 905, 1061
- matters of which Security Council seized, 32, 33
- Mauritius, statements by, 725
- measures involving use of armed force, 987, 990, 991, 993
- measures not involving use of armed force, 967
- Military Staff Committee, relations of Security Council with other UN organs, 250
- Namibia, statements by, 722, 724, 967
- Netherlands, statements by, 721
- Norway, statements by, 725

- President
 decisions announced in statements, 145, 146
 decisions recorded in notes, 152
 statements by, 32, 721, 725
 regional arrangements, 1061
 Resolution 1318 (2000), 722, 987, 990, 1029, 1046, 1060, 1061
 Resolution 1327 (2000), 33, 250, 723, 857, 987, 990, 991, 993
 Russian Federation, statements by, 251, 725, 993
 Secretary-General
 briefings by, 721, 724
 relations of Security Council with, 246
 Singapore, statements by, 725
 Sweden, statements by, 967
 Tunisia, statements by, 723
 Ukraine, letter dated 28 February 2001, 724, 725
 United Kingdom, statements by, 723, 725
 United States, statements by, 722
 Working Group on the Brahimi Report
 letter dated 10 November 2000, 722
 reports by, 722
- Equatorial Guinea**
 Central African region, statements on, 465, 903
- Eritrea**
 Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute
 letter dated 12 May 2000, 428, 1017
 letter dated 19 May 2000, 956
 letter dated 9 June 2000, 1017
 letter dated 20 and 21 July 2000, 430
 letter dated 15 March 2001, 433
 statements on, 431, 436
 Sierra Leone situation, letter dated 10 May 2000, 338, 848, 852
- Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute**
 Algeria
 letter dated 12 May 2000, 428
 letter dated 19 June 2000, 430
 Argentina, statements by, 432
 determinations of threats to the peace, 920
 Eritrea
 letter dated 12 May 2000, 428, 1017
 letter dated 19 May 2000, 956
 letter dated 9 June 2000, 1017
 letter dated 20 and 21 July 2000, 430
 letter dated 15 March 2001, 433
 statements by, 431, 436
 Ethiopia
 letter dated 7 April 2000, 1017, 1047
 letter dated 11 and 12 May 2000, 428
 letter dated 15 May 2000, 429, 956
 letter dated 18 May 2000, 956
 letter dated 2 June 2000, 1017
 letter dated 26 June and 18 July 2000, 430
 letter dated 9 January 2001, 956
 statements by, 431, 436
 force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1031
 Germany, letter dated 13 April 2000, 848
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 76, 81, 109
 measures not involving use of armed force, 944, 956
 new Security Council action, 44
 obligations of Member States, 995, 996
 peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 862, 867, 885
 Portugal, letter dated 12 May 2000, 429
- President**
 decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 148, 150
 decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159
 letter dated 7 July 2000, 194
 statements by, 175, 250, 432, 434, 435, 868, 869, 885, 945
 provisional measures, 939
 regional arrangements, 1073
 Resolution 1297 (2000), 10, 428, 867, 920, 939, 1073
 Resolution 1298 (2000), 166, 174, 211, 248, 429, 920, 940, 944, 1073, 1080
 Resolution 1312 (2000), 430, 867, 945, 1042, 1073
 Resolution 1320 (2000), 431, 867, 885, 945, 1073
 Resolution 1344 (2001), 433, 868
 Resolution 1369 (2001), 434, 868
 Resolution 1398 (2002), 436, 885
 Resolution 1430 (2002), 436
 Resolution 1434 (2002), 437, 868
 Resolution 1466 (2003), 437, 868, 885
 Resolution 1507 (2003), 44, 437, 869
 Russian Federation, statements by, 434, 956
- Secretary-General**
 briefings by, 431
 letter dated 5 and 29 July 2002, 436
 relations of Security Council with, 247
 reports by, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 436, 437
 Security Council Committees
 establishment, 174

- mandate implementation, 175
- monitoring and reporting, 175
- termination of mandate, 175, 211
- Security Council Missions, 10, 11, 428, 435, 830, 831, 857
- self-defence, invocation of right, 1017
- Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 430, 433
- Eritrea-Sudan dispute**
 - self-defence, invocation of right, 1019
 - Sudan, letter dated 7 October 2002, 1019
- Ethiopia**
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute
 - letter dated 7 April 2000, 1017, 1047
 - letter dated 11 and 12 May 2000, 428
 - letter dated 15 May 2000, 429, 956
 - letter dated 18 May 2000, 956
 - letter dated 2 June 2000, 1017
 - letter dated 26 June and 18 July 2000, 430
 - letter dated 9 January 2001, 956
 - statements on, 431, 436
 - Somalia situation, statements on, 286
- European Union**
 - Afghanistan situation, letter dated 8 and 17 October 2001, 1007
 - Angola situation, statements on behalf of, 953
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on behalf of, 553
 - Central African region, statements on behalf of, 452
 - civilians in armed conflict, statements on behalf of, 782, 905
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 - briefings on, 409
 - statements on behalf of, 382, 390, 973
 - ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on behalf of, 725
 - Georgia situation, briefings on, 596
 - HIV/AIDS, statements on behalf of, 715, 717
 - humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on behalf of, 909
 - Kosovo situation, statements on behalf of, 582
 - Middle East situation, statements on behalf of, 628, 1014
 - pacific settlement of disputes, statements on behalf of, 907, 908
 - prevention of armed conflict, statements on behalf of, 896
 - regional organizations, statements on behalf of, 827, 1065
 - Sierra Leone situation, statements on behalf of, 981, 989
 - small arms, statements on behalf of, 787
 - Somalia situation, statements on behalf of, 291
 - Tajikistan situation, statements on behalf of, 510
 - terrorism
 - letter dated 12 and 25 September 2001, 738
 - statements on behalf of, 744, 746, 749, 761
 - Timor-Leste situation, statements on behalf of, 473, 477, 479, 490, 496, 499
 - women and peace and security, statements on behalf of, 806
 - Yugoslavia situation, briefings on, 590
- Events of 11 September 2001. See Terrorism**
- Expert Group to Conduct a Review of the Effective Operation and Functioning of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda**
 - International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, reports on, 701
- Facilitator of Burundi Peace Process**
 - briefings by, 322, 324
 - statements by, 1071
- Fiji**
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1053
 - regional arrangements, letter dated 2 July 2003, 1061, 1079
- Food and security**
 - Afghanistan situation and, 822
 - Africa situation and, 823
 - Bulgaria, statements by, 823, 824, 825
 - determinations of threats to the peace, 932
 - France, statements by, 822
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 115, 128
 - Ireland, statements by, 824
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 37
 - Mauritius, statements by, 824
 - Mexico, statements by, 822
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 241, 822, 823
 - Singapore, statements by, 824
 - Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 822, 825
 - United Kingdom, statements by, 241, 822, 823, 824, 825
 - United States, statements by, 824
 - World Food Programme
 - briefings by, 128, 241, 822, 823, 825, 932

- statements by, 824
- Force, duty to refrain from threat or use of**
- affirmation of principle, 1029
 - condemnation of hostile action, 1030
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032
 - Cyprus, letters by, 1028
 - decisions regarding, 1029
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 1031
 - generally, 1028
 - Guinea situation, 1031
 - Iraq, letters by, 1028
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1038
 - Israel-Syria dispute, 1039
 - League of Arab States, letter dated 24 March 2003, 1029
 - Liberia situation, 1031
 - Mali, letter dated 11 June 2002, 1028
 - Middle East situation, 1030, 1031
 - Sierra Leone situation, 1031
 - Somalia situation, 1031
 - Yugoslavia, letter dated 5 October 2000, 1028
- France (permanent member of Security Council)**
- Afghanistan situation
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements on, 512, 513, 517, 521, 532, 533, 924, 952
 - Angola situation, statements on, 299, 307, 953
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 544, 552, 555, 557, 560
 - Burundi situation, statements on, 329, 331, 1071
 - Central African region
 - briefings on, 832
 - statements on, 464, 902
 - Central African Republic situation, statements on, 417
 - children and armed conflict, statements on, 932, 966
 - civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 1051
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
 - statements on, 365, 373, 375, 379, 386, 387, 388, 389, 402, 973
 - Côte d'Ivoire situation, letter dated 27 January 2003, 454
 - ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 721, 725, 1061, 1062
 - food and security, statements on, 822
 - Great Lakes region situation
 - briefings on, 357
 - reports on, 359
 - statements on, 356, 359
 - Guinea situation, statements on, 445
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 438, 441, 442, 443
 - HIV/AIDS, statements on, 719
 - humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 712, 1044, 1048
 - International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 702
 - invitations to participate in proceedings,
 - statements on, 65
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 - letter dated 24 February 2003, 927
 - statements on, 638, 643, 646, 655, 657, 658, 660, 661, 664, 667, 668, 674, 675, 678, 679, 682, 683, 684, 685, 926, 957, 958, 959, 976, 977, 979, 1003, 1028
 - Kosovo situation, statements on, 571, 584
 - letter dated 4 April 1991, deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 48
 - Liberia situation, statements on, 277, 282
 - Lockerbie bombing
 - letter dated 12 September 2003, 961
 - statements on, 333, 334, 961
 - Middle East situation, statements on, 613, 615, 623, 625, 630, 633, 858, 1014
 - mine action, statements on, 817, 818
 - no exit without strategy, statements on, 809
 - peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
 - post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 710, 819
 - prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 909, 910
 - protection of UN personnel, statements on, 795
 - regional organizations, statements on, 828, 1064
 - Rwanda situation, statements on, 321
 - sanctions, statements on, 799, 800, 801, 962, 965
 - Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339, 342, 349, 960, 961, 982, 989
 - small arms, statements on, 790
 - Somalia situation, statements on, 290, 291
 - terrorism, statements on, 737, 741, 762, 766, 1015
 - Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 469, 470, 471, 473, 476, 485, 487, 489, 490, 492, 500, 508
 - troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 811
 - Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 588

Functions and powers of Security Council

other functions and powers, 842

Gabon

Angola situation

letter regarding, 302

statements on, 303

Mubarak assassination attempt extradition

request, letter dated 2 June 2000, 962

Gambia

Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1011

Sierra Leone situation

letter dated 28 December 2000 and 23 January 2001, 347

statements on, 347

General Assembly

admission of new Member States, practice in relation to recommendations by Security Council, 223

Africa situation, recommendations to Security Council, 219

appointment of Secretary-General, practice in relation to recommendations by Security Council, 224

combating terrorism, recommendations to Security Council, 221

Middle East situation

practice in relation to Article 12 of Charter, 222

recommendations to Security Council, 221

prevention of armed conflict, recommendations to Security Council, 220

referral of disputes to Security Council by, 856

relations of Security Council with

election of non-permanent members, 217

generally, 216

maintenance of peace and security,

recommendations to Security Council, 218

practice in relation to Article 12 of Charter, 221

practice in relation to recommendations by Security Council, 223

reports by Security Council, 224

subsidiary organs, 226

sanctions, recommendations to Security Council, 219

Timor-Leste situation, briefings on, 484

Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining

mine action, briefings on, 816

Georgia

Georgia situation

briefings on, 595

letter dated 16 June 2000, 593

letter dated 13 September 2002, 1017

letter dated 15 September 2002, 1017

statements on, 595

Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 968

terrorism

letter dated 25 September 2001, 738

statements on, 753

Georgia situation

European Union, briefings by, 596

Georgia

briefings by, 595

letter dated 16 June 2000, 593

letter dated 13 September 2002, 1017

letter dated 15 September 2002, 1017

statements by, 595

invitations to participate in proceedings, 75, 81, 87, 97, 125, 595, 597, 599

Jamaica, statements by, 591

new Security Council action, 41

peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 877, 891

President

decisions announced in statements, 145, 146

decisions recorded in letters, 154, 159

statements by, 592, 594, 595, 596, 877, 891, 892

regional arrangements, 1074

Resolution 1287 (2000), 142, 591, 877, 891

Resolution 1311 (2000), 593, 877

Resolution 1339 (2001), 595, 877, 891

Resolution 1364 (2001), 597, 892

Resolution 1393 (2002), 597, 878, 892

Resolution 1427 (2002), 598, 878

Resolution 1462 (2003), 598

Resolution 1494 (2003), 41, 599

Russian Federation

letter dated 26 January 2000, 591

letter dated 26 June 2000, 593

letter dated 25 July 2000, 594

letter dated 11 September 2002, 1017

Secretary-General

relations of Security Council with, 247

reports by, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599

self-defence, invocation of right, 1017

Ukraine

- briefings by, 595
 letter dated 17 March 2001, 595
 voting, absence, 142
- Germany (elected member of Security Council 2003)**
 Afghanistan situation
 briefings on, 529
 letter regarding, 1007
 statements on, 529, 532, 972
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 560
 Bougainville situation, statements on, 537
 Burundi situation, statements on, 331
 Central African region, statements on, 464, 903
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 968
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
 statements on, 408, 409, 956
 Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, letter dated 13 April 2000, 848
 Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441, 442
 HIV/AIDS, statements on, 719
 International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia,
 statements on, 700
 Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 689
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 letter 24 February 2003, 927
 statements on, 667, 680, 683, 685, 959, 976, 979, 1028
 Kosovo situation, statements on, 584, 585
 Liberia situation, statements on, 282
 Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 334, 962
 Middle East situation, statements on, 632
 mine action, statements on, 817
 no exit without strategy, statements on, 809, 900
 pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 901, 905
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 894
 regional organizations, statements on, 1064
 sanctions
 briefings on, 798
 statements on, 800, 965
 terrorism, statements on, 761, 762
- Ghana**
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 455
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, letter regarding, 812
- Great Lakes region situation**
 African Union, statements by, 360
 Burundi, statements by, 358, 359, 365
- Congo, Democratic Republic of, statements by, 357, 359
- France
 briefings by, 357
 reports by, 359
 statements by, 356, 359
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 75, 81, 88, 126, 129
 Ireland, statements by, 356, 358
 Jamaica, statements by, 358
 new Security Council action, 43
 Norway, statements by, 356
- President
 decisions announced in statements, 151
 decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161
 statements by, 43, 361
- Rwanda
 briefings by, 356
 statements by, 358, 359
- Secretary-General
 briefings by, 356, 357
 reports by, 356, 358, 360, 903
- Security Council Missions, 10, 11, 381, 383, 831, 848, 857
- South Africa, statements by, 359
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes region, statements by, 361
- United Kingdom, statements by, 356, 358, 360
- United States, statements by, 356
- Zambia, letter dated 24 May 2001, 357
- Greece**
 peacekeeping operations, letter dated 10 June 2003, 813
- Group of Arab States**
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, letter dated 24 March 2003, 669
- Middle East situation
 letter dated 2 October 2000, 605
 letter dated 13 March 2001, 611
 letter dated 15 August 2001, 614
 letter dated 20 February 2002, 618
 letter dated 29 March 2002, 620
 letter dated 1 April 2002, 621
 letter dated 6 April 2002, 622
 letter dated 17 April 2002, 623
 letter dated 2 May 2002, 625, 852
 letter dated 23 July 2002, 626
 letter dated 12 September 2003, 631
 letter dated 9 October 2003, 633, 634

- statements on behalf of, 859
- small arms, statements on behalf of, 1051
- terrorism, statements on behalf of, 743, 744
- Guinea (elected member of Security Council 2003)**
 - Africa situation, statements on, 425, 966
 - Burundi situation, statements on, 331
 - civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 776
 - Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 456
 - Guinea situation, statements on, 445
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 443
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 664, 958
 - Liberia situation
 - letter dated 26 February 2001, 275
 - statements on, 279
 - mine action, statements on, 817
 - peaceful settlement of disputes, statements on, 1066
 - peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
 - sanctions, statements on, 801
 - Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 349
 - terrorism, statements on, 760, 761
 - Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 508
- Guinea situation**
 - Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 447
 - China, statements by, 445
 - Colombia, statements by, 445
 - Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator, briefings by, 446
 - force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1031
 - France, statements by, 445
 - Guinea, statements by, 445
 - High Commissioner for Refugees
 - briefings by, 444
 - statements by, 445
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 71, 73, 77, 99, 101, 443
 - Ireland, statements by, 447
 - Jamaica, statements by, 444, 447
 - Mali
 - letter dated 11 April 2001, 446
 - letter regarding, 443
 - statements by, 445, 447
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 33, 34, 36
 - Mauritius, statements by, 445
 - peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 869, 885
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 146, 147
 - decisions recorded in letters, 158
 - statements by, 33, 36, 443, 869, 885, 1031, 1069
 - regional arrangements, 1069
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 447
 - Secretary-General, letter dated 30 April 2001, 36, 77, 99, 147, 158, 446
 - Security Council Missions, 446
 - Sierra Leone, statements by, 446
 - Singapore, statements by, 445
 - Tunisia, statements by, 445, 1069
 - Ukraine, statements by, 447
 - Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations
 - briefings by, 446
 - statements by, 1069
 - United Kingdom, statements by, 444, 447
 - United States, statements by, 445, 447
- Guinea-Bissau**
 - Guinea-Bissau situation
 - briefings on, 439
 - statements on, 443
- Guinea-Bissau situation**
 - Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa
 - briefings by, 239
 - statements by, 239
 - Argentina, statements by, 438, 439, 440
 - Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 442
 - Bangladesh, statements by, 438
 - Bulgaria, statements by, 441
 - Chile, statements by, 441, 443
 - Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries
 - briefings by, 442
 - statements by, 440
 - ECOSOC
 - briefings by, 441
 - letter dated 5 February 2003, 239
 - France, statements by, 438, 441, 442, 443
 - Gambia, statements by, 441
 - Germany, statements by, 441, 442
 - Guinea, statements by, 443
 - Guinea-Bissau
 - briefings by, 439
 - statements by, 443
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 69, 87, 92, 110, 119, 124, 128, 129, 130, 132, 234
 - Jamaica, statements by, 439
 - Malaysia, statements by, 439, 440

- Mali, statements by, 439
 Mexico, statements by, 443
 Namibia, statements by, 440
 Netherlands, statements by, 438, 439
 new Security Council action, 44
 pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
 regarding, 869, 885
 Pakistan, statements by, 441
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 144, 146,
 150
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 157,
 158, 159, 162
 statements by, 233, 240, 438, 440, 442, 869
 Representative of the Secretary-General for
 Guinea-Bissau, briefings by, 440
 Russian Federation, statements by, 441, 443
 Secretary-General
 briefings by, 438
 reports by, 437, 438, 440
 Security Council Missions, 239
 Spain, statements by, 441
 Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on
 Africa, statements by, 239
 Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs,
 briefings by, 438
 United Kingdom, statements by, 438
 United States, statements by, 439, 441
 World Bank, briefings by, 439
- Haiti situation**
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 68, 466
 new Security Council action, 41
 pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
 regarding, 890
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 144
 statements by, 41, 232, 466, 890
 Secretary-General, reports by, 466
- Heads of state**
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 61
- High Commissioner for Human Rights**
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 briefings on, 404, 407
 reports on, 405
- High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)**
 civilians in armed conflict, briefings on, 772, 906
 Guinea situation
 briefings on, 444
 statements on, 445
 refugees
 briefings on, 32, 37, 91, 114, 766, 840
 statements on, 768
- High Representative for the Implementation of the
 Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina**
 briefings by, 547, 549, 551, 552, 558, 559
 reports by, 544, 547, 551, 552, 557, 559
- HIV/AIDS**
 Canada, statements by, 716
 Chile, statements by, 720
 Costa Rica, statements by, 1049
 determinations of threats to the peace, 923, 931,
 932
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 715,
 717
 France, statements by, 719
 generally, 1049
 Germany, statements by, 719
 India, statements by, 717, 933
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 72,
 91, 92, 93, 100, 121, 127
 Ireland, statements by, 716
 Jamaica, statements by, 716
 Joint UN Programme on HIV/AIDS
 briefings by, 419, 714, 716, 718
 statements by, 715, 932
 matters of which Security Council seized, 32
 Mexico, statements by, 719
 Nigeria, statements by, 717
 Norway, statements by, 717
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 147
 letter dated 31 January 2000, 235
 statements by, 233, 235, 236, 717, 931
 Resolution 1308 (2000), 227, 232, 235, 715, 923,
 932, 1046, 1049
 Secretary-General, letter dated 5 July 2000, 714
 Sweden, statements by, 933
 Tunisia, statements by, 715
 Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping
 Operations, briefings by, 715, 718
 United Kingdom, statements by, 716, 719
 United States, statements by, 717, 931, 1049
 Zimbabwe, statements by, 715
- Holy See**
 permanent observer, invitations to participate in
 proceedings, 62
- Honduras**
 ICJ
 letter dated 22 January 2002, 244
 letter dated 17 September 2002, 244
 pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 908

Humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security

Belarus, statements by, 713, 933
Brazil, statements by, 933, 1048
Canada, statements by, 1047
China, statements by, 713, 1048
Colombia, statements by, 1048
determinations of threats to the peace, 933
domestic affairs, non-intervention in, 1044
Egypt, statements by, 713, 1048
European Union, statements on behalf of, 909
France, statements by, 712, 1044, 1048
generally, 1047
India, statements by, 713, 1044, 1048
invitations to participate in proceedings, 68, 92
Iran, statements by, 713, 933
matters of which Security Council seized, 32
Netherlands, statements by, 909
Norway, statements by, 712, 909, 933
Pakistan, statements by, 713, 933, 1044
Portugal, statements by, 712
President
 decisions announced in statements, 144
 statements by, 32, 713, 1047, 1049
Russian Federation, statements by, 713, 933, 1048
Secretary-General, statements by, 711
Tunisia, statements by, 1044, 1048

IAEA. *See* International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

Iceland

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 977

ICJ. *See* International Court of Justice (ICJ)

ICRC. *See* International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

IMF (International Monetary Fund)

Timor-Leste situation, briefings on, 484

Incoming Security Council Members

invitations to participate in proceedings, 61

India

Afghanistan situation, statements on, 526, 924
Africa situation, statements on, 1052, 1067
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 557
children and armed conflict, statements on, 728, 932
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 772, 773
HIV/AIDS, statements on, 717, 933

humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 713, 1044, 1048
invitations to participate in proceedings, letter dated 28 April 2003, 66
Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 letter dated 26 March 2002, 1005
 statements on, 653, 975, 978, 1002, 1005
Middle East situation, statements on, 1013
no exit without strategy, statements on, 809
pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 902, 1016
post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 820, 1050
Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339, 981, 989
small arms, statements on, 784
terrorism, statements on, 743, 753, 761, 763
troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with
 letter regarding, 812
 statements on, 251, 810, 992, 994
women and peace and security, statements on, 806

India-Pakistan dispute

Pakistan

letter dated 23 January 2000, 1017
letter dated 22 May 2002, 1018
letter dated 19 August 2003, 855
President, decisions recorded in letters, 155, 157, 159
self-defence, invocation of right, 1017
UNMOGIP, 198

Indonesia

children and armed conflict, statements on, 967
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773, 906
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 1063
Timor-Leste situation
 briefings on, 478, 480
 letter dated 27 November 2000, 480
 statements on, 473, 476, 478, 480, 485, 490, 492, 496, 499, 502, 505, 506, 1025
women and peace and security, statements on, 803, 906

Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, 182

Informal working groups. *See also specific entity or situation*
generally, 182

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 briefings on, 659, 660, 664, 667, 927
 reports on, 926, 927

International Civilian Support Mission in Haiti (MICAH)

Secretary-General, reports by, 466

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

civilians in armed conflict, briefings on, 769, 778
 Iraq humanitarian situation, briefings on, 689
 protection of UN personnel, briefings by, 795

International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries, 790**International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, 707****International Court of Justice (ICJ)**

briefings by, 32, 91, 99, 114, 243
 Congo (Democratic Republic)-Uganda dispute, 244
 election of members, 46
 filling of vacancies, 46, 144
 Honduras
 letter dated 22 January 2002, 244
 letter dated 17 September 2002, 244
 letter dated 1 July 2000, 245
 pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 907
 President, statements by, 242, 243
 relations of Security Council with
 consideration of, 243
 election of members, 242
 generally, 242
 Resolution 1361 (2001), 46, 144, 242

International Labour Organization Convention No. 182, 730**International Monetary Fund (IMF)**

Timor-Leste situation, briefings on, 484

International Organization of la Francophonie

Central African Republic situation, statements on, 414

International Tribunal for Rwanda

annexes to statute, 209
 appointment of prosecutor, 210
 briefings by, 694, 696, 697, 699
 China, statements by, 697
 election of judges, 209
 generally, 209
 International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
 letter dated 12 May 2000, 701
 letter dated 14 June 2000, 701

invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 77, 82, 89, 95, 96, 109, 110, 123, 124

letter dated 26 July 2002, 704

letter dated 8 August 2002, 704

matters of which Security Council seized, 44

new Security Council action, 43, 44

obligations of Member States, 996

President

decisions announced in statements, 150, 151

decisions recorded in letters, 157, 159, 160, 161

letter dated 11 October 2002, 143

statements by, 44, 695, 697, 706

Prosecutor of the Tribunals

briefings by, 692, 694, 696, 697, 700

statements by, 698

reports by, 210, 699

Resolution 1329 (2000), 248, 695

Resolution 1347 (2001), 209, 704

Resolution 1411 (2002), 209, 697

Resolution 1431 (2002), 209, 248, 704

Resolution 1449 (2002), 209, 705

Resolution 1477 (2003), 210, 706

Resolution 1482 (2003), 706

Resolution 1503 (2003), 210, 698

Resolution 1504 (2003), 698

Resolution 1505 (2003), 210, 698

Resolution 1512 (2003), 44, 209, 706

Russian Federation, statements by, 693, 697

Rwanda

letter dated 26 July 2002, 704

letter dated 5 August 2003, 698

statements by, 693, 696, 700

Secretary-General

letter dated 7 September 2000, 695

letter dated 14 September 2001, 209

letter dated 26 September 2002, 705

letter dated 6 March 2003, 705

letter dated 16 April 2003, 706

letter dated 21 April 2003, 705

letter dated 28 July 2003, 698

letter dated 12 September 2003, 706

letter dated 29 September 2003, 210

letter dated 3 October 2003, 698

relations of Security Council with, 248

time frame for completion of trials, 210

Working Group on International Criminal Tribunals, 183

International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia

annexes to statute, 207

- appointment of prosecutor, 208
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, briefings on, 560
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina, statements by, 697, 700
 - briefings by, 693, 695, 697, 699, 701
 - Canada, statements by, 702
 - China, statements by, 693, 695, 697
 - Croatia, statements by, 701
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 52
 - election of judges, 208
 - Expert Group to Conduct a Review of the Effective Operation and Functioning of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda, reports by, 701
 - France, statements by, 702
 - generally, 207
 - Germany, statements by, 700
 - International Tribunal for Rwanda
 - letter dated 12 May 2000, 701
 - letter dated 14 June 2000, 701
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 76, 82, 88, 89, 95, 96, 109, 110, 123, 124
 - Jamaica, statements by, 702
 - letter dated 12 May 2000, 701
 - letter dated 14 June 2000, 701
 - letter dated 10 June 2002, 208
 - new Security Council action, 42, 43
 - obligations of Member States, 996
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 149
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 156, 161, 162
 - letter dated 19 January 2001, 143
 - statements by, 695, 697, 703
 - Prosecutor of the Tribunals
 - briefings by, 692, 694, 696, 697, 700
 - statements by, 698
 - reports by, 208, 699
 - Resolution 1329 (2000), 207, 248, 695
 - Resolution 1340 (2001), 208, 702
 - Resolution 1350 (2001), 208, 703
 - Resolution 1411 (2002), 208, 697
 - Resolution 1431 (2002), 208
 - Resolution 1481 (2003), 43, 208, 703
 - Resolution 1503 (2003), 698
 - Resolution 1504 (2003), 208, 698
 - Resolution 1505 (2003), 698
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 693, 694, 697, 702
 - Secretary-General
 - letter 7 May 2003, 703
 - letter dated 14 June 2000, 701
 - letter dated 7 September 2000, 695
 - letter dated 11 January 2001, 702
 - letter dated 19 April 2001, 703
 - letter dated 7 May 2003, 208
 - note dated 20 August 2003, 698
 - relations of Security Council with, 248
 - Serbia and Montenegro, statements by, 700
 - time frame for completion of trials, 208
 - Ukraine, statements by, 702
 - United States, statements by, 702
 - Working Group on International Criminal Tribunals, 183
 - Yugoslavia, statements by, 696
- Investigations and fact-finding.** *See also specific entity or situation*
- Burundi situation, 327
 - Côte d'Ivoire situation, 857, 859
 - ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, 857
 - generally, 856
 - Middle East situation, 857, 858
 - prevention of armed conflict, 858
 - Secretary-General, relations of Security Council with, 246
- Investigative bodies.** *See also specific entity or situation*
- generally, 183
- Invitations to participate in proceedings.** *See also specific entity or situation*
- Argentina, statements by, 65
 - basis of invitations
 - generally, 58
 - invitations not expressly extended under Rule 37 or Rule 39, 60
 - Rule 37, 58
 - Rule 39, 59
 - Brazil, statements by, 66
 - China, statements by, 64
 - Colombia, statements by, 66
 - France, statements by, 65
 - heads of state, 61
 - incoming Security Council Members, 61
 - India, letter dated 28 April 2003, 66
 - Mexico, letter dated 1 May 2003, 66
 - Palestine, statements by, 65

- participation without formal invitation, 62
 permanent observers, 62
 President
 note dated 28 February 2000, 61
 note dated 22 November 2002, 61
 statements by, 65, 66
 procedures relating to participation
 generally, 65
 limitations on participation, 66
 requests denied or not acted upon, 63
 Russian Federation, statements by, 64, 65
 stage at which participants heard, 65
 statements on behalf of other entities, 58
 transitional government representatives, 62
 Ukraine, statements by, 64
 United States, statements by, 64
- Iran, Islamic Republic of**
 Afghanistan situation, statements on, 515, 517, 522, 524, 526, 532, 924, 972
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 556, 1053, 1054
 humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 713, 933
 Iran-Iraq dispute
 letter dated 15 February 2000, 1018
 letter dated 18 April 2001, 1018
 letter regarding, 1018
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 652, 1011, 1012, 1038, 1056
 maintenance of peace and security, letter dated 3 June 2003, 1057
 Middle East situation, statements on, 615
 peacekeeping operations, statements on, 814
 terrorism, statements on, 743, 751, 753
- Iran-Iraq dispute**
 deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 52
 Iran
 letter dated 15 February 2000, 1018
 letter dated 18 April 2001, 1018
 letter regarding, 1018
 self-defence, invocation of right, 1018
- Iraq**
 children and armed conflict, statements on, 728, 966, 967
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 967
 domestic affairs, non-intervention in, letter dated 26 May 2001 and 20 December 2002, 1043
 force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, letters on, 1028
- Governing Council
 briefings by, 677
 letter dated 11 December 2003, 686
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 letter dated 10 July 2000, 928
 letter dated 17 February 2001, 1010
 letter dated 20 February 2001, 1010
 letter dated 18 June 2001, 644
 letter dated 16 August 2001, 1010
 letter dated 28 May 2002, 1010
 letter dated 11 June 2002, 1010
 letter dated 15 August 2002, 1010
 letter dated 16 September 2002, 1043
 letter dated 25 November 2002, 926
 letter dated 2 December 2002, 929
 letter dated 9 and 14 March 2003, 929
 letter dated 9 and 21 March 2003, 909
 letter dated 16 March 2003, 1011
 letter dated 21 March 2003, 929
 letter dated 24 March 2003, 1012, 1038, 1045
 letter on, 1047
 letter regarding, 1009
 statements on, 648, 654, 660, 661, 663, 665, 666, 668, 670, 686, 908, 926, 929, 957, 958, 974, 977, 1012, 1038, 1045, 1055, 1056
- Middle East situation
 letter dated 2 October 2000, 848, 851
 statements on, 608, 616, 1012
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 912, 1050
 sanctions, statements on, 963, 964
 self-determination, statements on, 1024
 terrorism, letter dated 18 September 2001, 739
- Iraq humanitarian situation**
 China, statements by, 690
 Deputy Secretary-General, briefings by, 688
 Georgia, statements by, 968
 Germany, statements by, 689
 International Committee of the Red Cross, briefings by, 689
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 127, 128, 129, 132
 matters of which Security Council seized, 39
 Mexico, statements by, 689
 President, decisions recorded in notes, 153
 Resolution 1483 (2003), 1042
 Russian Federation
 letter dated 15 June 2001, 848
 statements by, 689, 968
 Secretary-General, statements by, 968

- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 28, 689
UN Development Programme, briefings by, 688
UNICEF, briefings by, 688
United Kingdom, statements by, 689
United States, statements by, 689
World Food Programme, briefings by, 688
World Health Organization, briefings by, 688
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute**
abstention, 140, 141
Albania, statements by, 655, 663, 672
Algeria, statements by, 978, 1058, 1075
Angola, statements by, 664, 679, 976
Argentina, statements by, 643, 671, 975, 1038
assistance from Member States, 1041
Australia, statements by, 655, 663, 927, 1039
Belarus, statements by, 958
Brazil, statements by, 958
Bulgaria, statements by, 660, 664, 668, 958, 1003, 1004
Cameroon, statements by, 659, 664, 668, 678, 679, 958, 975
Canada, statements by, 643, 647, 663, 666, 978, 1003, 1055
Chile, statements by, 664, 667, 974
China, statements by, 638, 641, 642, 643, 647, 653, 657, 658, 667, 681, 976, 977, 979
Colombia, statements by, 974, 979
Cuba, statements by, 652, 672, 1011
deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 48
Deputy Secretary-General, statements by, 651, 1055
determinations of threats to the peace, 922, 925
domestic affairs, non-intervention in, 1045
Egypt
 letter dated 17 April 2000, 1003
 statements by, 957
El Salvador, statements by, 978
force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1038
France
 letter dated 24 February 2003, 927
 statements by, 638, 643, 646, 655, 657, 658, 660, 661, 664, 667, 668, 674, 675, 678, 679, 682, 683, 684, 685, 926, 957, 958, 959, 976, 977, 979, 1003, 1028
Gambia, statements by, 1011
Germany
 letter 24 February 2003, 927
 statements by, 667, 680, 683, 685, 959, 976, 979, 1028
Group of Arab States, letter dated 24 March 2003, 669
Guinea, statements by, 664, 958
Iceland, statements by, 977
India
 letter dated 26 March 2002, 1005
 statements by, 653, 975, 978, 1002, 1005
International Atomic Energy Agency
 briefings by, 659, 660, 664, 667, 927
 reports by, 926, 927
invitations to participate in proceedings, 75, 82, 83, 105, 106, 107, 115, 116, 121, 125, 128, 130, 131, 132, 687
Iran, statements by, 652, 1011, 1012, 1038, 1056
Iraq
 letter by, 1047
 letter dated 10 July 2000, 928
 letter dated 17 February 2001, 1010
 letter dated 20 February 2001, 1010
 letter dated 18 June 2001, 644
 letter dated 16 August 2001, 1010
 letter dated 28 May 2002, 1010
 letter dated 11 June 2002, 1010
 letter dated 15 August 2002, 1010
 letter dated 16 September 2002, 1043
 letter dated 25 November 2002, 926
 letter dated 2 December 2002, 929
 letter dated 9 and 14 March 2003, 929
 letter dated 9 and 21 March 2003, 909
 letter dated 16 March 2003, 1011
 letter dated 21 March 2003, 929
 letter dated 24 March 2003, 1012, 1038, 1045
 letter regarding, 1009
 statements by, 648, 654, 660, 661, 663, 665, 666, 668, 670, 686, 908, 926, 929, 957, 958, 974, 977, 1012, 1038, 1045, 1055, 1056
Ireland, statements by, 647, 976
Israel, statements by, 653, 1058
Jamaica, statements by, 957, 1004, 1055, 1056
Japan, statements by, 662
Jordan, statements by, 647, 926, 957, 1055, 1058
Kuwait
 letter dated 9 August 2000, 925
 letter dated 24 March 2003, 1038
 statements by, 647, 652, 673, 974
League of Arab States
 letter dated 24 March 2003, 669, 929, 1012
 statements on behalf of, 648, 654, 929, 957, 1056
Lebanon, statements by, 928, 1012

- Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, statements by, 647, 671, 957, 1038
- Liechtenstein, statements by, 974
- Macedonia, statements by, 978, 1003
- maintenance of peace and security, 1057
- Malaysia
- letter dated 17 July 2001, 1002
 - letter dated 7 March 2003, 665
 - letter dated 24 March 2003, 1012
 - statements by, 639, 642, 647, 662, 958, 976, 1003, 1038, 1045, 1056, 1058
- Mali, statements by, 957
- Marshall Islands, statements by, 663, 671
- matters of which Security Council seized, 38
- Mauritius, statements by, 663, 1058
- measures involving use of armed force, 971, 974, 986
- measures not involving use of armed force, 945, 956
- Mexico, statements by, 653, 655, 657, 664, 668, 675, 678, 679, 683, 685, 925, 975, 1027
- Morocco, statements by, 958, 974, 1038, 1055
- Namibia, statements by, 1003
- Netherlands, statements by, 637, 642
- new Security Council action, 41
- New Zealand, statements by, 653, 957, 975
- Nigeria, statements by, 655, 929, 977
- Non-Aligned Movement
- letter dated 10 October 2002, 650, 848
 - letter dated 6 February 2003, 661
 - letter dated 14 February 2003, 661
 - letter dated 7 March 2003, 850, 853
 - letter dated 24 March 2003, 669
 - statements on behalf of, 653, 654, 978, 979
- obligations of Member States, 997
- Office of the Iraq Programme, briefings by, 681
- peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 893
- Pakistan, statements by, 664, 674, 676, 678, 681, 927, 974, 1027, 1028, 1045, 1057
- Palestine, statements by, 1058
- Philippines, statements by, 666
- Poland, statements by, 1038
- Portugal, letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
- President
- decisions announced in statements, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162
 - letter dated 2 December 2003, 686
 - statements by, 41, 682, 687
- provisional measures, 941
- regional arrangements, 1075
- Resolution 1293 (2000), 639, 945
- Resolution 1302 (2000), 640, 945, 1010, 1041
- Resolution 1330 (2000), 206, 643
- Resolution 1352 (2001), 644, 945
- Resolution 1360 (2001), 143, 649
- Resolution 1382 (2001), 649, 945
- Resolution 1409 (2002), 168, 650, 945
- Resolution 1441 (2002), 143, 207, 656, 922, 925, 975, 1041, 1075
- Resolution 1443 (2002), 657
- Resolution 1447 (2002), 657
- Resolution 1454 (2002), 140, 658, 958
- Resolution 1472 (2003), 168, 673, 941, 946, 1027
- Resolution 1476 (2003), 168, 674, 946
- Resolution 1483 (2003), 142, 168, 206, 207, 675, 922, 946, 958, 1001, 1027
- Resolution 1490 (2003), 676
- Resolution 1500 (2003), 141, 678, 893, 1027
- Resolution 1511 (2003), 680, 922, 971, 986, 997, 1027
- Resolution 1518 (2003), 166, 169, 248, 685, 922, 946, 959, 1001
- Russian Federation
- letter 24 February 2003, 927
 - letter dated 15 June 2001, 644, 1055
 - statements by, 637, 641, 642, 643, 646, 654, 658, 659, 667, 673, 674, 675, 680, 682, 683, 684, 685, 926, 928, 957, 958, 976, 979, 980, 1028
- sanctions, 945, 946
- Saudi Arabia, statements by, 1058
- Secretary-General
- briefings by, 636, 677
 - letter dated 16 September 2002, 1043, 1075
 - note dated 28 February 2003, 663
 - note dated 10 May 2003, 676
 - reports by, 635, 639, 640, 642, 644, 648, 649, 657, 676, 678, 685, 687
 - statements by, 669, 680, 682, 686, 1026, 1045, 1056
- Security Council Committees
- briefings by, 1005
 - establishment, 168, 169
 - letter dated 22 March 2000, 636
 - letter dated 28 February 2002, 1005
 - mandate implementation, 168
 - monitoring and reporting, 168
 - termination of mandate, 168, 211

- self-defence, 1009
- self-determination, 1026
- Singapore, statements by, 671, 957, 1058
- South Africa, statements by, 666, 672, 927, 957, 974, 977, 978, 1057
- Spain
 - letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
 - statements by, 660, 661, 664, 668, 927, 976, 979
- special economic problems, 1001, 1002
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Iraq, briefings by, 677
- Sudan, statements by, 1011
- Sweden, statements by, 1004
- Switzerland, statements by, 655, 663, 666, 974
- Syrian Arab Republic
 - letter dated 22 May 2003, 142
 - statements by, 647, 650, 658, 668, 671, 674, 675, 678, 681, 684, 927, 957, 958, 976, 977, 979, 1010, 1027, 1058
- Tanzania, statements by, 929
- Tunisia
 - letter dated 24 June 2002, 1002, 1005
 - statements by, 641, 649, 975, 1003
- Turkey, statements by, 673, 957
- UN Compensation Commission
 - generally, 206
 - mandate implementation, 206
- Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, statements by, 1003
- UNICEF, statements by, 639
- United Arab Emirates, statements by, 1045
- United Kingdom
 - briefings by, 679, 683
 - letter dated 24 September 2002, 925
 - letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
 - letter dated 8 May 2003, 1027
 - statements by, 639, 641, 642, 645, 649, 655, 656, 660, 661, 664, 668, 672, 680, 682, 684, 956, 975, 976, 977, 979, 980, 1028, 1039
- United States
 - briefings by, 659, 679, 682
 - letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
 - letter dated 8 May 2003, 1027
 - statements by, 637, 643, 646, 649, 656, 661, 664, 668, 672, 678, 681, 682, 957, 958, 975, 976, 977, 980, 1010, 1011, 1027, 1028, 1039
- Venezuela, statements by, 1038
- Viet Nam, statements by, 1045
- voting, absence, 142
- Yemen, statements by, 647, 928, 929, 975, 980, 1012, 1038
- Zimbabwe, statements by, 958, 1011
- Iraq-Saudi Arabia dispute**
 - Saudi Arabia, letter dated 29 May 2001, 1018
 - self-defence, 1018
- Ireland (elected member of Security Council 2001-2002)**
 - Africa situation, statements on, 966
 - Angola situation, statements on, 309, 311
 - Burundi situation, statements on, 1071
 - civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 774, 776, 779
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 383, 393, 402, 954
 - food and security, statements on, 824
 - Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 356, 358
 - Guinea situation, statements on, 447
 - HIV/AIDS, statements on, 716
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 647, 976
 - Middle East situation, statements on, 630, 931
 - Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, statements on, 448, 962
 - Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 348, 349
 - small arms, statements on, 784
 - Somalia situation, statements on, 291
 - terrorism, statements on, 736, 746, 749, 751
 - Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 492
- Islamic Republic of Iran.** *See* Iran, Islamic Republic of
- Islamic Summit Conference**
 - Middle East situation
 - letter dated 29 March 2002, 620, 850, 853
 - letter dated 9 October 2003, 850, 853
- Israel**
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 653, 1058
 - Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 691, 1014, 1039
 - Middle East situation
 - letter dated 16 and 27 March 2001, 613
 - letter dated 6, 7, 8, 9 and 13 August 2001, 614
 - letter dated 8, 11, 19 and 20 February 2002, 618
 - letter dated 19 September 2002, 628
 - statements on, 606, 608, 609, 610, 612, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 620, 621, 623, 624, 625, 626, 628, 630, 631, 633, 634, 859, 930, 1013, 1014, 1054
 - small arms, statements on, 787

- terrorism, statements on, 743, 747, 752, 757, 1016
 UNIFIL, letter dated 2 June and 24 July 2003, 604
- Israel-Syria dispute**
 Egypt, statements by, 1015
 force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1039
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 88
 Israel, statements by, 691, 1014, 1039
 Jordan, statements by, 691, 1040
 League of Arab States, statements on behalf of, 1015
 Lebanon
 letter dated 5 October 2003, 39, 131, 690, 849, 852, 853, 1014
 statements by, 691, 1039
 matters of which Security Council seized, 39
 Morocco, statements by, 691, 1040
 Pakistan, statements by, 691, 1040
 President, statements by, 40
 referral of disputes to Security Council, 852
 self-defence, 1014
 Syrian Arab Republic
 letter dated 5 October 2003, 39, 88, 131, 690, 849, 852, 1014, 1039
 statements by, 690, 1039
 United States, statements by, 691, 1039
- Italy**
 Afghanistan situation, statements on, 517, 972
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, letter dated 14 July 2003, 408
 no exit without strategy, statements on, 900
- Jamaica (elected member of Security Council 2000-2001)**
 Angola situation, statements on, 299, 303
 Central African Republic situation, statements on, 416
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 770, 773, 774, 967
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 368, 393, 954
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 721, 724
 Georgia situation, statements on, 591
 Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 358
 Guinea situation, statements on, 444, 447
 Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 439
 HIV/AIDS, statements on, 716
- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 702
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 957, 1004, 1055, 1056
 post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 899
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 935
 refugees, statements on, 768
 Rwanda situation, statements on, 321
 sanctions, statements on, 962
 Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 348, 989
 small arms, statements on, 784, 968
 terrorism, statements on, 740
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 469, 496
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 8
 Western Sahara situation, statements on, 271
- Japan**
 Afghanistan situation
 briefings on, 529
 statements on, 529
 Agenda, statements on, 29
 Central African region, statements on, 452
 children and armed conflict, statements on, 733
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 782
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 410, 955, 973
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 725
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 662
 Kosovo situation, statements on, 582
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 899, 905
 Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 982
 small arms, statements on, 787
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 474, 484, 485, 496
- Joint UN Programme on HIV/AIDS**
 briefings by, 419, 714, 716, 718
 statements by, 715, 932
- Jordan**
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 556, 1053, 1054
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 647, 926, 957, 1055, 1058
 Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 691, 1040
 Middle East situation, letter dated 29 March 2003, 854

- peacekeeping operations, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339, 981, 990
- Somalia situation, statements on, 291
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, letter regarding, 812
- Justice and rule of law**
 - Cameroon, statements by, 837
 - Canada, statements by, 839
 - determinations of threats to the peace, 932
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 87, 122, 127
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 39
 - New Zealand, statements by, 838
 - Pakistan, statements by, 837
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 150
 - statements by, 837
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 837
 - Secretary-General, statements by, 836
 - Sweden, statements by, 839
 - Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 837
 - Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 838
 - United Kingdom, statements by, 837
 - United States, statements by, 837
 - Uruguay, statements by, 839
- Kazakhstan**
 - Afghanistan situation, statements on, 532, 972
- Kimberley Process Certification Scheme**
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 38
 - Resolution 1459 (2003), 826
- Korea, Republic of**
 - children and armed conflict, statements on, 967
 - civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 967
 - small arms, statements on, 784, 787
 - terrorism, statements on, 753
 - Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 490
 - troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 992
- Korean dispute**
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49, 51
- Kosovo situation**
 - Albania, statements by, 579, 1026
 - Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 566, 568, 576, 577, 580, 583, 584, 586
 - Bulgaria, statements by, 581, 584
 - China, statements by, 565, 566, 567, 570, 1026
 - European Union, statements on behalf of, 582
 - France, statements by, 571, 584
 - Germany, statements by, 584, 585
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 68, 72, 75, 76, 77, 85, 90, 92, 97, 101, 104, 111, 112, 118, 124, 125, 127, 565, 568, 573, 574, 575, 579, 581, 582, 587
 - Japan, statements by, 582
 - Macedonia
 - letter dated 8 June 2000, 565
 - statements by, 574
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 34
 - measures not involving use of armed force, 950
 - new Security Council action, 45
 - Norway, statements by, 569, 570
 - peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 878, 892
 - Pakistan, statements by, 582, 583, 584, 587, 1026
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161
 - statements by, 568, 569, 572, 575, 577, 579, 581, 583, 587, 878, 879, 892, 1026
 - Resolution 1244 (1999), 565, 830
 - Resolution 1367 (2001), 34, 173, 574, 950
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 574, 577, 579, 580, 581, 583, 584
 - sanctions, 950
 - Secretary-General
 - letter dated 6 September 2001, 172, 574
 - reports by, 565, 566, 568, 569, 571, 573, 575, 576, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 586, 1025
 - Security Council Committees
 - establishment, 172
 - mandate implementation, 172
 - monitoring and reporting, 172
 - termination of mandate, 172, 211
 - Security Council Missions, 10, 11, 830, 831, 857
 - self-determination, 1025
 - Serbia and Montenegro
 - letter dated 14 August 2003, 585, 849, 853, 854
 - statements by, 582, 585, 587
 - Singapore, statements by, 574, 576, 578
 - Spain, statements by, 584

- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Kosovo, briefings by, 565, 566, 567, 571, 575, 578, 580, 582, 585, 586
- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 581
- Tunisia, statements by, 572
- Ukraine, statements by, 566, 570
- Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 569, 570, 572, 573, 574, 576, 579, 581, 587
- United Kingdom, statements by, 1026
- United States, statements by, 567, 570, 574, 586
- Yugoslavia
 letter dated 13 February 2000, 848
 letter dated 13 February and 14 August 2000, 854
 letter dated 20 May 2000, 848
 letter dated 6 June, 19 July and 14 August 2000, 849
 letter dated 19 July 2000, 853
 letter dated 14 August 2000, 853
 letter dated 6 November 2001, 575
 letter dated 23 May 2002, 849
 statements by, 568, 569, 570, 571, 577, 580
- Kuwait**
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 letter dated 9 August 2000, 925
 letter dated 24 March 2003, 1038
 statements on, 647, 652, 673, 974
 Middle East situation, statements on, 607, 623
- Languages**
 provisional rules of procedure regarding application of Rules 41-47, 22
 generally, 22
- League of Arab States**
 force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, letter dated 24 March 2003, 1029
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 letter dated 24 March 2003, 669, 929, 1012
 statements on behalf of, 648, 654, 929, 957, 1056
 Israel-Syria dispute, statements on behalf of, 1015
 Middle East situation
 letter dated 2 October 2000, 605
 letter dated 13 March 2001, 854
 letter dated 13 December 2001, 616
 letter dated 20 February 2002, 850, 854
 letter dated 1, 6 and 17 April 2002, 854
 letter dated 2 May 2002, 850
 letter dated 11 June 2002, 850
 letter dated 23 July 2002, 850, 853, 854
 letter dated 20 September 2002, 854
 letter dated 12 September 2003, 854
 statements on behalf of, 616, 931
 regional arrangements, letters on, 1061, 1079
 regional organizations, statements on behalf of, 827, 1064
 Somalia situation, statements on behalf of, 286
- Lebanon**
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 928, 1012
 Israel-Syria dispute
 letter dated 5 October 2003, 39, 131, 690, 849, 852, 853, 1014
 statements on, 691, 1039
 terrorism, statements on, 751
- UNIFIL**
 letter dated 28 December 1999, 601
 letter dated 6 April 2000, 601
 letter dated 15 and 22 May 2000, 602
 letter dated 11 July 2000, 603
 letter dated 2 and 9 July 2003, 604
- Letters.** *See specific entity or situation*
- Liberia**
 Liberia situation
 letter dated 23 February 2001, 275
 letter dated 11 May 2001, 1018
 letter dated 4 June 2001, 1018
 letter dated 6 September 2001, 1018
 letter dated 31 October 2001, 276, 1019
 letter dated 20 March 2002, 1019
 statements on, 278, 1019
 Sierra Leone situation
 letter dated 3 January 2001, 347
 letter dated 24 January 2001, 347
 statements on, 349, 961
 small arms, statements on, 790
- Liberia situation**
 abstention, 141
 assistance from Member States, 1041
 Bangladesh, statements by, 277
 Belgium, statements by, 278
 China, statements by, 277
 determinations of threats to the peace, 920
 ECOWAS
 briefings by, 283, 959
 statements by, 1070
 force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1031
 France, statements by, 277, 282
 Germany, statements by, 282

- Guinea
 - letter dated 26 February 2001, 275
 - statements by, 279
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 76, 87, 95, 105, 106, 107, 125, 130, 284
 - Liberia
 - letter dated 23 February 2001, 275
 - letter dated 11 May 2001, 1018
 - letter dated 4 June 2001, 1018
 - letter dated 6 September 2001, 1018
 - letter dated 31 October 2001, 276, 1019
 - letter dated 20 March 2002, 1019
 - statements by, 278, 1019
 - Mali, statements by, 277
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 38
 - Mauritius, statements by, 277
 - measures involving use of armed force, 971
 - measures not involving use of armed force, 946, 959
 - Mexico, statements by, 282
 - new Security Council action, 41
 - obligations of Member States, 995, 996, 997, 998, 1000
 - Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, briefings by, 276
 - peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 869, 886
 - Panel of Experts
 - briefings by, 276
 - reports by, 176, 177, 275, 279, 280, 284, 1001
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 149, 150
 - decisions recorded in letters, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152
 - letters by, 281
 - statements by, 280, 283, 869, 886, 920, 940, 1070
 - provisional measures, 940
 - regional arrangements, 1070, 1076
 - Resolution 1343 (2001), 38, 166, 175, 176, 211, 248, 275, 921, 946, 998, 1031, 1041, 1076, 1080
 - Resolution 1395 (2002), 176, 279
 - Resolution 1408 (2002), 176, 177, 279, 947
 - Resolution 1458 (2003), 177, 280
 - Resolution 1478 (2003), 176, 177, 281, 920, 947, 996, 1001, 1070, 1076
 - Resolution 1497 (2003), 141, 282, 856, 920, 940, 971, 997, 1000, 1060, 1070, 1076
 - Resolution 1509 (2003), 284, 869, 886, 920, 940, 1071, 1076
 - Resolution 1521 (2003), 41, 166, 177, 248, 249, 285, 921, 940, 947, 1002
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 278
 - sanctions, 946, 947
 - Secretary-General
 - letter dated 28 June 2003, 249, 281, 856
 - letter dated 8 July 2003, 281
 - letter dated 29 July 2003, 281
 - reports by, 276, 279, 284, 1001, 1076
 - Security Council Committees
 - briefings by, 276
 - establishment, 175, 176, 177
 - letter dated 26 October 2001, 275
 - letter dated 19 April 2002, 177, 279
 - letter dated 24 April 2003, 280
 - letter dated 7 August 2003, 1001
 - letter dated 28 October 2003, 284
 - mandate implementation, 175, 176, 177
 - monitoring and reporting, 175, 176, 177
 - termination of mandate, 175, 177, 211
 - self-defence, 1018
 - Sierra Leone
 - letter dated 23 February 2001, 275
 - letter dated 27 February 2001, 275
 - Sierra Leone, statements by, 279
 - Singapore
 - letter dated 2 November 2001, 276
 - statements by, 278
 - special economic problems, 1001
 - Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Liberia, briefings by, 284
 - Tunisia, statements by, 277
 - United States, statements by, 278, 282
- Libyan Arab Jamahiriya**
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 647, 671, 957, 1038
 - Lockerbie bombing, letter dated 15 August 2003, 332, 961
 - Middle East situation
 - letter dated 21 November 2000, 608, 848, 852, 853, 854
 - statements on, 959, 1055
 - sanctions, statements on, 963
 - Somalia situation, statements on, 289, 291
- Liechtenstein**
- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1054
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 974

- peacekeeping operations, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813
- terrorism, statements on, 761
- Lockerbie bombing**
- abstention, 141
- Bulgaria, statements by, 334
- deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 53
- France
- letter dated 12 September 2003, 961
- statements by, 333, 334, 961
- Germany, statements by, 334, 962
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 87, 332
- Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, letter dated 15 August 2003, 332, 961
- measures not involving use of armed force, 949, 961
- Pakistan, statements by, 334, 962
- President, statements by, 30, 332
- Resolution 1506 (2003), 31, 141, 169, 333, 949, 961
- Russian Federation, statements by, 334
- sanctions, 949
- Security Council Committees
- mandate implementation, 169
- monitoring and reporting, 169
- termination of mandate, 169, 211
- Spain, statements by, 334
- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 334, 962
- United Kingdom
- letter dated 15 August 2003, 332, 961
- statements by, 334
- United States
- letter dated 15 August 2003, 332, 961
- statements by, 333, 961
- Macedonia situation**
- deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 50
- determinations of threats to the peace, 922
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 74, 76
- Macedonia
- briefings by, 563
- letter dated 4 March 2001, 34, 74, 146, 562, 849, 851, 855, 922, 1073, 1078
- letter dated 17 September 2001, 564
- letter dated 21 September 2001, 564
- matters of which Security Council seized, 34
- new Security Council action, 42
- President
- decisions announced in statements, 146, 147
- statements by, 563, 564, 922, 1074
- referral of disputes to Security Council, 851
- regional arrangements, 1073, 1077, 1078
- Resolution 1345 (2001), 34, 563, 922, 1073, 1077, 1078
- Resolution 1371 (2001), 42, 564, 1074, 1077
- Russian Federation, statements by, 563
- Yugoslavia, statements by, 563
- Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of**
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 978, 1003
- Kosovo situation
- letter dated 8 June 2000, 565
- statements on, 574
- Macedonia situation
- briefings on, 563
- letter dated 4 March 2001, 34, 74, 146, 562, 849, 851, 855, 922, 1073, 1078
- letter dated 17 September 2001, 564
- letter dated 21 September 2001, 564
- special economic problems, statements on, 1004
- Maintenance of peace and security**
- Egypt, statements by, 1005
- General Assembly, recommendations to Security Council, 218
- generally, 1046
- Iran, letter dated 3 June 2003, 1057
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1057
- meetings regarding, 6
- Mongolia, statements by, 1056
- obligations of Member States, 1056
- Palestine, letter dated 26 September 2002, 1057
- President, statements by, 6, 1057
- Somalia situation, 1057
- special economic problems, 1005
- Tunisia, statements by, 1005
- Malawi**
- Angola situation, statements on, 311, 953
- small arms, statements on, 787
- Malaysia (elected member of Security Council 2000)**
- Afghanistan situation, statements on, 513, 517, 951, 1008
- Angola situation, statements on, 298, 302
- Burundi situation, statements on, 323
- children and armed conflict, statements on, 966, 967
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 368
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 722

- Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 439, 440
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
letter dated 17 July 2001, 1002
letter dated 7 March 2003, 665
letter dated 24 March 2003, 1012
statements on, 639, 642, 647, 662, 958, 976,
1003, 1038, 1045, 1056, 1058
- Middle East situation
letter dated 2 October 2000, 848, 851, 853
statements on, 622, 959, 1055
- post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 710
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 896,
904, 910, 912
- refugees, statements on, 768
- responsibility of Security Council in maintenance
of peace and security, statements on, 708
- Rwanda situation, statements on, 321
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 337, 981,
988
- Somalia situation, statements on, 286
- terrorism, statements on, 747
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 469, 471,
474, 478, 480
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening
cooperation with, statements on, 992
- Western Sahara situation, statements on, 272
- Mali (elected member of Security Council
2000-2001)**
- Afghanistan situation, statements on, 952
- Angola situation, statements on, 307, 953
- conduct of business, statements on, 17
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 373, 375, 382
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in
maintenance of peace and security, statements
on, 724, 905, 1061
- force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, letter
dated 11 June 2002, 1028
- Guinea situation
letter dated 11 April 2001, 446
letter regarding, 443
statements on, 445, 447
- Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 439
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 957
- Liberia situation, statements on, 277
- Middle East situation, letter dated 15 August
2001, 848
- Rwanda situation, statements on, 320
- sanctions, statements on, 965
- Sierra Leone situation
letter dated 9 May 2000, 340
letter dated 11 May 2000, 338
statements on, 342
- small arms, statements on, 19, 784
- terrorism, letter dated 18 September 2001, 738
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening
cooperation with, statements on, 810, 990, 992
- Western Sahara situation, statements on, 271
- Marshall Islands**
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 663, 671
- Mauritius (elected member of Security Council
2001-2002)**
- Afghanistan situation, statements on, 952
- Africa situation
letter dated 10 January 2002, 420
statements on, 966
- Angola situation, statements on, 307, 311, 953,
954
- Central African region, statements on, 1065
- conduct of business, statements on, 17
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 375, 382, 394, 402
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in
maintenance of peace and security, statements
on, 725
- food and security, statements on, 824
- Guinea situation, statements on, 445
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 663, 1058
- Liberia situation, statements on, 277
- Middle East situation, statements on, 623, 628,
930, 959
- self-defence, statements on, 1013
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 349
- small arms, statements on, 784, 787, 935, 968
- terrorism, statements on, 736, 741, 746
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 487
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening
cooperation with, statements on, 251
- Measures involving use of armed force**
- Afghanistan situation, 969, 971, 984
- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 969, 984
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 970, 972,
985
- Côte d'Ivoire situation, 970, 984
- decisions relating to Article 42, 969
- decisions relating to Article 43, 984
- decisions relating to Article 44, 990
- decisions relating to Articles 46 and 47, 993
- discussion relating to Article 42, 971
- discussion relating to Article 43, 988

discussion relating to Article 44, 991
 discussion relating to Articles 46 and 47, 993
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in
 maintenance of peace and security, 987, 990,
 991, 993
 generally, 969
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 971, 974, 986
 Liberia situation, 971
 Military Staff Committee, 994
 no exit without strategy, 993
 Sierra Leone situation, 971, 980, 986, 988, 991
 Timor-Leste situation, 970, 985
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening
 cooperation with, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994

Measures not involving use of armed force

Afghanistan situation, 942, 951
 Africa situation, 966
 Angola situation, 944, 952
 children and armed conflict, 950, 966
 civilians in armed conflict, 967
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 944, 954
 decisions relating to Article 41, 942
 discussion relating to Article 41, 951
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in
 maintenance of peace and security, 967
 Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 944, 956
 generally, 942
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 945, 956
 Kosovo situation, 950
 Liberia situation, 946, 959
 Lockerbie bombing, 949, 961
 Middle East situation, 959
 Mubarak assassination attempt extradition
 request, 949, 962
 Sierra Leone situation, 948, 959
 small arms, 968
 Somalia situation, 949
 terrorism, 950
 women and peace and security, 951
 wrap-up discussions, 968

Meetings

maintenance of peace and security, regarding, 6
 provisional rules of procedure regarding
 application of Rules 1-5, 5
 generally, 5
 procedural developments, 7
 Security Council Missions, regarding, 9, 11
 United Kingdom, statements by, 7
 United States, statements by, 7

Mexico (elected member of Security Council 2002-2003)

Africa situation, statements on, 966, 1067
 Bougainville situation, statements on, 538
 Central African region
 briefings on, 834
 statements on, 1065
 children and armed conflict, statements on, 734
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 780,
 910
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
 statements on, 405, 973
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 458
 food and security, statements on, 822
 Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 443
 HIV/AIDS, statements on, 719
 invitations to participate in proceedings, letter
 dated 1 May 2003, 66
 Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 689
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 653, 655,
 657, 664, 668, 675, 678, 679, 683, 685, 925,
 975, 1027
 Liberia situation, statements on, 282
 Middle East situation, statements on, 619, 622,
 1013
 mine action, statements on, 818
 pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 907,
 908, 913
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 895
 protection of UN personnel, statements on, 796
 sanctions, statements on, 801, 966
 terrorism, statements on, 746, 760, 763, 1015
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 500, 508
 women and peace and security, statements on,
 807

Middle East situation. *See also specific country*

abstention, 139, 140, 141
 Algeria, statements by, 608, 612, 632
 Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs
 briefings by, 630
 statements by, 1014
 Australia, statements by, 632
 Bahrain
 letter dated 11 June 2002, 625, 852
 statements by, 930
 Bangladesh, statements by, 613, 616, 622
 Belgium, letter dated 8 and 10 August 2001, 614
 Brazil, statements by, 931, 1013
 Bulgaria, statements by, 630, 632, 633
 Cameroon, statements by, 622

- Canada, statements by, 1012
- Chile, statements by, 930
- China, statements by, 610, 633
- Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People
- letter dated 24 March 2000, 229
 - letter dated 2 October 2000, 229
 - letter dated 7 March 2001, 229
 - letter dated 24 March 2001, 229
 - letter dated 5 April 2001, 229
 - letter dated 19 April 2001, 230
 - letter dated 22 August 2001, 230
 - letter dated 28 September 2001, 230
 - letter dated 23 October 2001, 230
 - letter dated 4 December 2001, 230
 - letter dated 5 March 2002, 230
 - letter dated 23 April 2002, 230
 - letter dated 14 August 2002, 230
 - letter dated 21 April 2003, 231
 - letter dated 17 July 2003, 231
 - statements by, 627
- Cuba, statements by, 608, 616, 1012
- determinations of threats to the peace, 930
- draft resolutions, 142, 212, 222, 611, 613, 617, 630, 632, 634
- Egypt
- letter dated 13 December 2001, 854
- Egypt, statements by, 607, 609, 612, 617, 628, 858, 1055
- European Union, statements on behalf of, 628, 1014
- force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1030, 1031
- France, statements by, 613, 615, 623, 625, 630, 633, 858, 1014
- General Assembly
- practice in relation to Article 12 of Charter, 222
 - recommendations to Security Council, 221
- Germany, statements by, 632
- Group of Arab States
- letter dated 2 October 2000, 605
 - letter dated 13 March 2001, 611
 - letter dated 15 August 2001, 614
 - letter dated 20 February 2002, 618
 - letter dated 29 March 2002, 620
 - letter dated 1 April 2002, 621
 - letter dated 6 April 2002, 622
 - letter dated 17 April 2002, 623
 - letter dated 2 May 2002, 625, 852
 - letter dated 23 July 2002, 626
 - letter dated 12 September 2003, 631
 - letter dated 9 October 2003, 633, 634
 - statements on behalf of, 859
- India, statements by, 1013
- investigations and fact-finding, 857, 858
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 65, 70, 71, 74, 79, 87, 91, 93, 99, 101, 102, 111, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119, 124, 127, 130, 131
- Iran, statements by, 615
- Iraq
- letter dated 2 October 2000, 848, 851
 - statements by, 608, 616, 1012
- Ireland, statements by, 630, 931
- Islamic Summit Conference
- letter dated 29 March 2002, 620, 850, 853
 - letter dated 9 October 2003, 850, 853
- Israel
- letter dated 16 and 27 March 2001, 613
 - letter dated 6, 7, 8, 9 and 13 August 2001, 614
 - letter dated 8, 11, 19 and 20 February 2002, 618
 - letter dated 19 September 2002, 628
 - statements by, 606, 608, 609, 610, 612, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 620, 621, 623, 624, 625, 626, 628, 630, 631, 633, 634, 859, 930, 1013, 1014, 1054
- Jordan, letter dated 29 March 2003, 854
- Kuwait, statements by, 607, 623
- League of Arab States
- letter dated 2 October 2000, 605
 - letter dated 13 March 2001, 854
 - letter dated 13 December 2001, 616
 - letter dated 20 February 2002, 850, 854
 - letter dated 1, 6 and 17 April 2002, 854
 - letter dated 2 May 2002, 850
 - letter dated 11 June 2002, 850
 - letter dated 23 July 2002, 850, 853, 854
 - letter dated 20 September 2002, 854
 - letter dated 12 September 2003, 854
 - statements on behalf of, 616, 931
- Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
- letter dated 21 November 2000, 608, 848, 852, 853, 854
 - statements by, 959, 1055
- Malaysia
- letter dated 2 October 2000, 848, 851, 853
 - statements by, 622, 959, 1055
- Mali, letter dated 15 August 2001, 848
- matters of which Security Council seized, 32

- Mauritius, statements by, 623, 628, 930, 959
measures not involving use of armed force, 959
Mexico, statements by, 619, 622, 1013
Morocco, statements by, 930, 941
Namibia, statements by, 610
Netherlands, statements by, 610
new Security Council action, 40
Non-Aligned Movement
 letter dated 2 October 2000, 605, 848
 letter dated 2 April 2002, 621
 letter dated 12 September 2003, 850
 letter dated 9 October 2003, 633, 850, 853
 statements on behalf of, 610
Norway, statements by, 617, 630, 1014
Oman, statements by, 930
Organization of the Islamic Conference
 letter dated 9 October 2003, 633
 statements on behalf of, 930, 959
peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions
 regarding, 879, 893
Palestine
 letter dated 29 September 2000, 606
 letter dated 2 October 2000 and 20 February
 2002, 850
 letter dated 2 October 2000, 605, 851, 854
 letter dated 20 November 2000, 609
 letter dated 18 December 2000, 610
 letter dated 9 and 12 March 2001, 611
 letter dated 31 July and 13, 14 and 16 August
 2001, 614
 letter dated 1, 5, 13 and 15 February 2002, 618
 letter dated 20 February 2002, 618, 850, 854
 letter dated 29 March 2002, 620
 letter dated 10 April 2002, 858
 letter dated 20 September 2002, 627, 628
 statements by, 6, 606, 608, 609, 611, 615, 616,
 617, 618, 620, 621, 623, 624, 625, 626, 628,
 630, 631, 633, 634, 859, 1054
President
 decisions announced in statements, 144, 145,
 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156,
 157, 158, 161
 statements by, 40, 618, 623, 626, 880
proposed but not established subsidiary organs,
 212
Qatar
 letter dated 15 August 2001, 848
 statements by, 1012
referral of disputes to Security Council, 851
Resolution 1322 (2000), 139, 608, 614, 879
Resolution 1397 (2002), 140, 619, 880, 893
Resolution 1402 (2002), 142, 620, 880, 1031
Resolution 1403 (2002), 622
Resolution 1405 (2002), 250, 624, 625, 858
Resolution 1435 (2002), 140, 629, 880, 1031
Resolution 1515 (2003), 634, 880
Resolution 1520 (2003), 40
Russian Federation, statements by, 617, 633
Saudi Arabia, statements by, 931, 1012, 1014
Secretary-General
 briefings by, 618, 619, 931
 letter dated 22 April 2002, 858
 letter dated 1 May 2002, 625, 858
 statements by, 620, 628, 1013
self-defence, 1012
Singapore, statements by, 613, 623, 911, 1012
South Africa
 letter dated 2 October 2000, 848, 851
 statements by, 612, 622, 1012
Spain, statements by, 620, 625, 632
Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace
 Process, briefings by, 627, 629, 630, 631, 635,
 1014
Sudan, statements by, 930, 931, 1012
Syrian Arab Republic
 letter dated 20 September 2002, 627
 letter dated 9 October 2003, 850, 853, 854
 note verbale dated 20 September 2002, 6
 statements by, 6, 619, 620, 621, 630, 631, 633,
 1013
Tunisia
 letter dated 1 April 2002, 850
 letter dated 17 April 2002, 858
 statements by, 617, 930
Ukraine, statements by, 142, 610, 615
Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs
 briefings by, 629, 630, 634
 statements by, 1014
United Arab Emirates, statements by, 1013
United Kingdom, statements by, 610, 615, 617,
 623, 632, 859, 1013
United States
 letter dated 17 October 2000, 609
 statements by, 607, 610, 611, 613, 614, 616,
 617, 619, 620, 622, 623, 624, 625, 627, 628,
 629, 630, 632, 633, 634, 859
UNTSO, 203
vetoes of draft resolutions, 222
voting

- non-participation, 142
- non-procedural matters, 137
- Yemen, letter dated 20 February 2002, 854
- Yugoslavia, letter dated 29 June 2000, 852
- Military Staff Committee**
- measures involving use of armed force, 994
- relations of Security Council with
 - assessments of work of Security Council, 251
 - ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, 250
 - generally, 250
 - no exit without strategy, 251
 - troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, 251
- Russian Federation
 - letter dated 6 July 2001, 994
 - statements by, 994
- Mine action**
- Bulgaria, statements by, 817
- deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 51
- France, statements by, 817, 818
- Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining, briefings by, 816
- Germany, statements by, 817
- Guinea, statements by, 817
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 127, 132
- matters of which Security Council seized, 40
- Mexico, statements by, 818
- Pakistan, statements by, 817
- President
 - decisions announced in statements, 151
 - statements by, 40, 818
- Russian Federation, statements by, 817
- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 817
- Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 816
- United Kingdom, statements by, 817
- MINUCI.** *See* UN Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (MINUCI)
- MINURCA.** *See* UN Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA)
- MINURSO.** *See* UN Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO)
- MIPONUH.** *See* UN Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (MIPONUH)
- Moldova**
- terrorism, letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
- Mongolia**
- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1053, 1081
- maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 1056
- post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 711
- Montenegro.** *See* Serbia and Montenegro
- MONUC.** *See* UN Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC)
- Morocco**
- Angola situation, statements on, 299
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 958, 974, 1038, 1055
- Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 691, 1040
- Middle East situation, statements on, 930, 941
- Western Sahara situation
 - letter dated 24 February 2000, 270
 - letters regarding, 273, 274
- Mozambique**
- Angola situation, statements on, 307, 953
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 388, 972
- Mozambique situation**
- deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49
- Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request**
- abstention, 140
- Algeria, letter dated 1 June 2000, 962
- deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 51
- Gabon, letter dated 2 June 2000, 962
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 76
- Ireland, statements by, 448, 962
- matters of which Security Council seized, 35
- measures not involving use of armed force, 949, 962
- Resolution 1372 (2001), 35, 140, 448, 949, 962
- Russian Federation, statements by, 448
- sanctions, 949
- South Africa, letter dated 1 June 2000, 962
- Sudan
 - letter dated 1 June 2000, 962
 - statements by, 448
- United Kingdom, statements by, 448, 962
- United States, statements by, 448, 962
- Multinational forces**
- assistance from Member States, 1042
- Myanmar**
- children and armed conflict, statements on, 734
- Nagorny Karabakh situation**
- deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 50

Namibia (elected member of Security Council 2000)

- Angola situation, statements on, 297, 299, 311, 954
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 365, 368, 373, 379, 380, 383, 386, 388, 394, 972, 1032
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 722, 724, 967
- Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 440
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1003
- Middle East situation, statements on, 610
- no exit without strategy, statements on, 808
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 792, 902
- protection of UN personnel, statements on, 795
- Sierra Leone situation
 - letter dated 11 May 2000, 338, 848
 - statements on, 989
- small arms, statements on, 787
- Timor-Leste situation
 - briefings on, 480
 - statements on, 468, 476, 480
- Western Sahara situation
 - letters regarding, 274
 - statements on, 271
- women and peace and security, statements on, 906
- Yugoslavia situation
 - letter dated 11 May 2000, 852
 - statements on, 588

Navigation on Danube River

- deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 48

Nepal

- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 974
- terrorism, statements on, 754
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 810
- women and peace and security, statements on, 803

Netherlands (elected member of Security Council 2000)

- Afghanistan situation
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements on, 951, 971
- Angola situation, statements on, 297, 298, 302
- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 543, 548

- Burundi situation, statements on, 323
- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 770
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 365
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 721
- Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 438, 439
- humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 909
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 637, 642
- Middle East situation, statements on, 610
- no exit without strategy, letter dated 6 November 2000, 807
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 792, 896, 935
- refugees, statements on, 767
- responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 708
- Rwanda situation, statements on, 320
- sanctions, statements on, 962, 964
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 341, 960
- Somalia situation, statements on, 286
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 471, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 480
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, letter regarding, 812
- Western Sahara situation, statements on, 271

New Zealand

- Afghanistan situation
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements on, 522
- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1053, 1054
- Bougainville situation, statements on, 538
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 653, 957, 975
- justice and rule of law, statements on, 838
- peacekeeping operations, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813
- post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 711
- sanctions, statements on, 962, 964
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 505
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with
 - letter regarding, 812
 - statements on, 811, 992
- women and peace and security, statements on, 906

Nigeria

- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1054
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 393, 394, 954
- Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 456
- HIV/AIDS, statements on, 717
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 655, 929, 977
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 908, 1050
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 993

No exit without strategy

- Argentina, statements by, 809
- Bangladesh, statements by, 808
- Canada, statements by, 808, 809
- China, statements by, 993
- Denmark, statements by, 809
- Egypt, statements by, 808, 809
- France, statements by, 809
- Germany, statements by, 809, 900
- India, statements by, 809
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 71
- Italy, statements by, 900
- matters of which Security Council seized, 33
- measures involving use of armed force, 993
- Military Staff Committee, relations of Security Council with other UN organs, 251
- Namibia, statements by, 808
- Netherlands, letter dated 6 November 2000, 807
- Pakistan, statements by, 808
- President
 - decisions recorded in letters, 156
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152
 - statements by, 808
- Thailand, statements by, 900
- Ukraine, statements by, 900
- United Kingdom, statements by, 808, 809
- United States, statements by, 900

Nobel Peace Prize

- matters of which Security Council seized, 35
- President
 - decisions announced in statements, 147
 - statements by, 35, 821
- Secretary-General, statements by, 821

Non-Aligned Movement

- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 - letter dated 10 October 2002, 650, 848
 - letter dated 6 February 2003, 661
 - letter dated 14 February 2003, 661

- letter dated 7 March 2003, 850, 853
- letter dated 24 March 2003, 669
- statements on behalf of, 653, 654, 978, 979
- Middle East situation
 - letter dated 2 October 2000, 605, 848
 - letter dated 2 April 2002, 621
 - letter dated 12 September 2003, 850
 - letter dated 9 October 2003, 633, 850, 853
 - statements on behalf of, 610

Non-Member States, purposes and principles of UN and, 1043

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

- Afghanistan situation, letter dated 2 and 6 October 2003, 533

Norway (elected member of Security Council 2001-2002)

- Afghanistan situation, statements on, 517, 971, 1007
- Africa situation, statements on, 966
- Angola situation, statements on, 307, 313
- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 774, 781
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 402
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 725
- Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 356
- HIV/AIDS, statements on, 717
- humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 712, 909, 933
- Kosovo situation, statements on, 569, 570
- Middle East situation, statements on, 617, 630, 1014
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 349
- small arms, statements on, 19, 784
- Somalia situation, statements on, 289
- terrorism, statements on, 737, 741, 746, 749, 751, 1015
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 489, 491, 493, 496

Notes verbales. See specific entity or situation

OAS (Organization of American States)

- regional organizations, statements on, 827

OAU. See Organization of African Unity (OAU)

Obligations of Member States

- Afghanistan situation, 995, 996, 997, 999
- Angola situation, 995
- Article 48, under, 994
- Article 49, under, 998

- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 998, 1000, 1081
 calls for mutual assistance, 998, 999
 Charter, under, 1080
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 995, 997, 1000
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, 998
 Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 995, 996
 International Tribunal for Rwanda, 996
 International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, 996
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 997
 Liberia situation, 995, 996, 997, 998, 1000
 maintenance of peace and security, 1056
 pacific settlement of disputes, 901
 Security Council decisions under Article 41, under, 995
 Security Council decisions under Article 42, under, 997
 Sierra Leone situation, 995, 996, 999, 1000
 Somalia situation, 996, 999
- Occupied Arab territories.** *See specific country*
- Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs**
 Liberia situation, briefings on, 276
- Office of the Iraq Programme**
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, briefings on, 681
- OIC.** *See* Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC)
- Oman**
 Middle East situation, statements on, 930
- Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)**
 briefings by, 33, 73
 regional organizations, statements on, 827
- Organization of African Unity (OAU).** *See also* African Union
 Africa situation
 briefings on, 421
 statements on, 424
 Central African Republic situation, letter regarding, 412
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 362, 1033
- Organization of American States (OAS)**
 regional organizations, statements on, 827
- Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC)**
 Middle East situation
 letter dated 9 October 2003, 633
 statements on behalf of, 930, 959
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on behalf of, 1063
 terrorism
 letter dated 14 September 2001, 738
 statements on behalf of, 752, 754
- OSCE.** *See* Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)
- Pacific settlement of disputes**
 Afghanistan situation, 873, 888
 Africa situation, 888
 Angola situation, 861, 864, 882
 Armenia, statements by, 1016
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 875, 890
 Bougainville situation, 875, 890
 Bulgaria, statements by, 901, 907
 Burundi situation, 865, 883
 Cameroon, statements by, 907
 Central Africa region, 861
 Central African Republic situation, 883
 China, statements by, 901
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 861, 866, 884
 constitutional discussion bearing on generally, 893
 prevention of armed conflict, 894
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, 866, 884
 Croatia situation, 876
 Cyprus situation, 861, 876, 891
 efforts of Security Council, 880
 Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 862, 867, 885
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 907, 908
 general and thematic issues, 862
 generally, 860
 Georgia situation, 877, 891
 Germany, statements by, 901, 905
 Guinea situation, 869, 885
 Guinea, statements by, 1066
 Guinea-Bissau situation, 869, 885
 Haiti situation, 890
 Honduras, statements by, 908
 ICJ, statements by, 907
 India, statements by, 902, 1016
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 86, 128, 132
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 893
 Kosovo situation, 878, 892
 Liberia situation, 869, 886
 matters of which Security Council seized, 39
 Mexico, statements by, 907, 908, 913

- Middle East situation, 879, 893
obligations of Member States, 901
Pakistan, statements by, 901, 908
Personal Representative of the Secretary-General
for Timor-Leste, statements by, 829, 900
President
decisions announced in statements, 150
statements by, 39, 829, 880
recommendations, 864
regional arrangements, 893, 1066, 1068
role of Security Council, 862, 894, 900, 902, 907,
912
Secretary-General, statements by, 829, 900, 907,
912, 1066
self-defence, 1016
Sierra Leone situation, 862, 869, 886
Somalia situation, 861, 870, 886
Spain, statements by, 902, 905
Sudan situation, 872, 888
Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 901
Tajikistan situation, 875, 890
Timor-Leste situation, 874, 889
Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs,
statements by, 829
United States, statements by, 901, 913
West Africa region, 888
Western Sahara situation, 861, 872, 887
- Pakistan (elected member of Security Council 2003)**
Afghanistan situation, statements on, 515, 517,
522, 526, 952, 972
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on,
1054
children and armed conflict, statements on, 734
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773,
780, 967
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 368, 956, 973
Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441
humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and
security, statements on, 713, 933, 1044
India-Pakistan dispute
letter dated 23 January 2000, 1017
letter dated 22 May 2002, 1018
letter dated 19 August 2003, 855
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 664, 674,
676, 678, 681, 927, 974, 1027, 1028, 1045,
1057
Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 691, 1040
justice and rule of law, statements on, 837
Kosovo situation, statements on, 582, 583, 584,
587, 1026
Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 334, 962
mine action, statements on, 817
no exit without strategy, statements on, 808
pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 901,
908
peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 896,
898, 902, 909, 910, 912, 935, 1016
regional organizations, statements on, 828, 1064
sanctions, statements on, 800, 963
Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339, 982,
989
small arms, statements on, 784, 1051
terrorism
letter dated 13 September 2001, 738
statements on, 743, 744, 747, 753, 758, 759,
762
troop-contributing countries, strengthening
cooperation with, statements on, 810, 811
- Palestine.** *See also* Middle East situation
invitations to participate in proceedings,
statements on, 65
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1058
maintenance of peace and security, letter dated
26 September 2002, 1057
Middle East situation
letter dated 29 September 2000, 606
letter dated 2 October 2000 and 20 February
2002, 850
letter dated 2 October 2000, 605, 851, 854
letter dated 20 November 2000, 609
letter dated 18 December 2000, 610
letter dated 9 and 12 March 2001, 611
letter dated 31 July and 13, 14 and 16 August
2001, 614
letter dated 1, 5, 13 and 15 February 2002, 618
letter dated 20 February 2002, 618, 850, 854
letter dated 29 March 2002, 620
letter dated 10 April 2002, 858
letter dated 20 September 2002, 627, 628
statements on, 6, 606, 608, 609, 611, 615, 616,
617, 618, 620, 621, 623, 624, 625, 626, 628,
630, 631, 633, 634, 859, 1054
permanent observer, invitations to participate in
proceedings, 62
self-determination, statements on, 1024
terrorism, statements on, 743

Papua New Guinea

Bougainville situation, statements on, 536, 538

Peacekeeping operations. *See also specific entity or situation*

abstention, 140

Angola, statements by, 815

assistance from Member States, 1042

Bulgaria, statements by, 815

Canada, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813

China, statements by, 815

determinations of threats to the peace, 936

France, statements by, 815

generally, 184

Greece, letter dated 10 June 2003, 813

Guinea, statements by, 815

invitations to participate in proceedings, 87

Iran, statements by, 814

Jordan, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813

Liechtenstein, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813

matters of which Security Council seized, 37

New Zealand, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813

Pakistan, statements by, 815

President

decisions recorded in letters, 160

letter dated 7 March 2003, 228

statements by, 8

Resolution 1422 (2002), 813, 1053, 1082

Resolution 1487 (2003), 37, 140, 815, 1054, 1082

Russian Federation, statements by, 815

Secretary-General

relations of Security Council with, 248

statements by, 813

Spain, statements by, 815

Switzerland, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813

United Kingdom, statements by, 815

United States, statements by, 815

Uruguay, statements by, 814

Pelindaba, Treaty of

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 51

Permanent observers

invitations to participate in proceedings, 62

Personal Representative of the Secretary-General for Timor-Leste

pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 829, 900

Peru

small arms, statements on, 784, 785

terrorism, statements on, 743, 744, 747, 751, 754

Philippines

Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 973

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 666

Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 504

Poland

Afghanistan situation, letter regarding, 1007

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1038

Political Committee on the Implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement

briefings by, 377

statements by, 369, 370, 377, 390

Political missions. *See specific entity or situation***Portugal****Angola situation**

letter dated 26 April 2002, 315

letter regarding, 302

statements on, 313

Bosnia and Herzegovina situation

letter dated 23 May 2000, 544

letter dated 14 June 2000, 545

Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, letter dated 12 May 2000, 429

humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 712

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, letter dated 18 March 2003, 927

sanctions, statements on, 964

Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339

Timor-Leste situation

letter dated 25 January 2001, 483

statements on, 493, 502, 503, 1025

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Algeria, statements by, 710, 711, 1065

Canada, statements by, 711

Colombia, statements by, 1050, 1062

Croatia, statements by, 710

Egypt, statements by, 820, 1050

France, statements by, 710, 819

generally, 1049

India, statements by, 820, 1050

invitations to participate in proceedings, 69, 73

Jamaica, statements by, 899

Malaysia, statements by, 710

matters of which Security Council seized, 33

Mongolia, statements by, 711

new Security Council action, 45

New Zealand, statements by, 711

President

decisions announced in statements, 144, 146

- statements by, 33, 45, 232, 240, 711, 820, 864, 882, 899, 1050
- regional arrangements, 1062, 1065
- Secretary-General
 - briefings by, 709
 - reports by, 708, 711
 - statements by, 818, 899
- Tunisia, letter dated 25 January 2001, 818, 820, 1047
- Ukraine, statements by, 820
- United Kingdom, statements by, 1062
- United States, statements by, 710, 820, 1050
- Presidency**
 - Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa, decisions recorded in notes, 153, 154
 - admission of new Member States, decisions announced in statements, 144, 145, 148, 149
 - Afghanistan situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 145, 150
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 157, 158, 160, 161
 - decisions recorded in notes, 153
 - statements on, 512, 532, 873, 888, 921, 940, 1030
 - Africa Day, decisions recorded in notes, 153
 - Africa situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 148
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 156, 157, 158, 160, 162
 - decisions recorded in notes, 153
 - note dated 1 March 2002, 423
 - statements on, 233, 238, 419, 423, 425, 888, 1066
 - Agenda, statements on, 27
 - al-Qaida and Taliban, decisions recorded in notes, 153
 - Angola situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 147, 148
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152
 - notes regarding, 306, 308
 - statements on, 309, 311, 313, 864, 865, 882, 1041
 - anniversary of 11 September 2001
 - decisions announced in statements, 149
 - statements on, 37, 764
 - assessments of work of Security Council, 14
 - BONUCA, statements on, 195
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 146, 149
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 159
 - statements on, 544, 545, 546, 549, 559, 891
 - Bougainville situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 145
 - decisions recorded in letters, 157, 158, 160, 162
 - letter dated 23 December 2003, 890
 - statements on, 33, 539, 875
 - Burundi situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161
 - statements on, 42, 233, 324, 325, 327, 328, 329, 330, 332, 865, 866, 883, 1071
 - Central African region
 - decisions announced in statements, 149
 - statements on, 11, 37, 453, 835
 - Central African Republic situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 144, 146, 147, 149
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 159, 161
 - statements on, 413, 414, 415, 417, 418, 883
 - children and armed conflict
 - decisions announced in statements, 148
 - statements on, 731, 732
 - civilians in armed conflict
 - decisions announced in statements, 148, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 157
 - letter dated 14 February 2001, 227
 - letter dated 21 June 2001, 774
 - statements on, 771, 776, 779, 782, 1052
 - combating terrorism, statements on, 1079
 - conduct of business, statements on, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160
 - decisions recorded in notes, 153
 - letter dated 24 April 2000, 178
 - letter dated 12 July 2002, 179
 - statements on, 29, 43, 178, 179, 180, 364, 366, 368, 369, 371, 375, 376, 380, 385, 387, 389, 390, 394, 395, 396, 397, 399, 406, 412, 857, 867, 884, 1030, 1035, 1037, 1072

- Côte d'Ivoire situation
decisions announced in statements, 150, 151
decisions recorded in letters, 160, 161
statements on, 38, 454, 455, 459, 462, 860, 884, 937, 1030, 1042, 1068, 1069
- Counter-Terrorism Committee, decisions
recorded in notes, 152, 153, 154
- Croatia situation
decisions announced in statements, 149
decisions recorded in letters, 155
statements on, 42, 562, 876
- Cyprus situation
decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 162
statements on, 540, 542
- documentation
decisions recorded in letters, 159
decisions recorded in notes, 152
- draft report of Security Council, decisions
recorded in notes, 152, 153, 154
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in
maintenance of peace and security
decisions announced in statements, 145, 146
decisions recorded in notes, 152
statements on, 32, 721, 725
- Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute
decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 148, 150
decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159
letter dated 7 July 2000, 194
statements on, 175, 250, 432, 434, 435, 868, 869, 885, 945
- Georgia situation
decisions announced in statements, 145, 146
decisions recorded in letters, 154, 159
statements on, 592, 594, 595, 596, 877, 891, 892
- Great Lakes region situation
decisions announced in statements, 151
decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161
statements on, 43, 361
- Guinea situation
decisions announced in statements, 146, 147
decisions recorded in letters, 158
statements on, 33, 36, 443, 869, 885, 1031, 1069
- Guinea-Bissau situation
decisions announced in statements, 144, 146, 150
decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 157, 158, 159, 162
statements on, 233, 240, 438, 440, 442, 869
- Haiti situation
decisions announced in statements, 144
statements on, 41, 232, 466, 890
- HIV/AIDS
decisions announced in statements, 147
letter dated 31 January 2000, 235
statements on, 233, 235, 236, 717, 931
- humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and
security
decisions announced in statements, 144
statements on, 32, 713, 1047, 1049
- ICJ, statements on, 242, 243
- India-Pakistan dispute, decisions recorded in
letters, 155, 157, 159
- International Tribunal for Rwanda
decisions announced in statements, 150, 151
decisions recorded in letters, 157, 159, 160, 161
letter dated 11 October 2002, 143
statements on, 44, 695, 697, 706
- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
decisions announced in statements, 149
decisions recorded in letters, 154, 156, 161, 162
letter dated 19 January 2001, 143
statements on, 695, 697, 703
- invitations to participate in proceedings
note dated 28 February 2000, 61
note dated 22 November 2002, 61
statements on, 65, 66
- Iraq humanitarian situation, decisions recorded in
notes, 153
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
decisions announced in statements, 151
decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 18, 159, 160, 161, 162
letter dated 2 December 2003, 686
statements on, 41, 682, 687
- Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 40
- justice and rule of law
decisions announced in statements, 150
statements on, 837

- Kosovo situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161
 - statements on, 568, 569, 572, 575, 577, 579, 581, 583, 587, 878, 879, 892, 1026
 - letter dated 15 July 2002, 159
- Liberia situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 149, 150
 - decisions recorded in letters, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152
 - letters on, 281
 - statements on, 280, 283, 869, 886, 920, 940, 1070
- Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 30, 332
- Macedonia situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 146, 147
 - statements on, 563, 564, 922, 1074
- maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 6, 1057
- Middle East situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 161
 - statements on, 40, 618, 623, 626, 880
- mine action
 - decisions announced in statements, 151
 - statements on, 40, 818
- MIPONUH, statements on, 197
- no exit without strategy
 - decisions recorded in letters, 156
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152
 - statements on, 808
- Nobel Peace Prize
 - decisions announced in statements, 147
 - statements on, 35, 821
- note dated 31 March 2000, 23
- note dated 29 June 2001, 13, 23
- note dated 26 March 2002, 23
- note dated 12 June 1997, 13
- pacific settlement of disputes
 - decisions announced in statements, 150
 - statements on, 39, 829, 880
- peacekeeping operations
 - decisions recorded in letters, 160
 - letter dated 7 March 2003, 228
 - statements on, 8
- post-conflict peacebuilding
 - decisions announced in statements, 144, 146
 - statements on, 33, 45, 232, 240, 711, 820, 864, 882, 899, 1050
- prevention of armed conflict
 - decisions announced in statements, 145
 - statements on, 45, 232, 236, 792, 863, 895, 897, 1050, 1063
- protection of UN personnel
 - decisions announced in statements, 144
 - statements on, 795
- provisional rules of procedure regarding, 12
- refugees
 - decisions announced in statements, 144
 - statements on, 45, 768
- regional organizations, statements on, 1059
- reports by Secretary-General, note dated 22 May 2002, 225
- responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security
 - decisions announced in statements, 146
 - statements on, 44, 708
- Rwanda situation, decisions recorded in notes, 152
- sanctions
 - decisions recorded in notes, 151, 152, 153, 154
 - note dated 17 April 2000, 797, 1002
- Security Council Missions
 - decisions announced in statements, 150
 - decisions recorded in letters, 160
 - statements on, 9
- Sierra Leone situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 145, 148
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 157, 162
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153
 - note dated 20 December 2000, 346
 - statements on, 10, 337, 338, 342, 345, 353, 870, 940, 1000
- small arms
 - decisions announced in statements, 147, 149
 - statements on, 45, 785, 787, 1006, 1051
- Somalia situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 158, 161, 162
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152
 - statements on, 169, 286, 287, 289, 291, 293, 294, 295, 870, 871, 872, 886, 887, 999, 1073

- Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans, decisions recorded in letters, 156
- Sudan situation
decisions announced in statements, 150
statements on, 462, 872
- Tajikistan situation
decisions announced in statements, 144, 145
decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 160
statements on, 42, 509, 510, 875, 890
- terrorism
decisions announced in statements, 148, 149, 150, 151
statements on, 748, 754, 755, 758, 761, 763
- Timor-Leste situation
decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 147, 148
decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 161
statements on, 10, 476, 482, 494, 497, 504, 874, 875, 889
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with
decisions announced in statements, 146
decisions recorded in letters, 157, 158
note dated 27 August 2002, 61
statements on, 8, 809, 811, 983, 991
- UNDOF, statements on, 600
- UNIFIL, statements on, 601, 602, 603
- UNOB
letter dated 7 December 2001, 185
statements on, 186
- UNOL
letter dated 29 November 2002, 187
statements on, 187
- UNPOB, letter dated 23 December 2003, 199
- UNPOS, statements on, 186, 187
- UNTAET, statements on, 200
- UNTOP, statements on, 198
- voting, note dated 29 June 2001, 136
- West Africa region, statements on, 11, 449, 450, 888, 1079
- Western Sahara situation, decisions recorded in letters, 159, 160, 161
- women and peace and security
decisions announced in statements, 147, 149
decisions recorded in letters, 161
statements on, 803, 806
- Working Group on UN Peacekeeping Operations
decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153, 154
notes on, 36
working methods and procedures
decisions recorded in letters, 154
decisions recorded in notes, 151, 153
Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 589
- Prevention of armed conflict**
Argentina, statements by, 896, 898
Belarus, statements by, 908
Brazil, statements by, 910, 912
Cameroon, statements by, 894
Canada, statements by, 1063
China, statements by, 792, 896, 898, 904
constitutional discussion bearing on pacific settlement of disputes, 894
Costa Rica, statements by, 904
Deputy Secretary-General
reports by, 237
statements by, 793
determinations of threats to the peace, 923, 935
European Union, statements on behalf of, 896
France, statements by, 909, 910
General Assembly, recommendations to Security Council, 220
Germany, statements by, 894
Indonesia, statements by, 1063
investigations and fact-finding, 858
invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 75, 93
Iraq, statements by, 912, 1050
Jamaica, statements by, 935
Japan, statements by, 899, 905
Malaysia, statements by, 896, 904, 910, 912
Mexico, statements by, 895
Namibia, statements by, 792, 902
Netherlands, statements by, 792, 896, 935
new Security Council action, 45
Nigeria, statements by, 908, 1050
Organization of the Islamic Conference,
statements on behalf of, 1063
Pakistan, statements by, 896, 898, 902, 909, 910, 912, 935, 1016
President
decisions announced in statements, 145
statements by, 45, 232, 236, 792, 863, 895, 897, 1050, 1063
regional arrangements, 1062
Resolution 1366 (2001), 45, 232, 237, 248, 794, 858, 863, 881, 923, 1046, 1051, 1063
role of Security Council, 863, 895, 902, 904, 908, 909, 911, 1050

- Russian Federation, statements by, 896, 898, 904, 911
- Secretary-General
 - relations of Security Council with, 246, 248
 - reports by, 237, 894, 897, 904, 908, 910, 912, 935, 1063
 - statements by, 236, 791, 792, 895
- self-defence, 1016
- Singapore, statements by, 910, 912
- South Africa, statements by, 898, 905
- Spain, statements by, 895
- Sweden, statements by, 910
- Tanzania, statements by, 1063
- Tunisia, statements by, 896, 910, 912
- Ukraine, statements by, 910, 912
- United Kingdom, statements by, 895, 908, 909
- United States, statements by, 895, 908, 911, 935
- Programme for Coordination and Assistance for Security and Development**
 - small arms, briefings on, 788
- Protection of UN personnel**
 - China, statements by, 795
 - Deputy Secretary-General, briefings by, 794
 - Egypt, statements by, 795
 - France, statements by, 795
 - International Committee of the Red Cross, briefings by, 795
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 68, 92, 93
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 32
 - Mexico, statements by, 796
 - Namibia, statements by, 795
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 144
 - statements by, 795
 - Resolution 1502 (2003), 32, 796, 1046
 - Secretary-General, statements by, 796
 - United States, statements by, 796
 - World Food Programme, briefings by, 794
- Provisional measures**
 - Afghanistan situation, 940
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 941
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 938
 - Côte d'Ivoire situation, 937
 - decisions relating to Article 40, 937
 - discussion relating to Article 40, 941
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 939
 - generally, 937
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 941
 - Liberia situation, 940
 - Sierra Leone situation, 940
- Provisional rules of procedure**
 - conduct of business, regarding
 - application of Rules 27-36, 16
 - generally, 15
 - languages, regarding
 - application of Rules 41-47, 22
 - generally, 22
 - meetings, regarding
 - application of Rules 1-5, 5
 - generally, 5
 - procedural developments, 7
 - Presidency, regarding, 12
 - publicity of meetings and records, regarding, 23
 - representation and credentials, regarding, 12
 - Secretariat, regarding, 15
- Publicity of meetings and records**
 - provisional rules of procedure regarding, 23
- Purposes and principles of UN**
 - non-Member States and, 1043
- Qatar**
 - Middle East situation
 - letter dated 15 August 2001, 848
 - statements on, 1012
 - terrorism, statements on, 743
- Referral of disputes to Security Council**
 - action requested, 854
 - Article 34, under, 904
 - Article 35, under, 906
 - Article 36, under, 907
 - Article 99, under, 908
 - by General Assembly, 856
 - by Member States, 848
 - by Secretary-General, 855
 - Central African region, 852
 - generally, 848
 - Israel-Syria dispute, 852
 - Macedonia situation, 851
 - Middle East situation, 851
 - nature of matters referred, 852
- Refugees**
 - Canada, statements by, 768
 - High Commissioner for Refugees
 - briefings by, 32, 37, 91, 114, 766, 840
 - statements by, 768
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 91
 - Jamaica, statements by, 768
 - Malaysia, statements by, 768
 - Netherlands, statements by, 767
 - new Security Council action, 45

- President
 decisions announced in statements, 144
 statements by, 45, 768
 Ukraine, statements by, 768
 United Kingdom, statements by, 767
 United States, statements by, 767
- Regional arrangements**
 Afghanistan situation, 1077, 1078
 Africa situation, 1066
 assistance from Member States, 1042
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 1074
 Burundi situation, 1071
 Central African region, 1065
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 1072
 consultation, briefing and reporting, 1079
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, 1068, 1078
 Cyprus, letter dated 14 February 2001, 1061
 enforcement action, 1077
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in
 maintenance of peace and security, 1061
 Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 1073
 Fiji, letter dated 2 July 2003, 1061, 1079
 generally, 1059
 Georgia situation, 1074
 Guinea situation, 1069
 involvement in implementation of measures, 1075
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1075
 League of Arab States, letters by, 1061, 1079
 Liberia situation, 1070, 1076
 Macedonia situation, 1073, 1077, 1078
 pacific settlement of disputes, 893, 1066, 1068
 post-conflict peacebuilding, 1062, 1065
 prevention of armed conflict, 1062
 Resolution 1353 (2001), 1079
 Sierra Leone situation, 1069, 1075, 1077
 Somalia situation, 1072, 1076
 Sudan situation, 1073
- Regional Bureau for Africa**
 Central African Republic situation, briefings on,
 414
- Regional organizations**
 African Union, statements by, 827
 Angola, statements by, 1064
 Cameroon, statements by, 1064
 Chile, statements by, 828, 1064
 China, statements by, 828
 ECOWAS, statements by, 827
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 827,
 1065
 France, statements by, 828, 1064
 Germany, statements by, 1064
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 86, 129,
 130, 131
 League of Arab States, statements on behalf of,
 827, 1064
 matters of which Security Council seized, 39
 Organization for Security and Cooperation in
 Europe, statements by, 827
 Organization of American States, statements by,
 827
 Pakistan, statements by, 828, 1064
 President, statements on, 1059
 Russian Federation, statements by, 1064
 Secretary-General
 letter dated 22 October 2003, 1059
 statements by, 826
 United States, statements by, 1064
- Regional Peace Initiative for Burundi**
 briefings by, 327
- Relations of Security Council with other UN organs**
 Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable
 Rights of the Palestinian People, 227
 ECOSOC
 constitutional discussion, 233
 generally, 231
 requests or references, 231
 General Assembly
 election of non-permanent members, 217
 generally, 216
 maintenance of peace and security,
 recommendations to Security Council, 218
 practice in relation to Article 12 of Charter,
 221
 practice in relation to recommendations by
 Security Council, 223
 reports by Security Council, 224
 subsidiary organs, 226
 ICJ
 consideration of, 243
 election of members, 242
 generally, 242
 Military Staff Committee
 assessments of work of Security Council, 251
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in
 maintenance of peace and security, 250
 generally, 250
 no exit without strategy, 251
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening
 cooperation with, 251

- Secretariat
 - generally, 245
 - good offices, 246
 - international tribunals, support of, 248
 - investigations and fact-finding, 246
 - joint efforts to promote political settlement, 247
 - matters brought to attention of Security Council, 249
 - non-administrative functions, 245
 - peacekeeping operations, 248
 - sanctions, 248
- Trusteeship Council, 241
- Reports.** *See specific entity or situation*
- Representation and credentials**
 - provisional rules of procedure regarding, 12
- Representative of the Secretary-General for Guinea-Bissau**
 - briefings by, 440
- Representative of the Secretary-General for Somalia**
 - briefings by, 288, 292
- Resolutions.** *See specific entity or situation*
- Responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security**
 - Canada, statements by, 708
 - China, statements by, 708
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 90
 - Malaysia, statements by, 708
 - Netherlands, statements by, 708
 - new Security Council action, 44
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 146
 - statements by, 44, 708
 - Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs, briefings by, 707
 - United Kingdom, statements by, 708
 - United States, statements by, 708
- Rio Group**
 - terrorism, statements on behalf of, 744, 747, 750
- Rules of procedure.** *See* Provisional rules of procedure
- Russian Federation (permanent member of Security Council)**
 - Afghanistan situation
 - letter regarding, 521
 - statements on, 512, 514, 515, 517, 522, 524, 526, 532, 952
 - Africa situation, statements on, 1067
 - Angola situation, letter dated 26 April 2002, 315
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 543, 545, 546, 547, 551, 552, 558, 560, 1074
 - Burundi situation, statements on, 323
 - Central African region, statements on, 465, 903, 936, 1065
 - Central African Republic situation, statements on, 417
 - children and armed conflict, statements on, 734, 735
 - civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 782, 911, 934, 935, 1052
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 362, 365, 368, 373, 376, 383, 384, 389, 394, 402, 955, 973, 1033
 - Cyprus situation, statements on, 542
 - ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 251, 725, 993
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, statements on, 434, 956
 - food and security, statements on, 241, 822, 823
 - Georgia situation
 - letter dated 26 January 2000, 591
 - letter dated 26 June 2000, 593
 - letter dated 25 July 2000, 594
 - letter dated 11 September 2002, 1017
 - Guinea situation, statements on, 447
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441, 443
 - humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 713, 933, 1048
 - International Tribunal for Rwanda, statements on, 693, 697
 - International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 693, 694, 697, 702
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 64, 65
 - Iraq humanitarian situation
 - letter dated 15 June 2001, 848
 - statements on, 689, 968
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 - letter 24 February 2003, 927
 - letter dated 15 June 2001, 644, 1055
 - statements on, 637, 641, 642, 643, 646, 654, 658, 659, 667, 673, 674, 675, 680, 682, 683, 684, 685, 926, 928, 957, 958, 976, 979, 980, 1028
 - justice and rule of law, statements on, 837
 - Kosovo situation, statements on, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 574, 577, 579, 580, 581, 583, 584
 - Liberia situation, statements on, 278

- Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 334
- Macedonia situation, statements on, 563
- Middle East situation, statements on, 617, 633
- Military Staff Committee
letter dated 6 July 2001, 994
statements on, 994
- mine action, statements on, 817
- Mubarak assassination attempt extradition
request, statements on, 448
- peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 896,
898, 904, 911
- regional organizations, statements on, 1064
- Rwanda situation, statements on, 320
- sanctions, statements on, 800, 963, 964, 965
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339, 341,
347, 348, 349, 960, 981, 989
- small arms, statements on, 786, 935, 1015
- Tajikistan situation, statements on, 510
- terrorism, statements on, 737, 741, 746, 748, 753,
759, 760, 766
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 479, 487,
489, 496, 499, 500
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening
cooperation with, statements on, 251, 994
- Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 588, 589
- Rwanda**
- Angola situation
letter regarding, 302
statements on, 300, 304, 308
- Central African region, statements on, 833
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
letter dated 13 December 2000, 374
letter dated 18 February 2001, 376
letter dated 24 April 2001, 378
letter dated 1 May 2001, 378
letter dated 19 July 2001, 1035
letter dated 1 August 2001, 386
letter dated 8 August 2001, 386
letter dated 23 November and 7 December
2001, 392
letter dated 10 December 2001, 392
letter dated 18 March 2002, 395
letter dated 15 April 2002, 1009
letter dated 23 October 2002, 401
letter dated 28 October 2002, 401
statements on, 379, 382, 398, 401, 402, 405,
1033, 1036
- Great Lakes region situation
briefings on, 356
statements on, 358, 359
- International Tribunal for Rwanda
letter dated 26 July 2002, 704
letter dated 5 August 2003, 698
statements on, 693, 696, 700
- Rwanda situation, statements on, 321
- Rwanda situation**
- Argentina, statements by, 320
- Canada, statements by, 321
- Chairman of the Independent Inquiry, briefings
by, 319
- France, statements by, 321
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 69
- Jamaica, statements by, 321
- Malaysia, statements by, 321
- Mali, statements by, 320
- Netherlands, statements by, 320
- new Security Council action, 41
- President, decisions recorded in notes, 152
- Russian Federation, statements by, 320
- Rwanda, statements by, 321
- Secretariat
letter dated 15 December 1999, 319
reports by, 319
- Security Council Committees
establishment, 171
mandate implementation, 171
monitoring and reporting, 171
- self-defence, invocation of right, 1019
- United Kingdom, statements by, 320
- United States, statements by, 320
- Zimbabwe, letter dated 8 November 2000, 1019
- Rwanda-Uganda dispute**
- self-defence, invocation of right, 1019
- Uganda, letter dated 15 June 2000, 1019
- Sanctions**
- Afghanistan situation, 943
- al-Qaida and Taliban, 943
- Angola situation, 944
- Argentina, statements by, 963
- Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs,
statements by, 799, 800, 965
- Australia, statements by, 963, 964
- Bulgaria, statements by, 800, 801
- Canada, statements by, 963, 964
- Chile, statements by, 801, 965
- China, statements by, 800, 801, 963
- criteria for imposition and termination, 963
- Cuba, statements by, 963
- France, statements by, 799, 800, 801, 962, 965

General Assembly, recommendations to Security Council, 219
generally, 962
Germany
 briefings by, 798
 statements by, 800, 965
Guinea, statements by, 801
humanitarian impact of, 964
invitations to participate in proceedings, 69, 76, 85, 94, 119
Iraq, statements by, 963, 964
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 945, 946
Jamaica, statements by, 962
Kosovo situation, 950
Liberia situation, 946, 947
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, statements by, 963
Lockerbie bombing, 949
Mali, statements by, 965
matters of which Security Council seized, 32
Mexico, statements by, 801, 966
monitoring of, 965
Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, 949
Netherlands, statements by, 962, 964
New Zealand, statements by, 962, 964
Pakistan, statements by, 800, 963
Portugal, statements by, 964
President
 decisions recorded in notes, 151, 152, 153, 154
 note dated 17 April 2000, 797, 1002
purpose, 962
Russian Federation, statements by, 800, 963, 964, 965
Secretary-General, relations of Security Council with, 248
Security Council Committees, 166
Sierra Leone situation, 948
Somalia situation, 949
special economic problems, 1002
Sweden
 briefings by, 799
 statements by, 799, 965
Switzerland
 briefings by, 798
 statements by, 965
Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 800, 965
targeted sanctions, 964
Tunisia, statements by, 964, 965
Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, statements by, 797

United Kingdom, statements by, 800, 964
United States, statements by, 798, 800, 801, 963, 965

Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions, 182

Yugoslavia, letter dated 31 July 2001, 1060

Saudi Arabia

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1058

Iraq-Saudi Arabia dispute, letter dated 29 May 2001, 1018

Middle East situation, statements on, 931, 1012, 1014

Secretariat

Afghanistan situation

 briefings on, 516, 520

 letter dated 21 May 2001, 514, 516

 letter dated 5 December 2001, 518

 letter dated 25 November 2002, 527

 letter dated 7 October 2003, 533, 1078

 letter dated 13 October 2003, 533

 relations of Security Council with, 247

 reports on, 511, 512, 520, 521, 522, 525, 529, 530, 889

Africa situation, briefings on, 419, 425

Angola situation

 relations of Security Council with, 247

 reports on, 296, 301, 304, 316, 318

anniversary of 11 September 2001, statements on, 764

appointment, 46

 adoption of resolutions or decisions without vote, 144

 practice in relation to recommendations by Security Council, 224

BONUCA, reports on, 196, 413, 415

Bosnia and Herzegovina situation

 briefings on, 558

 letter dated 4 May 2000, 544

 letter dated 18 October 2000, 547

 letter dated 14 September 2001, 551

 letter dated 26 February 2002, 552

 letter dated 18 October 2002, 557

 letter dated 25 September 2003, 559

 reports on, 543, 544, 545, 548, 550, 551, 553, 554, 555, 558

 statements on, 552, 554

Bougainville situation, reports on, 536

briefings by, 33

Burundi situation

 briefings on, 322, 324

- reports on, 327, 329, 332
- Central African region
 - letter dated 10 November 2003, 463
 - reports on, 463
- Central African Republic situation, reports on, 412, 413, 414, 415
- children and armed conflict
 - briefings on, 730, 731, 733
 - relations of Security Council with, 250
 - reports on, 125, 128, 726, 728, 729, 731, 732, 735, 911, 932
- civilians in armed conflict
 - briefings on, 769, 777
 - reports on, 768, 771, 776, 779, 905, 906, 910
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 - briefings on, 361, 375, 376, 384, 390, 398, 409, 1032
 - letter dated 31 January 2000, 178
 - letter dated 18 April 2000, 178
 - letter dated 14 August 2000, 371
 - letter dated 12 April 2001, 178, 378, 380
 - letter dated 24 April 2001, 380
 - letter dated 25 June 2001, 179
 - letter dated 10 November 2001, 179, 391, 394
 - letter dated 15 May 2002, 855
 - letter dated 9 July 2002, 179
 - letter dated 15 October 2002, 179, 399, 401, 403, 411
 - letter dated 26 February 2003, 180
 - letter dated 25 June 2003, 407
 - letter dated 14 August 2003, 411
 - letter dated 23 October 2003, 411
 - relations of Security Council with, 246, 247
 - reports on, 364, 366, 371, 374, 376, 377, 380, 383, 387, 389, 395, 396, 403, 405, 406, 410, 985
 - statements on, 410, 1034
- Côte d'Ivoire situation
 - relations of Security Council with, 246
 - reports on, 456, 459
 - statements on, 455, 460
- Croatia situation, reports on, 561, 562
- Cyprus situation
 - relations of Security Council with, 246
 - reports on, 540, 542, 891
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security
 - briefings on, 721, 724
 - relations of Security Council with, 246
- Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute
 - briefings on, 431
 - letter dated 5 and 29 July 2002, 436
 - relations of Security Council with, 247
 - reports on, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 436, 437
- Georgia situation
 - relations of Security Council with, 247
 - reports on, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599
- Great Lakes region situation
 - briefings on, 356, 357
 - reports on, 356, 358, 360, 903
- Guinea situation, letter dated 30 April 2001, 36, 77, 99, 147, 158, 446
- Guinea-Bissau situation
 - briefings on, 438
 - reports on, 437, 438, 440
- Haiti situation, reports on, 466
- HIV/AIDS, letter dated 5 July 2000, 714
- humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 711
- International Tribunal for Rwanda
 - letter dated 7 September 2000, 695
 - letter dated 14 September 2001, 209
 - letter dated 26 September 2002, 705
 - letter dated 6 March 2003, 705
 - letter dated 16 April 2003, 706
 - letter dated 21 April 2003, 705
 - letter dated 28 July 2003, 698
 - letter dated 12 September 2003, 706
 - letter dated 29 September 2003, 210
 - letter dated 3 October 2003, 698
 - relations of Security Council with, 248
- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
 - letter 7 May 2003, 703
 - letter dated 14 June 2000, 701
 - letter dated 7 September 2000, 695
 - letter dated 11 January 2001, 702
 - letter dated 19 April 2001, 703
 - letter dated 7 May 2003, 208
 - note dated 20 August 2003, 698
 - relations of Security Council with, 248
- investigations and fact-finding, relations of Security Council and, 246
- Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 968
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 - briefings on, 636, 677
 - letter dated 16 September 2002, 1043, 1075
 - note dated 28 February 2003, 663
 - note dated 10 May 2003, 676

- reports on, 635, 639, 640, 642, 644, 648, 649, 657, 676, 678, 685, 687
- statements on, 669, 680, 682, 686, 1026, 1045, 1056
- justice and rule of law, statements on, 836
- Kosovo situation
 - letter dated 6 September 2001, 172, 574
 - reports on, 565, 566, 568, 569, 571, 573, 575, 576, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 586, 1025
- Liberia situation
 - letter dated 28 June 2003, 249, 281, 856
 - letter dated 8 July 2003, 281
 - letter dated 29 July 2003, 281
 - reports on, 276, 279, 284, 1001, 1076
- MICAH, reports on, 466
- Middle East situation
 - briefings on, 618, 619, 931
 - letter dated 22 April 2002, 858
 - letter dated 1 May 2002, 625, 858
 - statements on, 620, 628, 1013
- MINURCA, reports on, 412
- MINURSO, letter dated 12 November 2001, 185
- MIPONUH, reports on, 196, 466
- MONUC
 - letter dated 15 May 2003, 193
 - letter dated 14 August 2003, 193
 - reports on, 192, 364, 371, 380, 387, 395, 396, 403, 406
- Nobel Peace Prize, statements on, 821
- pacif settlement of disputes, statements on, 829, 900, 907, 912, 1066
- peacekeeping operations
 - relations of Security Council with, 248
 - statements on, 813
- post-conflict peacebuilding
 - briefings on, 709
 - reports on, 708, 711
 - statements on, 818, 899
- prevention of armed conflict
 - relations of Security Council with, 246, 248
 - reports on, 237, 894, 897, 904, 908, 910, 912, 935, 1063
 - statements on, 236, 791, 792, 895
- protection of UN personnel, statements on, 796
- provisional rules of procedure regarding, 15
- referral of disputes to Security Council by, 855
- regional organizations
 - letter dated 22 October 2003, 1059
 - statements on, 826
- relations of Security Council with
 - generally, 245
 - good offices, 246
 - international tribunals, support of, 248
 - investigations and fact-finding, 246
 - joint efforts to promote political settlement, 247
 - matters brought to attention of Security Council, 249
 - non-administrative functions, 245
 - peacekeeping operations, 248
 - sanctions, 248
- Resolution 1358 (2001), 46, 144
- Rwanda situation
 - letter dated 15 December 1999, 319
 - reports on, 319
- sanctions, relations of Security Council and, 248
- Sierra Leone situation
 - briefings on, 338
 - letter dated 23 December 1999, 335
 - letter dated 17 May 2000, 339
 - letter dated 2 August 2000, 343
 - reports on, 335, 336, 340, 343, 344, 345, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 1069
- small arms
 - briefings on, 783
 - reports on, 785, 787, 1015
 - statements on, 788
- Somalia situation, reports on, 286, 288, 289, 290, 292, 293, 294, 295, 886, 1072
- Tajikistan situation, reports on, 509
- terrorism
 - reports on, 756
 - statements on, 736, 739, 742, 750, 764
- Timor-Leste situation
 - briefings on, 501
 - letter dated 30 October 2001, 494
 - reports on, 467, 474, 476, 483, 485, 488, 490, 494, 497, 500, 502, 503, 504, 506
- UNAMA, reports on, 197
- UNAMI, reports on, 205, 206
- UNAMSIL
 - letter dated 28 December 1999, 190
 - letter dated 17 May 2000, 191
 - reports on, 190, 335, 336, 337, 340, 343, 344, 345, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355
- UNDOF, reports on, 203, 600
- UNFICYP, reports on, 540
- UNIFIL
 - letter dated 6 April 2000, 601

- letter dated 17 April 2000, 601
 letter dated 24 July 2000, 603
 reports on, 204, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604
 UNIKOM, reports on, 205
 UNMA, reports on, 189, 190
 UNMEE, reports on, 195, 430, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437
 UNMIBH, reports on, 201, 202, 543, 550, 553
 UNMIK, reports on, 203, 565, 568, 571, 575, 581, 582, 583
 UNMOP, reports on, 202, 561
 UNMOT, reports on, 198, 509
 UNOA, reports on, 189
 UNOB
 letter dated 15 November 2000, 185
 reports by, 185
 reports on, 186
 UNOGBIS, reports on, 440
 UNOL
 letter dated 15 January 2003, 187
 letter dated 11 April 2003, 187
 letter dated 29 July 2003, 188
 letter dated 16 September 2003, 188
 reports on, 188
 UNOMIG, reports on, 201
 UNPOB
 letter dated 22 October 2001, 199
 letter dated 19 December 2003, 199
 UNPOS
 letter dated 16 November 2001, 186
 reports on, 186, 187
 UNTAET, reports on, 200, 467, 483, 494, 497, 500, 503, 504, 506
 UNTOP, reports on, 198
 West Africa region
 letter dated 30 April 2001, 449
 relations of Security Council with, 247
 Western Sahara situation, reports on, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 872, 873, 887
 women and peace and security
 briefings on, 801, 805
 relations of Security Council with, 246
 reports on, 805, 806
Security assurances
 deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 50
Security Council Committees
 Afghanistan situation
 briefings by, 515
 letter dated 4 April 2000, 511
 reports by, 514, 952
 statements by, 516
 Africa situation, statements on, 426
 al-Qaida and Taliban
 establishment, 173
 mandate implementation, 173
 monitoring and reporting, 173
 reports by, 174
 Angola situation
 briefings by, 296, 298, 306
 establishment, 170
 letter dated 10 March 2000, 297, 301
 letter dated 21 December 2000, 306
 letter dated 12 October 2001, 310
 letter dated 14 October 2002, 317
 mandate implementation, 170
 monitoring and reporting, 170
 statements by, 301, 302
 termination of mandate, 171, 211
 briefings by, 40, 119, 120
 combating terrorism
 composition, 181
 establishment, 180
 letter dated 14 February 2003, 181
 mandate implementation, 181
 reports on, 181
 Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute
 establishment, 174
 mandate implementation, 175
 monitoring and reporting, 175
 termination of mandate, 175, 211
 generally, 166
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 briefings on, 1004
 establishment, 168, 169
 letter dated 22 March 2000, 636
 letter dated 28 February 2002, 1005
 mandate implementation, 168
 monitoring and reporting, 168
 termination of mandate, 168, 211
 Kosovo situation
 establishment, 172
 mandate implementation, 172
 monitoring and reporting, 172
 termination of mandate, 172, 211
 Liberia situation
 briefings by, 276
 establishment, 175, 176, 177
 letter dated 26 October 2001, 275
 letter dated 19 April 2002, 177, 279

- letter dated 24 April 2003, 280
- letter dated 7 August 2003, 1001
- letter dated 28 October 2003, 284
- mandate implementation, 175, 176, 177
- monitoring and reporting, 175, 176, 177
- termination of mandate, 175, 177, 211
- Lockerbie bombing
 - mandate implementation, 169
 - monitoring and reporting, 169
 - termination of mandate, 169, 211
- Rwanda situation
 - establishment, 171
 - mandate implementation, 171
 - monitoring and reporting, 171
- sanctions, 166
- Sierra Leone situation
 - briefings by, 347
 - establishment, 171
 - letter dated 30 March 2001, 172
 - mandate implementation, 171
 - monitoring and reporting, 172
- Somalia situation
 - establishment, 169
 - letter dated 25 March 2003, 170
 - letter dated 4 November 2003, 295
 - mandate implementation, 169
 - monitoring and reporting, 169
- terrorism
 - briefings on, 760
 - letter dated 7 July 2003, 760
- Security Council Missions**
 - Afghanistan situation, 11, 122, 832, 835, 857
 - Central African region, 11, 122, 831, 832, 857, 902
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 10, 830, 857
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 10, 11, 428, 435, 830, 831, 857
 - Great Lakes region situation, 10, 11, 381, 383, 831, 848, 857
 - Guinea situation, 446
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, 239
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 87
 - Kosovo situation, 10, 11, 830, 831, 857
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 39
 - meetings regarding, 9, 11
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 150
 - decisions recorded in letters, 160
 - statements by, 9
 - Resolution 1297 (2000), 9
 - Resolution 1355 (2001), 9
 - Sierra Leone situation, 10, 345, 830, 857
 - Timor-Leste situation, 10, 480, 482, 831, 857
 - West Africa region, 11, 120, 122, 239, 449, 831, 857
- Security of operations**
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 52
- Self-defence**
 - Afghanistan situation, 1007
 - Burundi situation, invocation of right, 1016
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 1008
 - Côte d'Ivoire situation, invocation of right, 1016
 - decisions relating to Article 51, 1006
 - discussion relating to Article 51, 1007
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, invocation of right, 1017
 - Eritrea-Sudan dispute, invocation of right, 1019
 - generally, 1006
 - Georgia situation, invocation of right, 1017
 - India-Pakistan dispute, invocation of right, 1017
 - invocation of right, 1016
 - Iran-Iraq dispute, invocation of right, 1018
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1009
 - Iraq-Saudi Arabia dispute, 1018
 - Israel-Syria dispute, 1014
 - Liberia situation, 1018
 - Mauritius, statements by, 1013
 - Middle East situation, 1012
 - peaceful settlement of disputes, 1016
 - prevention of armed conflict, 1016
 - Rwanda situation, invocation of right, 1019
 - Rwanda-Uganda dispute, invocation of right, 1019
 - small arms, 1006, 1015
 - Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process, statements by, 1014
 - terrorism, 1007, 1015
 - Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, statements by, 1014
 - wrap-up discussions, 1016
- Self-determination**
 - generally, 1024
 - Iraq, statements by, 1024
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1026
 - Kosovo situation, 1025
 - Palestine, statements by, 1024
 - Timor-Leste situation, 1025
- Serbia and Montenegro.** *See also* Yugoslavia, Federal Republic of

- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia,
statements on, 700
- Kosovo situation
letter dated 14 August 2003, 585, 849, 853,
854
statements on, 582, 585, 587
- Sierra Leone**
Africa situation, statements on, 425
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 782,
967
Guinea situation, statements on, 446
Liberia situation
letter dated 23 February 2001, 275
letter dated 27 February 2001, 275
statements on, 279
Sierra Leone situation
letter dated 17 January 2000, 335
letter dated 2 and 4 May 2000, 338
letter dated 15 May 2000, 340
letter dated 24 July 2000, 343
letter dated 9 August 2000, 343
statements on, 336, 339, 341, 349, 961
small arms, statements on, 785
- Sierra Leone situation**
abstention, 139
Algeria, statements by, 980, 988
Argentina, statements by, 337, 339, 960, 982, 989
Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping
Operations, briefings by, 337
Bangladesh, statements by, 981, 988
Burkina Faso, statements by, 347
Canada, statements by, 341, 348, 349, 960, 980,
988
China, statements by, 339, 341, 349, 981
Colombia, statements by, 348
determinations of threats to the peace, 921
Eritrea, letter dated 10 May 2000, 338, 848, 852
European Union, statements on behalf of, 981,
989
force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1031
France, statements by, 339, 342, 349, 960, 961,
982, 989
Gambia
letter dated 28 December 2000 and 23 January
2001, 347
statements by, 347
Guinea, statements by, 349
India, statements by, 339, 981, 989
invitations to participate in proceedings, 67, 72,
86, 92, 95, 97, 113, 338, 339, 343, 344, 345,
346, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355
Ireland, statements by, 348, 349
Jamaica, statements by, 348, 989
Japan, statements by, 982
Jordan, statements by, 339, 981, 990
Liberia
letter dated 3 January 2001, 347
letter dated 24 January 2001, 347
statements by, 349, 961
Malaysia, statements by, 337, 981, 988
Mali
letter dated 9 May 2000, 340
letter dated 11 May 2000, 338
statements by, 342
Mauritius, statements by, 349
measures involving use of armed force, 971, 980,
986, 988, 991
measures not involving use of armed force, 948,
959
Namibia
letter dated 11 May 2000, 338, 848
statements by, 989
Netherlands, statements by, 341
new Security Council action, 42
Norway, statements by, 349
obligations of Member States, 995, 996, 999,
1000
pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
regarding, 862, 869, 886
Pakistan, statements by, 339, 982, 989
Panel of Experts, reports by, 172, 346, 960
Portugal, statements by, 339
President
decisions announced in statements, 145, 148
decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 157,
162
decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153
note dated 20 December 2000, 346
statements by, 10, 337, 338, 342, 345, 353,
870, 940, 1000
provisional measures, 940
regional arrangements, 1069, 1075, 1077
Resolution 1289 (2000), 336, 869, 921, 940, 971,
980, 986, 1070
Resolution 1299 (2000), 340, 948, 987, 1000
Resolution 1306 (2000), 139, 166, 171, 172, 342,
948, 999, 1002, 1075, 1080
Resolution 1313 (2000), 343, 987

Resolution 1315 (2000), 344
Resolution 1317 (2000), 344
Resolution 1321 (2000), 344
Resolution 1334 (2000), 346, 869, 987
Resolution 1346 (2001), 350, 870, 987
Resolution 1370 (2001), 351, 1070
Resolution 1385 (2001), 352, 948
Resolution 1389 (2001), 352
Resolution 1400 (2002), 353, 870
Resolution 1436 (2002), 353, 886
Resolution 1446 (2002), 354, 921, 948
Resolution 1470 (2003), 354, 1031
Resolution 1478 (2003), 999
Resolution 1492 (2003), 355
Resolution 1508 (2003), 42, 355
Resolution 1521 (2003), 999
Russian Federation, statements by, 339, 341, 347,
348, 349, 960, 981, 989
sanctions, 948
Secretary-General
briefings by, 338
letter dated 23 December 1999, 335
letter dated 17 May 2000, 339
letter dated 2 August 2000, 343
reports by, 335, 336, 340, 343, 344, 345, 349,
350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 1069
Security Council Committees
briefings by, 347
establishment, 171
letter dated 30 March 2001, 172
mandate implementation, 171
monitoring and reporting, 172
Security Council Missions, 10, 345, 830, 857
Sierra Leone
letter dated 17 January 2000, 335
letter dated 2 and 4 May 2000, 338
letter dated 15 May 2000, 340
letter dated 24 July 2000, 343
letter dated 9 August 2000, 343
statements by, 336, 339, 341, 349, 961
Singapore, statements by, 349
special economic problems, 1002
Special Representative of the Secretary-General
for Sierra Leone, briefings by, 351
Sweden, statements by, 347, 348, 349
Switzerland
letter dated 21 December 2000, 347
statements by, 347
Tunisia, statements by, 348, 989
Ukraine, statements by, 347, 982, 989

Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping
Operations, briefings by, 335, 353
United Kingdom, statements by, 336, 337, 339,
348, 959, 960, 961, 980, 981, 988
United States, statements by, 341, 349, 960, 961,
980, 988

**Singapore (elected member of Security Council
2001-2002)**

Afghanistan situation, statements on, 524, 952,
968, 1016
Angola situation, statements on, 311
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on,
1081
Bougainville situation, statements on, 536
Central African Republic situation, statements on,
417
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773,
774, 775, 776, 779
conduct of business, statements on, 16, 17, 18
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 383, 385, 386, 388, 402
ensuring effective role of Security Council in
maintenance of peace and security, statements
on, 725
food and security, statements on, 824
Guinea situation, statements on, 445
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 671, 957,
1058
Kosovo situation, statements on, 574, 576, 578
Liberia situation
letter dated 2 November 2001, 276
statements on, 278
Middle East situation, statements on, 613, 623,
911, 1012
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 910,
912
reports by Secretary-General, statements on, 224
Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 349
terrorism, statements on, 736, 746, 749, 752
Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 487, 489,
491, 505
troop-contributing countries, strengthening
cooperation with
letter dated 8 January 2001, 809, 811
statements on, 811

Slovenia

Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 590

Small arms

African Union, briefings by, 788
Benin, statements by, 790

- Brazil, statements by, 968, 1051
 Burkina Faso, statements by, 790
 Cameroon, statements by, 934
 Canada, statements by, 787
 Chile, statements by, 785
 China, statements by, 784, 787
 Colombia, letter dated 25 July 2001, 783, 785, 935
 Costa Rica, statements by, 784, 936, 968
 Côte d'Ivoire, statements by, 790
 determinations of threats to the peace, 934, 935
 ECOWAS, briefings by, 788
 Egypt, statements by, 786, 787
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 787
 France, statements by, 790
 generally, 1051
 Group of Arab States, statements on behalf of, 1051
 in Africa, 788
 India, statements by, 784
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 76, 81, 86, 112, 129, 130, 131
 Ireland, statements by, 784
 Israel, statements by, 787
 Jamaica, statements by, 784, 968
 Japan, statements by, 787
 Korea, Republic of, statements by, 784, 787
 Liberia, statements by, 790
 Malawi, statements by, 787
 Mali, statements by, 19, 784
 matters of which Security Council seized, 38
 Mauritius, statements by, 784, 787, 935, 968
 measures not involving use of armed force, 968
 Namibia, statements by, 787
 new Security Council action, 45
 Norway, statements by, 19, 784
 Pakistan, statements by, 784, 1051
 Peru, statements by, 784, 785
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 147, 149
 statements by, 45, 785, 787, 1006, 1051
 Programme for Coordination and Assistance for Security and Development, briefings by, 788
 Resolution 1467 (2003), 790, 934
 Russian Federation, statements by, 786, 935, 1015
 Secretary-General
 briefings by, 783
 reports by, 785, 787, 1015
 statements by, 788
 self-defence, 1006, 1015
 Sierra Leone, statements by, 785
 South Africa, statements by, 784, 787, 1051
 Sudan, statements by, 784, 935
 Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 790, 934, 1015
 Thailand, statements by, 936
 Togo, statements by, 789
 Tunisia, statements by, 1015
 Ukraine, statements by, 785, 968
 Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, briefings by, 786, 936
 United Kingdom, statements by, 784
 United States, statements by, 784, 1051
- Solomon Islands**
 Bougainville situation, letter dated 10 November 2000, 33, 71, 145, 539, 875
- Somalia**
 Somalia situation
 briefings on, 281
 statements on, 288
- Somalia situation**
 assistance from Member States, 1041
 China, statements by, 286
 Colombia, statements by, 291
 determinations of threats to the peace, 921
 Djibouti
 briefings by, 281
 statements by, 285
 domestic affairs, non-intervention in, 1030
 Egypt, statements by, 289
 Ethiopia, statements by, 286
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 291
 force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1031
 France, statements by, 290, 291
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 76, 81, 86, 93, 97, 102, 110, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295
 Ireland, statements by, 291
 Jordan, statements by, 291
 League of Arab States, statements on behalf of, 286
 Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, statements by, 289, 291
 maintenance of peace and security, 1057
 Malaysia, statements by, 286
 measures not involving use of armed force, 949
 Netherlands, statements by, 286
 new Security Council action, 41
 Norway, statements by, 289
 obligations of Member States, 996, 999

- pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
 - regarding, 861, 870, 886
 - Panel of Experts, reports by, 170, 295
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 158, 161, 162
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152
 - statements by, 169, 286, 287, 289, 291, 293, 294, 295, 870, 871, 872, 886, 887, 999, 1073
 - regional arrangements, 1072, 1076
 - Representative of the Secretary-General for Somalia, briefings by, 288
 - Resolution 1356 (2001), 169, 287, 949
 - Resolution 1407 (2002), 292, 949, 1041
 - Resolution 1425 (2002), 170, 292, 871, 949
 - Resolution 1474 (2003), 169, 170, 294, 921, 1057, 1076
 - Resolution 1519 (2003), 41, 170, 295, 949, 1041, 1057, 1077
 - sanctions, 949
 - Secretary-General, reports by, 286, 288, 289, 290, 292, 293, 294, 295, 886, 1072
 - Security Council Committees
 - establishment, 169
 - letter dated 25 March 2003, 170
 - letter dated 4 November 2003, 295
 - mandate implementation, 169
 - monitoring and reporting, 169
 - Somalia
 - briefings by, 281
 - statements by, 288
 - Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 291
 - Tunisia, statements by, 286, 289
 - Ukraine, statements by, 286
 - Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 285
 - United Kingdom, statements by, 289
 - United States, statements by, 286, 289
 - Yemen, statements by, 286
- South Africa**
- Africa situation, statements on, 1067
 - Angola situation, statements on, 299
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1053, 1054
 - Burundi situation
 - briefings on, 329, 330
 - letter dated 25 October 2001, 325
 - children and armed conflict, statements on, 730
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 - letter dated 9 August 2000, 193
 - letter dated 25 October 2002, 401
 - note verbale dated 31 January 2000, 364
 - statements on, 362, 398, 401, 973
 - Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 359
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 666, 672, 927, 957, 974, 977, 978, 1057
 - Middle East situation
 - letter dated 2 October 2000, 848, 851
 - statements on, 612, 622, 1012
 - Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, letter dated 1 June 2000, 962
 - prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 898, 905
 - small arms, statements on, 784, 787, 1051
 - terrorism, statements on, 757, 763
 - women and peace and security, statements on, 807
- South Korea.** *See* Korea, Republic of
- Southern African Development Community**
terrorism, statements on behalf of, 746
- Spain (elected member of Security Council 2003)**
- Afghanistan situation, statements on, 522
 - Central African region, statements on, 464, 903
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 - letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
 - statements on, 660, 661, 664, 668, 927, 976, 979
 - Kosovo situation, statements on, 584
 - Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 334
 - Middle East situation, statements on, 620, 625, 632
 - pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 902, 905
 - peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
 - prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 895
 - terrorism, statements on, 758, 759, 766
 - Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 508
- Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Cyprus**
briefings by, 541
- Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process**
briefings by, 627, 629, 630, 631, 635, 1014
self-defence, statements on, 1014
- Special economic problems**
- al-Qaida and Taliban, 1006
 - Angola situation, 1001
 - decisions relating to Article 50, 1001
 - discussion relating to Article 50, 1002

- generally, 1000
 instances arising in subsidiary bodies, 1005
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1001, 1002
 Liberia situation, 1001
 Macedonia, statements by, 1004
 maintenance of peace and security, 1005
 sanctions, 1002
 Sierra Leone situation, 1002
- Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans**
 briefings by, 32, 90, 92, 588, 589, 1004
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 68
 President, decisions recorded in letters, 156
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of UN Operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina**
 briefings by, 544, 548, 550, 553, 558
 statements by, 550, 1074
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Transitional Administrator in East Timor**
 briefings by, 468, 472, 478, 481, 483, 491, 494, 498, 505, 507
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan**
 briefings by, 516, 520, 525, 526, 527, 528, 530
 statements by, 971
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Angola**
 briefings by, 318
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Central African Republic**
 briefings by, 413, 416
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children in Armed Conflict**
 briefings by, 727, 730, 731, 733, 747
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, briefings on, 381
 statements by, 966
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Iraq**
 briefings by, 677
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Kosovo**
 briefings by, 565, 566, 567, 571, 575, 578, 580, 582, 585, 586
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Liberia**
 briefings by, 284
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Sierra Leone**
 briefings by, 351
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Tajikistan**
 briefings by, 510
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes region**
 appointment, 881
 Burundi situation, briefings on, 326
 statements by, 361
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for West Africa**
 appointment, 888
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Democratic Republic of the Congo**
 briefings by, 384, 388, 409
- Standing committees.** *See specific entity or situation*
- Statements.** *See specific entity or situation*
- Subsidiary organs of the Security Council.** *See also specific entity or situation*
 ad hoc committees, 166
 ad hoc working groups, 182
 Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, 182
 informal working groups, 182
 investigative bodies, 183
 proposed but not established, 212
 special economic problems, 1005
 standing committees, 166
 Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions, 182
 Working Group on International Criminal Tribunals, 183
- Sudan**
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, letter dated 20 November 2001, 392
 Eritrea-Sudan dispute, letter dated 7 October 2002, 1019
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1011
 Middle East situation, statements on, 930, 931, 1012
 Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request letter dated 1 June 2000, 962
 statements on, 448
 small arms, statements on, 784, 935
 Sudan situation, letter dated 2 October 2003, 40, 88, 150, 462, 872, 888, 1073
- Sudan situation**
 Djibouti, letter dated 5 April 2000, 1060
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 88, 462
 matters of which Security Council seized, 40

peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions
regarding, 872, 888

President

decisions announced in statements, 150
statements by, 462, 872

regional arrangements, 1073

Sudan, letter dated 2 October 2003, 40, 88, 150,
462, 872, 888, 1073

Sweden

Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, letter dated
26 February and 8 March 2001, 549

ensuring effective role of Security Council in
maintenance of peace and security, statements
on, 967

HIV/AIDS, statements on, 933

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1004

justice and rule of law, statements on, 839

prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 910

sanctions

briefings on, 799

statements on, 799, 965

Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 347, 348,
349

Switzerland

admission of new Member States, 45, 256, 259

civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 967

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 655, 663,
666, 974

peacekeeping operations, letter dated 6 June
2003, 813

permanent observer, invitations to participate in
proceedings, 62

sanctions

briefings on, 798

statements on, 965

Sierra Leone situation

letter dated 21 December 2000, 347

statements on, 347

**Syrian Arab Republic (elected member of Security
Council 2002-2003)**

Bougainville situation, statements on, 537

civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 1052

Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 401

food and security, statements on, 822, 825

Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 28,
689

Iraq-Kuwait dispute

letter dated 22 May 2003, 142

statements on, 647, 650, 658, 668, 671, 674,
675, 678, 681, 684, 927, 957, 958, 976, 977,
979, 1010, 1027, 1058

Israel-Syria dispute

letter dated 5 October 2003, 39, 88, 131, 690,
849, 852, 1014, 1039

statements on, 690, 1039

justice and rule of law, statements on, 837

Kosovo situation, statements on, 581

Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 334, 962

Middle East situation

letter dated 20 September 2002, 627

letter dated 9 October 2003, 850, 853, 854

note verbale dated 20 September 2002, 6

statements on, 6, 619, 620, 621, 630, 631, 633,
1013

mine action, statements on, 817

peaceful settlement of disputes, statements on, 901

sanctions, statements on, 800, 965

small arms, statements on, 790, 934, 1015

Somalia situation, statements on, 291

terrorism, statements on, 743, 747, 752, 755, 757,
766

Tajikistan

Tajikistan situation, statements on, 510

Tajikistan situation

Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping
Operations, briefings by, 509

Canada, statements by, 510

European Union, statements on behalf of, 510

invitations to participate in proceedings, 69, 90

new Security Council action, 42

peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions
regarding, 875, 890

President

decisions announced in statements, 144, 145

decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158,
160

statements by, 42, 509, 510, 875, 890

Russian Federation, statements by, 510

Secretary-General, reports by, 509

Special Representative of the Secretary-General
for Tajikistan, briefings by, 510

Tajikistan, statements by, 510

United Kingdom, statements by, 510

Taliban. *See* Al-Qaida and Taliban

Tanzania, United Republic of

Central African region, statements on, 833

Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 379

- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 929
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 1063
- Terrorism**
- Afghanistan, letter dated 14 September 2001, 738
Australia, statements by, 746
Azerbaijan, letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
Bahrain, statements by, 757
Bulgaria, statements by, 751, 761
Burkina Faso, statements by, 754
Cameroon, statements by, 760, 762
Canada, statements by, 744
Chile, statements by, 747, 760, 765
China
 letter dated 27 September 2001, 738
 statements by, 737, 740, 749, 761
Colombia, statements by, 737, 741, 744, 749, 752, 760, 761
Congo, Democratic Republic of, statements by, 754
Counter-Terrorism Committee
 briefings by, 742, 745, 748, 750, 756, 758, 760, 762
 letter dated 15 July 2003, 759
 President, decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153, 154
 statements by, 746, 749, 751, 753, 765
Cuba, statements by, 757
determinations of threats to the peace, 923
Egypt, statements by, 753, 1016
European Union
 letter dated 12 and 25 September 2001, 738
 statements on behalf of, 744, 746, 749, 761
France, statements by, 737, 741, 762, 766, 1015
Georgia
 letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
 statements by, 753
Germany, statements by, 761, 762
Group of Arab States, statements on behalf of, 743, 744
Guinea, statements by, 760, 761
India, statements by, 743, 753, 761, 763
International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, 707
invitations to participate in proceedings, 85, 108, 116, 119, 120, 756
Iran, statements by, 743, 751, 753
Iraq, letter dated 18 September 2001, 739
Ireland, statements by, 736, 746, 749, 751
Israel, statements by, 743, 747, 752, 757, 1016
Jamaica, statements by, 740
Korea, Republic of, statements by, 753
Lebanon, statements by, 751
Liechtenstein, statements by, 761
Malaysia, statements by, 747
Mali, letter dated 18 September 2001, 738
matters of which Security Council seized, 34
Mauritius, statements by, 736, 741, 746
measures not involving use of armed force, 950
Mexico, statements by, 746, 760, 763, 1015
Moldova, letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
Nepal, statements by, 754
Norway, statements by, 737, 741, 746, 749, 751, 1015
Organization of the Islamic Conference
 letter dated 14 September 2001, 738
 statements on behalf of, 752, 754
Pakistan
 letter dated 13 September 2001, 738
 statements by, 743, 744, 747, 753, 758, 759, 762
Palestine, statements by, 743
Peru, statements by, 743, 744, 747, 751, 754
President
 decisions announced in statements, 148, 149, 150, 151
 statements by, 748, 754, 755, 758, 761, 763
Qatar, statements by, 743
Resolution 1368 (2001), 737, 923, 1007
Resolution 1373 (2001), 739, 923, 950, 1007, 1042
Resolution 1377 (2001), 741, 923
Resolution 1438 (2002), 754
Resolution 1440 (2002), 754
Resolution 1450 (2002), 755
Resolution 1452 (2002), 755
Resolution 1455 (2002), 756
Resolution 1456 (2003), 766
Resolution 1465 (2002), 756
Resolution 1516 (2003), 34, 763
Rio Group, statements on behalf of, 744, 747, 750
Russian Federation, statements by, 737, 741, 746, 748, 753, 759, 760, 766
Secretary-General
 reports by, 756
 statements by, 736, 739, 742, 750, 764
Security Council Committees
 briefings by, 760
 letter dated 7 July 2003, 760
self-defence, 1007, 1015
Singapore, statements by, 736, 746, 749, 752

- South Africa, statements by, 757, 763
Southern African Development Community, statements on behalf of, 746
Spain, statements by, 758, 759, 766
Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 743, 747, 752, 755, 757, 766
Tunisia, statements by, 736
Turkey, statements by, 747, 757, 763
Ukraine
 letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
 statements by, 761
United Arab Emirates, letter dated 25 September 2001, 739
United Kingdom, statements by, 736, 741, 759, 766
United States, statements by, 737, 741, 749, 751, 752, 758, 761, 766
Uzbekistan, letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
Yemen, statements by, 752
Yugoslavia, statements by, 753
Zambia, statements by, 752
- Thailand**
no exit without strategy, statements on, 900
small arms, statements on, 936
- Timor-Leste**
admission of new Member States, 45, 256, 259, 1025, 1163
Timor-Leste situation
 briefings on, 495, 501
 statements on, 506, 509
- Timor-Leste situation**
Angola, statements by, 508
Argentina, statements by, 471, 475
Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations
 briefings by, 469, 470, 471, 474, 476, 486, 488, 492, 501, 504
 statements by, 472, 487
Australia, statements by, 473, 474, 477, 490, 502, 504, 505, 508
Bangladesh, statements by, 469, 476, 487
Brazil, statements by, 477
Cameroon, statements by, 499
Canada, statements by, 468, 471, 473, 480, 489, 490, 492
China, statements by, 468, 471, 481, 485
Colombia, statements by, 484, 491, 493
Costa Rica, statements by, 503
Deputy Secretary-General
 briefings by, 503
 statements by, 1025
determinations of threats to the peace, 922
European Union, statements on behalf of, 473, 477, 479, 490, 496, 499
France, statements by, 469, 470, 471, 473, 476, 485, 487, 489, 490, 492, 500, 508
General Assembly, briefings by, 484
Guinea, statements by, 508
Indonesia
 briefings by, 478, 480
 letter dated 27 November 2000, 480
 statements by, 473, 476, 478, 480, 485, 490, 492, 496, 499, 502, 505, 506, 1025
International Monetary Fund, briefings by, 484
invitations to participate in proceedings, 17, 66, 69, 72, 78, 86, 90, 97, 99, 100, 102, 104, 111, 112, 117, 126, 127
Ireland, statements by, 492
Jamaica, statements by, 469, 496
Japan, statements by, 474, 484, 485, 496
Korea, Republic of, statements by, 490
Malaysia, statements by, 469, 471, 474, 478, 480
matters of which Security Council seized, 42
Mauritius, statements by, 487
measures involving use of armed force, 970, 985
Mexico, statements by, 500, 508
Namibia
 briefings by, 480
 statements by, 468, 476, 480
Netherlands, statements by, 471, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 480
new Security Council action, 41
New Zealand, statements by, 505
Norway, statements by, 489, 491, 493, 496
pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 874, 889
Philippines, statements by, 504
Portugal
 letter dated 25 January 2001, 483
 statements by, 493, 502, 503, 1025
President
 decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 147, 148
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 161
 statements by, 10, 476, 482, 494, 497, 504, 874, 875, 889
Resolution 1319 (2000), 478, 874
Resolution 1338 (2001), 485, 874, 889
Resolution 1392 (2002), 500, 889

- Resolution 1410 (2002), 502, 874, 889, 922, 970, 985
- Resolution 1473 (2003), 986
- Resolution 1480 (2003), 506, 970, 986
- Russian Federation, statements by, 479, 487, 489, 496, 499, 500
- Secretary-General
- briefings by, 501
 - letter dated 30 October 2001, 494
 - reports by, 467, 474, 476, 483, 485, 488, 490, 494, 497, 500, 502, 503, 504, 506
- Security Council Missions, 10, 480, 482, 831, 857
- self-determination, 1025
- Singapore, statements by, 487, 489, 491, 505
- Spain, statements by, 508
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Transitional Administrator in East Timor, briefings by, 468, 472, 478, 481, 483, 491, 494, 498, 505, 507
- Timor-Leste
- briefings by, 495, 501
 - statements by, 506, 509
- Ukraine, statements by, 475, 493
- UN Development Programme, briefings by, 484, 495
- Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations
- briefings by, 493
 - letter dated 28 March 2003, 986
- United Kingdom
- letter dated 3 April 2003, 200
 - statements by, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 475, 477, 478, 480, 481, 482, 485, 487, 490, 493, 496, 497, 499, 508
- United States, statements by, 469, 470, 471, 473, 474, 475, 481, 482, 487, 493, 497, 500, 505
- World Bank, briefings by, 484, 495
- Togo**
- Angola situation
 - letter regarding, 302
 - statements on, 300, 303, 308, 953
 - small arms, statements on, 789
- Transitional government representatives**
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 62
- Treaty of Pelindaba**
- deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 51
- Troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with**
- Argentina
- letter regarding, 812
 - statements by, 810, 993
- Bangladesh, statements by, 992
- Canada
- letter regarding, 812
 - statements by, 811, 993
- China, statements by, 811
- Colombia, statements by, 251, 994
- Deputy Secretary-General, briefings by, 810
- Egypt, statements by, 992
- France, statements by, 811
- generally, 983
- Ghana, letter regarding, 812
- India
- letter regarding, 812
 - statements by, 251, 810, 992, 994
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 60, 71, 95, 98, 103, 104, 105, 108, 112, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 125, 126
- Jamaica, statements by, 8
- Jordan, letter regarding, 812
- Korea, Republic of, statements by, 992
- Malaysia, statements by, 992
- Mali, statements by, 810, 990, 992
- matters of which Security Council seized, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40
- Mauritius, statements by, 251
- measures involving use of armed force, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994
- Military Staff Committee, relations of Security Council with other UN organs, 251
- Nepal, statements by, 810
- Netherlands, letter regarding, 812
- New Zealand
- letter regarding, 812
 - statements by, 811, 992
- Nigeria, statements by, 993
- Pakistan, statements by, 810, 811
- President
- decisions announced in statements, 146
 - decisions recorded in letters, 157, 158
 - note dated 27 August 2002, 61
 - statements by, 8, 809, 811, 983, 991
- Resolution 1327 (2000), 8, 983
- Resolution 1353 (2001), 8, 29, 33, 60, 251, 812, 983, 991, 993, 1046
- Russian Federation, statements by, 251, 994

Singapore
letter dated 8 January 2001, 809, 811
statements by, 811
United Kingdom, statements by, 811
United States, statements by, 810, 811
Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations,
letter dated 31 May 2001, 812
Zambia, statements by, 990, 992

Trusteeship Council

relations of Security Council with, 241

Tunisia (elected member of Security Council 2000-2001)

Afghanistan situation, statements on, 952
Africa situation, statements on, 1067
Angola situation, statements on, 299, 954
children and armed conflict, statements on, 966
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 1044
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 365, 370, 380, 386, 389
ensuring effective role of Security Council in
maintenance of peace and security, statements
on, 723
Guinea situation, statements on, 445, 1069
HIV/AIDS, statements on, 715
humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and
security, statements on, 1044, 1048
Iraq-Kuwait dispute
letter dated 24 June 2002, 1002, 1005
statements on, 641, 649, 975, 1003
Kosovo situation, statements on, 572
Liberia situation, statements on, 277
maintenance of peace and security, statements on,
1005
Middle East situation
letter dated 1 April 2002, 850
letter dated 17 April 2002, 858
statements on, 617, 930
post-conflict peacebuilding, letter dated
25 January 2001, 818, 820, 1047
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 896,
910, 912
sanctions, statements on, 964, 965
Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 348, 989
small arms, statements on, 1015
Somalia situation, statements on, 286, 289
terrorism, statements on, 736

Turkey

Afghanistan situation
letter dated 21 October 2002, 527
statements on, 524

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 673, 957
letter dated 2 April 1991, deleted from matters of
which Security Council seized, 48
terrorism, statements on, 747, 757, 763

Tuvalu

admission of new Member States, 45, 256, 257,
258, 261

Uganda

Angola situation
letter regarding, 298, 302
statements on, 300
Burundi situation, briefings on, 327
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
letter dated 26 January and 3 February 2000,
364
letter dated 20 February 2001, 376
letter dated 16 April 2001, 378
letter dated 14 November 2001, 392
letter dated 21 November and 10 December
2001, 392
letter dated 25 October 2002, 401
letter dated 4 November 2002, 401
statements on, 363, 379, 383, 393, 394, 401,
955, 972, 1033
Rwanda-Uganda dispute, letter dated 15 June
2000, 1019

Ukraine (elected member of Security Council 2000-2001)

Afghanistan situation, statements on, 513, 952
Angola situation, statements on, 303, 311, 953,
954, 1082
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on,
1081
children and armed conflict, statements on, 966
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 906
conduct of business, statements on, 17
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 368, 1034
ensuring effective role of Security Council in
maintenance of peace and security, letter dated
28 February 2001, 724, 725
Georgia situation
briefings on, 595
letter dated 17 March 2001, 595
Guinea situation, statements on, 447
International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia,
statements on, 702
invitations to participate in proceedings,
statements on, 64
Kosovo situation, statements on, 566, 570

- Middle East situation, statements on, 142, 610, 615
 no exit without strategy, statements on, 900
 post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 820
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 910, 912
 refugees, statements on, 768
 Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 347, 982, 989
 small arms, statements on, 785, 968
 Somalia situation, statements on, 286
 terrorism
 letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
 statements on, 761
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 475, 493
 Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 589, 590
- UN Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI).** *See also* Iraq humanitarian situation
 establishment, 205
 mandate implementation, 205
 Resolution 1483 (2003), 205
 Resolution 1500 (2003), 205
 Secretary-General, reports by, 205, 206
- UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA)**
 establishment, 197
 mandate implementation, 197
 Resolution 1383 (2001), 197
 Resolution 1401 (2002), 197
 Resolution 1471 (2003), 197
 Secretary-General, reports by, 197
- UN Children's Fund (UNICEF)**
 children and armed conflict, briefings on, 727, 730, 732, 733, 741
 Iraq humanitarian situation, briefings on, 688
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 639
- UN Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (MIPONUH).** *See also* Haiti situation
 generally, 196
 mandate implementation, 196
 President, statements by, 197
 Secretary-General, reports by, 196, 466
 termination of mandate, 196, 210
- UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM).** *See also* Women and peace and security
 briefings by, 802, 804
 statements by, 936
- UN Development Programme**
 Africa situation, briefings on, 419, 427
 Iraq humanitarian situation, briefings on, 688
 Timor-Leste situation, briefings on, 484, 495
- UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF).** *See also* Middle East situation
 generally, 203
 President, statements by, 600
 Resolution 1300 (2000), 600
 Resolution 1328 (2000), 600
 Resolution 1351 (2001), 600
 Resolution 1381 (2001), 600
 Resolution 1415 (2002), 600
 Resolution 1451 (2002), 600
 Resolution 1488 (2003), 600
 Resolution 1520 (2003), 600
 Secretary-General, reports by, 203, 600
- UN Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK).** *See also* Kosovo situation
 generally, 203
 mandate implementation, 203
 Secretary-General, reports by, 203, 565, 568, 571, 575, 581, 582, 583
- UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL).** *See also* Middle East situation
 generally, 204
 Israel, letter dated 2 June and 24 July 2003, 604
 Lebanon
 letter dated 28 December 1999, 601
 letter dated 6 April 2000, 601
 letter dated 15 and 22 May 2000, 602
 letter dated 11 July 2000, 603
 letter dated 2 and 9 July 2003, 604
 mandate implementation, 204
 President, statements by, 601, 602, 603
 Resolution 1288 (2000), 601
 Resolution 1310 (2000), 603
 Resolution 1337 (2001), 204, 604
 Resolution 1365 (2001), 204, 604
 Resolution 1391 (2002), 604
 Resolution 1428 (2002), 604
 Resolution 1461 (2003), 204, 604
 Resolution 1496 (2003), 605
 Secretary-General
 letter dated 6 April 2000, 601
 letter dated 17 April 2000, 601
 letter dated 24 July 2000, 603
 reports by, 204, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604
- UN Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM).** *See also* Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 generally, 204
 mandate implementation, 204
 Resolution 1490 (2003), 205
 Secretary-General, reports by, 205

- termination of mandate, 205, 211
- UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP).** *See also* India-Pakistan dispute generally, 198
- UN Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO).** *See also* Western Sahara situation generally, 184
Secretary-General, letter dated 12 November 2001, 185
- UN Mission in Angola (UNMA)**
establishment, 189
mandate implementation, 190
Resolution 1433 (2002), 189
Secretary-General, reports by, 189, 190
termination of mandate, 190
- UN Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH).** *See also* Bosnia and Herzegovina situation generally, 201
mandate implementation, 201
Resolution 1396 (2002), 202
Resolution 1423 (2002), 202
Secretary-General, reports by, 201, 202, 543, 550, 553
termination of mandate, 202, 211
- UN Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (MINUCI)**
establishment, 196
mandate implementation, 196
Resolution 1479 (2003), 196
Resolution 1514 (2003), 196
- UN Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE)**
generally, 194
mandate implementation, 194
Resolution 1312 (2000), 194
Resolution 1320 (2000), 195
Resolution 1430 (2002), 195
Secretary-General, reports by, 195, 430, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437
- UN Mission in Liberia (UNMIL)**
generally, 188
Resolution 1497 (2003), 188
Resolution 1509 (2003), 188
- UN Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL).** *See also* Sierra Leone situation generally, 190
mandate implementation, 190
Resolution 1289 (2000), 191
Resolution 1299 (2000), 191
Resolution 1313 (2000), 191
Resolution 1346 (2001), 191
Resolution 1436 (2002), 191
- Secretary-General
letter dated 28 December 1999, 190
letter dated 17 May 2000, 191
reports by, 190, 335, 336, 337, 340, 343, 344, 345, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355
- UN Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA).** *See also* Central African Republic situation generally, 195
Secretary-General, reports by, 412
termination of mandate, 195, 210
- UN Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (UNMOP)**
generally, 202
mandate implementation, 202
Resolution 1437 (2002), 202
Secretary-General, reports by, 202, 561
termination of mandate, 202, 211
- UN Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT).** *See also* Tajikistan situation generally, 198
Secretary-General, reports by, 198, 509
termination of mandate, 198, 211
- UN Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISET)**
establishment, 200
mandate implementation, 200
Resolution 1410 (2002), 200
Resolution 1473 (2003), 200
Resolution 1480 (2003), 200
Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping
Operations, letter dated 28 March 2003, 200
- UN Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC).** *See also* Iraq-Kuwait dispute
briefings by, 658, 660, 663, 667, 927, 976
generally, 206
mandate implementation, 207
reports by, 676, 926, 927, 977
- UN Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG).** *See also* Georgia situation
briefings by, 595, 596, 597, 599
generally, 201
mandate implementation, 201
Resolution 1494 (2003), 201
Secretary-General, reports by, 201
- UN Office in Angola (UNOA).** *See also* Angola situation generally, 189
mandate implementation, 189
Resolution 1294 (2000), 189
Secretary-General, reports by, 189
termination of mandate, 189, 211

- UN Office in Burundi (UNOB).** *See also* Burundi situation
generally, 185
mandate implementation, 185
President
letter dated 7 December 2001, 185
statements by, 186
Secretary-General
letter dated 15 November 2000, 185
reports by, 185, 186
- UN Office on Drugs and Crime**
Afghanistan situation, briefings on, 531
- UN Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC).** *See also* Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
generally, 192
mandate implementation, 192
reports by, 367
Resolution 1291 (2000), 192
Resolution 1355 (2001), 192
Resolution 1445 (2002), 193
Resolution 1484 (2003), 193
Resolution 1493 (2003), 193
Secretary-General
letter dated 15 May 2003, 193
letter dated 14 August 2003, 193
reports by, 192, 364, 371, 380, 387, 395, 396, 403, 406
women and peace and security, briefings on, 807
- UN Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNOGBIS).** *See also* Guinea-Bissau situation
briefings by, 440
generally, 193
mandate implementation, 194
Secretary-General, reports by, 440
- UN Peacebuilding Support Office in Liberia (UNOL).** *See also* Liberia situation
generally, 187
mandate implementation, 187
President
letter dated 29 November 2002, 187
statements by, 187
Resolution 1478 (2003), 188
Resolution 1509 (2003), 188
Secretary-General
letter dated 15 January 2003, 187
letter dated 11 April 2003, 187
letter dated 29 July 2003, 188
letter dated 16 September 2003, 188
reports by, 188
termination of mandate, 188, 211
- UN Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic (BONUCA).** *See also* Central African Republic situation
briefings by, 413
establishment, 195
mandate implementation, 196
President, statements by, 195
Secretary-General, reports by, 196, 413, 415
- UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP).** *See also* Cyprus situation
generally, 201
Secretary-General, reports by, 540
- UN Political Office for Somalia (UNPOS).** *See also* Somalia situation
generally, 186
mandate implementation, 186
President, statements by, 186, 187
Secretary-General
letter dated 16 November 2001, 186
reports by, 186, 187
- UN Political Office in Bougainville (UNPOB).** *See also* Bougainville situation
briefings by, 537
generally, 199
mandate implementation, 199
President, letter dated 23 December 2003, 199
Secretary-General
letter dated 22 October 2001, 199
letter dated 19 December 2003, 199
termination of mandate, 199, 211
- UN Protection Force**
deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 50
- UN Tajikistan Office of Peacebuilding (UNTOP).** *See also* Tajikistan situation
establishment, 198
mandate implementation, 199
President, statements by, 198
Secretary-General, reports by, 198
- UN Transitional Administration in Timor-Leste (UNTAET).** *See also* Timor-Leste situation
generally, 199
mandate implementation, 200
matters of which Security Council seized, 36
President, statements by, 200
Resolution 1392 (2002), 200
Secretary-General, reports by, 200, 467, 483, 494, 497, 500, 503, 504, 506
termination of mandate, 211

UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO). *See also* Middle East situation generally, 203

UNAMI. *See* UN Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI)

UNAMSIL. *See* UN Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL)

Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa

Angola situation
briefings on, 310, 312, 314, 953, 954
statements on, 305

Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 239

Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs
small arms, briefings on, 786, 936

Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator

Angola situation, briefings on, 315
civilians in armed conflict
briefings on, 772, 774, 775, 777, 780, 781
statements on, 776

Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs
responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, briefings on, 707

Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations

Afghanistan situation
briefings on, 529, 531, 533
statements on, 529

Africa situation, statements on, 426

Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, briefings on, 546, 547

Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, briefings on, 381, 404, 407, 408

Croatia situation, briefings on, 562

Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, briefings on, 430, 433

Guinea situation
briefings on, 446
statements on, 1069

HIV/AIDS, briefings on, 715, 718

justice and rule of law, briefings on, 838

Kosovo situation, briefings on, 569, 570, 572, 573, 574, 576, 579, 581, 587

mine action, briefings on, 816

Sierra Leone situation, briefings on, 335, 353

Timor-Leste situation
briefings on, 493
letter dated 28 March 2003, 986

UNMISSET, letter dated 28 March 2003, 200

women and peace and security, briefings on, 804, 806

Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs

Afghanistan situation, briefings on, 520, 523, 524

Africa situation, briefings on, 427

Angola situation, briefings on, 296

Bougainville situation, briefings on, 534

Guinea-Bissau situation, briefings on, 438

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1003

Middle East situation
briefings on, 629, 630, 634
statements on, 1014

pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 829

sanctions, statements on, 797

self-defence, statements on, 1014

Somalia situation, briefings on, 285

UNDOF. *See* UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF)

UNFICYP. *See* UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP)

UNHCR. *See* High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

UNICEF. *See* UN Children's Fund (UNICEF)

UNIFEM. *See* UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM)

UNIFIL. *See* UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL)

UNIKOM. *See* UN Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM)

UNITA. *See* Angola situation

United Arab Emirates

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1045

Middle East situation, statements on, 1013

terrorism, letter dated 25 September 2001, 739

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (permanent member of Security Council)

Afghanistan situation
letter dated 19 December 2001, 518
letter dated 14 March 2002, 521
letter regarding, 1007

statements on, 512, 513, 517, 522, 526, 532

Africa situation, letter dated 15 July 2002, 426

Agenda, statements on, 28

Angola situation, statements on, 297, 298, 302

Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 546, 560, 1074

Bougainville situation, statements on, 536

Burundi situation, statements on, 323, 326, 331

Central African region
briefings on, 834

- statements on, 464, 903
- Central African Republic situation, statements on, 417
- children and armed conflict, statements on, 730, 733, 734
- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 770, 776, 779, 780, 906, 911
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 363, 372, 376, 377, 386, 402, 973
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 723, 725
- food and security, statements on, 241, 822, 823, 824, 825
- Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 356, 358, 360
- Guinea situation, statements on, 444, 447
- Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 438
- HIV/AIDS, statements on, 716, 719
- Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 689
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
- briefings on, 679, 683
 - letter dated 24 September 2002, 925
 - letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
 - letter dated 8 May 2003, 1027
 - statements on, 639, 641, 642, 645, 649, 655, 656, 660, 661, 664, 668, 672, 680, 682, 684, 956, 975, 976, 977, 979, 980, 1028, 1039
- justice and rule of law, statements on, 837
- Kosovo situation, statements on, 1026
- Lockerbie bombing
- letter dated 15 August 2003, 332, 961
 - statements on, 334
- meetings, statements on, 7
- Middle East situation, statements on, 610, 615, 617, 623, 632, 859, 1013
- mine action, statements on, 817
- Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, statements on, 448, 962
- no exit without strategy, statements on, 808, 809
- peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
- post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 1062
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 895, 908, 909
- refugees, statements on, 767
- responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 708
- Rwanda situation, statements on, 320
- sanctions, statements on, 800, 964
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 336, 337, 339, 348, 959, 960, 961, 980, 981, 988
- small arms, statements on, 784
- Somalia situation, statements on, 289
- Tajikistan situation, statements on, 510
- terrorism, statements on, 736, 741, 759, 766
- Timor-Leste situation
- letter dated 3 April 2003, 200
 - statements on, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 475, 477, 478, 480, 481, 482, 485, 487, 490, 493, 496, 497, 499, 508
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 811
- women and peace and security, statements on, 805
- United States of America (permanent member of Security Council)**
- Afghanistan situation
- letter dated 7 October 2001, 1007
 - statements on, 512, 513, 515, 517, 521, 524, 526, 532, 924, 952, 971
- Africa situation, statements on, 426
- Angola situation
- letter dated 26 April 2002, 315
 - statements on, 306, 312
- anniversary of 11 September 2001, statements on, 764
- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 546, 548, 554, 556, 924, 1053, 1081, 1082
- Bougainville situation, statements on, 535, 537
- Burundi situation, statements on, 329
- Central African region, statements on, 452, 465, 903
- Central African Republic situation, statements on, 417
- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 770, 776, 1052
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 365, 369, 372, 373, 375, 384, 385, 387, 393, 394, 955, 1008, 1034
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 722
- food and security, statements on, 824
- Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 356
- Guinea situation, statements on, 445, 447
- Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 439, 441
- HIV/AIDS, statements on, 717, 931, 1049
- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 702

- invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 64
- Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 689
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 - briefings on, 659, 679, 682
 - letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
 - letter dated 8 May 2003, 1027
 - statements on, 637, 643, 646, 649, 656, 661, 664, 668, 672, 678, 681, 682, 957, 958, 975, 976, 977, 980, 1010, 1011, 1027, 1028, 1039
- Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 691, 1039
- justice and rule of law, statements on, 837
- Kosovo situation, statements on, 567, 570, 574, 586
- Liberia situation, statements on, 278, 282
- Lockerbie bombing
 - letter dated 15 August 2003, 332, 961
 - statements on, 333, 961
- meetings, statements on, 7
- Middle East situation
 - letter dated 17 October 2000, 609
 - statements on, 607, 610, 611, 613, 614, 616, 617, 619, 620, 622, 623, 624, 625, 627, 628, 629, 630, 632, 633, 634, 859
- Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, statements on, 448, 962
- no exit without strategy, statements on, 900
- pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 901, 913
- peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
- post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 710, 820, 1050
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 895, 908, 911, 935
- protection of UN personnel, statements on, 796
- refugees, statements on, 767
- regional organizations, statements on, 1064
- responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 708
- Rwanda situation, statements on, 320
- sanctions, statements on, 798, 800, 801, 963, 965
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 341, 349, 960, 961, 980, 988
- small arms, statements on, 784, 1051
- Somalia situation, statements on, 286, 289
- terrorism, statements on, 737, 741, 749, 751, 752, 758, 761, 766
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 469, 470, 471, 473, 474, 475, 481, 482, 487, 493, 497, 500, 505
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 810, 811
- West Africa region, statements on, 450
- Western Sahara situation, statements on, 272
- women and peace and security, statements on, 803, 906
- Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 589
- UNMA.** *See* UN Mission in Angola (UNMA)
- UNMEE.** *See* UN Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE)
- UNMIBH.** *See* UN Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH)
- UNMIK.** *See* UN Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK)
- UNMIL.** *See* UN Mission in Liberia (UNMIL)
- UNMISSET.** *See* UN Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISSET)
- UNMOGIP (UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan).** *See also* India-Pakistan dispute generally, 198
- UNMOP.** *See* UN Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (UNMOP)
- UNMOT.** *See* UN Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT)
- UNMOVIC.** *See* UN Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC)
- UNOA.** *See* UN Office in Angola (UNOA)
- UNOB.** *See* UN Office in Burundi (UNOB)
- UNOGBIS.** *See* UN Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNOGBIS)
- UNOL.** *See* UN Peacebuilding Support Office in Liberia (UNOL)
- UNOMIG.** *See* UN Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG)
- UNPOB.** *See* UN Political Office in Bougainville (UNPOB)
- UNPOS.** *See* UN Political Office for Somalia (UNPOS)
- UNTAET.** *See* UN Transitional Administration in Timor-Leste (UNTAET)
- UNTOP.** *See* UN Tajikistan Office of Peacebuilding (UNTOP)
- UNTSO (UN Truce Supervision Organization).** *See also* Middle East situation generally, 203
- Uruguay**
 - justice and rule of law, statements on, 839
 - peacekeeping operations, statements on, 814
- Uzbekistan**
 - Afghanistan situation, statements on, 952
 - terrorism, letter dated 25 September 2001, 738

Venezuela

- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1038
- women and peace and security, statements on, 806

Vetoes of draft resolutions

- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 554
- Middle East situation, 222

Viet Nam

- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1045

Voting

- absence, 139, 142
- adoption of resolutions or decisions without vote, 143
- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, non-procedural matters, 137
- Georgia situation, absence, 142
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, absence, 142
- Middle East situation
 - non-participation, 142
 - non-procedural matters, 137
- non-participation, 139, 142
- President, note dated 29 June 2001, 135
- procedural and non-procedural matters, 136, 138
- procedures relating to, 135

West Africa region

- Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 449
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 120, 122
- peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 888
- President, statements by, 11, 449, 450, 888, 1079
- Secretary-General
 - letter dated 30 April 2001, 449
 - relations of Security Council with, 247
- Security Council Missions, 11, 120, 122, 239, 449, 831, 857
- United States, statements by, 450

Western Sahara situation

- abstention, 139
- Algeria, letters regarding, 273, 274
- Argentina, statements by, 272
- China, statements by, 271
- Jamaica, statements by, 271
- Malaysia, statements by, 272
- Mali, statements by, 271
- Morocco
 - letter dated 24 February 2000, 270
 - letters regarding, 273, 274
- Namibia
 - letters regarding, 274

statements by, 271

- Netherlands, statements by, 271
 - new Security Council action, 41
 - peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 861, 872, 887
 - President, decisions recorded in letters, 159, 160, 161
 - Resolution 1292 (2000), 270, 872, 887
 - Resolution 1301 (2000), 139, 272, 872
 - Resolution 1309 (2000), 272
 - Resolution 1324 (2000), 272
 - Resolution 1342 (2001), 272
 - Resolution 1349 (2001), 272
 - Resolution 1359 (2001), 273, 872, 887
 - Resolution 1380 (2001), 273
 - Resolution 1394 (2002), 273
 - Resolution 1406 (2002), 273
 - Resolution 1429 (2002), 273, 873, 887
 - Resolution 1463 (2003), 273
 - Resolution 1469 (2003), 273
 - Resolution 1485 (2003), 273
 - Resolution 1495 (2003), 274, 873, 887
 - Resolution 1513 (2003), 41, 275
 - Secretary-General, reports by, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 873, 887
 - United States, statements by, 272
- WFP.** *See* World Food Programme (WFP)
- WHO.** *See* World Health Organization (WHO)
- Women and peace and security**
- Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, briefings by, 802, 804
 - Australia, statements by, 936
 - Bangladesh, statements by, 803
 - determinations of threats to the peace, 936
 - Egypt, statements by, 936
 - European Union, statements on behalf of, 806
 - India, statements by, 806
 - Indonesia, statements by, 803, 906
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 71, 81, 88, 89, 91, 103, 109, 113, 114, 124, 127, 234
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 32
 - measures not involving use of armed force, 951
 - Mexico, statements by, 807
 - MONUC, briefings by, 807
 - Namibia, statements by, 906
 - Nepal, statements by, 803
 - New Zealand, statements by, 906
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 147, 149

- decisions recorded in letters, 161
 - statements by, 803, 806
 - Resolution 1325 (2000), 803, 951, 1046
 - Resolution 1379, 951
 - Secretary-General
 - briefings by, 801, 805
 - relations of Security Council with, 246
 - reports by, 805, 806
 - South Africa, statements by, 807
 - Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 804, 806
 - UNIFEM
 - briefings by, 802, 804
 - statements by, 936
 - United Kingdom, statements by, 805
 - United States, statements by, 803, 906
 - Venezuela, statements by, 806
 - Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions**, 182
 - Working Group on International Criminal Tribunals**, 183
 - Working Group on the Brahimi Report**
 - ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security
 - letter dated 10 November 2000, 722
 - reports on, 722
 - establishment, 983
 - letter dated 10 November 2000, 8
 - reports by, 990
 - Working Group on UN Peacekeeping Operations**
 - creation, 8
 - establishment, 8, 183, 227
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 105, 106, 107, 109
 - letter dated 31 December 2001, 812
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 36, 38
 - President
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153, 154
 - notes by, 36
 - reports by, 228, 812
 - troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, letter dated 31 May 2001, 812
 - Working methods and procedures**
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 50
 - President
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154
 - decisions recorded in notes, 151, 153
 - World Bank**
 - Africa situation, briefings on, 419
 - Central African region, briefings on, 451
 - Central African Republic situation, briefings on, 414, 416
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, briefings on, 439
 - Timor-Leste situation, briefings on, 484, 495
 - World Food Programme (WFP)**
 - food and security
 - briefings on, 128, 241, 822, 823, 825, 932
 - statements on, 824
 - Iraq humanitarian situation, briefings on, 688
 - protection of UN personnel, briefings on, 794
 - World Health Organization (WHO)**
 - Iraq humanitarian situation, briefings on, 688
 - Wrap-up discussions**
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 80, 86, 128
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 34
 - measures not involving use of armed force, 968
 - self-defence, 1016
 - Yemen**
 - civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 934
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 647, 928, 929, 975, 980, 1012, 1038
 - Middle East situation, letter dated 20 February 2002, 854
 - Somalia situation, statements on, 286
 - terrorism, statements on, 752
 - Yemen situation**
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49
 - Yugoslavia situation.** *See also* Bosnia and Herzegovina situation; Croatia situation; Kosovo situation; Macedonia situation
 - Belarus, statements by, 590
 - China, statements by, 588, 590
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49, 51
 - European Union, briefings by, 590
 - France, statements by, 588
 - Namibia
 - letter dated 11 May 2000, 852
 - statements by, 588
 - President, statements by, 589
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 588, 589
 - Slovenia, statements by, 590
 - Ukraine, statements by, 589, 590
 - United States, statements by, 589
- Yugoslavia, Federal Republic of.** *See also* Serbia and Montenegro
 - admission of new Member States, 45, 256, 258

- Agenda, statements on, 28
- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 547, 550
- briefings by, 35, 76, 97
- Croatia situation
- letter dated 24 December 1999, 561
 - letter dated 22 December 2000, 561
 - letter dated 3 July 2001, 561
 - letter dated 28 December 2001, 561
 - letter dated 10 April 2002, 561
- domestic affairs, non-intervention in, letter dated 5 October 2000, 1043
- force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, letter dated 5 October 2000, 1028
- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 696
- Kosovo situation
- letter dated 13 February 2000, 848
 - letter dated 13 February and 14 August 2000, 854
 - letter dated 20 May 2000, 848
 - letter dated 6 June, 19 July and 14 August 2000, 849
 - letter dated 19 July 2000, 853
 - letter dated 14 August 2000, 853
 - letter dated 6 November 2001, 575
- letter dated 23 May 2002, 849
 - statements on, 568, 569, 570, 571, 577, 580
- Macedonia situation, statements on, 563
- Middle East situation, letter dated 29 June 2000, 852
- sanctions, letter dated 31 July 2001, 1060
- terrorism, statements on, 753
- Zaire.** *See* Congo, Democratic Republic of
- Zambia**
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 362, 393
 - Great Lakes region situation, letter dated 24 May 2001, 357
 - terrorism, statements on, 752
 - troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 990, 992
- Zimbabwe**
- Angola situation, statements on, 304, 311
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 362, 379, 384, 393, 394, 401, 402, 955, 972, 1008, 1032
 - HIV/AIDS, statements on, 715
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 958, 1011
 - Rwanda situation, letter dated 8 November 2000, 1019



United Nations

Department of Political Affairs

**Repertoire of the Practice
of the Security Council**

Supplement 2000-2003

Volume II

Department of Political Affairs

**Repertoire of the Practice
of the Security Council**

Supplement 2000-2003

Volume II



United Nations • New York, 2012

Note

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

ST/PSCA/1/Add.14

United Nations publication

Sales No. E.12.VII.3

ISBN 978-92-1-137039-3

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Volume I	
Introduction	xv
Members of the Security Council, 2000-2003.	xvi
Items considered by the Security Council at formal meetings, 2000-2003.	xviii
Chapter I. Provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council and related procedural developments	
Introductory note	3
Part I. Meetings (rules 1-5).	5
Note	5
A. Special cases concerning the application of rules 1-5	5
B. Procedural developments relating to meetings.	7
Part II. Representation and credentials (rules 13-17)	12
Part III. Presidency (rules 18-20)	12
Note	12
Part IV. Secretariat (rules 21-26)	15
Part V. Conduct of business (rules 27-36)	15
Note	15
Special cases concerning the application of rules 27-36	16
Part VI. Languages (rules 41-47)	22
Note	22
Special cases concerning the application of rules 41-47	22
Part VII. Publicity of meetings, records (rules 48-57)	23
Chapter II. Agenda	
Introductory note	X
Part I. The provisional agenda (rules 6-8 and 12)	27
Note	27
A. Circulation of communications by the Secretary-General (rule 6)	27
B. Preparation of the provisional agenda (rule 7)	27
C. Communication of the provisional agenda (rule 8)	27
Part II. Adoption of the agenda (rule 9)	28

Note	28
Discussions on the adoption of the agenda	28
A. Scope of items on the agenda in relation to the scope of discussion	28
B. Phrasing of agenda items	29
C. Postponement of consideration of items	29
Part III. The agenda and matters of which the Security Council is seized (rules 10 and 11) ..	30
Note	30
Practice of the Security Council regarding the retention and deletion of items from the list of matters of which the Council is seized (rule 11)	31
Addition, retention and deletion of items during the period under review	31
A. Items added to the list of matters of which the Security Council was seized during the period 2000-2003	32
B. Items that appeared in previous volumes of the <i>Repertoire</i> on which new action by the Security Council was reported in summary statements issued during the period 2000-2003	40
C. Items that were deleted from the list of matters of which the Security Council was seized during the period 2000-2003	48
Chapter III. Participation in the proceedings of the Security Council	
Introductory note	57
Part I. Basis of invitations to participate	58
Note	58
A. Invitations under rule 37 (States Members of the United Nations)	58
B. Invitations under rule 39 (members of the Secretariat or other persons)	59
C. Invitations not expressly extended under rule 37 or rule 39	60
D. Requests for invitations denied or not acted upon	63
Part II. Procedures relating to participation of invited representatives or individuals	65
Note	65
A. The stage at which those invited to participate are heard	65
B. Limitations on participation	66
Annexes	
I. Invitations extended under rule 37	67
II. Invitations extended under rule 39	89
Chapter IV. Voting	
Introductory note	135
Part I. Procedures relating to decision-making and voting	135

Part II. Procedural and non-procedural matters	136
Note	136
Cases in which the vote indicated the non-procedural character of the matter	137
Part III. Proceedings of the Security Council regarding voting upon the question whether the matter was procedural within the meaning of Article 27, paragraph 2, of the Charter	138
Part IV. Abstention, non-participation or absence in relation to Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter	138
Note	138
A. Obligatory abstention	138
B. Voluntary abstention, non-participation or absence in relation to Article 27, paragraph 3	139
1. Cases in which permanent and/or elected members abstained otherwise than in accordance with the proviso to Article 27, paragraph 3	139
2. Cases in which elected members did not participate or were absent during the voting	142
Part V. Adoption of resolutions and decisions without a vote	143
Note	143
A. Cases in which the Security Council adopted resolutions without a vote	144
B. Cases in which Security Council decisions were announced in presidential statements issued after being agreed upon by the members of the Council at consultations	144
C. Cases in which Security Council decisions were recorded in notes by the President of the Security Council.	151
D. Cases in which Security Council decisions were recorded in letters from the President of the Security Council	154
Chapter V. Subsidiary organs of the Security Council	
Introductory note	165
Part I. Subsidiary organs of the Security Council established or continuing during the period 2000-2003.	166
A. Standing committees and ad hoc committees	166
B. Security Council committees	166
C. Informal and ad hoc working groups	182
D. Investigative bodies	183
E. Peacekeeping operations and political missions.	184
F. Ad hoc commissions and ad hoc international tribunals	206
Part II. Subsidiary organs of the Security Council whose mandate was completed or terminated during the period 2000-2003	210

Part III. Subsidiary organs of the Security Council proposed but not established	212
Chapter VI. Relations with other United Nations organs	
Introductory note	216
Part I. Relations with the General Assembly	216
Note	216
A. Election by the General Assembly of non-permanent members of the Security Council	216
B. Recommendations by the General Assembly to the Security Council in the form of resolutions under Articles 10 and 11 of the Charter	218
Note	218
1. Recommendations on matters relating to the Council's powers and functions or with regard to the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security	219
2. Recommendations with regard to questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security, or requesting action on such questions by the Council	221
C. Practice in relation to Article 12 of the Charter	221
Note	221
D. Practice in relation to provisions of the Charter involving recommendations by the Security Council to the General Assembly	223
Note	223
1. Membership in the United Nations	223
2. Appointment of the Secretary-General	224
E. Reports of the Security Council to the General Assembly	224
F. Relations with subsidiary organs established by the General Assembly	226
Note	226
Communications from subsidiary organs established by the General Assembly	229
Part II. Relations with the Economic and Social Council: practice in relation to Article 65 of the Charter	231
Note	231
A. Requests or references to the Economic and Social Council in decisions of the Security Council	231
Note	231
1. Resolutions containing references to the Economic and Social Council	232
2. Presidential statements containing references to the Economic and Social Council	232

B. Constitutional discussion arising in connection with the Economic and Social Council	233
Note	233
Part III. Relations with the Trusteeship Council	241
Part IV. Relations with the International Court of Justice	242
Note	242
A. Practice in relation to the election of members of the International Court of Justice	242
Note	242
B. Consideration of the relationship between the Security Council and the Court	243
Note	243
Part V. Relations with the Secretariat	245
Note	245
A. Functions other than those of an administrative nature entrusted to the Secretary-General by the Security Council	245
Note	245
B. Matters brought to the attention of the Security Council by the Secretary-General	249
Part VI. Relations with the Military Staff Committee	250
Note	250
Chapter VII. Practice relative to recommendations to the General Assembly regarding membership in the United Nations	
Introductory note	255
Part I. Applications for admission to membership in the United Nations and action taken thereon by the Security Council and the General Assembly, 2000-2003	256
Note	256
A. Applications recommended by the Security Council	256
B. Discussion of the question in the Security Council	256
C. Applications pending on 1 January 2000	257
D. Applications submitted and action taken thereon by the Security Council and the General Assembly from 1 January 2000 to 31 December 2003	258
Part II. Presentation of applications	260
Part III. Referral of applications to the Committee on the Admission of New Members	260
Part IV. Procedures in the consideration of applications within the Security Council	260
Part V. Practices relating to the applicability of Article 4 of the Charter	261
Note	261

Chapter VIII. Consideration of questions under the responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security

Introductory note	268
Africa	
1. The situation concerning Western Sahara	270
2. The situation in Liberia	275
3. The situation in Somalia	285
4. The situation in Angola	296
5. The situation concerning Rwanda	319
6. The situation in Burundi	322
7. Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America	332
8. The situation in Sierra Leone	335
9. The situation in the Great Lakes region	356
10. The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo	361
11. The situation in the Central African Republic	412
12. The situation in Africa	418
13. The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia	428
14. The situation in Guinea-Bissau	437
15. The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone	443
16. Security Council resolution 1054 (1996) of 26 April 1996	448
17. Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council	449
18. Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security	451
19. Letter dated 29 November 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	453
20. The situation in Côte d'Ivoire	454
21. Letter dated 2 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	462
22. Central African region	463
Americas	
23. The question concerning Haiti	466
Asia	
24. The situation in Timor-Leste	467

25. The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border	512
26. The situation in Afghanistan	514
27. Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.	537
28. Letter dated 10 November 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Solomon Islands to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	542
Index	I
Volume II	
Introduction	xv
Members of the Security Council, 2000-2003.	xvi
Chapter VIII (continued). Consideration of questions under the responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security	
Introductory note	
Europe	
29. The situation in Cyprus.	540
30. Items relating to the situation in the former Yugoslavia	543
A. The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.	543
B. The situation in Croatia	560
C. Items relating to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.	562
D. Items relating to Kosovo	565
E. Briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans	588
31. The situation in Georgia.	591
Middle East	
32. The situation in the Middle East	600
A. United Nations Disengagement Observer Force	600
B. United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and developments in the Israel-Lebanon sector	601
33. The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question	605
34. Items relating to Iraq.	635
A. The situation between Iraq and Kuwait	635
B. Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq	688
35. Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	

Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	690
Thematic issues	
36. Items relating to the International Tribunals	692
A. International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	
International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994	692
B. International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991	701
C. International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994	704
37. Items relating to the maintenance of international peace and security	707
A. The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security.	707
B. Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peacebuilding	708
C. Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council	711
D. The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations.	714
E. Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa	720
38. Children and armed conflict.	725
39. Items relating to terrorism	735
A. Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts.	735
B. High-level meeting of the Security Council on the anniversary of 11 September 2001: acts of international terrorism.	763
C. High-level meeting of the Security Council: combating terrorism.	763
40. Promoting peace and security: humanitarian assistance to refugees in Africa.	765
41. Protection of civilians in armed conflict.	767
42. Items relating to small arms	782

A. Small arms	782
B. Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa	787
43. Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts	790
44. Protection of United Nations personnel, associated personnel and humanitarian personnel in conflict zones	793
45. General issues relating to sanctions	795
46. Women and peace and security	800
47. Items relating to peacekeeping	806
A. No exit without strategy	806
B. Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries	808
C. Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations	811
D. United Nations peacekeeping	812
E. The importance of mine action for peacekeeping operations	815
48. Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach	817
49. Nobel Peace Prize	820
50. Items relating to food and security	821
A. Food aid in the context of conflict settlement: Afghanistan and other crisis areas	821
B. Africa's food crisis as a threat to peace and security	822
51. Kimberley Process Certification Scheme	825
52. The Security Council and regional organizations: facing the new challenges to international peace and security	825
53. The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes	827
54. Security Council mission	829
55. Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role	835
56. Briefings	838
Chapter IX. Decisions taken by the Security Council in the exercise of its other functions and powers	
Note	840
Chapter X. Consideration of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter	
Introductory note	843
Part I. Referral of disputes and situations to the Security Council	846
Note	846
Part II. Investigation of disputes and fact-finding	854
Note	854

Part III. Decisions of the Security Council concerning the pacific settlement of disputes	858
Note	858
A. Decisions of the Security Council on general and thematic issues relating to the pacific settlement of disputes.	860
B. Recommendations relating to methods, procedures or terms of the pacific settlement of disputes	862
C. Decisions involving the Secretary-General in the Council's efforts at the pacific settlement of disputes	878
D. Decisions involving regional arrangements or agencies	891
Part IV. Constitutional discussion bearing on the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter	891
Note	891
Chapter XI. Consideration of the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter	
Introductory note	916
Part I. Determination of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression in accordance with Article 39 of the Charter	917
Note	917
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 39	917
B. Discussion relating to Article 39	922
Part II. Provisional measures to prevent the aggravation of a situation in accordance with Article 40 of the Charter	934
Note	934
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 40	934
B. Discussion relating to Article 40	939
Part III. Measures not involving the use of armed force in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter	940
Note	940
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 41	940
B. Discussion relating to Article 41	949
Part IV. Measures to maintain or restore international peace and security in accordance with Article 42 of the Charter	967
Note	967
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 42	967
B. Discussion relating to Article 42	969
Part V. Decisions and deliberations having relevance to Articles 43 to 47 of the Charter	980
Note	981

A.	Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 43	982
B.	Discussion relating to Article 43	986
C.	Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 44	988
D.	Discussion relating to Article 44	989
E.	Decisions of the Security Council relating to Articles 46 and 47	991
F.	Discussion relating to Articles 46 and 47	991
Part VI.	Obligations of Member States under Article 48 of the Charter	992
Note	992
A.	Obligations arising pursuant to Security Council decisions adopted under Article 41	993
B.	Obligations arising pursuant to the Security Council decisions adopted under Article 42	995
Part VII.	Obligations of Member States under Article 49 of the Charter	996
Note	996
A.	Calls for mutual assistance in the implementation of decisions adopted under Article 41	996
B.	Calls for mutual assistance in the implementation of decisions adopted under Article 42	997
Part VIII.	Special economic problems of the nature described in Article 50 of the Charter	998
Note	998
A.	Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 50	999
B.	Discussion relating to Article 50	1000
C.	Instances arising in Security Council subsidiary bodies	1003
Part IX.	Right of self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter	1004
Note	1004
A.	Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 51	1004
B.	Discussion relating to Article 51	1005
C.	Invocation of the right of self-defence in other instances	1014
Chapter XII. Consideration of the provisions of other Articles of the Charter		
Introductory note	1021
Part I.	Consideration of the purposes and principles of the United Nations (Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter)	1022
A.	Article 1, paragraph 2	1022
B.	Article 2, paragraph 4	1026
C.	Article 2, paragraph 5	1038

D. Article 2, paragraph 6	1041
E. Article 2, paragraph 7	1041
Part II. Consideration of the functions and powers of the Security Council (Articles 24 and 25 of the Charter)	1044
A. Article 24	1044
B. Article 25	1054
Part III. Consideration of the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter	1057
Note	1057
A. General consideration of the provisions of Chapter VIII	1059
B. Encouragement or calls by the Security Council for action by regional arrangements in the pacific settlement of disputes	1066
C. Calls by the Security Council for involvement of regional arrangements in the implementation of Chapter VII measures	1073
D. Consideration or authorization by the Security Council of enforcement action by regional arrangements	1075
E. Consultation, briefing and reporting by regional arrangements	1077
Part IV. Consideration of the miscellaneous provisions of the Charter	1078
Note	1078
Index	I

Introduction

The present publication, in two volumes, constitutes the fourteenth supplement to the *Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council, 1946-1951*, which was issued in 1954. It covers the proceedings of the Security Council from the 4087th meeting, on 10 January 2000, to the 4891st meeting, on 22 December 2003.

The *Repertoire* was mandated by the General Assembly in its resolution 686 (VII) of 5 December 1952, entitled “Ways and means for making the evidence of customary international law more readily available”. It is a guide to the proceedings of the Council and sets forth in a readily accessible form the practices and procedures to which the Council has had recourse. The *Repertoire* is not intended as a substitute for the records of the Council, which constitute the only comprehensive and authoritative account of its deliberations.

The categories employed to arrange the material are not intended to suggest the existence of procedures or practices that have not been clearly or demonstrably established by the Council itself. The Council is at all times, within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations, its own provisional rules of procedure, and practice established through notes by the President of the Security Council, master of its own procedure.

In recording the Council’s practice, the headings under which the practices and procedures of the Council were presented in the original publication have been largely retained. Where necessary, however, adjustments have been made to better reflect the Council’s practice. For ease of reference, the studies contained in chapter VIII are organized according to region or thematic issues. This introduction contains a table indicating the membership of the Security Council during the period under review.

The agenda items considered by the Council during 2000-2003, and the meetings at which they were considered, are presented in a table hereunder in the order in which the items were initially taken up during the period.*

* * *

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of letters combined with figures. Security Council documents are indicated by a symbol such as S/2000/537. References to the verbatim records of meetings of the Council are given in the form S/PV.4886, meetings being numbered consecutively, starting with the first meeting in 1946. As in previous recent supplements, reference is made in this Supplement only to the provisional verbatim records of Security Council meetings, as the practice of publishing the meeting records in the *Official Records* has been discontinued.

The resolutions adopted by the Security Council and most of the statements by the President are published in the yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. Resolutions are identified by a number followed by the year of adoption in parentheses, for example, resolution 1324 (2000). Statements

* For the table, see volume I, introduction.

by the President not included in the yearly volumes are recorded in the relevant verbatim records.

Readers who wish to consult the full record of a meeting or the text of a Security Council document referred to in the *Repertoire* may do so on the official United Nations Documentation Centre website, www.un.org/en/documents/. Security Council documents can be accessed on the website by selecting “Official Document System (ODS)” or one of the direct links to specific categories of documents. The volumes of resolutions and decisions may be accessed by symbol (S/INF/56, for 2000; S/INF/57, for 2001/02; S/INF/58, for 2002/03; and S/INF/59, for 2003/04). The original *Repertoire* and the other supplements may be consulted at www.un.org/en/sc/repertoire.

Members of the Security Council, 2000-2003

<i>Member</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>2003</i>
Angola				•
Argentina	•			
Bangladesh	•	•		
Bulgaria			•	•
Cameroon			•	•
Canada	•			
Chile				•
China (permanent member)	•	•	•	•
Colombia		•	•	
France (permanent member)	•	•	•	•
Germany				•
Guinea			•	•
Ireland		•	•	
Jamaica	•	•		
Malaysia	•			
Mali	•	•		
Mauritius		•	•	
Mexico			•	•
Namibia	•			
Netherlands	•			
Norway		•	•	
Pakistan				•
Russian Federation (permanent member)	•	•	•	•
Singapore		•	•	

<i>Member</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>2003</i>
Spain				•
Syrian Arab Republic			•	•
Tunisia	•	•		
Ukraine	•	•		
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (permanent member)	•	•	•	•
United States of America (permanent member)	•	•	•	•

Chapter VIII (continued)

Consideration of questions under the responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security

Introductory note

Chapter VIII of the *Repertoire* focuses on the substance of each of the questions included in the agenda of the Security Council that relate to its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Examining the entire chain of proceedings of the Council on each agenda item gives an overall sense of their political context.¹ The range of items covers broadly those that may be deemed to fall under Chapters VI and VII of the Charter.

The overview of the proceedings of the Council provided in chapter VIII of the *Repertoire* constitutes a framework within which the procedural developments recorded in chapters I to VII and the legal and constitutional discussions recorded in chapters X to XII may be considered. Chapter VIII also examines the substantive aspects of the Council's practice that are not covered in other chapters of the *Repertoire*.

The agenda items are grouped by region, for ease of reference, with an additional category of thematic issues. Within each region, items are listed in the order in which they were first included in the list of items of which the Council is seized.

Generally, individual sections cover all proceedings relating to a specific item. In exceptional cases, in order to improve the coherence of the text, related items have been grouped together under the heading "Items relating to ...".

The material included in chapter VIII is drawn from the formal meetings of the Council, and includes summaries of the statements made in the Council and of all Council documents, including reports and letters, that were referred to during the meetings.² The chapter also includes summaries of all of the decisions that were adopted at those formal Council meetings.³

Each section is organized around the decisions taken by the Council on a specific item. All of the meetings leading to a decision are included under the heading for that decision. Meetings that do not lead to a decision are grouped together under the heading "Deliberations".

When the Council includes a new item in its agenda, the section covering its first consideration bears the heading "Initial proceedings".

Some meetings have been grouped together, and an overview of all developments at those meetings is provided. In some of these cases, similar resolutions, generally renewing the mandate of a subsidiary body and adopted without debate, have also been grouped together; a brief overview of their main provisions is provided.

Meetings with countries contributing troops to a peacekeeping mission are dealt with under the item that covers that mission.

¹ The *Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council* covers formal meetings and documents of the Security Council. Some of the questions considered in this chapter were also discussed in informal consultations among the members of the Council.

² Other documents relating to a specific item but not mentioned at a formal meeting of the Council are listed in the annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly.

³ The summaries are based on those contained in the *Index to Proceedings of the Security Council*.

Information on formal meetings held in private is given in a footnote to the subsequent open meeting.

Unless otherwise noted, representatives of States Members of the United Nations who were invited to participate in the Council's proceedings were invited under rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, and all other speakers were invited under rule 39.⁴

Unless otherwise indicated, draft resolutions were prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

⁴ See chapter III for more information.

Europe

29. The situation in Cyprus

**Decisions of 14 June 2000 to 25 November 2002:
resolutions 1303 (2000), 1331 (2000), 1354
(2001), 1384 (2001), 1416 (2002) and 1442 (2002)**

During the period from 14 June 2000 to 25 November 2002, at each of the six meetings held on the agenda item,¹ the Security Council, unanimously and without debate, adopted a resolution² extending the mandate of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for a period of six months, on the basis of the recommendations contained in the reports of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus.³

In his reports, the Secretary-General stated that the situation along the ceasefire lines in Cyprus had remained stable. In his report dated 1 December 2000⁴ and in subsequent reports, the Secretary-General noted that restrictions had been imposed on UNFICYP by the Turkish Cypriot authorities and the Turkish forces as from 30 June 2000, and called for the restoration of the military status quo ante in the area of Strovolia. In the prevailing circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNFICYP essential for the maintenance of the ceasefire on the island and recommended the extension of the mandate of the Force. In resolution 1331 (2000) and subsequent resolutions, the Council urged the Turkish Cypriot side and Turkish forces to rescind the restrictions on the

operations of UNFICYP and to restore the military status quo ante at Strovolia.

At the 4155th meeting, on 14 June 2000, the President of the Council stated that he had received letters from the parties concerned; at the meetings held from 13 December 2000 to 25 November 2002,⁵ the President stated that he had met with representatives of the parties, who had confirmed that they maintained their well-known positions vis-à-vis the item on the Council's agenda.

**Decision of 14 April 2003 (4740th meeting):
resolution 1475 (2003)**

On 1 April 2003, the Secretary-General submitted a report on his mission of good offices in Cyprus.⁶ In that report, the Secretary-General informed the Council on his intensive efforts undertaken from 1999 to early 2003 to assist the two sides in Cyprus to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem, which would have allowed a reunited Cyprus to sign the Treaty of Accession to the European Union on 16 April 2003. The Secretary-General noted that, during that period, he had refrained from reporting in writing to the Council, other than by brief references in his reports on UNFICYP, while the members of the Council had been kept informed through regular oral briefings by his Special Adviser and himself. He recalled that the adoption by the Council of resolution 1250 (1999), together with the evolving Greek-Turkish rapprochement, the candidature of Turkey for accession to the European Union, and the prospect of accession of Cyprus to the European Union had presented a set of new circumstances and a unique opportunity. By resolution 1250 (1999), the Council had requested him to invite the leaders of the two sides to negotiations and had set the following four principles as guidelines for the negotiations, namely, no preconditions; all issues on the table; commitment in good faith to continue to negotiate until a settlement is reached; and full consideration of relevant United Nations resolutions and treaties.

¹ The 4155th (14 June 2000), 4246th (13 December 2000), 4328th (15 June 2001), 4436th (14 December 2001), 4551st (13 June 2002) and 4649th (25 November 2002) meetings. During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held a number of meetings in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus, pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B. Those meetings were held on 7 December 2001 (4435th), 5 June 2002 (4549th), 21 November 2002 (4648th), 5 June 2003 (4769th) and 20 November 2003 (4866th).

² Resolutions 1303 (2000), 1331 (2000), 1354 (2001), 1384 (2001), 1416 (2002) and 1442 (2002).

³ S/2000/496 and Corr.1, S/2000/1138, S/2001/534, S/2001/1122, S/2002/590 and S/2002/1243.

⁴ S/2000/1138, submitted pursuant to resolution 1303 (2000).

⁵ See footnote 1.

⁶ S/2003/398.

As part of the good offices efforts under the auspices of the Secretary-General, proximity talks had been held between the United Nations and each of the parties from December 1999 to November 2000. Direct talks had then been facilitated from January 2002 to February 2003. During the process, the parties had not been able to reach agreement without third-party assistance. Accordingly, the Secretary-General had submitted a comprehensive settlement proposal (“Basis for Agreement on a Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem”) to the parties on 11 November 2002, which had then been revised and refined twice — once on 10 December 2002 and then again on 26 February 2003 — after further consultations with the parties.

The Secretary-General noted that his plan was not simply a framework but a truly comprehensive proposal, including all necessary legal instruments, and leaving nothing to be negotiated subsequently. In conformity with the vision of the Council for a settlement, the plan provided for a United Cyprus Republic with a single sovereignty, international personality and citizenship. It would comprise two politically equal constituent States — the “Greek Cypriot State” and the “Turkish Cypriot State” — which were to be joined together in a bicomunal, bizonal federation. The plan contained detailed proposals on all necessary aspects of governance, security, property, territory, constituent state residency, economic aspects, reconciliation and implementation. As a constitutive act for a reunified Cyprus, the plan required the holding of separate simultaneous referenda by the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot populations. The plan required the referenda to be held before 16 April 2003 to allow a reunited Cyprus to sign the Treaty of Accession to the European Union on that date.

The Secretary-General, in his report, noted that the process had come to an end, when, at negotiations in The Hague on 10 and 11 March 2003, the leaders of the two parties were unable to reach an agreement to submit the plan for approval at separate simultaneous referenda on 30 March 2003. Reflecting on the reasons for the failure of the parties to seize the opportunity to achieve a comprehensive settlement, the Secretary-General recalled that both sides bore a share of the blame for the many opportunities that had been missed over the years. With respect to the most recent failure, however, he held that the Turkish Cypriot leader bore prime responsibility. With a few exceptions, he had

declined to engage in negotiations on the basis of give and take, which had greatly complicated the efforts by the Secretary-General to accommodate both the legitimate concerns of principle and the concrete and practical interests of the Turkish Cypriots. At the negotiations in The Hague, the newly elected Greek Cypriot leader, while expressing misgivings concerning the plan of the Secretary-General, had agreed conditionally that the plan be submitted to referenda and had expressed the willingness not to reopen negotiations on the plan itself, albeit under very stringent conditions. The Turkish Cypriot leader had informed the Secretary-General that he was not prepared to agree to put the plan to referenda, citing fundamental objections to the plan to basic points and expressing the belief that further negotiations were likely to be successful only if they began from a new starting point and if the parties agreed on basic principles. Accordingly, the Secretary-General had drawn the conclusion that the process had reached an end. While noting that his plan remained on the table, the Secretary-General did not propose to take a new initiative without a solid reason to believe that the political will necessary for a successful outcome existed.

At its 4738th meeting, on 10 April 2003, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General on his mission of good offices in Cyprus.⁶ At the meeting, at which no statements were made, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Cyprus. During his briefing, the Special Adviser expressed his belief that the settlement proposal had been a fair and honourable package, comprehensive in approach and only needing technical finalization. He held that the fact that a solution had not been achieved was deeply disappointing and seemed attributable to failings of political will rather than to the absence of favourable circumstances. He reiterated the regret of the Secretary-General that a unique opportunity had been missed and that the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots had been denied the opportunity to vote to reunite Cyprus. Reiterating that the Secretary-General did not intend to take a new initiative unless and until such time that the political will necessary for a successful outcome existed, he expressed the view that this would come about only if there was an unequivocally stated preparedness on the part of the leaders of both sides, fully and determinedly backed at the highest political level in both motherlands, to

commit to finalizing the plan, without reopening its basic principles or key trade-offs, by a specific date, with United Nations assistance; and to putting it to separate simultaneous referenda, as provided for in the plan, on a certain date soon thereafter. He held that the onus was on the parties and the motherlands to demonstrate the political will to solve the problem on the basis of the plan of the Secretary-General.⁷

At its 4740th meeting, on 14 April 2003, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General.⁶ A statement was made by the representative of the Russian Federation.

At the meeting, a draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria, France, Germany, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States⁸ was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1475 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Commended the Secretary-General for taking the initiative to present to the parties a comprehensive settlement plan aimed at bridging the gaps between them;

Regretted that, due to the negative approach of the Turkish Cypriot leader, culminating in the position taken at the meeting held in The Hague on 10 and 11 March 2003, it was not possible to reach agreement to put the plan to simultaneous referenda as suggested by the Secretary-General, and thus that the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots had been denied the opportunity to decide for themselves on a plan that would have permitted the reunification of Cyprus and as a consequence it would not be possible to achieve a comprehensive settlement before 16 April 2003;

Gave its full support to the Secretary-General's carefully balanced plan of 26 February 2003 as a unique basis for further negotiations, and called on all concerned to negotiate within the framework of the Secretary-General's good offices, using the plan to reach a comprehensive settlement;

Stressed its full support for the mission of good offices of the Secretary-General as entrusted to him in resolution 1250

(1999); and requested the Secretary-General to continue to make available his good offices for Cyprus as outlined in his report.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of the Russian Federation stated that the basic parameters of the Secretary-General's plan were balanced in nature and called upon the parties to continue the negotiating process to reach a peaceful settlement, using those basic parameters as a basis for dialogue. He noted that the Russian Federation had supported resolution 1475 (2003) based on the belief that, taking into account the well-known concerns of both parties to the conflict regarding individual elements of the Secretary-General's plan, it would be possible to adjust the plan to reach a compromise solution.⁹

**Decisions of 11 June and 24 November 2003
(4771st and 4870th meetings): resolutions
1486 (2003) and 1517 (2003)**

At its 4771st and 4870th meetings, held on 11 June and 24 November 2003, respectively, the Council adopted unanimously and without debate resolutions 1486 (2003) and 1517 (2003), extending the mandate of UNFICYP for periods of six months, upon the recommendations contained in the reports of the Secretary-General.¹⁰ In his reports, the Secretary-General stated that the situation along the ceasefire lines in Cyprus had remained stable. In the prevailing circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNFICYP essential for the maintenance of the ceasefire on the island and recommended the extension of the mandate of the Force. At the meetings, the President of the Council stated that he had met with representatives of the parties, who had confirmed that they maintained their well-known positions vis-à-vis the item on the Council's agenda.

⁷ S/PV.4738, pp. 2-4.

⁸ S/2003/418.

⁹ S/PV.4740, p. 2.

¹⁰ S/2003/572, submitted pursuant to resolutions 1442 (2002) and 1250 (1999); and S/2003/1078, submitted pursuant to resolutions 1486 (2003) and 1250 (1999).

30. Items relating to the situation in the former Yugoslavia

A. The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Decision of 21 June 2000 (4162nd meeting): resolution 1305 (2000)

At its 4117th meeting,¹ on 22 March 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH) dated 15 March 2000.² In his report, the Secretary-General, *inter alia*, stated that despite some progress, the Mission had to take strong action to seek to overcome continued obstruction, resistance and delay in some key areas, including concerning the establishment of a state-level State Border Service, the integration of the Ministry of the Interior and minority recruitment for police forces. He reported that parties had, on several issues, acted against the letter and spirit of the New York Declaration of 15 November 1999³ that was adopted during the appearance of the members of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina before the Council. The Secretary-General maintained that UNMIBH would need the support of the Security Council and Member States with influence on the Bosnian Croat and Bosnian Serb authorities to overcome resistance in important areas.

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, following which most members of the Council made statements.⁴ In addition, statements were made by the representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Germany, Italy, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union⁵) and Turkey.

In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General reported that UNMIBH continued to focus on minority recruitment for the police, the establishment of the State Border Service, the implementation of the Brčko arbitration award, the provision of assistance in judicial reform and the setting up of a multi-ethnic Bosnian police contingent for service in a United Nations peacekeeping operation as its five main priority areas.⁶

Most speakers shared the assessment in the Secretary-General's report on progress in the areas of judicial reform and police restructuring, as well as his concern at challenges in key areas of reform. Several speakers urged a firm response against obstruction and interference in the implementation of the peace process.⁷ In addition, the representative of the Netherlands expressed concern about the current strength of the stabilization force (SFOR), which in his view should be kept at the mandated strength. He also noted that his Government was not in favour of armed contingents of the International Police Task Force of UNMIBH.⁸ The representative of the Russian Federation stressed that the activities of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 should be depoliticized and that those indicted on the basis of Tribunal warrants should not be detained without the consent of the States in whose territory they were located.⁹ Other speakers underlined the importance of the work of the Tribunal.¹⁰ The representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina noted the importance of a review of the effectiveness of the numerous international factors operating in Bosnia and Herzegovina. He also noted that his Government cooperated fully with the Tribunal and that the Presidency, as the sovereign authority of Bosnia and Herzegovina, had not sought fit to

¹ During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held one meeting in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina, pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B (4553rd meeting, held on 13 June 2002).

² S/2000/215, submitted pursuant to resolution 1247 (1999).

³ S/1999/1179, annex.

⁴ The representative of Mali did not make a statement.

⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

⁶ S/PV.4117, pp. 2-3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (United States); p. 7 (Malaysia); p. 9 (Tunisia); p. 10 (France, Ukraine); and p. 13 (Bangladesh).

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Malaysia); pp. 15-16 (Portugal on behalf of the European Union); and p. 17 (Turkey).

challenge the arrests made by SFOR and other legal forces within Bosnia and Herzegovina on behalf of the Tribunal.¹¹

At the end of the meeting, the President (Bangladesh) summarized the main points of the debate. In particular, he concluded that the members of the Council urged all parties to redouble their efforts to implement outstanding commitments concerning the implementation of the New York Declaration. He stated that members also urged those concerned to ensure without further delay the integration of the Ministry of the Interior as well as the integration of the chain of command and communication systems of the police throughout the Federation and in particular in Mostar, as well as to increase the number of minority police officers.¹²

At its 4136th meeting, on 9 May 2000, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Briefing by Mr. Wolfgang Petritsch, High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina". All members of the Council made statements.

The President (China) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 4 May 2000 from the Secretary-General, transmitting the High Representative's report on his activities.¹³ In his report, the High Representative highlighted the slow progress in the consolidation of efficient State institutions, progress with his concept of "ownership" of the peace process by the authorities and society of Bosnia and Herzegovina and with the development of a civil society and a welcome increase in the number of minority returns. In addition, he reported on the result of the recent municipal elections, stating that party pluralism had improved, although nationalist parties continued to dominate in predominately Croat or Serb municipalities.

In his briefing, the High Representative indicated that he would focus on economic reform, acceleration of the return of refugees and displaced persons and the consolidation of state institutions as three key areas of peace implementation.¹⁴

Most members of the Council agreed with the assessment by the High Representative of progress and challenges. Many speakers welcomed the holding and the results of the recent municipal elections. In addition, several speakers welcomed the priorities outlined by the High Representative.¹⁵ Other speakers expressed concern about the lack of implementation of the New York Declaration.¹⁶ The representative of France, echoed by the representative of Canada, expressed regret that States not members of the Council that were directly involved in the search for a settlement in Bosnia and Herzegovina were unable to speak at the meeting.¹⁷

At its 4154th meeting, on 13 June 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIBH dated 2 June 2000.¹⁸ In his report, the Secretary-General, *inter alia*, reported progress in the establishment of the State Border Service and the integration of the Ministry of the Interior and the chain of command and communication systems of the police, while regretting the lack of progress in the area of refugee returns and recruitment of minority police officers. He also reported that all UNMIBH components had begun the preparation of a strategic and operational framework for the fulfilment of the core mandate of the Mission by December 2002. He therefore recommended the extension of the mandate of UNMIBH for a further 12-month period.

At that meeting, the President (France) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a letter dated 23 May 2000 from the representative of Portugal.¹⁹ The Council heard a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of United Nations operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, following which all members of the Council made statements.

In his briefing, the Special Representative elaborated on the details of the activities of UNMIBH.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹³ S/2000/376.

¹⁴ S/PV.4136, pp. 2-6.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Bangladesh); p. 8 (Netherlands, France); and p. 11 (Canada).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Russian Federation); and p. 11 (United Kingdom).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (France); and p. 11 (Canada).

¹⁸ S/2000/529, submitted pursuant to resolution 1247 (1999).

¹⁹ S/2000/486, transmitting a statement issued on 22 May 2000 by the Presidency of the European Union on the Peace Implementation Conference for Bosnia and Herzegovina, to be held on 23 and 24 May 2000.

He expressed his belief that the basic mandate of UNMIBH could be discharged within the following two and a half years.²⁰

After the briefing, the President noted that the previous day he had had a meeting with representatives of the troop-contributing countries. Most speakers welcomed the progress made by UNMIBH and noted the challenges that remained. Most speakers also expressed their support for an extension of the mandate of UNMIBH. In addition, the representative of the Russian Federation noted that with regard to the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, his delegation's priority remained freeing its activities from elements of politicization and short-term interests. He also stressed that the "violation of the mandate of SFOR", particularly in the form of the deliberate use of force to arrest people, should be brought to an end. He also noted that the failure to invite the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the meeting of the Peace Implementation Council, which was held on 23 and 24 May in Brussels, was a serious blow to the entire structure of the Dayton process, and that the Russian Federation, not wishing to bear responsibility for that failure, had been compelled not to participate in the Brussels meeting.²¹

At its 4162nd meeting, on 21 June 2000, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 2 June 2000.¹⁸ Statements were made by the representatives of the Russian Federation, China, the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States.²² The President (France) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States.²³ He also drew the attention of members to a letter dated 14 June from the representative of Portugal, transmitting the text of the declaration of the ministerial meeting of the Peace and Implementation Council, held in Brussels on 23 and 24 May 2000.²⁴

Speaking before the vote, the representative of the Russian Federation noted that his country was convinced that the mandate of UNMIBH should be

extended for another year and would not object to the draft resolution before the Council in the interest of continuing the peace process. However, the Russian Federation could not support the draft resolution and, for the first time in the last two years, had refused to join the sponsors of the draft resolution on that subject, since operative paragraph 5, which expressed support for the declaration of the meeting of the Peace Implementation Council in Brussels on 23 and 24 May 2000, was not acceptable to the Russian Federation. The Russian Federation had been compelled to refuse to participate in that meeting, since the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia — a direct participant and signatory to the Dayton Agreement — had not been allowed to participate in that forum. The Russian Federation was categorically opposed to attempts to oust the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia from all multilateral mechanisms on a settlement in the former Yugoslavia and believed that the Brussels Declaration had no force since the meeting of the Peace Implementation Council had been conducted virtually in violation of the Dayton Agreement. The representative of the Russian Federation also expressed serious concerns over the provision of the draft resolution that extended the reporting period of UNMIBH from three to six months and considered it as an attempt to weaken oversight by the Security Council over the Bosnian settlement process.²⁵

The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted, by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention (Russian Federation), as resolution 1305 (2000), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations with regard to sections I and II of the resolution, *inter alia*:

Authorized the Member States acting through or in cooperation with the organization referred to in annex 1-A of the Peace Agreement to continue for a further planned period of 12 months the Stabilization Force as established in accordance with resolution 1088 (1996) under unified command and control in order to fulfil the role specified in annexes 1-A and 2 of the Peace Agreement;

Authorized the Member States to take all necessary measures to effect the implementation of and to ensure compliance with annex 1-A of the Peace Agreement; authorized Member States to take all necessary measures, at the request of SFOR, either in defence of SFOR or to assist the force in carrying out its mission, and recognized the right of the force to take all necessary measures to defend itself from attack or threat of attack;

²⁰ S/PV.4154, pp. 2-7.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 9.

²² The representatives of Germany and Italy were invited to participate in the meeting but did not make statements.

²³ S/2000/591.

²⁴ S/2000/586.

²⁵ S/PV.4162, pp. 2-3.

Authorized the Member States to take all necessary measures to ensure compliance with the rules and procedures established by the Commander of SFOR, governing command and control of airspace over Bosnia and Herzegovina with respect to all civilian and military air traffic.

In section III of the resolution, the Council, reaffirming the legal basis of the Charter on which the task force was given its mandate in resolution 1035 (1995), *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of UNMIBH, which included the International Police Task Force, for an additional period terminating on 21 June 2001, and also decided that the Task Force should continue to be entrusted with the tasks set out in annex 11 of the Peace Agreement, including the tasks referred to in the conclusions of the London, Bonn, Luxembourg, Madrid and Brussels Conferences and agreed by the authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Requested the Secretary-General to keep the Council regularly informed and to report at least every six months on the implementation of the mandate of UNMIBH as a whole.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of China noted that, while his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, he was of the view that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, as a signatory to the Dayton Agreement, should have been invited to the meeting of the Peace Implementation Council held in Brussels in May 2000.²⁶ The representative of the United Kingdom, supported by the representative of the United States, held that the lack of unanimity on parts of the resolution should not be seen as detracting from the unanimous support of the Council for the work of the United Nations Mission.²⁷ The representatives of Canada and the United States noted that they fully supported the decision not to invite the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the ministerial meeting of the Peace Implementation Council in Brussels.²⁸

**Decision of 13 July 2000 (4169th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4169th meeting, on 13 July 2000, the Council extended an invitation to the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to participate. The President (Jamaica) made a statement on behalf of the Council²⁹

in commemoration of the tragic events at Srebrenica, by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Paid tribute to the thousands of civilians murdered or forcibly relocated as a result of the policy of ethnic cleansing;

Regretted the deplorable events and recalled its resolve to ensure that justice was carried out fully through the work of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia;

Acknowledged the report of the Secretary-General on Srebrenica;³⁰

Reiterated its commitment to the full implementation of the Dayton-Paris Peace Agreement and the establishment of multi-ethnic democracy and the rule of law throughout the territory of the former Yugoslavia.

The Council subsequently observed a minute of silence in honour of the victims of the Srebrenica massacre.

**Deliberations of 15 August 2000 to
12 December 2000 (4188th, 4209th, 4222nd
and 4245th meetings)**

At its 4188th meeting, on 15 August 2000, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. Statements were made by most members of the Council.³¹ In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General reported progress in all areas of the mandate of UNMIBH, including police reform, judicial reform and the return of minority refugees and displaced persons. In particular, he noted that the judicial system assessment programme of UNMIBH was finalizing its work and was coordinating closely with the Office of the High Representative, which was expected to assume most of the judicial assessment functions when the mandate of UNMIBH in that area expired late in 2000.³²

Most of the speakers welcomed the progress in the main areas of the mandate of UNMIBH. Nevertheless, several speakers cautioned that progress depended on overcoming continued obstruction and delays.³³ The representative of the Russian Federation expressed his belief that raising questions about the establishment of a single defence system in Bosnia and Herzegovina ran counter to the provisions of the

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (United Kingdom); and p. 4 (United States).

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (Canada, United States).

²⁹ S/PRST/2000/23.

³⁰ A/54/549.

³¹ The representative of Mali did not make a statement.

³² S/PV.4188, pp. 2-3.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5 (United States); pp. 5-6 (Bangladesh); pp. 7-8 (United Kingdom); pp. 11-12 (Russian Federation); p. 12 (Namibia); and pp. 12-13 (Malaysia).

Dayton Agreement. He reaffirmed his country's position that arrests of persons indicted by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia by SFOR contingents contravened the mandate of SFOR. He also reiterated that attempts to isolate the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia from the Balkan settlement processes were counterproductive.³⁴

At its 4209th meeting, on 26 October 2000, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 18 October 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,³⁵ transmitting the seventeenth report on the activities of the Office of the High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina. In his report, the High Representative reported, *inter alia*, on the decision of the Constitutional Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina on the Constituent Peoples' Case, in which the Court decided that no ethnic group constituent on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina should be excluded from exercising its right in the entities and that the entity Constitutions would have to be changed in that regard. He also reported on a high increase of minority returns to pre-war homes, even in areas previously considered dangerous, on the adoption of state treasury and party financing laws, and on his imposition of the single national passport.

At the same meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the High Representative. Statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Germany and Italy.

In his briefing, the High Representative, *inter alia*, commented on the "seismic changes" that had occurred in the two key neighbouring countries of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Croatia, expressing both hope and caution for the effects of this change on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. On the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina itself, he reported slow progress in all areas of reform and expressed his opinion that sustained change would depend on the outcome of the general elections on 11 November 2000.³⁶

Most speakers welcomed the democratic changes in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and recognized both the progress and continuing obstacles outlined by the High Representative. In response to some of the

criticism expressed by the High Representative, the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina stressed that responsibility for both progress and difficulties was shared between the international community and the people and Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina. He also cautioned that the democratic success of elections could not be judged by the outcome, but rather by the process of the elections.³⁷

At its 4222nd meeting, on 14 November 2000, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. At the meeting, statements were made by most members of the Council,³⁸ as well as by the representatives of Austria³⁹ and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General focused on the outcome of the elections held on 11 November 2000. He stated that the activities of UNMIBH and the International Police Task Force had contributed to a calm atmosphere during the elections. The Under-Secretary-General reported that preliminary results indicated a mixed picture concerning the performance of nationalist and moderate, multi-ethnic parties and concluded that the hope that the elections would produce local political authorities who would work constructively to consolidate a sovereign and multi-ethnic Bosnia had not been fully borne out.⁴⁰

In their statements, most speakers welcomed the successful holding of elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina and expressed their hope that the newly elected authorities would be committed to pursuing the peace process. However, the representative of the Russian Federation stressed that the "pushing through" of the Dayton Agreement often destroyed the compromise variants achieved by the Bosnians themselves and was counterproductive.⁴¹ The representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia stated that following the major democratic changes in his country, conditions were being created to view the problems and outstanding issues related to the implementation of the Dayton Agreement in a new, democratic way. He stressed that the Federal Republic

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

³⁵ S/2000/999.

³⁶ S/PV.4209, pp. 2-5.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

³⁸ The President of the Council (Netherlands) did not make a statement in his national capacity.

³⁹ In the capacity of Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

⁴⁰ S/PV.4222, pp. 2-4.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

of Yugoslavia accepted the Dayton-Paris Peace Agreement and that one of its main foreign policy priorities was the normalization of relations with all former Yugoslav republics.⁴²

At its 4245th meeting, on 12 December 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIBH dated 30 November 2000.⁴³ In his report, the Secretary-General, *inter alia*, observed that the international community had made a massive contribution to the cause of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the past five years, but progress had been frustratingly slow and difficult, owing mainly to political obstruction by extremist nationalists. He held that the recent general elections held in Bosnia and Herzegovina had demonstrated yet again how nationalist parties were willing to incite inter-ethnic fear and suspicion in order to preserve their power and privileges. Nevertheless, he reported that progress had been made in all core areas of the mandate of UNMIBH and that, together with the changes in the leaderships of core neighbouring countries, this progress had enabled the Mission to draw up the mandate implementation plan with a proposed timetable of December 2002 for the completion of the core mandate of UNMIBH. The Secretary-General requested the Council to support the Mission's assessment that the authorized strength of UNMIBH for the period 2001/2002 might be reduced to 1,850 officers of the International Police Task Force.

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of United Nations operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, following which statements were made by all members of the Council⁴⁴ and the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In his briefing, the Special Representative focused on the progress made by UNMIBH in its mandate implementation plan, while calling the

attention of the Council to the major resource shortfalls that UNMIBH was facing in completing its mandate.⁴⁵

Most speakers welcomed the assessment of progress and challenges as presented in the report of the Secretary-General and the briefing of the Special Representative.

Nevertheless, the representative of the Netherlands held that, five years after the Dayton Agreement, the political and the economic situations of Bosnia and Herzegovina were disconcerting. Although the security situation was good, the animosity among the three population groups had hardly subsided since the Peace Agreement. He also held that the result of the recent elections had been disappointing, in that they underlined how Bosnia and Herzegovina was divided along ethnic lines.⁴⁶

The representative of the United States emphasized that the lesson learned from Bosnia and Herzegovina was that, to be effective, every mission needed a clear, credible and achievable mandate; peacekeeping troops had to be given rules of engagement that enabled them adequately to defend themselves; Member States should be permitted to contribute troops only if they were able to commit to equip them adequately; missions required a more thorough training of personnel and needed to consist of several types of peacekeepers; and the peacekeeping structures of the United Nations must be redesigned to be able to provide the resources of expertise to fulfil more complex mandates.⁴⁷

The representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina expressed his country's appreciation for the changes in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and in Croatia, which he deemed of paramount importance for Bosnia and Herzegovina and the region as a whole.⁴⁸

**Decision of 22 March 2001 (4304th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4303rd meeting, on 22 March 2001, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Briefing by Mr. Wolfgang Petritsch, High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

⁴³ S/2000/1137, submitted pursuant to resolution 1305 (2000).

⁴⁴ The representative of France spoke on behalf of the European Union. Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania and Slovakia aligned themselves with the statement.

⁴⁵ S/PV.4245, pp. 2-6.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-10. At this meeting, the United States was represented by Senator Joseph R. Biden.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.

Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina". Statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union⁴⁹) and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The President (Ukraine)⁵⁰ drew the attention of the members of the Council to two letters, dated 26 February and 8 March 2001, respectively, from the representative of Sweden addressed to the Secretary-General,⁵¹ transmitting a statement by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union concerning the formation of a new Council of Ministers in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as a statement by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on the conclusions of the Croat National Congress of Bosnia and Herzegovina, condemning its recent moves to place itself outside the provisions of the Dayton-Paris Agreement.

In his briefing, the High Representative *inter alia* cautioned against disappointment in the international community over the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. He reported that while the results of the elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina had been seen as a disappointment given the revolutionary changes in Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia the same year, nationalist parties had indeed lost ground and the shift to more moderate parties was both real and encouraging. The Government at both State level and in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina were headed by non-nationalist parties, in the Republika Srpska by a moderate technocrat. He also reported that he had removed Mr. Ante Jelavić from his post as the Croat member of Bosnia's Joint Presidency, after his party had boycotted official institutions, held a referendum and announced a plan for self-rule. He briefed the Council on progress in the return of refugees, the financial system, constitutional questions and judicial reform. He informed the Council that he had taken the decision to set up so-called constitutional commissions in both entities, which would ensure that the ruling of the Constitutional Court on the Constituent Peoples' Case, in which the Court had ruled that no ethnic group constituent on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina should be excluded from

exercising its rights in the entities, was implemented on an interim basis until the entity constitutions were amended. While maintaining that too many of the positive advances had needed to be imposed by him, the High Representative expressed the belief that this would change with the new administrations in Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁵²

In their statements following the briefing, most speakers welcomed the formation of moderate administrations in Bosnia and Herzegovina after the elections, but expressed concern at unilateral moves by the Croat National Congress to establish Croat self-rule. The representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia both warned that if the return of displaced persons and refugees was not accelerated, time would become a major factor and that too many refugees and internally displaced persons would accept the fact that ethnic cleansing had been successfully completed.⁵³ In addition, the representative of Croatia expressed his regret at the unilateral decisions taken by some Croatian political actors, which he deemed damaging both for the interests of Bosnia and Herzegovina and for Croatia. He expressed understanding of the High Representative's reaction and stated that his Government viewed the High Representative's intervention as a reaction against radical methods being used, and not as a step against the legitimate interests of the Croatian community in Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁵⁴

At the 4304th meeting, also on 22 March 2001, the President (Ukraine)⁵⁵ made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁵⁶ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Encouraged further regional political and economic cooperation, in compliance with the principles of the sovereignty and territorial integrity and the inviolability of the borders of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the other States of the region;

Welcomed the new State-level and entity-level Governments formed after the general elections of 11 November 2000 and called on them to take active measures to make further progress on the return of refugees, consolidation of the state institutions, and economic reform; welcomed the establishment

⁴⁹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁵⁰ Ukraine was represented by its Foreign Minister.

⁵¹ S/2001/181 and S/2001/212.

⁵² S/PV.4303, pp. 2-5.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20 (Bosnia and Herzegovina); and pp. 21-23 (Croatia).

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁵⁵ Ukraine was represented by its Foreign Minister.

⁵⁶ S/PRST/2001/11.

of constitutional commissions to protect the vital interest of the constituent peoples;

Noted the recent conclusion of the Agreement on a special relationship between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republika Srpska and urged the High Representative to monitor its implementation and any amendments to it;

Condemned recent unilateral moves by the so-called Croat national congress to establish Croat self-rule in open contradiction of the provisions of the Peace Agreement;

Welcomed the progress made on the return of refugees and property law implementation in 2000; and urged all political parties and their respective leaders to engage constructively in order to implement fully the Peace Agreement.

**Decision of 21 June 2001 (4333rd meeting):
resolution 1357 (2001)**

At its 4330th meeting, on 15 June 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIBH dated 7 June 2001.⁵⁷ In his report, the Secretary-General, *inter alia*, reported that UNMIBH continued to make measurable progress in the implementation of its mandate and towards its goal of completing the core mandate by December 2002. He therefore recommended to the Security Council an extension of the mandate of UNMIBH at an authorized strength of 1,850 police officers for a further 12-month period.

At the meeting, the Council heard a statement by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of United Nations operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, following which statements were made by all members of the Council, as well as by the representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union⁵⁸) and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

In his briefing, the Special Representative expressed optimism at the developments in the field, and held that the core issues addressed in the Dayton settlement could be resolved within the following two to three years, at which point European institutions

could take over the economic and social harmonization.⁵⁹

In their statements, most speakers welcomed the progress achieved by UNMIBH and supported the proposed extension of the mandate. Several speakers condemned the attempts to establish Croat self-rule, as well as recent ethnically motivated violence in Mostar, Trebinje and Banja Luka.⁶⁰ The representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia underlined the growing cooperation among the neighbouring countries of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.⁶¹ In response to statements, the Special Representative pointed to the issue of a transition of tasks to another international organization after the envisaged termination of the mandate of UNMIBH, naming the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the European Union as possible options.⁶²

At its 4333rd meeting, on 21 June 2001, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 7 June 2001.⁵⁷ The Council extended an invitation to the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to participate in the meeting. A draft resolution⁶³ was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without a debate as resolution 1357 (2001), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter with regard to sections I and II of the resolution, *inter alia*:

Authorized the Member States acting through or in cooperation with the organization referred to in annex 1-A of the Peace Agreement to continue for a further planned period of 12 months SFOR as established in accordance with resolution 1088 (1996) under unified command and control in order to fulfil the role specified in annexes 1-A and 2 of the Peace Agreement;

Authorized the Member States to take all necessary measures to effect the implementation of and to ensure compliance with annex 1-A of the Peace Agreement;

Authorized Member States to take all necessary measures, at the request of SFOR, either in defence of SFOR or to assist the Force in carrying out its mission, and recognized the right of

⁵⁷ S/2001/571 and Corr.1 submitted pursuant to resolution 1305 (2000).

⁵⁸ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁵⁹ S/PV.4330, pp. 2-7.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9 (France); pp. 9-10 (Russian Federation); pp. 12-13 (Norway); pp. 13-15 (Ukraine); p. 16 (Ireland); pp. 16-17 (Mauritius); p. 20 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union); and p. 23 (Bangladesh).

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 23-25.

⁶³ S/2001/610.

the Force to take all necessary measures to defend itself from attack or threat of attack;

Authorized the Member States to take all necessary measures to ensure compliance with the rules and procedures established by the Commander of SFOR governing command and control of airspace over Bosnia and Herzegovina with respect to all civilian and military air traffic.

In section III of the resolution, the Council, reaffirming the legal basis of the Charter on which the International Police Task Force was given its mandate in resolution 1035 (1995), *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of UNMIBH, which included the International Police Task Force, for an additional period terminating on 21 June 2002, and decided also that the Task Force should continue to be entrusted with the tasks set out in annex 11 of the Peace Agreement, including the tasks referred to in the conclusions of the London, Bonn, Luxembourg, Madrid and Brussels Conferences and agreed by the authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina; and requested the Secretary-General to keep the Council regularly informed and to report at least every six months on the implementation of the mandate of UNMIBH as a whole.

Deliberations of 21 September and 5 December 2001 (4379th and 4433rd meetings)

At its 4379th meeting, on 21 September 2001, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 14 September 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁶⁴ transmitting the twentieth report on the activities of the Office of the High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina. In his report, the High Representative, *inter alia*, described his efforts to resolve difficulties concerning the consolidation of the Bosnia and Herzegovina State institutions and the strengthening of their competencies, informed the Council of the progress in Bosnia and Herzegovina towards European and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) integration processes and reported on problems with the pace of economic revitalization.

At the meeting, the Council heard briefings by the High Representative and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of United Nations operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, following which statements were made by all members of the Council, as well as the representatives of

⁶⁴ S/2001/868.

Belgium (on behalf of the European Union⁶⁵) and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In his briefing, the High Representative reported considerable progress in his work. In addition, he reported that his Office had carried out a comprehensive overview of the international community's activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with a view to streamlining the civil international peace implementation structures.⁶⁶ The Special Representative, in his briefing, warned that the UNMIBH mission of police reform and restructuring would be futile without adequate funding and without a complementary reform of the judicial system. With regard to the period after the completion of the mandate of UNMIBH in December 2002, he proposed, among other options, a comprehensive rule-of-law mission as a follow-up to UNMIBH.⁶⁷

In their statements following the briefings, several speakers held that continued international involvement would be necessary in Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁶⁸ Other speakers welcomed the streamlining process of the international presence in Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁶⁹ The representative of the Russian Federation held that bringing into force important laws through a decision of the High Representative, while possibly necessary, was not the best possible way of encouraging State-building in Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁷⁰

At its 4433rd meeting, on 5 December 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIBH dated 29 November 2001.⁷¹ In his report, the Secretary-General, *inter alia*, informed the Council of progress made by UNMIBH towards the goal of completing its core mandate, including on police reform and restructuring, and the

⁶⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁶⁶ S/PV.4379, pp. 2-8.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-12.

⁶⁸ S/PV.4379 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Tunisia); pp. 2-3 (Ireland); pp. 7-8 (Bangladesh); and pp. 11-12 (France).

⁶⁹ S/PV.4379, p. 13 (United States); p. 14 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4379 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3 (Ireland); pp. 6-7 (Norway); pp. 7-8 (Bangladesh); and pp. 14-15 (Belgium on behalf of the European Union).

⁷⁰ S/PV.4379 (Resumption 1), pp. 5-6.

⁷¹ S/2001/1132 and Corr.1, submitted pursuant to resolution 1357 (2001).

establishment of the State Border Service. The Secretary-General, in underlining the need for continued monitoring and assistance, suggested that this could be carried out by a smaller police mission of approximately one quarter of the strength of UNMIBH, while stressing that it would be desirable for regional actors to assume responsibility for such a mission. He emphasized that in order to ensure a smooth transition, an early decision on this matter would be important.

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, following which statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Belgium (on behalf of the European Union⁷²) and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Assistant Secretary-General, in his briefing, welcomed initial assessments made by the High Representative, the European Union and OSCE in planning a post-UNMIBH international police monitoring presence and affirmed that the Special Representative cooperated fully with those organizations.⁷³

Most speakers noted the Secretary-General's suggestion that regional organizations assume responsibility for continued monitoring and assistance. The representative of France emphasized that the choice of the regional organization assuming the functions of the police mission should be made only when the time was right, but noted the advantages of the European Union in that regard.⁷⁴ The representative of the Russian Federation expressed his opinion that OSCE was the best prepared organization for continuing the police operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but also warned of any haste and stressed that the decision should be taken by the Security Council.⁷⁵

**Decision of 5 March 2002 (4484th meeting):
resolution 1396 (2002)**

At its 4484th meeting, on 5 March 2002, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated

⁷² Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁷³ S/PV.4433, pp. 2-3.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

26 February 2002 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitting the twenty-first report on the activities of the High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁷⁶ In his report, the High Representative reported, *inter alia*, that the Steering Board of the Peace Implementation Council had endorsed his draft action plan on streamlining the work of the international civilian organizations in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In addition, the implementation of the decision of the Constitutional Court in the Constituent Peoples' Case, including the establishment of fair representation of all constituent peoples on all public institutions and the establishment of a system to protect the vital interests of the constituent peoples, was in a crucial phase. The entities' constitutional commissions had proposed amendments to the respective constitutions and the leaders of the main parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina had met several times with the aim of finding a compromise solution.

At the meeting, the Council was addressed by the Secretary-General, the High Representative, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of United Nations operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the High Representative for the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy, following which statements were made by all members of the Council⁷⁷ and the representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Spain, Ukraine and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution.⁷⁸

The Secretary-General, in his statement to the Council, emphasized that UNMIBH was well on track to completing its core mandate by the end of 2002 and welcomed the decision by the European Union to establish a post-UNMIBH follow-on police mission.⁷⁹

The High Representative, in his briefing, emphasized that the concept of ownership was increasingly gaining roots in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In addition, he welcomed the increasing Europeanization of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as

⁷⁶ S/2002/209.

⁷⁷ Norway (holding the Presidency of the Council) was represented by the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

⁷⁸ S/2002/221.

⁷⁹ S/PV.4484, p. 3.

crystallized in the imminent accession of the country to the Council of Europe and in the European Union road map for eventual membership. He further noted the intention of the European Union to establish a police mission as well as his office's cooperation with the Council of Europe on a reinvigorated programme of judicial reform.⁸⁰

The Special Representative, in his briefing, reported that UNMIBH was making strong progress towards completing its core mandate on schedule and within its budget by the end of 2002 and pledged a seamless transfer to the European Union mission.⁸¹

The High Representative for the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy, in his statement, indicated that the European Union police mission would seek to establish sustainable policing arrangements under Bosnia and Herzegovina ownership in accordance with best European and international practice. He stated that the Mission would have a strength of about 480 police officers and 70 civilians, and expected that its goal would be achieved by the end of 2005.⁸²

Most speakers, including the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina,⁸³ welcomed the offer of the European Union to establish a follow-on police mission and the intention of UNMIBH and the European Union to ensure a seamless transition.

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1396 (2002), by which the Council, inter alia:

Welcomed the acceptance by the Steering Board of the Peace Implementation Council on 28 February 2002 of the offer made by the European Union to provide a European Union police mission, from 1 January 2003, to follow the end of the UNMIBH mandate, and the European Union's intention also to invite States that are not members of the European Union to participate in the police mission;

Encouraged coordination between UNMIBH, the European Union and the High Representative in order to ensure a seamless transition of responsibilities from the International Police Task Force to the European Union police mission;

Reaffirmed the importance it attached to the role of the High Representative in pursuing the implementation of the Peace Agreement;

Reaffirmed also the final authority of the High Representative in theatre regarding the interpretation of annex 10 on civilian implementation of the Peace Agreement.

Decisions of 19 June 2002 to 12 July 2002: resolutions 1418 (2002), 1420 (2002), 1421 (2002) and 1423 (2002) and rejection of a draft resolution

At its 4555th meeting, on 19 June 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIBH dated 5 June 2002.⁸⁴ In that report, the Secretary-General observed that UNMIBH was moving rapidly towards the completion of its core tasks, but that the systematic weakness of the rule of law in Bosnia and Herzegovina would require continued monitoring of and assistance to local police, a task that would be taken over by the European Union follow-on mission. In addition, the Secretary-General stressed that the continued presence and support of SFOR would be essential. He therefore recommended the extension of the current mandate of UNMIBH at an authorized strength of 1,600 police officers, to be drawn down after the October general elections to 460 officers, until 31 December 2002.

At the meeting, at which no statements were made, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of United Nations operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in which he underlined the achievements of UNMIBH at the end of its term, including the creation of a modern police force of European standard from a wartime militia, the creation of a State Border Service, a Criminal Justice Advisory Unit and a Special Trafficking Operations Programme.⁸⁵

At its 4558th meeting, on 21 June 2002, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 5 June 2002.⁸⁴ The Council extended an invitation to the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to participate in the meeting. A draft resolution⁸⁶ was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without a debate as resolution 1418 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, inter alia:

⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 4-7.

⁸¹ Ibid., pp. 7-11.

⁸² Ibid., pp. 11-12.

⁸³ Ibid., pp. 28-30.

⁸⁴ S/2002/618, submitted pursuant to resolution 1357 (2001).

⁸⁵ S/PV.4555, pp. 2-6.

⁸⁶ S/2002/680.

Decided that the provisions of its resolution 1357 (2001) should continue in force until 30 June 2002;

Decided to remain seized of the matter.

At its 4563rd meeting, on 30 June 2002, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 5 June 2002.⁸⁴ Statements were made by the Secretary-General, as well as the representatives of Bulgaria, China, Colombia, France, Ireland, Norway, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States. The President (Syrian Arab Republic) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Norway, the Russian Federation and the United Kingdom,⁸⁷ by which the Council would have extended the mandate of UNMIBH for an additional period terminating on 31 December 2002.

Speaking before the vote, the representative of the United States noted that while the longstanding commitment of the United States to peace and stability in the Balkans was beyond question, the United States had also been clear and consistent about its concerns on the question of the International Criminal Court, in particular the need to ensure its national jurisdiction over its personnel and officials involved in United Nations peacekeeping and in coalition-of-the-willing operations. He stated that it was with great regret that the United States found itself on the eve of that date, and despite its best efforts, without a solution. He held that with its global responsibilities, the United States was and would remain a special target and could not have its decisions second-guessed by a court whose jurisdiction it did not recognize. He emphasized that with the Court coming into being, the problem needed to be resolved in a way that took into account the fact that the United States wanted to participate in international peacekeeping, but that it did not and would not accept the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court over the peacekeepers that it contributed to operations established and authorized by the United Nations. He held that the failure of the Security Council to act to preserve an appropriate legal status for the United States and peacekeepers from other non-parties to the International Criminal Court could only end in damage to international peacekeeping generally. He recalled that the United States had proposed to establish immunity for United

Nations peacekeeping, building on immunities already recognized in the United Nations system, and held that this solution would not run counter to the obligations of signatories of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. The representative emphasized that the United States would vote against the draft resolution with great reluctance and that this decision was not directed at the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. He held, however, that the fact that the United States was vetoing the draft resolution in the face of its commitment to the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina was an indication of the seriousness of its concerns about the risks to its peacekeepers.⁸⁸

The draft resolution was then put to the vote; it received 13 votes in favour, 1 against (United States) and 1 abstention (Bulgaria), and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.⁸⁹

Speaking after the vote, the Secretary-General stated that, on that day, the mandate of UNMIBH was coming to an abrupt end for reasons that were unrelated to the vitally important work that it was performing to implement the Dayton Peace Agreement. He warned that unless an agreement could be reached on an orderly wind-down of the Mission, the police in Bosnia would be left unmonitored, unguided and unassisted. Key programmes, including the control of the borders by a professional State Border Service, would be left uncompleted and the long-planned handover to the European Union police mission would be severely compromised. More generally, he remained convinced that United Nations peacekeeping was an indispensable tool for the international community's promotion of global peace and security and he appealed to members of the Security Council to intensify the high-level negotiations so as to find a solution acceptable to all concerned that respected the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and treaty obligations of Member States. He stressed that the world could not afford a situation in which the Security Council was deeply divided on such an important issue that could have implications for all peace operations.⁹⁰

The representative of Bulgaria stated that his country had wished to abstain in the vote on the draft

⁸⁷ S/2002/712.

⁸⁸ S/PV.4563, pp. 2-3.

⁸⁹ For more information on the discussion with regard to procedure see chap. IV, part IV, sect. B, case 1.

⁹⁰ S/PV.4563, pp. 3-4.

resolution, not because it did not support the principle of a United Nations presence in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but because it wanted to draw attention to the lack of unity in the Council on this issue. He reminded delegations of the various formulas his delegation had proposed in informal consultations to resolve the situation before the Council and he appealed to all members of the Security Council to seek compromise.⁹¹

All other speakers also regretted the rejection of the draft resolution, and expressed their hope that a mutually acceptable solution would be found soon. Several speakers emphasized the legal commitments of their States as signatories of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.⁹² Some speakers also pointed to the principle of complementarity, under which the International Criminal Court would take over jurisdiction only if States were unwilling or unable to prosecute perpetrators.⁹³ In addition, the representative of France pointed to the possibility that either the United States conclude an agreement with the host countries of United Nations missions on extradition to the International Criminal Court, or the Security Council request the Court, through a resolution, to not be seized for a one-year renewable period, in the case of an ongoing investigation on a member of a force who was a citizen of a State that was not a party to the Statute of the Court.⁹⁴

At its 4564th meeting, also on 30 June 2002, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 5 June 2002.⁹⁵ The Council extended an invitation to the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to participate in the meeting. The President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by France, Ireland, Norway and the United Kingdom.⁹⁶ It was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution

1420 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided that the provisions of its resolution 1357 (2001) should continue in force until 3 July 2002;

Decided to remain seized of the matter;

At the 4566th meeting, on 3 July 2002, a draft resolution⁹⁷ was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1421 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided that the provisions of its resolution 1357 (2001) should continue in force until 15 July 2002;

Decided to remain seized of the matter.

By a letter dated 3 July 2002,⁹⁸ the representative of Canada requested an open meeting of the Security Council, arguing that what was at issue in the Council's deliberations on UNMIBH concerned not just the extension of the mandate of UNMIBH, but also a "potentially irreversible decision negatively affecting the integrity of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the integrity of treaty negotiations generally, the credibility of the Security Council, the viability of international law with respect to investigation and prosecution of grievous crimes and the established responsibilities of States under international law to act on such crimes", and that it was therefore appropriate for the Council to hear the views of the wider United Nations membership.

At the 4568th meeting, held on 10 July 2002 in response to the request contained in the above-mentioned letter, statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Rio Group), Cuba, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union⁹⁹), Fiji, Germany, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Mongolia, New Zealand, Samoa, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Thailand, Ukraine, Venezuela and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, as well as the Permanent Observer of Switzerland.¹⁰⁰

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5 (France); pp. 5-6 (United Kingdom); p. 6 (Colombia); p. 7 (Norway); and pp. 7-8 (Ireland).

⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6 (United Kingdom); p. 6 (Colombia); p. 7 (Norway); and pp. 7-8 (Ireland).

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5. For more information on the discussion regarding exemptions for peacekeepers from prosecution by the International Criminal Court, see chap. XII, parts II and IV, with regard to Articles 24 and 103 of the Charter, and the study in the present chapter on United Nations peacekeeping (sect. 47.D).

⁹⁵ S/2002/618.

⁹⁶ S/2002/716.

⁹⁷ S/2002/724.

⁹⁸ S/2002/723.

⁹⁹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁰⁰ The representative of Croatia was invited to participate

At the meeting, the representative of Canada raised concern over the discussion that had been taking place among members of the Council regarding exemptions for peacekeepers from prosecution by the International Criminal Court.¹⁰¹ He maintained that with regard to the issue at hand, fundamental principles of law were in question, that the Council had not been empowered to rewrite treaties, that the draft resolutions being circulated¹⁰² contained elements that “exceed[ed] the Council’s mandate” and that their adoption would “undermine the credibility of the Council”. In his opinion, the adoption of a resolution on the International Criminal Court under Chapter VII of the Charter, in the absence of a threat to international peace and security, would be *ultra vires*. For those reasons, he held that adoption of the draft resolutions circulating at that time could place Canada and other Member States “in the unprecedented position of having to examine the legality of a Security Council resolution”. In addition, he held that options existed that would preserve the integrity of the international legal system and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, including the withdrawal of United States forces from current peacekeeping missions or the negotiation of bilateral agreements with receiving States.¹⁰³

During the debate, many speakers similarly argued that in interpreting or amending a treaty without the approval of its States parties, the Security Council would overstep its authority and mandate. Several speakers explicitly stated that in their opinion the issue at hand did not constitute a threat to international peace and security.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, several speakers agreed with the representative of Canada that it was undesirable for the Council to place States into a position where they were in a conflict between their legal obligations with regard to Council decisions and their obligations entered into under the Statute of the International Criminal Court.¹⁰⁵ Many speakers also maintained that failure to extend the mandate of

UNMIBH would not only threaten United Nations achievements in the Balkans but endanger United Nations peacekeeping operations in general. In that regard, the representative of Bulgaria held that the discussions on the extension of peacekeeping mandates and exemptions for peacekeepers from prosecution by the International Criminal Court had “tested the Council’s ability to carry out its mandate under Chapter VII of the Charter”.¹⁰⁶ The representatives of the Islamic Republic of Iran and Jordan held that given the obligations conferred to it in Article 24 of the Charter, it was inconceivable that the Council could ponder placing peacekeeping operations in jeopardy.¹⁰⁷ Most speakers held that the safeguards built into the Rome Statute should be sufficient to protect peacekeepers from politically motivated charges. Many speakers argued strongly that the search for a compromise solution should not result in an erosion of the Statute. In that regard, many speakers noted that article 16 of the Statute of the International Criminal Court was intended to be used on a case-by-case to suspend prosecutions where a temporary conflict between the resolution of armed conflict and the prosecution of offences existed, and not to be invoked for general exemptions.

The representative of the United States reaffirmed his country’s commitment to justice and the rule of law, to accountability for war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide, as well as to peace and security in Bosnia and around the world. He nevertheless held that peacekeepers from States not parties to the Statute of the International Criminal Court should not face, in addition to the dangers and hardships of deployment, additional, unnecessary legal jeopardy and he contended that the principle of immunity for peacekeeping troops had been acknowledged over decades. He held that a deferral of investigations and prosecutions in keeping with the Rome Statute could not undermine the role of the Court, while a failure to address concerns about placing peacekeepers in legal jeopardy before the Court could impede the provision of peacekeepers to the United Nations. He held that by invoking article 16 of the Statute in its latest proposals, the United States had sought to work within the provisions of that Statute

but did not make a statement.

¹⁰¹ See footnote 94.

¹⁰² Not issued as documents of the Council.

¹⁰³ S/PV.4568, p. 3.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (New Zealand); and p. 16 (Jordan); S/PV.4568 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Germany).

¹⁰⁵ S/PV.4568, p. 6 (New Zealand); p. 19 (Mongolia); p. 20 (Liechtenstein); and pp. 24-25 (Singapore); S/PV.4568 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Ukraine). See also chap. XII, part IV, with regard to Article 103 of the Charter.

¹⁰⁶ S/PV.4568, p. 12.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 15 (Islamic Republic of Iran); and p. 16 (Jordan). See also chap. XII, part II, with regard to Article 24 of the Charter.

and he held that this approach was consistent with the terms of article 16 and with the primary responsibility of the Security Council for maintaining international peace and security.¹⁰⁸ The representative of India also held that the Council should give careful consideration to the views of major troop-contributing countries that were not parties to the Rome Statute.¹⁰⁹

With regard to the future of UNMIBH, the representative of France held that it should be possible to extend its mandate one last time until the end of 2002 by adding to the draft resolution a paragraph stressing the primacy of the competence of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia over that of the International Criminal Court, but added that, if that solution was not accepted by the United States, France would support a draft resolution of the United Kingdom allowing for the orderly withdrawal of UNMIBH and its replacement, on 1 November, by the European Union police mission.¹¹⁰ The representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina stated his country's readiness to consider during the remaining six months of the mandate of UNMIBH, and bearing in mind the Statute of the International Criminal Court, modalities for the transfer, surrender or extradition of nationals participating in UNMIBH suspected of committing crimes under the jurisdiction of the Court.¹¹¹

At its 4573rd meeting, on 12 July 2002, the Council extended an invitation to the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to participate in the discussion. A draft resolution¹¹² was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1423 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter with regard to sections I and II of the resolution, authorized the continuation of SFOR for a further period of 12 months and, reaffirming the legal basis of the Charter on which the International Police Task Force was given its mandate in resolution 1035 (1995), in section III of the resolution:

Decided to extend the mandate of UNMIBH, which included the International Police Task Force, for an additional period terminating on 31 December 2002, and also decided that, during that period, the Task Force should continue to be entrusted with the tasks set out in annex 11 of the Peace

Agreement, including the tasks referred to in the conclusions of the London, Bonn, Luxembourg, Madrid and Brussels Conferences and agreed by the authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Requested the Secretary-General to keep the Council regularly informed and to report in six months on the implementation of the mandate of UNMIBH as a whole;

Reiterated that the successful implementation of the tasks of the Task Force rested on the quality, experience and professional skills of its personnel, and once again urged Member States, with the support of the Secretary-General, to ensure the provision of such qualified personnel;

Urged Member States, in response to demonstrable progress by the parties in restructuring their law enforcement institutions, to intensify their efforts to provide, on a voluntary-funded basis and in coordination with the Task Force, training, equipment and related assistance for local police forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Requested the Secretary-General to continue to submit to the Council reports from the High Representative, in particular on compliance by the parties with their commitments under the Peace Agreement.

Decision of 12 December 2002 (4661st meeting): statement by the President

At its 4631st meeting, on 23 October 2002, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 18 October 2002 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹¹³ transmitting the twenty-third report on the activities of the High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina. In his report, the newly appointed High Representative stated that his aim was to set Bosnia and Herzegovina irreversibly on the road to statehood within the European Union.

At its meeting, the Council heard briefings by the High Representative, as well as by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of United Nations operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, following which statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Croatia, Denmark (on behalf of the

¹¹³ S/2002/1176.

¹⁰⁸ S/PV.4568, pp. 9-10.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., pp. 13-14.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 10-12.

¹¹¹ S/PV.4568 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

¹¹² S/2002/757.

European Union¹¹⁴) and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.¹¹⁵

In his briefing, the High Representative described his priorities as “first justice, then jobs, through reform”. On economic reform, he held that reforms were needed quickly and that at this time speed would matter more than perfection. He noted that he had instructed his staff to draw up a mandate implementation plan — similar to that of UNMIBH.¹¹⁶ The Special Representative, noting that the work of UNMIBH was coming to an end, emphasized the concrete successes of UNMIBH, underlining that the restructuring and reform of the police had led to a low general crime rate and a significant drop in the numbers of illegal migrants. He also reported that arrangements for a seamless transition to the European Union police mission at the end of the mandate of UNMIBH were in place.¹¹⁷

Most speakers agreed with the priorities set out by the High Representative. In addition, they welcomed the transition from UNMIBH to the European Union police mission and lauded the achievements of UNMIBH. In addition, the representative of the Russian Federation conveyed his understanding that the Security Council, as the main body responsible for peacekeeping and international security, would, even after UNMIBH had completed its work, continue to receive, on a regular basis, reports on the process of implementing the police operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.¹¹⁸

At its 4661st meeting, on 12 December 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIBH dated 2 December 2002.¹¹⁹ In his final report on UNMIBH, which would complete its mandate on 31 December 2002, the Secretary-General held that, through UNMIBH, the United Nations had demonstrated its ability to

complete a complex mandate in accordance with a strategic plan and within a realistic and finite time frame. He held that police reform and restructuring in accordance with international standards had created in Bosnia and Herzegovina what had been termed “a police fit for Europe”. As successes of UNMIBH he highlighted, among others, the high standard of security throughout the country, a dramatically reduced flow of illegal migrants, narcotics smuggling and human trafficking and the return of over 250,000 refugees.

At the meeting, the Council was addressed by the Secretary-General, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of United Nations operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Presiding member and two other members of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina.¹²⁰

In his address to the Council, the Secretary-General underlined that UNMIBH had completed the most extensive police reform and restructuring project that the United Nations had undertaken so far. He held that, with the end of UNMIBH and the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka, an era of United Nations involvement in the former Yugoslavia came to an end that had seen some of the bitterest moments of peacekeeping. He emphasized that the United Nations had drawn important conclusions about the nature, scope and role of United Nations peacekeeping and had made it a better instrument for the international community.¹²¹

The Special Representative, in his briefing, held that UNMIBH had been a success, its mandate had been implemented and there were visible signs that reforms were at work. In addition, he pointed to lessons learned that he hoped would be applied to other peace operations, such as the use of a mandate implementation plan as a strategic and operational vision and as an exit strategy.¹²²

In their consecutive statements, the three members of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina expressed their gratitude to the United Nations and to the Council for their assistance to Bosnia and Herzegovina. They underlined the key role of the

¹¹⁴ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹¹⁵ The representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Japan, Slovenia and Ukraine were invited to participate but did not make statements.

¹¹⁶ S/PV.4631, pp. 2-7.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-11.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-17.

¹¹⁹ S/2002/1314, submitted pursuant to resolution 1423 (2002).

¹²⁰ The Prime Minister of Bosnia and Herzegovina was invited to participate in the meeting but did not make a statement.

¹²¹ S/PV.4661, pp. 2-3.

¹²² *Ibid.*, pp. 3-7.

United Nations in assisting the parties to ensure stability and establish the reform process. They indicated that they considered the withdrawal of the peacekeeping operation as a sign of confidence in Bosnia and Herzegovina. They expressed their support for the transition from UNMIBH to the European Union police mission. They confirmed their commitment to reform and to the European and Euro-Atlantic integration processes and emphasized their determination to continue the process of democratic transformation.¹²³

At the same meeting, the President (Colombia) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹²⁴ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the decision of the European Union to send a Police Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1 January 2003, as part of a broader rule of law approach, as well as the close coordination between all those concerned to ensure a seamless transition of responsibilities from the International Police Task Force to the European Union police mission, with the participation of the interested States non-members of the European Union;

Reiterated that the primary responsibility for the further successful implementation of the Peace Agreement lay with the authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina themselves and that the continued willingness of the international community and major donors to assume the political, military and economic burden of implementation and reconstruction efforts would be determined by the compliance and active participation by all the authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina in implementing the Peace Agreement and all reforms needed to rebuild a civil society.

Decision of 11 July 2003 (4786th meeting): resolution 1491 (2003)

At its 4786th meeting, on 11 July 2003, the Council extended an invitation to the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to participate. A draft resolution¹²⁵ was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without a debate as resolution 1491 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Called upon the parties to comply strictly with the obligations under the Agreements, and expressed its intention to keep the implementation of the Peace Agreement, and the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, under review; authorized the Member States acting through or in cooperation with the organization referred to in annex 1-A of the Peace Agreement to

continue for a further planned period of 12 months SFOR as established in accordance with its resolution 1088 (1996) under unified command and control in order to fulfil the role specified in annexes 1-A and 2 of the Peace Agreement;

Authorized the Member States acting under paragraph 10 of the resolution to take all necessary measures to effect the implementation of and to ensure compliance with annex 1-A of the Peace Agreement, stressed that the parties should continue to be held equally responsible for compliance with that annex and should be equally subject to such enforcement action by SFOR as may be necessary to ensure implementation of that annex and the protection of SFOR, and took note that the parties consented to SFOR's taking such measures;

Demanded that the parties respect the security and freedom of movement of SFOR and other international personnel.

Deliberations of 8 October 2003 (4837th meeting)

At its 4837th meeting, on 8 October 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 25 September 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹²⁶ transmitting the twenty-fourth report on the activities of the High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina. In his report, the High Representative observed measurable progress in the main areas of his mandate. In addition, he reported that the European Union police mission was launched on 1 January 2003 and was fully operational.

At the meeting, the Council heard briefings by the High Representative, as well as by the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, following which statements were made by all members of the Council, as well as by the representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Italy (on behalf of the European Union¹²⁷).

In his briefing, the High Representative, commenting on the rule of law and the economy as his two priorities, observed that the task of reforming the entire judiciary and court system was on track for completion in the following five to six months. On economic reforms, he pointed to a report of the

¹²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-10.

¹²⁴ S/PRST/2002/33.

¹²⁵ S/2003/697.

¹²⁶ S/2003/918.

¹²⁷ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

International Monetary Fund commending Bosnia and Herzegovina for the speed with which its macroeconomic framework was strengthened. He attributed some of this success to the work of recently established local reform committees, composed entirely of local civil society representatives under international chairmanship, which had produced high-quality, European-standard legislative reforms and forwarded them to Governments and Parliaments for adoption. The High Representative considered this a sign for a shift in the political culture and mindset and emphasized that the need to resort to the extraordinary powers of his Office had halved in the period under review.¹²⁸

The President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, in his briefing, reported on the joint initiative of the Office of the High Representative and the Tribunal to establish a special War Crimes Chamber within the State Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which he held had been recognized by the Security Council in resolution 1503 (2003) as an essential prerequisite for the success of the completion strategy of the Tribunal, and which would, in addition,

¹²⁸ S/PV.4837, pp. 2-7.

contribute to the process of reconciliation in the region. In that regard, he appealed for adequate funding of the project.¹²⁹

Most speakers welcomed the improvements in key areas of reform. Many speakers also welcomed the establishment of a War Crimes Chamber at the State Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In addition, the representative of France, along with the representatives of the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation welcomed the dialogue in Bosnia and Herzegovina on military reform and noted the progress towards putting the armed forces of the entities under effective civilian control with a view to the eventual establishment of a unified command structure.¹³⁰ The representative of Germany, in addition to seeing internationally assisted national courts as an interesting and cost-effective alternative, suggested that in the future, the Council give increased consideration to the possibility of referring situations to the International Criminal Court whenever there was a need for international criminal justice.¹³¹

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8. For more information, see the study in the present chapter on items relating to the International Tribunals (sect. 36).

¹³⁰ S/PV.4837, pp. 10-11 (France); pp. 14-15 (United Kingdom); and pp. 17-18 (Russian Federation).

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

B. The situation in Croatia

Decisions of 13 January 2000 to 11 October 2002: resolutions 1285 (2000), 1307 (2000), 1335 (2001), 1362 (2001), 1387 (2002), 1424 (2002) and 1437 (2002)

During this period, the Security Council held seven meetings,¹³² at each of which, unanimously and without debate, it adopted a resolution by which it extend the mandate of the United Nations Mission of

¹³² The 4088th (13 January 2000), 4170th (13 July 2000), 4256th (12 January 2001), 4346th (11 July 2001), 4448th (15 January 2002), 4574th (12 July 2002) and 4622nd (11 October 2002) meetings. During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held a number of meetings in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (UNMOP), pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B. The meetings were held on 10 January 2002 (4446th), 10 July 2002 (4569th) and 10 October 2002 (4620th).

Observers in Prevlaka (UNMOP)¹³³ on the basis of the recommendations contained in the reports of the Secretary-General on UNMOP,¹³⁴ until its termination on 15 December 2002.

At those meetings, in which the representation of Croatia, Germany and Italy were invited to

¹³³ By resolutions 1285 (2000), 1307 (2000), 1335 (2001), 1362 (2001) and 1387 (2002), the Council extended the mandate of UNMOP by six-month periods. By resolutions 1424 (2002) and 1437 (2002), the Council extended the mandate of UNMOP by three months and two months, respectively.

¹³⁴ Reports dated 31 December 1999 (S/1999/1302), 3 July 2000 (S/2000/647), 29 December 2000 (S/2000/1251), 3 July 2001 (S/2001/661), 2 January 2002 (S/2002/1), 28 June 2002 (S/2002/713) and 2 October 2002 (S/2002/1101).

participate,¹³⁵ a number of documents were brought to the attention of the Council.¹³⁶

In his reports on UNMOP, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that in accordance with its mandate UNMOP had continued to monitor the demilitarization of the Prevlaka peninsula and the neighbouring areas in Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and had held regular meetings with the local authorities in order to strengthen liaison, reduce tensions, improve safety and security and promote confidence between the parties. In 2000, the absence of major conflict in the region and the change of government in both Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had created more favourable conditions for progress on the Prevlaka issue. A process of consultation between the two sides had led to the formation in December 2001 of a joint Interstate Diplomatic Commission tasked with resolving the outstanding border disputes between the two States. During 2002, the Commission and its constituent subcommissions had met continually in an effort to develop a common agenda for resolving the Prevlaka

dispute. The Secretary-General, in his report dated 28 June 2002, considered that given the progress made by the parties towards resolving the dispute, once the parties agreed upon a transitional border-crossing regime UNMOP would be able to withdraw. However, in order to maintain a favourable condition for the negotiations, he recommended to the Council a three-month extension of the Mission.¹³⁷ In April 2002, the two sides had been able to report in a joint letter to the President of the Security Council that they had been negotiating, in good faith and in an atmosphere of mutual confidence and respect, a comprehensive cross-border regime which “would eventually contribute to the successful ending of the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka”.¹³⁸ In his report dated 2 October 2002, the Secretary-General recommended a two-month extension of the mandate of UNMOP, with the Mission preparing for its withdrawal thereafter, to be completed by 31 December 2002.¹³⁹

By the resolutions adopted,¹⁴⁰ the Council, *inter alia*, authorized the United Nations military observers to continue monitoring the demilitarization of the Prevlaka peninsula, urged the parties to abide by their mutual commitments and implement fully the Agreement on Normalization of Relations and called upon the parties to cease all violations of the demilitarized regime in the United Nations designated zones. Furthermore, by resolution 1424 (2002) of 12 July 2002, the Council expressed its intention to review the duration of the authority of UNMOP if the parties informed the Council that a negotiated agreement had been reached as described in the report of the Secretary-General.¹⁴¹ By resolution 1437 (2002) of 11 October 2002, in authorizing the last extension of the mandate of UNMOP, until 15 December 2002, the

¹³⁵ The representatives of Germany and Italy attended only the 4088th meeting, and the representative of Croatia attended all meetings except the 4170th meeting. No statements were made.

¹³⁶ Letter dated 10 January 2000 from Croatia transmitting its position on the security issue of the Prevlaka peninsula (S/2000/8); letter dated 24 December 1999 from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia transmitting a report to the Secretary-General on the situation of negotiations with Croatia in connection with the resolution of the disputed issue of Prevlaka (S/1999/1278); letter dated 22 December 2000 from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia concerning the mandate of UNMOP (S/2000/1235); letter dated 5 January 2001 from Croatia indicating its readiness to resolve the Prevlaka issue with the new Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and agreeing to a single six-month extension of the mandate of UNMOP (S/2001/13); letter dated 3 July 2001 from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia concerning the extension of the mandate of UNMOP (S/2001/668); letter dated 9 July 2001 from Croatia concerning the extension of the mandate of UNMOP and welcoming the constructive approach of the new Government in Belgrade to the resolution to the issue of Prevlaka (S/2001/680); letter dated 28 December 2001 from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia concerning the extension of the mandate of UNMOP (S/2001/130); and letter dated 7 January 2002 from Croatia concerning the extension of the mandate of UNMOP (S/2002/29).

¹³⁷ S/2002/713, para. 13.

¹³⁸ S/2002/1341, para. 9, citing a letter dated 10 April 2002 from the representatives of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia reporting, pursuant to resolution 1387 (2002), on the progress of the two countries on talks on the Prevlaka issue, and stating that the Interstate Diplomatic Commission had initiated the Protocol on the Principles for Identification — Delimitation and Drafting of the State Border Agreement, which was due to be signed at the next meeting, in Belgrade on 23 April 2002 (S/2002/368).

¹³⁹ S/2002/1101, para. 13.

¹⁴⁰ See footnote 133.

¹⁴¹ S/2002/713, section V.

Council requested the Secretary-General to prepare for the termination of the mandate of UNMOP.

Decision of 12 December 2002 (4662nd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4662nd meeting, on 12 December 2002, in which the representative of Croatia was invited to participate, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMOP.¹⁴² In his report, the Secretary-General, *inter alia*, welcomed the protocol signed by Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on 10 December 2002, concerning interim regime along the southern border between the two States. He noted that the parties had advanced sufficiently in their bilateral relations so that an international monitoring mechanism was no longer required. The Secretary-General observed that by contributing to isolating Prevlaka from the surrounding conflicts and tensions throughout a turbulent decade in the Balkans, UNMOP had demonstrated that even a small United Nations presence, properly conceived and executed, could make a difference.

At the meeting, the President (Colombia) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 10 December 2002 from the representatives of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the President

¹⁴² S/2002/1341.

of the Security Council;¹⁴³ the Council then heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations on the basis of the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General stated that the signing of the Protocol had been a significant step forward on the way to the full normalization of relations between Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and had paved the way for a smooth and orderly handover of the responsibilities of UNMOP to the local authorities.

The President then made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁴⁴ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the protocol signed by the Government of Croatia and the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on 10 December 2002 establishing a provisional cross-border regime on the Prevlaka peninsula;

Welcomed the commitment of both Governments to continue negotiations on Prevlaka with a view to amicably resolving all outstanding issues, and commended their diplomatic efforts to bolster peace and stability in the region;

Commended the important role played by the UNMOP in helping to create conditions conducive to a negotiated settlement of the dispute.

¹⁴³ S/2002/1348, transmitting the Protocol between the Governments of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on the Interim Regime along the Southern Border between the two States signed on 10 December 2002.

¹⁴⁴ S/PRST/2002/34.

C. Items relating to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Letter dated 4 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Initial proceedings

Decision of 7 March 2001 (4290th meeting): statement by the President

By a letter dated 4 March 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹⁴⁵ the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, referring to an incident on the border with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in which three soldiers of the national army of his Government had been killed, requested an urgent meeting of the Council at which the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia would present an action plan of his Government on measures for the cessation of violence and stabilization “on the border with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Kosovo section)” and for the prevention of a spillover of violence into his country.

¹⁴⁵ S/2001/191.

At its 4289th meeting, held on 7 March 2001 in response to the request contained in the above-mentioned letter, the Council included in its agenda, without objection, the item entitled “Letter dated 4 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/191)”. In addition to members of the Council,¹⁴⁶ statements were made by the representatives of Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Greece, Slovenia and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union¹⁴⁷).

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of his country. He informed the Council that the “disturbing developments” on the northern border of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, in addition to affecting the national inter-ethnic relations, had also threatened the peace, security and stability of his country and the entire region. He explained that as a result of that situation, his Government had adopted an action plan to implement preventive measures, with a continued measured security response, against a spillover of the conflict from both sides of the border. The plan called for the “full observance” of resolution 1244 (1999) and the strengthening of cooperation between the Kosovo Force and the national army of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.¹⁴⁸

All speakers acknowledged the gravity of the current situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and expressed their condemnation of the violence. Furthermore, most speakers applauded the measured response by the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the violence and expressed support for the continuation of the efforts of the Government to ensure the rule of law within its territory. Recognition was also extended by speakers to the important roles of the United Nations, NATO, OSCE and the European Union in assisting the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

¹⁴⁶ The representative of Bangladesh did not make a statement.

¹⁴⁷ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁴⁸ S/PV.4289, pp. 2-4.

The representative of the Russian Federation noted that it was time for the “international community to draw lessons from the sad experience of aiding and abetting separatist elements of the Albanian extremists”.¹⁴⁹

The representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia stated that his country was “faced with the same problems” on its territory and referred to an incident whereby “Albanian terrorists” had been responsible for an attack on a Yugoslav army vehicle which had resulted in the killing of two national soldiers.¹⁵⁰

At the 4290th meeting, on 7 March 2001, the President (Ukraine) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁵¹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Strongly condemned recent violence by ethnic Albanian armed extremists in the north of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, in particular the killing of three soldiers of the armed forces of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in the area of Tanusevci;

Regretted that the violence continued and called for an immediate end to it;

Underlined the responsibility of the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for the rule of law in its territory;

Supported actions by the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to address the violence with an appropriate level of restraint and to preserve the political stability of the country and foster harmony between all ethnic components of the population;

Recalled the need to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

**Decision of 21 March 2001 (4301st meeting):
resolution 1345 (2001)**

At the 4301st meeting, on 21 March 2001, the President (Ukraine) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁵² it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1345 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Strongly condemned extremist violence, including terrorist activities, in certain parts of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and certain municipalities in southern Serbia;

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹⁵¹ S/PRST/2001/7.

¹⁵² S/2001/256.

Demanded that all those who are currently engaged in armed action against the authorities of those States immediately cease all such action, lay down their weapons and return to their homes; called on Kosovo Albanian political leaders, and leaders of the ethnic Albanian communities in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, southern Serbia and elsewhere, publicly to condemn violence and ethnic intolerance;

Welcomed the efforts of the Kosovo Force to implement resolution 1244 (1999);

Called on States and appropriate international organizations to give practical help to strengthen democratic, multi-ethnic societies;

Decided to monitor developments on the ground carefully and remain actively seized of the matter.

The situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Decision of 13 August 2001 (4356th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4356th meeting, on 13 August 2001, the President (Colombia) made a statement on behalf of the Council.¹⁵³ by which the Council, inter alia:

Welcomed the signing of the Framework Agreement on the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and called for its full and immediate implementation;

Reaffirmed the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and called for the full implementation of Council resolution 1345 (2001);

Condemned the ongoing violence by extremists and called on all parties to respect the ceasefire;

Supported the actions of the President and Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia aimed at resolving the crisis;

Welcomed the efforts of the international community and called on them to assist the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in the implement often of the Framework Agreement.

¹⁵³ S/PRST/2001/20.

Decision of 26 September 2001 (4381st meeting): resolution 1371 (2001)

At the 4381st meeting, on 26 September 2001, the President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 21 September 2001 from the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia addressed to the President of the Council.¹⁵⁴

The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁵⁵ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1371 (2001), by which the Council, inter alia:

Reaffirmed its commitment to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and other States of the region;

Called for the full implementation of resolution 1345 (2001);

Supported the full and timely implementation of the Framework Agreement, rejected the use of violence in pursuit of political aims and stressed that only peaceful political solutions can assure a stable and democratic future for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia;

Demanded that all concerned ensure the safety of international personnel in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia;

Welcomed the efforts of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo and the international security presence to implement fully resolution 1244 (1999).

¹⁵⁴ S/2001/897, transmitting a letter dated 17 September 2001 from the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Chairman-in-Office of OSCE regarding a further enhancement of the OSCE spillover monitor mission to Skopje; and a letter dated 18 September 2001 from the President of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Secretary General of NATO concerning a light NATO presence in the country to provide additional security for the international monitors.

¹⁵⁵ S/2001/902.

D. Items relating to Kosovo¹⁵⁶

Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)

Deliberations of 11 May to 16 November 2000 (4138th, 4153rd, 4171st, 4190th, 4200th and 4225th meetings)

At its 4138th meeting,¹⁵⁷ on 11 May 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the report of the Security Council mission on the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999),¹⁵⁸ which was dispatched to Kosovo from 27 to 29 April 2000. In the report, the mission observed, *inter alia*, that while progress had been made with regard to the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999), inadequate physical, social and economic security had remained a major concern. Furthermore, it was stressed that lack of freedom of movement, access to education, health care, social services and employment hampered the return of the internally displaced, primarily Kosovo Serbs and Kosovo Roma.

At the meeting, following the presentation of the report by the head of the mission (Bangladesh),¹⁵⁹ all members of the Council concurred with the findings of the report.

The representative of China recalled that resolution 1244 (1999) reaffirmed the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. He added that the presence of the United Nations in Kosovo was by no means for the purpose of helping the local people gain independence.¹⁶⁰

The representative of the Russian Federation expressed concern over the implementation of the

provisions of resolution 1244 (1999) that were connected with the respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and in that regard noted that all activities of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) had to correspond to that provision of the resolution to ensure the functioning of Kosovo with substantial autonomy within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The representative also made reference to the problem of the return of agreed contingents of the Yugoslav military and police to Kosovo as stipulated in paragraph 4 of resolution 1244 (1999), which had not yet been resolved.¹⁶¹

At its 4153rd meeting, on 9 June 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK dated 6 June 2000.¹⁶² In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that UNMIK, working closely with the Kosovo Force (KFOR), had consolidated the central and municipal structures through which the people of Kosovo participated in the interim administration of the province. With the participation of both ethnic Albanian and non-Albanian communities in Kosovo, the composition of those structures had become more reflective of the population in the province, while the overall security situation, despite some improvements, remained fragile. The Secretary-General pointed out that the harassment and intimidation of non-Albanian communities continued at unacceptable levels, and made reference to the tremendous complexity faced in building coexistence and tolerance.

At the meeting, in which the representative of Albania, Portugal and Spain were invited to participate, the President (France) drew the attention of the Council to several documents.¹⁶³ The Council was then

¹⁵⁶ In this Supplement, the term "Kosovo" is used as the short form for "Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia" and "Kosovo, State Union of Serbia and Montenegro", without prejudice to issues of status.

¹⁵⁷ At its 4102nd and 4108th meetings, held in private on 16 February and 6 March 2000, the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the head of the international security presence in Kosovo.

¹⁵⁸ S/2000/363.

¹⁵⁹ S/PV.4138, pp. 2-5.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹⁶² S/2000/538, submitted pursuant to resolution 1244 (1999).

¹⁶³ Letters from the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, calling for the full implementation of resolution 1244 (1999) notably with regard to the security situation of the non-Albanian community (S/2000/491, S/2000/497, S/2000/508, S/2000/525, S/2000/526, S/2000/527, S/2000/553 and S/2000/547); letter dated 8 June 2000 from the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, concerning two incidents which occurred at the border of the former

briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of UNMIK, marking one year after the adoption of resolution 1244 (1999). In his briefing, the Special Representative noted that although progress had been made since the inception of UNMIK in June 1999 with regard to, *inter alia*, the return of Kosovo Albanian refugees, demilitarization and the establishment of an interim administration, a great deal remained to be done in the fields of rule of law and protection of minority rights. He stressed that the ambiguities in resolution 1244 (1999), concerning the interim status of Kosovo, demanded explanation with regard to the wording of “substantial autonomy”.¹⁶⁴

Most speakers expressed concern over the continued fragile security situation described in the report of the Secretary-General and called upon relevant actors to ensure the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999). Some speakers also argued that UNMIK and KFOR should ensure that their actions be in full conformity with resolution 1244 (1999).¹⁶⁵

The representative of China asserted that despite the clear provisions of resolution 1244 (1999) with regard to the status of Kosovo, some of the administrative measures adopted in Kosovo impaired the sovereignty of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which created a false impression that Kosovo was moving towards independence. Furthermore, he emphasized that any attempt to lead Kosovo to independence was dangerous and illegal.¹⁶⁶

The representative of Ukraine opined that the only foreseeable way to settle the issue of the future status of Kosovo would be by agreement reached between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Kosovo Albanians through talks under international auspices. The representative noted that other scenarios might undermine the fragile atmosphere of peace in the whole region, as well as the role of the Council itself.¹⁶⁷

At its 4171st and 4190th meetings, held on 13 July and 24 August 2000, the Council was briefed by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations on the status of implementation of

resolution 1244 (1999). Those briefings included, *inter alia*, security updates of the situation on the ground and the status of preparations for the upcoming municipal elections, the first to be held since the inception of UNMIK in 1999.¹⁶⁸ At both meetings, statements were made by almost all members of the Council.¹⁶⁹

Most speakers welcomed the holding of the upcoming elections, although the representative of the Russian Federation cautioned that such elections might provoke a new crisis that would constitute a threat to regional stability and security. In that regard, the representative reiterated that in violating resolution 1244 (1999), the Special Representative had “*de facto* arrogated to himself the exclusive rights to run Kosovo” without consulting the Security Council and without any cooperation from the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.¹⁷⁰

At its 4200th meeting, on 27 September 2000, the Council had before it the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK dated 18 September 2000.¹⁷¹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that UNMIK had continued its preparations for the scheduled municipal elections on 28 October 2000. Regarding the situation of the minority communities in Kosovo, UNMIK remained deeply concerned at the violence against non-Albanian ethnic groups, in particular Kosovo Serbs and Kosovo Roma. However, the Mission welcomed recent signs that members of the minority communities of Kosovo had begun to return to the province, and expressed its continued efforts to encourage the return process.

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, following which all members of the Council made statements. In his briefing, the Special Representative reported on progress achieved by the Mission since its inception in June 1999, which included the establishment of the Joint Administrative Structure in December 1999, the Kosovo Transitional Council, with the representation of all communities, and the Interim Administrative Council. With regard to the work of the Mission’s four pillars: the UNHCR pillar had

Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia with Kosovo, on 2 April and 5 June 2000 (S/2000/552).

¹⁶⁴ S/PV.4153, pp. 2-9.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 16 (Russian Federation); and p. 25 (Ukraine).

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

¹⁶⁸ S/PV.4171, pp. 2-7; and S/PV.4190, pp. 2-5.

¹⁶⁹ The representative of Mali did not make a statement at the 4171st meeting.

¹⁷⁰ S/PV.4190, p. 8.

¹⁷¹ S/2000/878, submitted pursuant to resolution 1244 (1999).

facilitated the return of one million refugees to Kosovo; the United Nations pillar had established a functioning civil administration in all areas of public life in Kosovo; the OSCE pillar had been instrumental in developing the media sector and commencing the establishment of a Kosovo police service; and the European Union pillar had helped to lay the foundation for a functioning market economy. The preparations for the elections to be held on 28 October 2000 had been ongoing over the past 14 months, and the Special Representative noted that all the elements were in place for the elections to be held in a successful manner. Noting that the Kosovo Serb community had decided not to participate in the elections, the Special Representative stressed that the Mission remained determined to foster coexistence and thus lay the foundations for eventual reconciliation. He stated that the first democratic elections were a very important step towards that process.¹⁷²

At the meeting, although most speakers expressed their support and encouragement to the electoral process, the representatives of the Russian Federation and China both asserted that the requisite conditions for holding municipal elections were lacking, as such elections needed thorough preparation and to be conducted in a climate of freedom and peace.¹⁷³

At its 4225th meeting, on 16 November 2000, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. In addition to most members of the Council,¹⁷⁴ the representatives of Albania, Austria¹⁷⁵ and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia made statements. In his briefing, the Special Representative described the municipal elections held on 28 October 2000 as a technical success. With regard to the tasks in the aftermath of the elections, he emphasized the urgent need to (1) define “substantial autonomy”; (2) develop institutions of self-government as laid down by resolution 1244 (1999); and (3) organize general elections throughout Kosovo.¹⁷⁶

Most speakers expressed their support and welcomed the achievements of the municipal elections held on 28 October 2000. At the same time, most

speakers expressed regret regarding the non-participation in the elections of the Kosovo Serb community and concurred with the steps taken by the Special Representative to ensure that representatives of that community and other minorities would be able to participate in the local municipal administration. Many speakers stressed that the next challenge was to implement the results of the municipal elections and urged the leaders and people of Kosovo to continue to cooperate with UNMIK in that regard.

Regarding the elections, the representative of the United States pointed out that contrary to the predictions of many, including some in the Council, the elections had not been plagued by violence.¹⁷⁷ The representative of the Russian Federation did not share the positive assessment of the Special Representative with regard to the elections, highlighting that the Kosovo Albanian political leaders who had participated had conducted the campaign around the question of the independence of Kosovo. He also noted that controlling and halting the tendencies towards the secession of Kosovo should be a priority of UNMIK. He stressed that the future status of Kosovo needed to be resolved by the launching of a dialogue between the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Kosovo leaders and not by violating resolution 1244 (1999).¹⁷⁸ The representative of China commented that his delegation took note of the fact that the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had deemed the election result null and void. Noting that the non-Albanian communities in Kosovo did not have effective participation in the elections due to the lack of security guarantees as members of ethnic groups, his delegation expected UNMIK to implement measures to ensure their representation. Furthermore, echoing the view of the Russian Federation that the elections had been regarded locally as a symbol of Kosovo moving towards independence, the representative of China stressed that, if the tendency towards the independence of Kosovo continued to grow, it would be in contravention of resolution 1244 (1999). He noted that the Council should pay attention to such a tendency towards the independence of Kosovo and to the consequences it could have on the situation in the Balkans.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷² S/PV.4200, pp. 2-5.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Russian Federation); and p. 12 (China).

¹⁷⁴ The representative of the Netherlands did not make a statement.

¹⁷⁵ In the capacity of Chairman-in-Office of OSCE.

¹⁷⁶ S/PV.4225, pp. 2-8.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

The representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia reaffirmed that the new Government of his country fully subscribed to resolution 1244 (1999), considering it “the main and only basis for a just and lasting solution” and stressed the importance of proceeding urgently towards its full implementation, while ensuring the active participation of his Government in that process. He listed a number of priorities in that regard, including the conclusion of an agreement on the status of the international presences in Kosovo and Metohija and the return of a limited contingent of the army of Yugoslavia and police to those provinces. While it was premature to address the issue of political negotiations on the final status of Kosovo and Metohija, he stated that his Government was willing, bearing in mind the importance it placed on its sovereignty and territorial integrity, to work towards achieving substantial autonomy for Kosovo and Metohija, within the context of resolution 1244 (1999).¹⁸⁰

At the same meeting, drawing attention to another matter, the representative of the Russian Federation stated that in view of new circumstances the lifting of the arms embargo imposed on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia by resolution 1160 (1998) was a long overdue step since the demands of that resolution had already been met.¹⁸¹

**Decision of 22 November 2000
(4232nd meeting): statement by the President**

At the 4232nd meeting, on 22 November 2000, in which the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was invited to participate, the President (Netherlands) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁸² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Expressed its shock at, and strongly condemned, the attack perpetrated on the home of the head of the liaison committee of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in Pristina on 22 November 2000, as well as on Serbian policemen in the south of Serbia on 21 November 2000;

Called for an immediate and full investigation to bring the perpetrators to justice;

Called on KFOR and UNMIK to continue to make all necessary efforts to prevent further attacks;

Demanded that all those concerned refrain from acts of violence and cooperate with KFOR and UNMIK.

**Decision of 19 December 2000 (4250th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4249th meeting, on 19 December 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK dated 15 December 2000.¹⁸³ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that significant progress had been made with regard to successful municipal elections on 28 October 2000, despite the non-participation of the Kosovo Serb community, and the establishment of provisional municipal assemblies. UNMIK had continued its efforts to consolidate and further strengthen the existing joint interim administrative structures. The Secretary-General reported that recent changes in the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had provided not only renewed hope for the people of the Republic, but also a new opportunity for UNMIK to improve its consultations with Federal authorities, and to engage in a constructive dialogue on issues of mutual concern. With regard to the interim administration, UNMIK had expressed the belief that the international community must actively pursue the process of defining substantial autonomy with the population of Kosovo sharing more and more responsibility in the administration of the province. In that regard, it was noted that UNMIK would work closely with Member States and representatives of the local population to formulate such a framework in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999). The Secretary-General denoted concern over the lack of returns of Kosovo Serbs and cooperation between the Kosovo Serbs and the Mission. The continuing conflict in the Presevo Valley in southern Serbia proper had served to destabilize the region and undermine relations between Kosovo and the Federal authorities, and had posed a serious threat to both the local population and to community relations inside Kosovo.

At that meeting, at which all members of the Council and the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia made statements, the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations in line with the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

¹⁸² S/PRST/2000/35.

¹⁸³ S/2000/1196, submitted pursuant to resolution 1244 (1999).

Most speakers expressed grave concern over the recent events in the Presevo Valley and maintained that the events posed a serious threat to regional stabilization. Noting the measures taken by UNMIK and KFOR to curb the violence, speakers urged the relevant Kosovo Albanians to engage in political dialogue.

The representative of the Russian Federation stressed that the Security Council and the Secretary-General needed to ensure tighter control over the activities of UNMIK as resolution 1244 (1999) was being implemented partially and unsatisfactorily. He noted the imperative need to immediately establish constructive cooperation among UNMIK, KFOR and the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on all matters connected with the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999), including ensuring conditions for the return of the internally displaced and refugees and preparing for a timetable and conditions for the return to Kosovo of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia military and Serbian police personnel.¹⁸⁴

At its 4250th meeting, on 19 December 2000, the Council had before it the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK.¹⁸⁵ The President (Russian Federation) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁸⁶ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Called for the dissolution of Albanian extremist groups; and called for the withdrawal from the area, in particular from the ground safety zone, of non-residents engaged in violent activities;

Welcomed the commitment of Yugoslav authorities to work towards a peaceful settlement;

Welcomed specific measures taken by KFOR to address the problem, including increased surveillance of the border, confiscation of weapons and the disruption of identified and illegal activity within Kosovo in the vicinity of the eastern administrative boundary;

Welcomed the dialogue between KFOR and the Yugoslav and Serbian authorities.

Deliberations of 18 January and 13 February 2001 (4258th and 4277th meetings)

At its 4258th meeting, on 18 January 2001, the Council heard a briefing on developments in the

¹⁸⁴ S/PV.4249, p. 18.

¹⁸⁵ S/2000/1196, submitted pursuant to resolution 1244 (1999).

¹⁸⁶ S/PRST/2000/40.

implementation of resolution 1244 (1999) by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. In addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union¹⁸⁷).

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General noted that with regard to minority communities in Kosovo, Kosovo Serbs and their property had continued to be the targets of violent incidents, including arson and grenade attacks. With regard to the situation in southern Serbia, he observed that the security environment in the Presevo Valley had remained tense although the risks of major conflict appeared to have diminished. The Under-Secretary-General also elaborated on developments within the political and administrative structures of Kosovo and progress achieved in civil matters.¹⁸⁸ Most speakers expressed concern with regard to security in and around Kosovo, including the Presevo Valley, and focused their remarks on the subjects of elections, the need for reconciliation among the Kosovo ethnic communities, the judiciary, political prisoners, refugee return, missing persons and detainees and economic recovery.

The representative of Norway called on UNMIK and KFOR to make every possible effort to prevent activities which could destabilize the situation in the region and adversely affect developments inside Kosovo.¹⁸⁹

In his statement, the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia highlighted the major security problems in the ground safety zone, stemming from the incursions of "terrorists," and, recalling the presidential statement of 19 December 2000,¹⁹⁰ called on the Council, UNMIK and KFOR to take even more active and robust measures to overcome the situation.¹⁹¹

On the subject of Kosovo-wide elections, the representative of the Russian Federation noted that his

¹⁸⁷ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁸⁸ S/PV.4258, pp. 2-6.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹⁹⁰ S/PRST/2000/40.

¹⁹¹ S/PV.4258, p. 25.

delegation believed that the timing of such elections should be determined by assessing how they would help to achieve a comprehensive settlement in Kosovo.¹⁹² A few speakers shared the view of the Special Representative that the legal framework for elections should be settled before the elections were held.¹⁹³ The representative of China warned that such elections could have serious negative effects and stressed that resolution 1244 (1999) was very clear on the final status of Kosovo.¹⁹⁴

At the same meeting, the representative of the United States argued that Kosovo would never be peaceful and stable until its status was resolved. He underlined that resolution 1244 (1999) clearly stated that all options remained on the table, and set forth a process without dictating a solution. Within that context, he stressed that the terms of any eventual settlement must be mutually acceptable to both sides, and backed by the international community, as no other approach would result in a stable, long-term solution.¹⁹⁵

At its 4277th meeting, on 13 February 2001, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. In addition to most members of the Council,¹⁹⁶ statements were made by the representatives of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union¹⁹⁷).

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General noted that, while the situation in the Presevo Valley, where training activities had been observed, remained worrying, UNMIK and KFOR had continued to play a key role in monitoring the Kosovo side of the administrative boundary.¹⁹⁸

Most speakers condemned the ongoing violence in southern Serbia and other areas within Kosovo, and recalled the presidential statement of 19 December 2000.¹⁹⁹ Echoed by other members, the representative

of Norway held that the tense situation in southern Serbia threatened to become the next focal point of conflict in the Balkans and urged that the crisis be addressed immediately.²⁰⁰

The representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia stated that the situation in Kosovo and Metohija was unsatisfactory and that not enough had been done to implement the key provisions of resolution 1244 (1999). He maintained that attempts at solving it hastily and inadequately through the holding of “so-called Kosovo-wide elections” would only exacerbate the situation, and underlined the need for elections to be prepared in cooperation with the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.²⁰¹

The representative of the United States expressed the hope that Kosovo-wide elections would be held as soon as possible in 2001.²⁰²

At the meeting, several speakers stressed that, prior to the proposed Kosovo-wide elections, the following steps needed to be taken: clearly define the nature and functions of the provisional institutions of self-government; fully implement the results of the municipal elections held in 2000; and complete voter registration so that all ethnic groups would be properly represented in the next elections.²⁰³ The representative of Norway cautioned that premature or ill-prepared elections risked undermining the stability the Council sought to bolster.²⁰⁴ Underlining the need for Belgrade to participate fully in preparations for the elections, the representative of the Russian Federation questioned the appropriateness of attempts to speed up the date for holding elections without first providing the necessary conditions for the return of approximately 200,000 refugees and displaced persons. Echoed by the representative of Ukraine,²⁰⁵ he held that there should be greater clarity in defining the concept of autonomy for Kosovo within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and consolidation of the legal framework for provisional self-government prior to elections.²⁰⁶

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 12 (Jamaica); and p. 15 (Ukraine).

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

¹⁹⁶ The representative of Mali did not make a statement.

¹⁹⁷ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁹⁸ S/PV.4277, p. 4.

¹⁹⁹ S/PRST/2000/40.

²⁰⁰ S/PV.4277, p. 16.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 11.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (France); pp. 13-14 (China); p. 14 (Ireland); p. 16 (Norway); and p. 19 (Sweden).

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

Decision of 16 March 2001 (4298th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4296th and 4298th meetings,²⁰⁷ on 16 March 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK dated 13 March 2001.²⁰⁸ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that despite the political, security and economic challenges facing the Mission, there had been considerable progress in the implementation of the mandate of UNMIK. As the emergency phase was largely over, emphasis was focused on capacity-building in which the groundwork for elaborating a legal framework for provisional institutions of self-government had been laid and consultations had begun with representatives from the communities within Kosovo. The Secretary-General noted that the reluctance of many of the leaders of Kosovo to espouse fully the principles upon which self-autonomy was predicated had undermined the progress made by the international community. In that context, he underlined that the political leadership in Kosovo had to finally decide, and demonstrate that it was ready to take on the responsibility of self-government for a tolerant and all-inclusive democratic society and a well-regulated market economy.

At the 4296th meeting, in addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Albania, Bulgaria, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union²⁰⁹), the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey.

The Special Representative briefed the Council on the status of UNMIK and the challenges ahead regarding the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999). He recalled that on assuming office he had outlined the following road map for the work of UNMIK: drawing up a legal framework for substantial autonomy that would lead to Kosovo-wide elections; strengthening the law enforcement and criminal justice system of Kosovo; creating the preconditions for self-

sustained economic growth; and engaging the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in cooperation on issues of common concern. On regional security issues, the Special Representative noted that the developments in the Presevo Valley, while not falling under his remit, had a direct impact on the internal stability and on the political process in Kosovo. He underlined that UNMIK strongly supported the international community's intervention and backing for a negotiated political solution that would make it possible to abolish the ground safety zone. He also noted that extremist actions in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had been destabilizing the situation in the region. While noting that it was an internal problem, he underlined the importance of KFOR and UNMIK supporting the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in solving the immediate problems including sealing off the border. In conclusion, the Special Representative noted that a precondition for an improved security environment was the creation of a meaningful provisional self-government through the elaboration of a legal framework, followed in due course by Kosovo-wide elections, and "not the other way round".²¹⁰

Regarding the elections, the representative of the Russian Federation cautioned that "rushing through to elections" before the return of refugees and proper security of all peoples would strengthen the mono-ethnic nature of Kosovo and heighten a nationalist mood in the area. He underlined the importance of UNMIK making it absolutely clear on what "autonomy" within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia actually meant in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999), and stressed the need for the direct involvement of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, not just informing it.²¹¹ The representative of France opined that the elections could be held once the conditions were met and that setting a date *a priori* would be risky.²¹² The representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia held the view that prior to holding Kosovo-wide elections certain conditions had to be met, such as the return of all displaced persons, as well as the establishment of a legal framework with

²⁰⁷ At its 4286th meeting, held in private on 6 March 2001, the Council had a constructive discussion with the Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

²⁰⁸ S/2001/218, submitted pursuant to resolution 1244 (1999).

²⁰⁹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

²¹⁰ S/PV.4296, pp. 3-5.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²¹² *Ibid.*, p. 9.

a clear delineation of competencies of the elected bodies.²¹³

At the 4298th meeting, the President (Ukraine), on the basis of the report of the Secretary-General,²¹⁴ made a statement on behalf of the Council,²¹⁵ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the establishment of a working group under the authority of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General aimed at developing a legal framework for provisional institutions for democratic and autonomous self-government in Kosovo, and stressed the need for all ethnic groups to be represented in the work of that group;

Called on all parties to support the efforts of UNMIK to build a stable multi-ethnic democratic society in Kosovo and to ensure suitable conditions for Kosovo-wide elections;

Welcomed close contact between the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and UNMIK and KFOR;

Called for an end to all acts of violence in Kosovo, in particular those which were ethnically motivated, and urged all political leaders in Kosovo to condemn those acts and to increase their efforts to create inter-ethnic tolerance;

Remained concerned about the security situation in certain municipalities in southern Serbia as a result of the violent actions of ethnic Albanian armed groups;

Welcomed the ceasefire agreements signed on 12 March 2001 and called for strict compliance with their provisions;

Welcomed the decision taken by NATO to authorize the commander of KFOR to allow the controlled return of forces of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the ground safety zone.

Deliberations of 9 April, 19 June and 22 June 2001 (4309th, 4331st and 4335th meetings)

At its 4309th meeting, on 9 April 2001, the Council was briefed on developments in the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999) by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. In addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union²¹⁶).

²¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.

²¹⁴ S/2001/218.

²¹⁵ S/PRST/2001/8.

²¹⁶ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General noted that intensive work by the Joint Working Group had continued on the development of a legal framework. He noted that during a meeting of the Special Representative with the President of Serbia, Vojislav Koštunica, the President had confirmed his support for Kosovo Serb participation in the Working Group, if it was backed up by expert support. The Under-Secretary-General observed that, based on the progress that had been made, elections would be possible before the end of the year, and said that every effort was being made to ensure full participation of Kosovo Serb and other ethnic minorities. Noting that progress had been made at the local level with the establishment of democratically functioning municipal assemblies, the Under-Secretary-General noted that concern remained with regard to the apparent politicization of municipal civil administration. He informed the Council that, in an effort to prioritize law and order, work continued on realigning the police and judicial institutions into a single new UNMIK pillar. On relations with the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, he pointed to several positive developments in relations between UNMIK and Belgrade, including the opening of the UNMIK Belgrade office.²¹⁷

Most speakers reiterated their support for the four priority areas identified by the Special Representative, and welcomed the progress that had been achieved. Most speakers also highlighted the need for the drafting of the legal framework and the electoral process to be conducted with the full participation of all communities, and in that regard, welcomed the support that the President of Serbia had pledged. Many speakers appealed to UNMIK and KFOR to step up their efforts to curb violence and extremism in Kosovo.

A few speakers stressed that the necessary security conditions should be in place to ensure the participation of all ethnic communities in Kosovo.²¹⁸ Regarding the arms embargo to Kosovo, several speakers called for stricter implementation of resolution 1160 (1998).²¹⁹

The representative of Tunisia opined that the Council should give prompt thought to the exit strategy

²¹⁷ S/PV.4309, pp. 2-5.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Russian Federation); and p. 16 (Norway).

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Russian Federation); p. 14 (Jamaica); p. 16 (Colombia); and p. 20 (Mali).

of UNMIK given the complexity of the situation in the region as a whole.²²⁰ In the light of that statement, the representative of Singapore expressed uncertainty as to whether, in terms of the end goal of getting Kosovo off the agenda of Council, the Council was moving forward or backwards.²²¹

At its 4331st meeting, on 19 June 2001, at which no statements were made, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Security Council mission to Kosovo, conducted from 16 to 18 June 2001.²²² The representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was invited to participate in the meeting. In his capacity as head of the mission of the Council, the President (Bangladesh) presented the report. The findings of the mission included the recognition that the status quo in Kosovo was unacceptable and that a political process had to be taken forward in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999).

At its 4335th meeting, on 22 June 2001, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Security Council mission and the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK dated 7 June 2001.²²³ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that UNMIK had continued to make steady progress in the implementation of its mandate notably through the elaboration of the Constitutional Framework for provisional self-government, which would form the basis of Kosovo-wide elections on 17 November 2001. The Secretary-General underlined that the Constitutional Framework represented a balanced elaboration of the concept of “substantial autonomy” envisaged in resolution 1244 (1999). However, he noted that the success of the Provisional Government depended on the participation of all communities. The tense security situation punctuated by outbursts of violence against Kosovo minority communities had remained the single most important threat to the attainment of the international community’s goals.

At that meeting, the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. In addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Albania, the

Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union²²⁴).

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General focused on the main interrelated challenges that faced Kosovo, including issues related to security, return of refugees and internally displaced persons, confidence-building measures and the holding of Kosovo-wide elections later that year. He noted that UNMIK would focus on the creation of confidence-building measures Kosovo wide. On returns of the internally displaced and refugees, he stated that the process should be conducted in secure and sustainable conditions. He looked to the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to support UNMIK in its endeavours, through, *inter alia*, encouraging the Kosovo Serb community to participate in elections and take their rightful place in the provisional government. The Under-Secretary-General noted that in its report the Council mission concurred with the views expressed by the report of the Secretary-General.²²⁵

Most speakers noted the need for substantial progress in the security situation to ensure the return of refugees and internally displaced persons and the participation in the political process of Kosovo Serbs, strongly condemned violence and extremism and repeated their willingness to support all those who favoured moderation. Commending the initiatives of UNMIK in the area of law and order, including the establishment of a new pillar and the recent promulgation of three pertinent regulations, speakers endorsed the intention of UNMIK to create the new post of Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General to lead the pillar, as well as the need to recruit additional international judges and prosecutors. Warmly welcoming improved relations between UNMIK and Belgrade and urging that they continue to develop, most speakers commended the invitation of Belgrade to Kosovo Serbs to register for the forthcoming elections, and encouraged further cooperation with the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on all issues concerning the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999).

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

²²² S/2001/600.

²²³ S/2001/565, submitted pursuant to resolution 1244 (1999).

²²⁴ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²²⁵ S/PV.4335, pp. 2-5.

Although most speakers endorsed the political strategy of UNMIK regarding the promulgation of the Constitutional Framework and the forthcoming elections, the representative of the Russian Federation was critical of the fact that the Constitutional Framework contained no reference to the need for full compliance with resolution 1244 (1999), including its basic provision of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.²²⁶ The representative of Singapore noted that the political status of Kosovo was clear in resolution 1244 (1999), which should not be allowed to create further divisions in Kosovo, with all their adverse regional implications.²²⁷

At its 4350th and 4359th meetings, held on 26 July and 28 August 2001, the Council heard briefings on developments in the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999) from the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. In addition to almost all members of the Council,²²⁸ statements were made by the representatives of Belgium (on behalf of the European Union²²⁹), the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

In his briefings, the Under-Secretary-General elaborated on, *inter alia*, developments *vis-à-vis* preparations for Kosovo-wide elections and the handover to the provisional institutions of self-government, and efforts to engage the minority communities, improve the situation of law and order and implement confidence-building measures. He cautioned that the Kosovo Serb community had not yet participated in voter registration in any great numbers, and expressed hope that clear persistent signals from Belgrade for Kosovo Serbs to register would help to reverse that trend.²³⁰

Most speakers expressed disappointment at the low level of registration among the non-Albanian Kosovo population for the scheduled elections and reiterated the need for the total participation of all

communities. They welcomed the support of the Serb authorities in encouraging Kosovo Serbs to register, and called for their unequivocal and sustained support in the run-up to the elections.

Concerning the arms embargo in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the representative of the United States noted the full support of his Government for its lifting as discussed with the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia during the visit of the Council in June.²³¹ In support of the statement by the United States, the representative of the Russian Federation, echoed by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, reaffirmed their position in favour of lifting the arms embargo.²³²

Security Council resolution 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998

Decision of 10 September 2001 (4366th meeting): resolution 1367 (2001)

At the 4366th meeting, on 10 September 2001, in which the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was invited to participate, the President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 6 September 2001 from the Secretary-General.²³³ The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;²³⁴ it was put to vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1367 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to terminate the prohibitions established by paragraph 8 of resolution 1160 (1998);

Decided further to dissolve the Committee established by paragraph 9 of resolution 1160 (1998).

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²²⁸ The representative of Tunisia did not make a statement at the 4350th meeting.

²²⁹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²³⁰ S/PV.4350, pp. 2-5; and S/PV.4359, pp. 2-5.

²³¹ S/PV.4359, p. 6.

²³² *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Russian Federation); and p. 23 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia).

²³³ S/2001/849, in which he stated that the new authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia were cooperating constructively with the international community in efforts to bring peace and stability to the region, expressed the belief that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had complied with the provisions of resolution 1160 (1998) and suggested that the Security Council reconsider the prohibitions imposed by paragraph 8 of that resolution.

²³⁴ S/2001/854.

Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)

Decision of 5 October 2001 (4388th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4387th meeting,^{235,236} on 5 October 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK.²³⁷ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that UNMIK had continued to work intensively on preparations for the Kosovo-wide elections to be held on 17 November 2001, on implementation of the Constitutional Framework for Provisional Self-Government and on building public administration capacities in order to prepare for the transfer of authority that would bring substantial autonomy to the people of Kosovo as laid down in resolution 1244 (1999). Despite some difficulties, the Mission had made significant strides in strengthening security and law and order through the establishment of the police and justice pillar. However, continued inter-ethnic and criminal activity had remained a major concern.

At that meeting, the Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the basis of the above-mentioned report. In addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Albania, Belgium (on behalf of the European Union²³⁸) and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

At its 4388th meeting, on 5 October 2001, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.²³⁷ The representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was invited to attend the meeting. The President (Ireland), then made a statement on behalf of the Council,²³⁹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the elections to be held on 17 November 2001 as a basis for the establishment of democratic self-governing institutions as specified in the Constitutional Framework for Provisional Self-Government, under which the people of Kosovo would enjoy substantial autonomy in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999);

Emphasized the responsibility of the elected leaders of Kosovo to respect fully the final status provisions of resolution 1244 (1999);

Supported the continuing efforts by UNMIK and KFOR to improve public security;

Called on Kosovo Albanian leaders to actively support these efforts to promote security and return, and to combat extremism, including terrorist activities;

Stressed the need for proper organization and adequate security for the elections on 17 November, and welcomed continuing steps taken in that regard;

Called on all women and men of Kosovo to vote in the elections of 17 November;

Commended the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for their encouragement to the Kosovo Serb community to register, which confirmed the multi-ethnic character of Kosovo, and called on them to also actively encourage the fullest possible participation in the vote;

Underlined the importance, for the Kosovo Serb community, to integrate into the structures set up by UNMIK;

Encouraged the further development of a constructive dialogue between UNMIK and the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Decision of 9 November 2001 (4409th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4409th meeting, on 9 November 2001, in which the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was invited to participate, the President (Jamaica) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 6 November 2001 from the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the Secretary-

²³⁵ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. I, part V, case 6, with regard to special cases concerning the application of rules 27-36 of the provisional rules of procedure.

²³⁶ At its 4373rd meeting, held in private on 17 September 2001, the Council considered the item entitled "Briefing by His Excellency Nebojša Čović, Deputy Prime Minister of Serbia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia". At that meeting, the Council had a constructive interactive discussion with the Deputy Prime Minister of Serbia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo.

²³⁷ S/2001/926 and Add.1, submitted pursuant to resolution 1244 (1999).

²³⁸ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²³⁹ S/PRST/2001/27.

General.²⁴⁰ She then made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁴¹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Called upon all women and men of Kosovo to vote;

Welcomed the signing on 5 November 2001 of the UNMIK-Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Common Document by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the Special Representative of the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Government of the Republic of Serbia;

Emphasized the responsibility of the provisional institutions of self-government and all concerned to respect fully the final status provisions of resolution 1244 (1999).

**Decision of 13 February 2002 (4473rd meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4430th and 4454th meetings, on 27 November 2001 and 21 January 2002, the Council heard briefings on developments in the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999) by the Assistant Secretary-General and the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, respectively. In addition to all members of the Council, statements were also made by the representatives of Belgium (on behalf of the European Union), the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Spain and Ukraine.²⁴² At its 4454th meeting, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK dated 15 January 2002.²⁴³ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the election of the Kosovo Assembly, held on 17 November 2001, was generally considered a great success. Once the provisional institutions of self-government were established, UNMIK would commence with the transfer of competencies, while retaining those reserved to the Special Representative.²⁴⁴ The Secretary-General noted that on 5 November 2002 his Special Representative and the

Deputy Prime Minister of Serbia had signed a Common Document which, first, provided the authorities of Belgrade with a list of measures that UNMIK had already taken, or was taking, to assist the Kosovo Serb community, so as to make it easier to encourage Kosovo Serb participation in the election; and, secondly, provided a solid basis for a cooperative relationship with the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The Common Document reiterated the basic principles of resolution 1244 (1999) and outlined in detail a number of areas of mutual interest and common concern such as: swift progress on returns; integration of Kosovo Serbs into the provisional institutions; establishment of a multi-ethnic and unbiased justice system. One of the key provisions of the Common Document was the establishment of a high-ranking working group as the official forum for dialogue and cooperation between UNMIK and the provisional institutions on the one hand, and the Belgrade authorities on the other. The Secretary-General stated that whatever the final determination of the status of Kosovo would be, the relationship between Pristina and Belgrade would be crucial for the future well-being of the region.

In their briefings, the Assistant Secretary-General and the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations updated the Council on the results of the general elections held on 17 November 2001, and discussed the establishment of a provisional government which would involve, *inter alia*, setting up ministries, establishing a functioning local civil service and providing services for the incoming Assembly, including security for certain Assembly members.²⁴⁵

Most speakers expressed satisfaction with the relatively orderly and peaceful conduct of the elections, along with the widely representative turnout of voters. However, the representative of Singapore drew attention to the relatively low participation by the Serbian community (46 per cent), stressing that more attention needed to be placed on providing security to that part of the community.²⁴⁶

Furthermore, the representative of Singapore expressed the need to start addressing the issue of defining an exit strategy, in line with the note by the President on this subject.²⁴⁷ He cited the Council's

²⁴⁰ S/2001/1051, transmitting a letter from the President of the Former Republic of Yugoslavia on the common document signed by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and UNMIK regarding the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999) and the elections to be held in Kosovo on 17 November 2001.

²⁴¹ S/PRST/2001/34.

²⁴² The representative of Belgium made a statement only at the 4430th meeting, and the representatives of Spain and Ukraine made statements at the 4454th meeting.

²⁴³ S/2002/62, submitted pursuant to resolution 1244 (1999).

²⁴⁴ See S/2002/62, para.15, for an overview of the reserved competencies.

²⁴⁵ S/PV.4430, pp. 2-4; and S/PV.4454, pp. 2-3.

²⁴⁶ S/PV.4430, p. 7.

²⁴⁷ S/2001/905.

decision, in resolution 1244 (1999), that UNMIK should facilitate the “political process designed to determine Kosovo’s future status, taking into account the Rambouillet accords” and asked when the international meeting called for in those accords might be convened.²⁴⁸

The representative of the Russian Federation expressed support with the widely held view among countries involved in the settlement process that the process of defining the final status of Kosovo should be frozen for some time to come.²⁴⁹

The representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia asserted that resolution 1244 (1999), which guaranteed the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, “continued to be the sole basis for the consideration of the future status of Kosovo and Metohija”.²⁵⁰

At the 4473rd meeting,²⁵¹ on 13 February 2002, the President (Mexico) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁵² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Noted the progress made in the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999) and the Constitutional Framework for Provisional Self-Government, including the inauguration of the Kosovo Assembly following the elections on 17 November 2001 in Kosovo;

Called upon the elected representatives of Kosovo to resolve the deadlock over the formation of executive structures of the provisional self-governing institutions and to allow the functioning of those institutions, in accordance with the Constitutional Framework and the outcome of the elections, which expressed the will of the voters;

Supported the development of cooperation between UNMIK, the elected representatives of Kosovo and the authorities in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and stated that such cooperation was vital in implementing resolution 1244 (1999);

Reaffirmed the fundamental importance of the rule of law in the political development of Kosovo and condemned any attempt to undermine it;

Supported all efforts of UNMIK, together with KFOR and the Kosovo Police Service, to combat all kinds of crime, violence and extremism.

²⁴⁸ S/PV.4430, pp. 7-8.

²⁴⁹ S/PV.4454, p. 16.

²⁵⁰ S/PV.4430, p. 19.

²⁵¹ The representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

²⁵² S/PRST/2002/4.

Decision of 24 April 2002 (4519th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4498th meeting,²⁵³ on 27 March 2002, the Council heard a briefing on recent developments in Kosovo by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, following which all members of the Council, the representative of Spain (on behalf of the European Union²⁵⁴) and the Deputy Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia made statements.

In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General noted that efforts by UNMIK to engage the Kosovo Serbs in the Government had continued. On the issue of returns, he reported that UNMIK had been planning returns to 25 different locations throughout Kosovo, with confidence-building measures aimed at promoting reconciliation and a climate conducive to returns already under way. Despite the continuation of attacks on minority communities, the overall security situation had improved in Kosovo.²⁵⁵

The Deputy Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia stressed the urgency of creating a truly multi-ethnic society. Pointing to the positive steps taken by the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to that end, he urged the Council and the wider international community to assist in the effort and warned of the consequences should extremist groups prevail.²⁵⁶

On the issue of the final status of Kosovo, the representative of the Russian Federation maintained that until multi-ethnic coexistence had been established in the province, it would be counter-productive and politically dangerous to begin considering that issue. Noting that many matters were in need of urgent resolution, he proposed, with the support of several speakers, that the Council should undertake a

²⁵³ At the 4475th meeting, held in private on 25 February 2002, the Council, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the representatives of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Spain (on behalf of the European Union and associated States) and the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations had a constructive discussion.

²⁵⁴ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁵⁵ S/PV.4498, pp. 2-6.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

comprehensive survey on the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999), with the participation of the Special Representative.²⁵⁷

Pointing out that the issue of Kosovo had been discussed by the Council more regularly than any other issue, the representative of Singapore suggested the need for a more focused approach with regard to the achievements and failures of the Council's work in Kosovo in order to avoid assessments by other parties. He emphasized that, as UNMIK had an unusual mandate in perpetuity when every other peacekeeping operation had very specific time frames, the regular review of the activities of UNMIK was of necessity to the Council. Within that context, the representative expressed the hope that the Council would also address the final resolution of the future status of Kosovo in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999), in which it called on UNMIK to facilitate "a political process designed to determine the future status of Kosovo, taking into account the Rambouillet accords". Drawing attention to the fact that the Rambouillet accords called for a formulated mechanism for a final settlement for Kosovo three years after its signature on 18 March 1999, he proposed that the Security Council address the issue of that time frame which had expired on 18 March 2002.²⁵⁸

At its 4518th meeting, on 24 April 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 22 April 2002.²⁵⁹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that the formation of the Government was an important step forward in the implementation of one of the core tasks of resolution 1244 (1999). He encouraged the Kosovo Serb political entity to participate in the Government and work for the improvement of the Kosovo Serb community from within. The Secretary-General, highlighting the need for a political roadmap for both UNMIK and the provisional institutions of self-government, reported that he had requested his Special Representative to develop benchmarks against which progress could be measured in the critical areas of the rule of law, functioning democratic institutions, the economy, freedom of movement, the return of

internally displaced persons and refugees and contributions to regional stability.

At that meeting, the Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. In addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Albania, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Spain (on behalf of the European Union²⁶⁰) and Ukraine.

In his briefing, the Special Representative observed that UNMIK had been entering into a new phase. He underlined the need to transfer authority within Kosovo to the provisional government, and to convince Kosovans to look beyond Kosovo to Belgrade and the region. To accomplish those goals, the Special Representative outlined a set of priorities, stressing the need to: consolidate reliable and multi-ethnic institutions; boost the economy through job creation and privatization; further strengthen the rule of law; and focus on an integrated effort to facilitate return. On the transfer of responsibilities from UNMIK to the provisional institutions, he observed that the following benchmarks should be achieved before launching a discussion on the issue of status: existence of effective, representative and functioning institutions; enforcement of the rule of law; freedom of movement; respect for the right of all Kosovans to remain and return; development of a sound basis for a market economy; clarity of property titles; normalized dialogue with Belgrade; and reduction and transformation of the Kosovo Protection Corps in line with its mandate.²⁶¹

Most speakers offered their support for the Special Representative's mission priorities and commended his efforts to develop the benchmarks requested by the Secretary-General.²⁶²

While cautioning against an early withdrawal of UNMIK, the representative of Singapore opined that the failure of the Council to address the final status question contributed to the unstable situation in Kosovo and hindered efforts at reconciliation.²⁶³

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 12 (Russian Federation); p. 15 (Singapore); p. 16 (Cameroon); p. 16 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 19 (Colombia); and p. 21 (Mexico).

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

²⁵⁹ S/2002/436.

²⁶⁰ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey also aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁶¹ S/PV.4518, pp. 2-4.

²⁶² S/2002/436, para. 54.

²⁶³ S/PV.4518, p. 14.

The representative of the Russian Federation warned that the necessary conditions for the beginning of the political process were not currently in place. Thus any kind of hasty action could only destabilize the situation in Kosovo and in the region.²⁶⁴ The representative of Albania declared that any old ideas of creating a greater Serbia, a greater Croatia or a greater Albania belonged to history and that no one should reactivate them.²⁶⁵

At its 4519th meeting, on 24 April 2002, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.²⁶⁶ The President (Russian Federation) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁶⁷ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed progress made in the formation of the executive bodies of the provisional institutions of self-government in Kosovo, to include representatives of all communities;

Called upon the leaders of the provisional institutions of self-government actively to demonstrate their commitment and support efforts to promote security, returns, human rights, economic development, and a multi-ethnic and fair society with peaceful coexistence and freedom of movement for all the population of Kosovo;

Welcomed the decision of the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to transfer Kosovo Albanian prisoners into the custody of UNMIK.

**Decision of 24 May 2002 (4543rd meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4533rd meeting, on 16 May 2002, in which the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was invited to participate, the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations on developments in Kosovo. No statements were made at the meeting.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General drew the attention of the Council to the draft programme of the Kosovo Government which envisaged the following priorities: consolidation of democratic structures; improvement of education and health care; promotion of economic development; protection of the rights and interests of communities; and regional integration, including meaningful dialogue with the

authorities. He expressed regret that the Kosovo Serbs were not putting forward candidates for the three allotted government posts, which meant that the Kosovo Serbs were still not part of the decision-making process and had not participated in the talks on the government programme.²⁶⁸

At the 4543rd meeting,²⁶⁹ on 24 May 2002, the President (Singapore) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁷⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its previous relevant resolutions and statements regarding Kosovo, in particular the statements of its President of 7 March 2001²⁷¹ and 9 November 2001;²⁷²

Called upon the elected leaders of Kosovo to focus their attention on the urgent matters for which they have responsibility, in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999) and the Constitutional Framework;

Reiterated its full support for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General;

Urged Kosovo's leaders to work in close cooperation with UNMIK and KFOR, with a view to promoting a better future for Kosovo and stability in the region.

**Deliberations of 26 June, 30 July and
5 September 2002 (4559th, 4592nd and
4605th meetings)**

At its 4559th meeting, on 26 June 2002, the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations on recent developments in Kosovo. In addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Spain (on behalf of the European Union²⁷³).

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General reported on the much welcomed development of the

²⁶⁸ S/PV.4533, pp. 2-4.

²⁶⁹ The representatives of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Germany, Italy and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia were invited to attend but made no statements.

²⁷⁰ S/PRST/2002/16.

²⁷¹ S/PRST/2001/7; see section 30.c above.

²⁷² S/PRST/2001/34.

²⁷³ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

²⁶⁶ S/2002/436.

²⁶⁷ S/PRST/2002/11.

completion of the Kosovo Government in which two Kosovo Serb representatives had assumed positions.²⁷⁴

Most speakers reiterated their support for the Special Representative's establishment of benchmarks against which progress could be measured in the critical areas of the democratic provisional government of Kosovo.

The representative of the Russian Federation, however, reaffirmed the position of his delegation, and the understanding previously reached with the Special Representative that the benchmarks could in no way be regarded as any sort of road map to independence for Kosovo.²⁷⁵

At its 4592nd meeting, on 30 July 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK dated 17 July 2002.²⁷⁶ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that the formation of the Government with the participation of the Kosovo Serbs was an important step forward for the provisional institutions of self-government. The scheduled municipal elections would provide an important opportunity to consolidate elected democratic structures. Strengthening the rule of law throughout Kosovo remained a high priority. UNMIK remained committed to achieving sustainable returns in the course of the year and improve living conditions for minority communities.

In addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Albania, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union²⁷⁷), the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine.

At that meeting, the Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, who reported on the progress *vis-à-vis* the benchmarks outlined during his last briefing. He informed the Council that the message of UNMIK was "standards before status", towards which progress had been made. He furthermore noted that the benchmarks allowed for measurement of progress and to eventually decide, when the time was right, to commence the process to

determine the future status of Kosovo, in line with paragraph 11 (e) of resolution 1244 (1999). The Special Representative noted that although he could not say what the future status of Kosovo would be, he could say what it would not be: there would be no partition, no cantonization, and no return to the status *quo ante* of 1999.²⁷⁸ He proposed to the Council to visit Kosovo in the context of the municipal elections scheduled for 26 October 2002 for a first-hand assessment of the progress made and where work had yet to be achieved.²⁷⁹

Most speakers welcomed the positive developments outlined in the Secretary-General's report, and expressed their appreciation and support for the efforts of the Special Representative towards that end. Many speakers expressed concern at the slow pace of internally displaced persons and refugee return, but nevertheless were encouraged by the more favourable climate and by the commitment of UNMIK to achieving sustainable returns in the course of that year.

Regarding the future status of Kosovo, the Deputy Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia supported the statement of the Special Representative that final status should not be discussed until certain standards were achieved, and noted that politicians should take into account the stability of the region and should reach the decision on the final status only after a truly multi-ethnic society had been established in Kosovo.²⁸⁰

At its 4605th meeting, on 5 September 2002, the Council was briefed by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations on recent developments in Kosovo. In addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Denmark (on behalf of the European Union²⁸¹), the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine.

In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General elaborated on developments in the priority areas of UNMIK, including the building of functioning democratic institutions and preparing for the municipal

²⁷⁴ S/PV.4559, pp. 2-5.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²⁷⁶ S/2002/779.

²⁷⁷ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁷⁸ S/PV.4592, pp. 2-5.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²⁸¹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

elections. Regarding the return of internally displaced persons, he noted the considerable increase in spontaneous returns, which, in some cases, had led to violence. He stressed that there could not be artificial mass returns and pointed out that the policy of UNMIK was based on the right of individual return in an organized and sustainable manner.²⁸²

Most speakers noted with satisfaction the positive steps taken by UNMIK in the process of establishing democratic institutions in Kosovo. On the other hand, the representative of the Russian Federation stressed that the local authorities had a long way to go before the Council could seriously speak about the consolidation of the day-to-day workings of the institutions of self-government of Kosovo and about the principle of multi-ethnicity.²⁸³

The representative of the Russian Federation, echoed by the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Bulgaria,²⁸⁴ suggested that a visit of the Council to Kosovo and Belgrade after the holding of municipal elections on 26 October 2002 would be timely in order to assess progress made and get to know the situation on the ground as proposed by the Special Representative.²⁸⁵

Decision of 24 October 2002 (4633rd meeting): statement by the President

At the 4633rd meeting, on 24 October 2002, in which the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was invited to participate, the President (Cameroon) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁸⁶ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its continued commitment to the full and effective implementation of Council resolution 1244 (1999) in Kosovo, commended the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the Commander of KFOR for the ongoing efforts to that end, and called upon the provisional institutions of self-government, local leaders and all others concerned to cooperate fully with them;

Welcomed the progress made in preparing the municipal elections on 26 October 2002, and called upon all eligible voters, including those from minority communities, to seize the

chance to have their interests properly represented by taking part in the elections;

Expressed its firm belief that wide participation in the voting was essential to provide the best opportunity for future progress towards the building of a multi-ethnic and tolerant society.

Deliberations of 6 November and 19 December 2002 (4643rd and 4676th meetings)

At its 4643rd meeting, on 6 November 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK dated 9 October 2002.²⁸⁷ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that although the scheduled elections on 26 October 2002 would be an important step forward in the democratic process, of equal significance was the meaningful participation in the elected bodies at the central and local levels by all communities in Kosovo in order to ensure successful governance. The Secretary-General also emphasized the importance of the rule of law and noted positive development with regard to the Kosovo Police Service.

At that meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. In addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Denmark (on behalf of the European Union²⁸⁸), the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Japan and Ukraine.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General observed that the municipal elections held on 26 October were confirmed by the Council of Europe Election Observation Mission as “in line with Council of Europe principles and international standards for democratic elections”. He also noted the low participation of the Kosovo Serb community.²⁸⁹

Most speakers concurred with the report of the Secretary-General. The representative of the Russian Federation, echoed by most speakers, underlined the key importance of strengthening constructive cooperation between the UNMIK leadership and Belgrade in order to resolve many ongoing problems in implementing the provisions of resolution 1244

²⁸² S/PV.4605, pp. 2-6.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Russian Federation); p. 12 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 17 (Bulgaria).

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

²⁸⁶ S/PRST/2002/29.

²⁸⁷ S/2002/1126.

²⁸⁸ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁸⁹ S/PV.4643, pp. 2-5.

(1999).²⁹⁰ The representative of Denmark, speaking on behalf of the European Union, asserted that the final status of Kosovo needed to be addressed in due course in line with resolution 1244 (1999).²⁹¹

The representative of Japan raised the issue of Security Council missions, observing that the Council had decided to send a third mission to Kosovo. Although recognizing the importance of such missions, the representative noted that their cost and the criteria for deciding when and where to dispatch them, as well as their composition, be discussed in a transparent manner.²⁹²

At the 4676th meeting, on 19 December 2002, in which the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was invited to participate, no statements were made. The Council included in its agenda the report of the Security Council mission to Kosovo and Belgrade, conducted from 14 to 17 December 2002.²⁹³ Overall, the mission noted the positive developments with regard to the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999), while assessing that the situation in Kosovo remained fragile and much more work was needed to achieve implementation of resolution 1244 (1999). At that meeting, the Council was briefed, on the basis of the above-mentioned report, by the head of the Security Council mission (Norway).²⁹⁴

**Decision of 6 February 2003 (4703rd meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4702nd meeting, on 6 February 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 29 January 2003.²⁹⁵ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that significant achievements were made towards the end of 2002, including the second municipal elections in Kosovo and the beginning of the handover to local control of the electoral process. However, he noted that Kosovo still had considerable length from reaching the individual benchmarks under the principle of “standards before status”. The Secretary-General expressed concern over the violence among the Kosovo

Albanian community as well as the persistent violence against the Kosovo Serb community.

At that meeting, following a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, all members of the Council, and the representatives of Greece (on behalf of the European Union²⁹⁶), Norway and Serbia and Montenegro made statements.

In his briefing, the Special Representative remarked, *inter alia*, that 2003 would not be the year for finally resolving the status of Kosovo, but that it was time to lay the groundwork for the political process which, in the end, would determine its status.²⁹⁷

Most speakers expressed concern about the unilateral statements made and initiatives taken by some in Kosovo and in the region concerning the status of Kosovo in contravention of resolution 1244 (1999). In view of such worrisome developments, most speakers stressed that meeting the standards laid out in the benchmarks was a prerequisite for the question of the final status to be addressed validly, pursuant to resolution 1244 (1999).

The representative of Pakistan expressed the hope that, when the time came for the political process, it would be based on consultations with all concerned, particularly the people of Kosovo, and that it would ensure their fundamental rights, consistent with the Charter of the United Nations.²⁹⁸

The representative of Serbia and Montenegro emphasized that international obligations and laws relevant to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including resolution 1244 (1999), continued to apply, under the adoption of the new Constitutional Charter, to Serbia and Montenegro.²⁹⁹ The representative called for the full implementation of resolution 1244 (1999), including paragraph 9, which outlined the responsibilities of the international security presence to be deployed and acting in Kosovo.³⁰⁰

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

²⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 22.

²⁹³ S/2002/1376.

²⁹⁴ S/PV.4676, pp. 2-5.

²⁹⁵ S/2003/113.

²⁹⁶ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁹⁷ S/PV.4702, p. 5.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

At its 4703rd meeting, on 6 February 2003, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 29 January 2003.³⁰¹ The President (Germany) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁰² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its continued commitment to the full and effective implementation of resolution 1244 (1999);

Further reaffirmed its commitment to the objective of a multi-ethnic and democratic Kosovo, and called upon all communities to work towards that goal and actively participate in the public institutions as well as the decision-making process, and integrate into society;

Encouraged the establishment of direct dialogue between Pristina and Belgrade on issues of practical importance to both sides;

Condemned the violence within the Kosovo Albanian community, as well as the violence against the Kosovo Serb community;

Urged local institutions and leaders to exert influence on the climate for the rule of law by condemning all violence and actively supporting the efforts of the police and the judiciary;

Welcomed the report of the Secretary-General on the activities of UNMIK and recent developments in Kosovo³⁰¹ and the briefing of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the status of implementation of the benchmarks for Kosovo;

Strongly rejected unilateral initiatives which might jeopardize stability and the normalization process not only in Kosovo but also in the entire region;

Supported the continued efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, including in such priority areas as revitalizing the economy through investment, combating crime and illegal trafficking, and building a multi-ethnic society, while ensuring conditions for the sustainable return of refugees and internally displaced persons.

Deliberations of 23 April to 30 October 2003 (4742nd, 4770th, 4782nd, 4809th, 4823rd and 4853rd meetings)

At its 4742nd meeting,³⁰³ on 23 April 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK dated 14 April 2003.³⁰⁴ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter*

alia, that the tendency of local Kosovo Albanian leaders and the provisional institutions of self-government to focus on symbols and image and to publicly promote positions contrary to resolution 1244 (1999) was a cause of concern. He welcomed the continuing and accelerating transfer of responsibilities to the provisional institutions and underlined that the transfer process would not affect the authority of UNMIK and KFOR under resolution 1244 (1999) or the powers and responsibilities reserved to the Special Representative. The Secretary-General called for all local leaders to strictly adhere to resolution 1244 (1999) and the Constitutional Framework. Observing that acts of intimidation, threats and violence directed against minorities continued to occur, he called for the leaders and people in Kosovo to put an end to such acts, and work actively on inter-ethnic dialogue and reconciliation. The Secretary-General commended the initiative by his Special Representative to start dialogue on practical matters of mutual concern between Belgrade and Pristina.

At the meeting, at which all members of the Council and the representatives of Albania, Greece (on behalf of the European Union³⁰⁵) and Serbia and Montenegro made statements, the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, based on the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.

Most speakers welcomed the progress made on the transfer of further powers to the provisional institutions for self-government of Kosovo.

The representative of the Russian Federation stressed that the process of handing over authority should in no way subvert the decision of principle regarding the status of the province as that decision should be taken at a later stage, in "strict compliance" with resolution 1244 (1999).³⁰⁶

Regarding the final status question, the representative of Pakistan expressed the belief that the resolution of the status question should be the primary

³⁰¹ S/2003/113.

³⁰² S/PRST/2003/1.

³⁰³ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XII, part I, sect. A, case 2, with regard to Article 1 (2) of the Charter.

³⁰⁴ S/2003/421.

³⁰⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³⁰⁶ S/PV.4742, p. 11.

focus of the Council's work in all but the most exceptional of cases.³⁰⁷

Several speakers argued that solving the status issue, one way or another, in a rushed manner would not solve the underlying problems of Kosovo and the region as a whole as much more needed to be achieved with regards to implementing the standards outlined by the Special Representative.³⁰⁸

At its 4770th meeting, on 10 June 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. In addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Greece (on behalf of the European Union³⁰⁹) and Serbia and Montenegro.

In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General noted that UNMIK and the provisional institutions had continued their joint efforts to transfer to the provisional institutions the non-reserved responsibilities. At the same time, he observed that much remained to be done in developing provisional democratic self-governing institutions and ensuring conditions for a peaceful and normal life for all the inhabitants of Kosovo. He further noted that political pressure on UNMIK had significantly increased with attempts to challenge its role under resolution 1244 (1999) and the Constitutional Framework.³¹⁰

The representative of France stated that no progress could be achieved in Kosovo on the basis of unilateral action contrary to resolution 1244 (1999) or by flouting the authority of UNMIK and KFOR.³¹¹

The representative of Bulgaria opined that the final word on the status of Kosovo should be given to the United Nations, in compliance with resolution 1244 (1999).³¹²

The representative of Spain viewed with great concern the attitude of the Kosovo Albanian leaders,

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

³⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Germany); and p. 10 (Bulgaria).

³⁰⁹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³¹⁰ S/PV.4770, pp. 2-5.

³¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

³¹² *Ibid.*, p. 8.

who publicly promoted, on an ongoing basis, positions that ran counter to resolution 1244 (1999).³¹³

The representative of Pakistan expressed the hope that progress on the final status issue could begin at an early stage, adding that there could be no exception or special exemptions to the application of the principle of self-determination.³¹⁴

The representative of Germany stated that the question of status would be addressed at the appropriate time and through the appropriate process. He underlined that only the Council had the power to assess the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999), and had the final word in settling the status issue. No unilateral move or arrangements intended to predetermine the status of Kosovo — either for the whole or for parts of Kosovo — could be accepted.³¹⁵

The representative of the Russian Federation advised that the process of the transfer of competencies could in no way be a substitute for a fundamental decision in principle on the status of the region, which must be taken at a later stage and exclusively on the basis of resolution 1244 (1999).³¹⁶

At its 4782nd meeting, on 3 July 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK dated 26 June 2003.³¹⁷ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that although Kosovo had made significant progress in achieving substantial autonomy and self-government, as required under resolution 1244 (1999), major challenges remained. In that regard, the “standards before status” policy remained the guiding principle of UNMIK activities. Concerning the transfer of competencies to the provisional institutions of Kosovo, the Kosovo Assembly continued to show a tendency to go beyond its prescribed institutional role as a legislative body which was clearly beyond the scope of its competencies under the Constitutional Framework. The Secretary-General noted that much work remained to be done on the issue of returns and reintegration. As UNMIK implemented its mandate and steered the political process in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999), it faced increasing and competing political pressures, and unilateral calls from Kosovo Albanians, Kosovo Serbs and Belgrade for

³¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

³¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

³¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

³¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

³¹⁷ S/2003/675.

mutually exclusive approaches to the future of Kosovo had continued.

At the meeting, at which, in addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Albania, Italy (on behalf of the European Union³¹⁸), Japan and Serbia and Montenegro, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Representative.

In his briefing, the Special Representative outlined the progress of the provisional government of Kosovo towards implementation of the standards. While recognizing that some progress had been achieved, he noted that the political rhetoric on both the Kosovo Albanian and Serbian sides had become more adversarial as both sides were pre-positioning themselves on the future status of Kosovo. In that regard, the Special Representative underlined the need for both sides to foster confidence.³¹⁹

Most speakers expressed their support for the gradual transfer of non-reserved competencies in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999) and recognized that much work remained with regard to the implementation of the benchmarks in conformity with the “standards before status” principle.

By a letter dated 14 August 2003 to the President,³²⁰ the representative of Serbia and Montenegro requested that an urgent meeting of the Council be convened to consider the latest developments in Kosovo and Metohija, especially the alleged terrorist attack in the village of Gorazdevac in the Pec region, which had resulted in the death of two Serb children and injuries to others on 13 August 2003.

At its 4809th meeting, held on 18 August 2003 in response to the request contained in the above-mentioned letter, which was included in the agenda, the Council heard a statement by the Deputy Prime Minister of Serbia and President of the Coordination Centre for Kosovo and Metohija, followed by statements by members of the Council.

The Deputy Prime Minister briefed the Council on the Gorazdevac attack as described in the above-

mentioned letter. He blamed the attack on Albanian “extremists and terrorists”, who sought to drive all Serbs out from Kosovo and Metohija and to discourage the refugees and internally displaced persons from returning. He stated that UNMIK and KFOR had become “hostage” to a determined Albanian minority and urged the international community to take “vigorous and decisive measures” in order to ensure that resolution 1244 (1999) was implemented equitably to all parties and ethnic groups; international law enforcement officials investigated ethnically motivated crimes and brought perpetrators to justice; a thorough disarmament was carried out; a thorough investigation of the crimes committed by individual members of the Kosovo Protection Corps was conducted leading to the abolishment of the Corps; and perpetrators of war crimes were indicted by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and extradited to The Hague.³²¹

All speakers condemned the Gorazdevac attack and expressed the hope that UNMIK, under the leadership of the new Special Representative, would spare no efforts to arrest the perpetrators and bring them to justice. Speakers reiterated their commitment to a multi-ethnic Kosovo and maintained that ethnically motivated violence could not be allowed to obstruct the reconciliation process, the return of refugees and the upcoming dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina. In that regard, speakers expressed their continued support for the principle of “standards before status”.

Regarding the future status of Kosovo, the representative of Germany noted that all parties must understand that no unilateral act could change the status of Kosovo as laid down in resolution 1244 (1999) and that there could be no debate of the status issue before the benchmarks were met.³²²

At its 4823rd meeting, on 12 September 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, following which, in addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the representatives of Albania, Italy (on behalf of the European Union³²³) and Serbia and Montenegro.

³¹⁸ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³¹⁹ S/PV.4782, pp. 3-5.

³²⁰ S/2003/815.

³²¹ S/PV.4809, pp. 2-5.

³²² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³²³ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

In his briefing, the Assistant Secretary-General noted, *inter alia*, that the previous reporting period had been characterized by a number of violent attacks and shootings which had occurred throughout Kosovo and primarily targeted the Kosovo Serb community as well as UNMIK law enforcement authorities. The former incidents had raised further feelings of insecurity among Kosovo Serbs and signs of an increase in inter-ethnic tension had been evident. With regard to the “standards before status” policy framework, the Special Representative reconfirmed the commitment of UNMIK towards that end and its focus on progress towards achieving the benchmarks for implementation of that policy.³²⁴

The representative of the United States emphasized that unilateral comments or declarations by neighbouring Governments or parties inside Kosovo about the future of Kosovo were premature and unhelpful. In that context, the representative added that attempts to prejudge final status would only distract from the important work at hand of implementing the standards and beginning the direct dialogue on practical matters where the focus should be.³²⁵

Several speakers reiterated their support with the policy promoted by UNMIK in conformity with the “standards before status” principle.

At the 4853rd meeting, on 30 October 2003, statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Albania, Italy (on behalf of the European Union³²⁶), Japan, Serbia and Montenegro and Ukraine. The Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK dated 15 October 2003.³²⁷ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that UNMIK had continued to make progress in establishing substantial autonomy and self-government, as required under resolution 1244 (1999). In implementing the Mission’s mandate, the Special Representative had continued to operate within the framework provided by the “standards before status” policy. While there had been noticeable improvements in the internal coordination and effectiveness of the policymaking and legislative

processes within the provisional institutions of self-government, more had remained to be done to ensure adequate levels of minority representation and employment at both the central and local levels of government. The security situation had remained a cause of concern due to a number of serious incidents involving minorities. The Secretary-General noted that his Special Representative had made the establishment of direct dialogue — one of the eight outlined standards — on practical matters of mutual concern between Pristina and Belgrade one of his central priorities, and had called on both sides to make their best efforts to ensure that the talks, which had been launched on 14 October 2003 in Vienna, would result in concrete actions leading to a measurable improvement in the daily lives of residents.

At that meeting, the Council received a briefing by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, who acknowledged that, despite vast improvements in the overall security situation across most of Kosovo, the inter-ethnic violence over the summer had had a serious effect on the perception of security within the minority communities. Stressing that those incidents should not be allowed to hamper the positive trends in returns, he welcomed the open letter signed by the provisional institutions urging internally displaced persons to return, and the allocation of significant budget resources by the provisional institutions to fund return projects. The Special Representative noted that security and the rule of law had remained the highest priority. He informed the Council that the launch of direct dialogue between Pristina and Belgrade in Vienna on 14 October 2003 had provided encouraging signals that progress could be made. With regard to implementation of all eight standards, the Special Representative noted that UNMIK and the provisional government had been intensely involved in elaborating a joint plan of implementation that would allow the provisional institutions to meet the standards within agreed timeframes. On a related matter, he noted that the agreed transfer of competencies in non-reserved areas to the provisional institutions was nearing completion. At the same time, he referred to the increasing demands by the leaders of Kosovo that UNMIK also transfer competencies in reserved areas.³²⁸

Most speakers reiterated their support for the priorities outlined by UNMIK, namely, improving the rule of law and the security situation, in particular for

³²⁴ S/PV.4823, pp. 2-5.

³²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

³²⁶ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³²⁷ S/2003/996.

³²⁸ S/PV.4853, pp. 2-5.

minority communities; furthering returns and minority rights; and strengthening economic development. Most speakers welcomed the continued transfer of non-reserved competencies, as listed in chapter 5 of the Constitutional Framework, to the provisional institutions and the launch of the direct dialogue on practical matters between Pristina and Belgrade on 14 October 2003.

Decision of 12 December 2003 (4880th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4880th meeting, on 12 December 2003, in which the representative of Serbia and Montenegro was invited to participate, no statements were made. The President (Bulgaria) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³²⁹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the launching of a review mechanism giving new momentum to the implementation of the “standards before status” policy that was designed for Kosovo;

Urged the provisional institutions of self-government to participate fully and demonstrate their commitment to the process;

Supported the “standards for Kosovo” document and reaffirmed its intention to continue to consider the regular reports of the Secretary-General as to the progress of the provisional institutions of self-government towards meeting the standards;

Supported the prospect of a comprehensive review of the progress of the provisional institutions of self-government in meeting the standards;

Stressed that further advancement towards a process to determine the future status of Kosovo in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999) would depend on the positive outcome of the comprehensive review;

Reaffirmed its full support to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and called on the provisional institutions of self-government of Kosovo and all concerned to cooperate fully with him.

Deliberations of 17 December 2003 (4886th meeting)

At its 4886th meeting, on 17 December 2003, the Council received a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. In addition to all members of the Council, statements were made by the

³²⁹ S/PRST/2003/26.

representatives of Albania, Italy (on behalf of the European Union³³⁰) and Serbia and Montenegro.

The Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations noted, *inter alia*, that, depending on progress made towards reaching the standards, as assessed during the reporting period, a general review of the progress of the provisional institutions would be undertaken around mid-2005. He explained that if the provisional institutions had not fulfilled the standards by that time, it had been proposed that they be given a further period to work on meeting the standards. The Under-Secretary-General made clear that no deadline was set for the standards implementation and the future status process would not start automatically on the general review date.³³¹

All speakers reiterated their support of the launching of a review mechanism for the implementation of the “standards before status” policy. Although most speakers recognized notable progress in Kosovo, it was generally agreed that work remained to be done with regard to the implementation of the standards.

The representative of Pakistan said that the “standards before status” policy, devised only for Kosovo, should not set a precedent for other similar situations, either past, present or future. He also stated that the standards should not become an excuse to avoid addressing the status question, which was the underlying problem in Kosovo. He expressed that the solution to the status issue should be based on the wishes of the people of Kosovo, in accordance with the principle of self-determination enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, and at the same time respond to the interests and welfare of all the people of Kosovo.³³²

The representative of Serbia and Montenegro stressed that such a review mechanism for the implementation of standards must provide for regular and active involvement by Serbia and Montenegro, whose sovereignty over Kosovo and its territorial integrity were basic elements of resolution 1244 (1999).³³³

³³⁰ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³³¹ S/PV.4886, pp. 2-7.

³³² *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

³³³ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

E. Briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans

Initial proceedings

Deliberations of 28 February and 23 June 2000 (4105th and 4164th meetings)

At its 4105th meeting, on 28 February 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda, without objection, the item entitled “Briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans”. The Council was briefed by the Special Envoy on the situation in the Balkans. All members of the Council made statements.³³⁴

In his briefing, the Special Envoy focused on the Balkan region as a whole, noting that his task was to assess what could be done to prevent new conflicts from occurring and to pave the way for self-sustaining stability in the region as a whole. In his assessment, the underlying issue in the region was the conflict between forces that favoured or accepted integration within and between societies and the forces who favoured disintegration — often in the name of extreme nationalism. Referring to the situation in Kosovo, the Special Envoy held that the lack of a proper peace agreement was not only making it difficult to resolve the situation there, but also to move towards stability for the region as a whole. The Special Envoy suggested four starting points for a search for a settlement, including the solid support of the Council; active participation of the States of the region; a true deal that would meet the minimum demands of everyone, but the maximum demands of no one; and an agreement set within the context of a wider arrangement for the region as a whole, and preferably for the region within the wider European context. However, the Special Envoy cautioned that efforts for finding peace were handicapped by the fact that neither was it possible to make peace without including the regime in Belgrade, nor could the international community deal with personalities who were indicted by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Turning to the situation between Serbia and Montenegro, he warned that those two republics of the Federal Republic of

Yugoslavia were on a slow but steady collision course, lauded the leadership of Montenegro for reacting in a measured way to provocations and indicated that the efforts to help Montenegro in that situation should be accelerated.³³⁵

Most members of the Council concurred with the statement made by the Special Envoy with regard to his emphasis on the need for a comprehensive and regional approach to the resolution of conflicts in the Balkans, while adding different factors necessary for a solution to his assessment. Speakers mentioned security, the return of refugees, reconciliation and reconstruction as priority areas in the search for peace. The representative of France held that democratic reform was a key element in the stabilization process.³³⁶ The representative of China held that high priority should be given to realizing self-governance and self-reliance in the countries of the region by gradually reducing their dependency on external assistance.³³⁷ The representative of Namibia held that a series of regional security conferences should be instituted and that the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe should be reviewed and adjusted to include the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.³³⁸

Several speakers supported the assessment of the Special Envoy with regard to the regime in Belgrade.³³⁹ On the other hand, the representative of the Russian Federation disagreed with the Special Envoy’s reference to the Belgrade regime as an obstacle to the development of the entire region, warning of the politicization of the activities of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and holding that there should be more engagement with the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.³⁴⁰

³³⁴ The representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia were invited to participate in the meeting but did not make statements. The Secretary-General also attended the meeting, but did not make a statement.

³³⁵ S/PV.4105, pp. 2-5.

³³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³³⁷ S/PV.4105 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

³³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 2 (Canada); p. 3 (United Kingdom); p. 5 (Netherlands); and pp. 6-7 (United States).

³⁴⁰ S/PV.4105, pp. 8-9; and S/PV.4105 (Resumption 1), p. 10.

The representative of Ukraine noted the absence of an established dialogue between the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans and the Security Council. Being aware that the broad mandate of the Special Envoy, entrusted to him by the Secretary-General, allowed him to address some issues that fell outside the focus of the Council, the representative nevertheless held that the efforts of the Special Envoy were a valuable contribution to the common cause of establishing sustainable peace and stability in the Balkans. He expressed his belief that those common efforts could be much more effective if the two-way communication between the Council and the Special Envoy were established on a permanent basis.³⁴¹

At its 4164th meeting,³⁴² on 23 June 2000, the President (France) informed the Council that he had received several requests to participate in the meeting variously on the basis of rule 37, rule 39 and without reference to either rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council. Following a debate on these procedural issues, the Council voted on the requests for participation and, while accepting all other requests, rejected the request by Mr. Jovanović, which made no reference to either rule 37 or 39, by 7 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.³⁴³

Before the vote on the request by Mr. Jovanović, statements were made by the representatives of Ukraine and the United States. After the vote, statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, China, France and the Russian Federation. The representative of the United States held that Mr. Jovanović represented a Government whose senior leadership had been indicted for war crimes and other violations of international humanitarian law by a Tribunal established by the Council itself. In his opinion, allowing any representative of that leadership to participate in a meeting of the Council would undermine the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.³⁴⁴ The representative of Ukraine stated that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was a participant in the peace process in the Balkans, a signatory to the Dayton Peace Agreement, a host country of the international presence in Kosovo and a

party to the settlement of the Prevlaka dispute. He believed that this provided sufficient grounds to allow the country to participate in the discussion of the Council on the situation in the Balkans, and recalled Article 32 of the Charter, under which any party to a dispute under consideration had to be invited to participate in the discussion on the dispute.³⁴⁵

The representative of the Russian Federation regretted the policy of certain countries to exclude the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia from the settlement process for the Balkans. Recalling Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter, he noted that the interests of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia were directly affected by the item under discussion and held that a discussion of the Balkan problem without the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was “nonsense”.³⁴⁶

After the procedural voting, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans. Statements were then made by most members of the Council,³⁴⁷ by the representatives of Albania, Austria,³⁴⁸ Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Iraq, Japan, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union³⁴⁹), Slovenia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,³⁵⁰ as well as by the Secretary-General of the Council of the European Union.

In his briefing, the Special Envoy held that stability in the region was hardly achievable in the long run, if there was not a stable structure for the region as a whole and a firm place for the region in the wider process of European integration. He expressed the belief that the most pressing issue in the region was the question of the future of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, whose current structure he deemed unsustainable, both with a view to the constitutional crisis between the Republic of Montenegro and the federal authorities in Belgrade, as well as with a view to the unresolved issue of the future status of Kosovo.

³⁴¹ S/PV.4105, pp. 7-8.

³⁴² For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part VIII, sect. B, with regard to Article 50 of the Charter.

³⁴³ For details, see chap. III, part I, case 7.

³⁴⁴ S/PV.4164, pp. 3-4.

³⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

³⁴⁷ The representatives of Mali and the Russian Federation did not make statements following the briefing.

³⁴⁸ In the capacity of Chairman-in-Office of OSCE.

³⁴⁹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³⁵⁰ The representatives of Greece, Romania and Turkey were invited to participate but did not make statements.

On the latter, he opined that he could not see any circumstances under which a peace agreement would not have to include a clear constitutional separation between Kosovo and the Republic of Serbia, while recognizing that most leaders in the region saw the continued territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as important. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that all of the mentioned issues would in the future come together in a comprehensive regional settlement of the outstanding political issues and expressed his belief that the forces of disintegration in the region would finally be overcome only on the day when the full conditions existed for the region to be subject to the forces of integration in Europe as a whole.³⁵¹

The Secretary-General of the Council of the European Union, recalling the commitment of the European Union to the region, affirmed that the European Union would further pursue its policy of bringing the countries of the region closer to the European Union.³⁵²

Most speakers commented on the situations in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Several speakers condemned the recent violence against non-Albanians in Kosovo.³⁵³ Several speakers called for democratization in Serbia.³⁵⁴

Commenting on the situation in Kosovo, the representative of China, supported by the representative of Iraq, condemned the use of force by NATO in 1999, as well as the bombing of civilian facilities and a foreign diplomatic establishment and held that ethnic conflicts were domestic concerns, while the wilful interference of foreign forces was an external factor that had exacerbated the conflict. He emphasized that the United Nations should not encourage and support any activity of changing a Government of a country through foreign interference and that the Kosovo problem could only be resolved within the framework of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.³⁵⁵ The representatives of Ukraine and Belarus also supported the notion that the territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia must be preserved.³⁵⁶

The representative of Ukraine reiterated his regret over the lack of an established dialogue between the Special Envoy and the Security Council and held that a written report on the activities of the Special Envoy was indispensable.³⁵⁷

The representative of Slovenia saw the tensions between the Republics of Serbia and Montenegro as a type of dispute the continuation of which was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security and held that its prevention deserved the closer attention of the Security Council.³⁵⁸

³⁵¹ S/PV.4164, pp. 6-9.

³⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 13.

³⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10 (Portugal on behalf of the European Union); pp. 13-16 (United States); pp. 21-22 (Ukraine); pp. 22-23 (Argentina); p. 27 (Norway); pp. 27-28 (Japan); and S/PV.4164 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-4 (Bulgaria).

³⁵⁴ S/PV.4164, pp. 9-10 (Portugal on behalf of the European Union); pp. 13-16 (United States); pp. 18-19 (Malaysia); p. 20 (Canada); p. 27 (Norway); pp. 27-28 (Japan); and S/PV.4164 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-4 (Bulgaria); pp. 11-12 (Albania); pp. 12-14 (Bosnia and Herzegovina); and pp. 15-16 (Croatia).

³⁵⁵ S/PV.4164, pp. 16-17 (China); S/PV.4164 (Resumption 1), pp. 14-15 (Iraq).

³⁵⁶ S/PV.4164, pp. 21-22 (Ukraine); S/PV.4164 (Resumption 1), pp. 9-10 (Belarus).

³⁵⁷ S/PV.4164, p. 22.

³⁵⁸ S/PV.4164 (Resumption 1), pp. 4-6.

31. The situation in Georgia

Decision of 31 January 2000 (4094th meeting): resolution 1287 (2000)

At its 4094th meeting,¹ on 31 January 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia, dated 19 January 2000.² In his report, the Secretary-General observed that his Special Representative, with support from representatives of the Russian Federation, as facilitator, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General, and with the good will of the Georgian and Abkhaz sides, had tried to move the peace process forward by reviving the machinery created since 1997 in the framework of the Geneva process³ and formulating proposals addressing the distribution of constitutional competencies between Tbilisi and Sukhumi. The Secretary-General noted that the ultimate goal of the Geneva process was the comprehensive political settlement of the conflict, and that progress on the matter of status was an indispensable step towards that goal. In that regard, he expressed distress over the continuing reluctance of the Abkhaz side to discuss the matter.

The Secretary-General underlined that the critical issue of the return of refugees and internally displaced persons, whose continued exile years after the cessation of hostilities remained an unacceptable tragedy, demanded to be addressed urgently. He urged both sides to put forward and implement new approaches to resolve the problem of displacement, continue steps towards the full implementation of confidence-building measures and called upon both sides to fully implement the measures on which they had agreed upon during the Athens and Istanbul meetings.⁴ In that regard, appreciation was expressed

of the invitation of the Government of Ukraine to host the third meeting on confidence-building measures.

Regarding the security situation, the Secretary-General expressed major concern at the prolonged absence of monitoring by the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG) in the Georgian-controlled upper part of the Kodori Valley since the hostage-taking incident of 13 October 1999. He reaffirmed that the Georgian authorities were responsible for providing the necessary security conditions to enable the UNOMIG personnel to carry out their mandate in the Kodori Valley, and that they should take the necessary measures in that regard without delay. He recognized the continued efforts of UNOMIG as a central element in the efforts to stabilize the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia, especially through its monitoring presence on the ground, and through its sustained efforts to further the peace process. The Secretary-General recommended that the Council extend the mandate of UNOMIG for a further six-month period.

At the meeting, the President (United States) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 26 January 2000 from the representative of the Russian Federation.⁵ The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁶ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1287 (2000),⁷ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reiterated its call for the parties to the conflict to deepen their commitment to the United Nations-led peace process and display the necessary will to achieve substantial results on the key issues of the negotiations, in particular on the distribution of constitutional competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi as part of a comprehensive settlement, with full respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia within its internationally recognized borders;

¹ During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held a number of meetings in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia, pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B. The meetings were held on 24 January 2002 (4457th), 24 July 2002 (4586th), 17 January 2003 (4687th) and 25 July 2003 (4796th).

² S/2000/39, submitted pursuant to resolution 1255 (1999).

³ For details of the framework, see S/26875.

⁴ For details of the Athens and Istanbul meetings, see

S/1998/1012 and S/1999/805, respectively.

⁵ S/2000/52, transmitting a decision of the Council of Heads of State of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) on further measures for the settlement of the conflict in Abkhazia, Georgia, including extending the presence of the collective peacekeeping forces of CIS for six months.

⁶ S/2000/743.

⁷ The representative of Jamaica subsequently indicated that she would have voted in favour had she been present at the time of the voting.

Considered unacceptable and illegitimate the holding of self-styled elections in Abkhazia, Georgia;

Called upon the parties to continue to enhance their efforts to implement fully the confidence-building measures on which they agreed at the Athens and Istanbul meetings of 16 to 18 October 1998 and 7 to 9 June 1999, respectively;

Reaffirmed the necessity for the parties to strictly respect human rights;

Reaffirmed the unacceptability of the demographic changes resulting from the conflict, and called upon the parties to address this issue urgently by agreeing and implementing effective measures to guarantee the security of those who exercise their unconditional right to return;

Demanded that both sides observe strictly the Moscow Agreement;

Welcomed UNOMIG keeping its security under constant review;

Decided to extend the mandate of UNOMIG for a new period terminating on 31 July 2000;

Requested the Secretary-General to continue to keep the Council regularly informed and to report three months from the date of the adoption of the resolution on the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia.

**Decision of 11 May 2000 (4137th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4137th meeting, on 11 May 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia, dated 24 April 2000.⁸ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that, since the beginning of the United Nations-led peace process, the ultimate goal was the comprehensive settlement of the conflict, including defining the status of Abkhazia within the State of Georgia, on the basis of the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Georgia, and the imprescriptible right of refugees and displaced persons to return to their previous places of permanent residence. In pursuance of resolution 1287 (2000), work had continued on the question of the distribution of constitutional competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi. A revised draft paper on that issue had been distributed in mid-March 2000 to the Russian Federation, as facilitator, and to members of the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General, incorporating their comments on the original draft.

⁸ S/2000/345, submitted pursuant to resolution 1287 (2000).

Further discussions had been ongoing with a view to finalizing the draft in the near future and submitting it to the two sides of the conflict. While its basic position on the question of the status had not changed, the Abkhaz side had indicated its interest not to be excluded from the discussion.

The Secretary-General further noted that although confidence-building measures had continued to be facilitated by international and local non-governmental organizations, academic institutions and the United Nations Human Rights Office in Abkhazia, Georgia, the process had somewhat lagged as a result of the mistrust engendered by the long delays in the exchange of detainees. He, however, expressed satisfaction over the good will demonstrated by the two sides that had brought about the successful exchange of hostages on 29 March 2000 and called for the two sides to actively consider the implementation of the confidence-building measures agreed on during the meetings held in Athens and Istanbul in 1998 and 1999.

The Secretary-General observed that the situation in the UNOMIG area of responsibility had remained generally calm although unstable during the reporting period, and there were no significant violations of the Agreement on a Ceasefire and Separation of Forces (Moscow Agreement) signed in Moscow on 14 May 1994.⁹ He noted that both sides should be reminded of their responsibility to provide a safe, secure and dignified return for all refugees and internally displaced persons. It was also noted that the two sides had the primary responsibility to ensure a proper security environment for the work of UNOMIG and other agencies and organizations.

At the meeting, the President (China) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the efforts by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to enhance contacts at all levels between the Georgian and Abkhaz sides, and called upon the parties to continue to expand such contacts;

Called upon the parties to finalize their work on and to sign a draft agreement on peace and guarantees for the prevention of armed confrontation and a draft protocol on the return of refugees to the Gali region and measures for economic rehabilitation;

⁹ S/1994/583 and Corr.1, annex I.

¹⁰ S/PRST/2000/16.

Noted with deep concern the continued failure of the parties to achieve a comprehensive political settlement, which included a settlement on the political status of Abkhazia within the State of Georgia;

Called upon the parties to display the political will required for a breakthrough and to spare no efforts in order to achieve substantive progress without further delay;

Joined the Secretary-General in encouraging the parties to be ready to consider proposals, based on the Security Council decisions, to be presented in due course by the Special Representative on the question of the distribution of constitutional competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi;

Regretted that the Protocol of 3 February 2000 had not been implemented in full and, in particular, that the withdrawal of illegal armed groups had not been brought about;

Called on the parties to refrain from any actions which could increase tensions on the ground and to ensure the safety of the UNOMIG personnel.

**Decision of 28 July 2000 (4179th meeting):
resolution 1311 (2000)**

At its 4179th meeting, on 28 July 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia dated 17 July 2000.¹¹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that no major progress in the framework of the Geneva process had been achieved during the reporting period, but that the results of the session of the Coordinating Council held on 11 July 2000 had opened the prospect for constructive engagement between the parties, especially on security matters. The Special Representative had continued to work closely with the Group of Friends, whom he had met with at least once a month, to further refine the draft document dealing with the distribution of competencies between Tbilisi and Sukhumi on the basis of the principles of Georgian sovereignty. A version of the draft document, dated 25 May 2000, had been produced and circulated among the Group of Friends in the expectation that it might have served in the near future as a basis on which to open a political dialogue between the Georgian and Abkhaz sides. However, differences of views had since arisen among the Group of Friends themselves concerning both content and strategy. Thus the Secretary-General noted that strong concerted efforts

were urgently needed to produce a coordinated draft and approach.

During the period under review, one confirmed violation of the Moscow Agreement had occurred in which a UNOMIG helicopter patrol spotted an armoured vehicle at an Abkhaz observation post within the restricted weapons zone. Endemic organized crime throughout the area remained a serious problem whereby most violent incidents in the conflict area were products of power struggles or revenge among various criminal groupings. On 1 June 2000, in the Kodori Valley, a group of armed and masked men took hostage a UNOMIG foot patrol, the members of which were held for several days in the upper Kodori Valley. They were released unharmed on 5 June following consultations which included a high-level negotiating team of the Government of Georgia.

The Secretary-General also reported that the plight of thousands of internally displaced persons, and of those thousands more who had chosen to return to their homes in the Gali district, had become increasingly desperate. He encouraged both sides to negotiate with a view to reaching agreement on measures aimed at achieving that return. Satisfaction was expressed that confidence-building measures in various fields had continued, often behind the scenes, and both sides were encouraged to engage with full seriousness and resolution by strengthening the depth and breadth of contact at all levels.

Despite the slow progress, the Secretary-General observed that UNOMIG continued to play an essential role in the search for a peaceful solution to the Georgian-Abkhaz conflict through its sustained efforts to further the peace process. He also noted the Mission remained a central element in the efforts to stabilize the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia, and recommended that the Council extend the mandate of UNOMIG for a further six-month period.

At the meeting, the President (Jamaica) drew the attention of the Council to several documents.¹² The

¹¹ S/2000/697, submitted pursuant to resolution 1287 (2000).

¹² Letter dated 16 June 2000 from the representative of Georgia, transmitting a statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs related to the situation in Abkhazia (S/2000/594); letters dated 26 June 2000 from the representative of the Russian Federation transmitting decisions on the collective peacekeeping forces in Abkhazia, Georgia, and Tajikistan, adopted at the meeting of the Council of Heads of State of CIS, held in

President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution,¹³ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1311 (2000), by which the Council, inter alia:

Deplored all violent incidents, as well as the development of criminal activities, in the conflict zone, and called on the two sides to take urgent measures to cooperate with each other in the fight against crime of all sorts and in improving the work of their respective law enforcement organs;

Demanded that both sides observe strictly the Agreement on a Ceasefire and Separation of Forces, signed in Moscow on 14 May 1994;

Decided to extend the mandate of UNOMIG for a new period terminating on 31 January 2001, subject to a review by the Council of the mandate of UNOMIG in the event of any changes that may be made in the mandate or in the presence of the collective peacekeeping force, and expressed its intention to conduct a thorough review of the operation at the end of its current mandate, in the light of steps taken by the parties to achieve a comprehensive settlement.

**Decision of 14 November 2000 (4221st meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4221st meeting, on 14 November 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia dated 25 October 2000.¹⁴ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, inter alia, that the general situation in the zone of conflict remained calm but unstable during the reporting period. Some improvement in the security situation might have been attributed in part to the reactivation of Working Group I (on security issues) of the Coordinating Council and the increasing cooperation of the Georgian and Abkhaz sides in implementing agreements reached within that format. Also, the heads of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the United Nations Development Programme in Georgia, in their capacity as coordinators of Working Group II (on refugees and internally displaced persons) and

Moscow, on 21 June 2000 (S/2000/629 and 630); letter dated 25 July 2000 from the representative of the Russian Federation transmitting a communiqué of the same date concerning remarks made by the head of the Georgian delegation at a recent meeting of one of the working bodies of the Economic and Social Council and rejecting the remarks as groundless and detrimental to Russian-Georgian relations (S/2000/742).

¹³ S/2000/743.

¹⁴ S/2000/1023, submitted pursuant to resolution 1311 (2000).

Working Group III (on social and economic questions), respectively, had held consultations with the Abkhaz side. Efforts of the Group of Friends, including visits by the Special Representative to capitals, to arrive at a coordinated draft document addressing basic principles for the distribution of competencies between Tbilisi and Sukhumi had not yet succeeded.

The Secretary-General noted that the late summer harvest season had brought with it what appeared to be the largest spontaneous return of population to the Gali district since the end of the war in 1993. He described it as disturbing that the substantial de facto returnee population continued to live in an undefined and insecure state, and that it should continue to endure daily social and economic hardship, insufficient protection of its human rights and a continuing lack of appropriate representation in local administrative structures. Thus he encouraged both sides to prepare actively for the event and to be ready to take decisions that would improve confidence and contribute to the overall peace effort.

At the meeting, the President (Netherlands) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁵ by which the Council, inter alia:

Strongly supported the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, undertaken with the support of the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General, to address the issue of the future constitutional status of Abkhazia and, in particular, his intention to submit, in the near future, a draft paper containing proposals to the parties on the question of the distribution of competencies between Tbilisi and Sukhumi as a basis for meaningful negotiations on that issue;

Called upon the parties to agree upon and to take, in the near future, concrete steps towards implementing effective measures to guarantee the security of the refugees and internally displaced persons who exercised their right to return to their homes; and expressed the opinion that the status of spontaneous returnees to the Gali district was a matter that must be addressed urgently;

Strongly condemned the murder of Zurab Achba, legal assistant to the United Nations Human Rights Office in Sukhumi; recalled the commitment of the Abkhaz side to keep UNOMIG fully informed on the course of the investigation into that crime; and deplored the abduction of United Nations and humanitarian personnel.

¹⁵ S/PRST/2000/32.

**Decision of 31 January 2001 (4269th meeting):
resolution 1339 (2001)**

At its 4269th meeting, on 31 January 2001, at which a statement was made by the representative of Georgia, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia, dated 18 January 2001.¹⁶ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that the continued lack of progress on the fundamental issue of the future political status of Abkhazia within the State of Georgia was regrettable and had the potential to jeopardize the whole peace process in the future. No substantive progress had been made on the draft document for the distribution of competencies between Tbilisi and Sukhumi. The Group of Friends of the Secretary-General had yet to arrive at a coordinated position. Meanwhile, the Abkhaz side had continued to refuse to discuss any document that would address the status issue. As such, the Secretary-General urged both sides to show a stronger political will in order to overcome that impasse.

The Secretary-General further noted that the human rights situation of returnees in the Gali district remained precarious and several human rights violations had been registered. For the third time in four months, two UNOMIG military observers had been abducted and held hostage for three days. The absence of effective law enforcement and the continued extreme economic hardship in the UNOMIG area of operations contributed to the overall volatility of the situation, which, if not remedied, had the potential to deteriorate. Two violations of the Moscow Agreement had been reported, one of which involved the use of heavy weapons in a training exercise where the Abkhaz authorities prohibited UNOMIG as well as the collective peacekeeping force of the Commonwealth of Independent States from flying over the area. The Secretary-General expressed hope that the third meeting on confidence-building measures planned for March 2001 in Yalta, Ukraine, would facilitate the much-needed process of reconciliation and strengthen the ongoing positive trend towards the establishment and development of mutual contact at various levels between the two sides and as such contribute to mutual understanding and confidence.

Since the Secretary-General remained convinced that UNOMIG, through its monitoring presence on the

¹⁶ S/2001/59, submitted pursuant to resolution 1311 (2000).

ground, had played a crucial role in the stabilization of the zone of conflict, and its sustained efforts to further the negotiation process also represented a central element in the search for a peaceful settlement of the conflict, he recommended that the mandate of UNOMIG be extended for a further six-month period.

The representative of Georgia stated that the reference in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution before the Council to the draft protocol and the draft agreement on peace and guarantees [for the prevention and non-resumption of hostilities], which had not been referred to in the report of the Secretary-General or been discussed by the members of the Council, was unacceptable to the Government of Georgia. As the parties to the conflict had already signed several agreements on renouncing the use of force in the settlement of the conflict, the representative of Georgia opined that the emphasis should be placed on the necessity of accelerating work on the issues of the return of refugees and internally displaced persons to the Gali district, the economic rehabilitation of the region and guarantees of the non-resumption of hostilities.¹⁷

At the meeting, the President (Singapore) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution,¹⁸ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1339 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of UNOMIG for a new period that terminated on 31 July 2001, subject to a review by the Council of the mandate of UNOMIG in the event of any changes that may be made in the mandate or in the presence of the collective peacekeeping force.

**Decision of 21 March 2001 (4300th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4300th meeting,¹⁹ on 21 March 2001, in which the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Georgia was invited to participate, the Council included in its

¹⁷ S/PV.4269, p. 2.

¹⁸ S/2001/93.

¹⁹ At its 4299th meeting, held in private on 21 March 2001, the Council was briefed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Georgia, the Special Representative and Head of UNOMIG and the representative of Ukraine on the outcome of the third meeting on confidence-building measures between the Georgian and Abkhaz sides, held at Yalta, Ukraine, on 15 and 16 March 2001, and had a constructive discussion.

agenda a letter dated 17 March 2001 from the representative of Ukraine.²⁰ At the meeting, the President (Ukraine) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²¹ by which the Council, inter alia:

Welcomed the successful holding of the third meeting on confidence-building measures between the Georgian and Abkhaz sides in Yalta on 15 and 16 March 2001 and the resumption of dialogue between them, and noted the documents signed there;

Hoped that action flowing from the Yalta meeting would lead to a narrowing of the positions of the two sides and stimulate further constructive dialogue aimed at achieving a comprehensive political settlement of the conflict;

Underlined the unacceptability of the holding of self-styled local elections in Abkhazia, Georgia, on 10 March 2001, which it deemed illegitimate and unhelpful; and stressed the importance of negotiations on the core political questions of the conflict.

**Decision of 24 April 2001 (4314th meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4314th meeting,²² on 24 April 2001,²² in which the Minister for Special Affairs of Georgia was invited to participate, the President (United Kingdom) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²³ by which the Council, inter alia:

Underlined the decisive importance of early negotiations on the core political questions of the conflict in Abkhazia, Georgia;

Strongly supported, in this context, the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to promote the achievement of a comprehensive political settlement based on the resolutions of the Security Council, which must include a settlement of the political status of Abkhazia within the State of Georgia;

²⁰ S/2001/242, transmitting final documents signed at the outcome of the third meeting on confidence-building measures between the Georgian and Abkhaz sides, held at Yalta, on 15 and 16 March 2001, namely, the Yalta Declaration of the Georgian and Abkhaz Sides, and the Programme of Action on Confidence-building between the Georgian and Abkhaz sides.

²¹ S/PRST/2001/9.

²² At its 4313th meeting, held in private on 24 April 2001, the Council was briefed by the Special Representative and Head of UNOMIG, with the participation of the Minister for Special Affairs of Georgia, and the representative of Sweden (speaking on behalf of the European Union and associated States), and had a constructive discussion.

²³ S/PRST/2001/12.

Strongly supported, in particular, the intention of the Special Representative to submit, in the near future, his draft paper containing specific proposals to the parties on the question of the distribution of constitutional competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi;

Welcomed the intention of the Special Representative to submit the draft paper to the parties soon, as a starting point for negotiation, and not as an attempt to impose or dictate any possible solution; and called upon the parties constructively to accept the paper in that light and work towards a mutually acceptable settlement.

**Decision of 31 July 2001 (4353rd meeting):
resolution 1364 (2001)**

At its 4353rd meeting, on 31 July 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia, dated 19 July 2001.²⁴ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, inter alia, that the interruption of negotiating activities following the killings and hostage-taking incidents over the past four months demonstrated that the overall peace process remained fragile. Also related to the fragile peace process was the fact that meaningful negotiations on the future political status of Abkhazia within the State of Georgia had not yet begun, and in the absence of such negotiations the entire peace process remained in jeopardy. The Group of Friends of the Secretary-General, in close cooperation with the Special Representative, had intensified its efforts to finalize the draft paper on the distribution of competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi. In this regard, the Abkhaz authorities had reiterated their well-known position that any discussion of the status issue was obsolete because, in their view, the political status of Abkhazia was conclusively decided upon with the Act on State Independence of the Republic of Abkhazia of 1999.²⁵

Furthermore, the Secretary-General noted that the increasing number of violations of the Moscow Agreement in the period under review gave rise to grave concern. The same applied for the restrictions of movement imposed on UNOMIG, which prevented the Mission from carrying out its mandate to the full. Since UNOMIG had continued to play a crucial role in the stabilization of the zone of conflict, and its efforts to advance the negotiation process constituted a central

²⁴ S/2001/713, submitted pursuant to resolution 1339 (2001).

²⁵ S/2001/713, para. 5. See also S/1999/1087, para. 7.

element in the search for a peaceful settlement, the Secretary-General recommended that the mandate of UNOMIG be extended for a further six-month period.

At the meeting, the President (China) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution,²⁶ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1364 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Strongly supported the sustained efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, with the assistance of the Russian Federation, in its capacity as facilitator, as well as of the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General and of OSCE, to promote the stabilization of the situation and the achievement of a comprehensive political settlement, which must include a settlement of the political status of Abkhazia within the State of Georgia;

Deplored all violations of the Agreement on a Ceasefire and Separation of Forces, and noted with particular concern the military exercises conducted by both parties in June and July 2001 in violation of the Moscow Agreement; reminded the Georgian side in particular to uphold its commitment to put a stop to the activities of illegal armed groups crossing into Abkhazia, Georgia, from the Georgian-controlled side of the ceasefire line; decided to extend the mandate of UNOMIG for a new period that terminated on 31 January 2002, subject to a review by the Council of the mandate of UNOMIG in the event of any changes that may be made in the mandate or in the presence of the collective peacekeeping force.

**Decision of 31 January 2002 (4464th meeting):
resolution 1393 (2002)**

At its 4464th meeting,²⁷ on 31 January 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia, dated 18 January 2002.²⁸ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that the past three months had seen progress in the political process. After two years of discussion, the finalization of the paper entitled “Basic Principles for the Distribution of Competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi” was a significant step forward. Furthermore, on the basis of the finalized paper, the Special

²⁶ S/2001/747.

²⁷ At its 4400th meeting, held in private on 30 October 2001, the Council was briefed by the Special Representative and Head of UNOMIG; the Minister for Special Affairs of Georgia and the representative of Belgium participated, and a constructive discussion was held.

²⁸ S/2002/88, submitted pursuant to resolution 1364 (2001).

Representative had held consultations in Sukhumi and Tbilisi to prepare the ground for substantive negotiations. The situation remained calm but tense due to, *inter alia*, the continuing presence of the Georgian troops in the upper Kodori Valley. In his report, the Secretary-General welcomed the agreement reached on 17 January 2001 on the withdrawal of the Georgian troops from the Kodori Valley and stated that it should be implemented expeditiously and fully. He also recommended the two sides to implement the Yalta Programme of Action on Confidence-building,²⁹ as agreed during the meeting held at Yalta in March 2001, as well as the recommendations of the joint assessment mission to the Gali district.³⁰ Since UNOMIG had continued to play an important role in the stabilization of the zone of conflict and in the search for a political settlement, the Secretary-General recommended that the mandate of UNOMIG be extended for a further six-month period.

At the same meeting, the President (Mauritius) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;³¹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1393 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of UNOMIG for a new period terminating on 31 July 2002, and to review the mandate of UNOMIG unless the decision on the extension of the presence of the collective peacekeeping force was taken by 15 February 2002, and noted that on 31 January 2002 the Georgian authorities agreed on the extension of the mandate of the collective peacekeeping force until the end of June 2002;

Requested the Secretary-General to continue to keep the Council regularly informed and to report three months from the date of the adoption of the resolution on the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia, and decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

**Decision of 29 July 2002 (4591st meeting):
resolution 1427 (2002)**

At its 4591st meeting,³² on 29 July 2002, in which Georgia was invited to participate, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia,

²⁹ See S/2001/242.

³⁰ See S/2001/59, annex II.

³¹ S/2002/133.

³² At its 4590th meeting, held in private on 29 July 2002, the Council and the Minister for Special Affairs of Georgia had a constructive discussion.

dated 10 July 2002.³³ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that there was a regrettable lack of progress on the initiation of political status negotiations between the Georgian and Abkhaz sides as the latter side continued to reject any discussion of the paper entitled “Basic Principles for the Distribution of Competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi” on the grounds of Abkhazia’s self-declared independence. However, the Georgian and Abkhaz sides continued practical work within the framework of the Coordinating Council’s working groups. As the Secretary-General remained convinced that the presence of UNOMIG continued to be essential for creating the conditions for a political process towards a settlement of the conflict, and for moving that process forward, he recommended that the mandate of UNOMIG be extended for a further six-month period.

At the meeting, the President (United Kingdom) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;³⁴ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1427 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Commended and strongly supported the sustained efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, with the assistance of the Russian Federation in its capacity as facilitator, as well as of the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General and of OSCE, to promote the stabilization of the situation and the achievement of a comprehensive political settlement, which must include a settlement of the political status of Abkhazia within the State of Georgia;

Underlined further that the process of negotiation leading to a lasting political settlement acceptable to both sides would require concessions from both sides;

Deeply regretted, in particular, the repeated refusal of the Abkhaz side to agree to a discussion on the substance of the document entitled “Basic Principles for the Distribution of Competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi”, again strongly urged the Abkhaz side to receive the document and its letter of transmittal; condemned any violations of the provisions of the Agreement on a Ceasefire and Separation of Forces and demanded that they cease immediately;

Urged once again the parties to implement the recommendations of the joint assessment mission to the Gali district, called in particular on the Abkhaz side to improve law enforcement involving the local population and to address the lack of instruction in their mother tongue for the ethnic Georgian population;

Reminded the Georgian side in particular to uphold its commitment to put an end to the activities of illegal armed groups.

**Decision of 30 January 2003 (4697th meeting):
resolution 1462 (2003)**

At its 4697th meeting, on 30 January 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia, dated 13 January 2003.³⁵ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that after one year of strenuous efforts by his Special Representative, the two sides had not moved much closer to the start of negotiations with regard to the document entitled “Basic Principles for the Distribution of Competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi”. The Abkhaz side refused to even enter into discussions on the principles on which negotiations should be based. The return of internally displaced persons to their homes in safe and secure conditions remained a burning issue and no progress had been made in the implementation of the Quadripartite Agreement on the Voluntary Return of Refugees and Displaced Persons of 4 April 1994.³⁶ The Secretary-General underlined that the resumption of sessions of the Coordinating Council, which had not met since January 2001, was essential for further progress to be made in the Georgian-Abkhaz peace process. He noted that the prompt convening of the next session of the Coordinating Council would allow a timely decision to be made on a fourth meeting on confidence-building measures and for preparations to commence accordingly. The Secretary-General recommended that the mandate of UNOMIG be extended for a further six-month period.

At the same meeting, the President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;³⁷ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1462 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Strongly urged the parties involved in the conflict in Abkhazia, Georgia, to ensure the necessary revitalization of the peace process in all its major aspects;

Stressed the urgent need for progress on the question of refugees and internally displaced persons;

³³ S/2002/742, submitted pursuant to resolution 1393 (2002).

³⁴ S/2002/845.

³⁵ S/2003/39, submitted pursuant to resolution 1427 (2002).

³⁶ S/1994/397, annex II.

³⁷ S/2003/102.

Decided to extend the mandate of UNOMIG for a new period that terminated on 31 July 2003 and to further review that mandate unless a decision on the presence of the collective peacekeeping force was taken by 15 February 2003.

**Decision of 30 July 2003 (4800th meeting):
resolution 1494 (2003)**

At its 4800th meeting,³⁸ on 30 July 2003, in which the representative of Georgia was invited to participate, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General concerning the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia, dated 21 July 2003.³⁹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed, *inter alia*, that the United Nations-led peace process had received a welcome boost following the brainstorming session of the Group of Friends held at Geneva in February 2003, at which it was recommended that the two sides work on three sets of issues, namely, economic cooperation, the return of internally displaced persons and refugees and political and security matters, and the Sochi summit.⁴⁰ The United Nations strongly supported these activities which had been aimed at enhancing cooperation between the two sides on matters of mutual concern and advancing, ultimately, towards a comprehensive political settlement. However, the Secretary-General regretted that the core political issue — the future status of Abkhazia within the State of Georgia — still had not been addressed, despite the renewed opportunity to do so within the framework of the recommendations made by the Group of Friends in February 2003.

The Secretary-General noted that the recent initiative by Georgia and the Russian Federation to start a dialogue on the process of refugee return, on the basis of the Quadripartite Agreement of 1994, was most encouraging. In the light of the recommendations of the joint assessment mission to the Gali district of November 2000,⁴¹ and the recommendations

formulated by the security assessment mission of October to December 2002,⁴² the Secretary-General recommended that a civilian police component of 20 officers be added to UNOMIG to strengthen its capacity to carry out its mandate and, in particular, to contribute to the conditions conducive to the safe and dignified return of internally displaced persons and refugees. Noting that UNOMIG continued to play an essential role in stabilizing the situation in the conflict zone and in providing a framework within which the sides could advance towards a comprehensive settlement, the Secretary-General recommended a further extension of the mandate of UNOMIG for six months.

At the meeting, the President (Spain) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁴³ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1494 (2003) by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Endorsed the recommendation of the Secretary-General in his report of 21 July 2003 that a civilian police component of 20 officers be added to UNOMIG;

Condemned any violations of the provisions of the Agreement on a Ceasefire and Separation of Forces;

Strongly condemned the abduction of four UNOMIG personnel on 5 June 2003, deeply deplored that none of the perpetrators had ever been identified or brought to justice, and supported the Secretary-General's call that that impunity must end;

Called on the Georgian side to continue to improve security for joint patrols of UNOMIG and collective peacekeeping force in the Kodori Valley; decided to extend the mandate of UNOMIG for a new period terminating on 31 January 2004, subject to a review, as appropriate, of its mandate by the Council in the event of changes in the mandate of the collective peacekeeping force;

Requested the Secretary-General to continue to keep the Council regularly informed and to report three months from the date of the adoption of the resolution on the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia; and decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

³⁸ At its 4799th meeting, held in private on 30 July 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Head of the United Nations Mission in Georgia, and had a constructive exchange of views.

³⁹ S/2003/751, submitted pursuant to resolution 1462 (2003).

⁴⁰ See S/2003/412 paras. 3 and 5.

⁴¹ See S/2001/59, annex II.

⁴² S/2003/412, para. 16.

⁴³ S/2003/771.

Middle East

32. The situation in the Middle East

A. United Nations Disengagement Observer Force

Decisions of 22 May 2000 to 9 December 2003: resolutions 1300 (2000), 1328 (2000), 1351 (2001), 1381 (2001), 1415 (2002), 1451 (2002), 1488 (2003) and 1520 (2003) and statements by the President

During this period, the Security Council held eight meetings on the item,¹ at each of which, unanimously and without debate, it adopted a resolution extending the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) on the basis of the recommendations contained in the reports of the Secretary-General on UNDOF.² In his reports, the Secretary-General stated that the situation in the Israeli-Syrian sector had generally remained calm, without serious incident. He did note increased activity in the Shab'a farms area originating from the area of operation of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon;³ a shooting incident on 8 January 2003, in which one member of the Syrian security forces was killed and another was taken into custody by the Israel Defense Forces; the latter was later released through the intervention of UNDOF;⁴ and the disruption of the

ceasefire on 5 October 2003 by an Israeli air strike on a target north-west of Damascus.⁵ The Secretary-General considered the continuing presence of UNDOF to the area to be essential and recommended that the Security Council extend the mandate of the Force. He also noted that the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic and the Government of Israel had given their assent to the proposed extensions.

In the resolutions adopted during this period,⁶ the Council called on the parties concerned to implement Council resolution 338 (1973); renewed the mandate of UNDOF for subsequent six-month periods, the last expiring on 30 June 2004; and requested the Secretary-General to submit reports on the developments in the situation and the measures taken to implement the resolution.

Complementary statements by the President were also released, in which it was stated that, despite the quiet in the Israeli-Syrian sector, the situation in the Middle East continued to be potentially dangerous and was likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem could be reached.⁷

¹ 4148th meeting, held on 22 May 2000, 4235th meeting, held on 17 November 2000, 4322nd meeting, held on 18 May 2001, 4428th meeting, held on 15 November 2001, 4546th meeting, held on 17 May 2001, 4670th meeting, held on 4 December 2002, 4779th meeting, held on 18 June 2003 and 4889th meeting, held on 9 December 2003. During this period, in addition to those meetings, the Council held a number of meetings in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B. The meetings were held on 21 November 2001 (4425th), 24 May 2002 (4545th), 17 December 2002 (4669th), 11 December 2003 (4778th) and 11 December 2003 (4878th).

² S/2000/459, S/2000/1103, S/2001/499, S/2001/1079, S/2002/542, S/2002/1328, S/2003/655 and S/2003/1148.

³ S/2001/499, S/2001/1079, S/2002/542, S/2002/1328, S/2003/655 and S/2003/1148. See also subsection B, relating to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon.

⁴ S/2003/655.

⁵ S/2003/1148.

⁶ Resolutions 1300 (2000), 1328 (2000), 1351 (2001), 1381 (2001), 1415 (2002), 1451 (2002), 1488 (2003) and 1520 (2003).

⁷ S/PRST/2000/19, S/PRST/2000/36, S/PRST/2001/15, S/PRST/2001/37, S/PRST/2002/18, S/PRST/2002/37, S/PRST/2003/9 and S/PRST/2003/29.

B. United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and developments in the Israel-Lebanon sector

Decisions of 31 January 2000 (4095th meeting): resolution 1288 (2000) and statement by the President

At its 4095th meeting,⁸ on 31 January 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda a report of the Secretary-General dated 17 January 2000 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL).⁹ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the fighting in southern Lebanon had continued and the area remained volatile. He noted that a significant political development in the region had been the resumption, in December 1999, of negotiations between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic as brokered by the United States of America.

At the meeting, the President (United States) drew attention to a letter dated 28 December 1999 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General,¹⁰ in which Lebanon requested the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL, which expired on 31 January 2000, for a further period of six months.

The President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹¹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1288 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months, until 31 July 2000;

Reiterated its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

Re-emphasized the terms of reference and general guidelines of the Force and called upon all parties concerned to fully cooperate with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate;

⁸ During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held a number of meetings in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B. The meetings were held on 21 January 2002 (4455th), 17 July 2002 (4576th), 21 January 2003 (4689th) and 25 July 2003 (4795th).

⁹ S/2000/28, submitted pursuant to resolution 1254 (1999).

¹⁰ S/1999/1284.

¹¹ S/2000/57.

Condemned all acts of violence committed in particular against the Force, and urged the parties to put an end to them;

Encouraged further efficiency and savings provided they did not affect the operational capacity of the Force;

Requested the Secretary-General to continue consultations with the Government of Lebanon and other parties directly concerned with the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.

At the same meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its commitment to the full sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

Asserted that all States should refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State;

Reiterated its full support for the Taif Agreement and for the continued efforts of the Lebanese Government to consolidate peace, national unity and security in the country;

Commended the Lebanese Government for its successful effort to extend its authority in the south of the country in full coordination with UNIFIL;

Expressed concern over the continuing violence in southern Lebanon and urged all parties to exercise restraint; and paid a special tribute to all those who gave their life while serving in UNIFIL.

Decision of 20 April 2000 (4131st meeting): statement by the President

At its 4131st meeting, on 20 April 2000, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 6 April 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹³ in which he reported on his meeting with the Foreign Minister of Israel, held at Geneva on 4 April 2000, concerning Israel's decision to withdraw its troops from southern Lebanon. Also included in the agenda was a letter dated 17 April 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President,¹⁴ informing the Council that Israel had conveyed by formal notification its decision to withdraw its forces present in Lebanon, by July 2000. This was to be carried out in full accordance with Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). The Secretary-General also reported that he had

¹² S/PRST/2000/3.

¹³ S/2000/294.

¹⁴ S/2000/322.

initiated preparations to enable the United Nations to carry out its responsibilities and intended to consult with the parties and interested Member States, including those contributing troops to UNIFIL. He requested that his Special Envoy go to the region as soon as practical.

At the meeting, the President (Canada) drew attention to a letter dated 6 April 2000 from the representative of Lebanon concerning the withdrawal of Israel from southern Lebanon in compliance with Council resolution 425 (1978).¹⁵ The President then made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁶ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the decision of Israel to withdraw its forces present in Lebanon in full accordance with resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and Israel's intention to cooperate fully with the United Nations;

Endorsed the decision of the Secretary-General to initiate preparations to enable the United Nations to carry out its responsibilities under those resolutions;

Shared the view of the Secretary-General that cooperation by all parties concerned would be required to avoid a deterioration of the situation;

Welcomed his decision to send his Special Envoy to the region as soon as practicable;

Looked forward to his report on relevant developments, including the outcome of the consultations with the parties and all interested Member States and his conclusions and recommendations on plans and requirements to implement resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and all other relevant resolutions.

**Decision of 23 May 2000 (4146th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4146th meeting, on 23 May 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 22 May 2000 on the implementation of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and the situation in the Middle East.¹⁷ In his report, the Secretary-General informed the Council that, as a first step for preparations to enable the United Nations to carry out its responsibilities under resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), he had sent his

Special Envoy, together with the Force Commander of UNIFIL and a team of experts, to meet with the Governments of Israel and Lebanon. He also observed that resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) called not only for the withdrawal of Israel from Lebanon but provided for the means, supported by UNIFIL, whereby the withdrawal could lead to enhanced conditions for international peace and security and the return of effective authority of the Government of Lebanon in the area. He noted the short deadline of 7 July 2000 set by the Government of Israel for the completion of the withdrawal of its forces from Lebanon and set out the minimum conditions and requirements which needed to be met if resolution 425 (1978) was to be implemented fully and without conditions and if the United Nations was to be in a position to fulfil its responsibilities. For the Government of Israel he defined the main requirements which would have to be met for the United Nations to confirm that the Israeli withdrawal had been completed in full compliance with resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). From the Governments of Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic he requested full cooperation in the process of identifying on the ground the lines on the Lebanese-Israeli and Lebanese-Syrian boundaries, respectively, to be used for the purpose of confirming the withdrawal. He stressed that only with the support of all parties would it be possible for peace and security to be restored in southern Lebanon.

At the meeting, the President (China) drew the attention of Council members to two letters submitted by the President of the Council of Ministers of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General, dated 15 May 2000¹⁸ and 22 May 2000.¹⁹ The President then made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed and strongly endorsed the report of the Secretary-General of 22 May 2000;

Welcomed also his intention to take all necessary steps for any eventuality and to enable UNIFIL to confirm that a complete

¹⁵ S/2000/295, transmitting a letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lebanon concerning the need to disarm Palestinians in camps in Lebanon.

¹⁶ S/PRST/2000/13.

¹⁷ S/2000/460, submitted pursuant to resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978).

¹⁸ S/2000/443, enclosing documents and a map regarding the position of Lebanon with respect to the Shab'a farms.

¹⁹ S/2000/465, reporting that Israeli helicopters and tanks had opened fire on villagers who had returned to inspect their homes in the villages from which Israeli forces had withdrawn, killing six persons and injuring 22.

²⁰ S/PRST/2000/18.

withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon had taken place in compliance with resolution 425 (1978);

Endorsed his requirement for confirming the compliance of all parties concerned with resolution 425 (1978);

Called on all parties concerned to cooperate fully in implementing the recommendations of the Secretary-General, to exercise utmost restraint and to cooperate with UNIFIL and the United Nations to ensure the full implementation of its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978);

Welcomed the decision of the Secretary-General to send his Special Envoy back to the region immediately to ensure that the requirements were met and that all parties concerned cooperated fully with the United Nations in the complete implementation of its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978).

Decision of 18 June 2000 (4160th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4160th meeting, on 18 June 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 16 June 2000 on the implementation of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978).²¹ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that Israel had met the requirements set out in his report of 22 May 2000 according to resolution 425 (1978), and confirmed that Israeli forces had completed their withdrawal in conformity with the line identified by the United Nations. He noted that Israel's auxiliary force, known as the South Lebanon Army, had been dismantled, and there were no more detainees at Al-Khiam prison. He also observed that the Government of Lebanon had cooperated with the United Nations, quickly re-established its effective authority in the area through the deployment of security forces, and planned to send a force composed of army and internal security personnel upon confirmation of the withdrawal of Israel.

At the meeting, the President (France) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the report of the Secretary-General of 16 June 2000 and endorsed the work done by the United Nations as mandated by the Security Council, including the Secretary-General's conclusion that as of 16 June 2000 Israel had withdrawn its forces from Lebanon in accordance with resolution 425 (1978) and met the requirements defined in the Secretary-General's report of 22 May 2000;

²¹ S/2000/590, submitted pursuant to the report of the Secretary-General of 22 May 2000 (S/2000/460).

²² S/PRST/2000/21.

Stressed that the redeployment of UNIFIL should be conducted in coordination with the Government of Lebanon and with the Lebanese armed forces as stated in paragraph 21 of the report of the Secretary-General of 16 June 2000.

Decision of 27 July 2000 (4177th meeting): resolution 1310 (2000)

At its 4177th meeting, on 27 July 2000, the Council included in its agenda a report of the Secretary-General dated 20 July 2000 on UNIFIL,²³ and a letter dated 24 July 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council.²⁴ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that the Israeli forces had left, the local Lebanese auxiliary had been disbanded, the guns had fallen silent, and that the fighters of the Lebanese resistance had conducted themselves in a controlled manner. He emphasized that while it was an enormous improvement compared to the past, the situation in the Israel-Lebanon sector fell well short of peace, and the potential for serious incidents still existed.

By his letter dated 24 July 2000, the Secretary-General observed that the Israeli authorities had removed all violations of the line of withdrawal and that the deployment of UNIFIL would take place on 26 July 2000 and be immediately followed by the deployment of the Lebanese unit.

At the meeting, the President (Jamaica) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 11 July 2000 from the representative of Lebanon to the Secretary-General.²⁵ The President further drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution²⁶ prepared on the basis of the report of the Secretary-General; it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1310 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Endorsed the understanding, expressed in the report of the Secretary-General of 20 July 2000, that UNIFIL would deploy and function fully throughout its area of operations and that the

²³ S/2000/718, submitted pursuant to resolution 1288 (2000).

²⁴ S/2000/731.

²⁵ S/2000/674, in which Lebanon requested that the Security Council extend the mandate of UNIFIL on the basis of the provisions of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and called for the release of the Lebanese who had been detained for years in Israeli jails "without due process of law".

²⁶ S/2000/741.

Government of Lebanon would strengthen its presence in this area by deploying additional troops and internal security forces;

Decided, in this context, to extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months, until 31 January 2001;

Reiterated its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

Requested the Secretary-General to continue consultations with the Government of Lebanon and other parties directly concerned on the implementation of the resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon;

Decided to review the situation, by early November 2000, and to consider any steps it deemed appropriate regarding UNIFIL, on the basis of the report to be submitted by the Secretary-General, the extent of the deployment of UNIFIL and the actions taken by the Government of Lebanon to restore its effective authority and presence in the area.

Decisions of 30 January 2001 to 30 January 2003: resolutions 1337 (2001), 1365 (2001), 1391 (2002), 1428 (2002) and 1461 (2003)

At its 4267th, 4354th, 4458th, 4593rd and 4696th meetings,²⁷ the Security Council adopted, unanimously and without debate, a resolution extending the mandate of UNIFIL on the basis of the reports of the Secretary-General²⁸ and the requests of Lebanon²⁹ and Israel.³⁰ In his reports, the Secretary-General noted that the general situation in southern Lebanon had remained mostly calm and orderly. Nevertheless, tension between Israel and Lebanon remained high and the relative calm along the Blue Line was an uneasy one. The Secretary-General condemned the violations of the Blue Line over the period that had occurred. These included the launching of hostile attacks across the Blue Line and in the Shab'a farms area by Hizbullah; as well as the recurring violations of the Blue Line by Israeli aircraft. Following the incidents, he stressed that each violation of the Blue Line risked an escalation into confrontation. He determined that UNIFIL had essentially completed two of the three parts of the mandate stipulated in resolution 1310 (2000) and noted that UNIFIL had focused on the last part of the mandate, which was the restoration of peace and

security. Pending a comprehensive peace, UNIFIL had sought at least to maintain the ceasefire along the Blue Line through patrols and observation from fixed positions and close contact with the parties, with a view to correcting violations and preventing the escalation of incidents.

By the resolutions adopted during this period,³¹ the Council renewed the mandate of UNIFIL for subsequent six-month periods, the last expiring on 31 July 2003; reiterated its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries; and condemned all acts of violence and expressed concern over the violations of the withdrawal line. The Council also requested that the Secretary-General continue his consultations with the Government of Lebanon and other parties directly concerned on the implementation of those resolutions and report to the Security Council thereon.

Decision of 31 July 2003 (4802nd meeting): resolution 1496 (2003)

At its 4802nd meeting, on 31 July 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 23 July 2003 on UNIFIL.³² In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the UNIFIL area of operation had generally remained calm since the last report, but that tension between Israel and Lebanon still remained high. On 21 January, a breach of the ceasefire occurred when Hizbullah fired mortar rounds at an Israel Defense Forces position; one Lebanese civilian was killed and two civilians were injured by Israel Defense Forces fire. He stated that the air incursions by Israel had provoked and intimidated the population of Lebanon and were at variance with Israel's otherwise full compliance with resolution 425 (1978). The firing of anti-aircraft weapons by Hizbullah across the Blue Line was a violation and placed the civilians of both Lebanon and Israel at risk, as well as UNIFIL personnel. The Secretary-General noted that the Government of Lebanon had demonstrated its capacity to increase its authority throughout southern Lebanon, complying with resolution 425 (1978).

²⁷ Held on 30 January 2001, 31 July 2001, 28 January 2002, 30 July 2002 and 30 January 2003, respectively.

²⁸ S/2001/66, S/2001/714, S/2002/55, S/2002/746 and S/2003/38.

²⁹ S/2001/14, S/2001/677, S/2001/734, S/2002/40, S/2002/739 and S/2003/36.

³⁰ S/2001/55.

³¹ Resolutions 1337 (2001), 1365 (2001), 1391 (2002), 1428 (2002) and 1461 (2003).

³² S/2003/728, submitted pursuant to resolution 1461 (2003).

At the meeting, the President (Spain) drew the attention of the Council to two letters from the representative of Israel addressed to the Secretary-General, dated 2 June 2003³³ and 24 July 2003.³⁴ The President further drew attention to two letters from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General, dated 2 July 2003³⁵ and 9 July 2003.³⁶

³³ S/2003/603, noting that the Government of Lebanon had failed to comply with its international obligations under resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 1310 (2000) and 1337 (2001) to eliminate terrorism from its territory, namely ending the ongoing violations of the Blue Line by the terrorist organization Hizbullah.

³⁴ S/2003/758, reporting that Hizbullah had fired missiles across the Blue Line on 21 July 2003, resulting in three injured civilians; stating that the Government of Lebanon had not satisfied its obligations under the norms of international law and Security Council resolutions; and alleging that the Government of Lebanon had relinquished control of southern Lebanon to Hizbullah.

³⁵ S/2003/685, requesting an extension of the mandate of UNIFIL for a further interim period of six months.

³⁶ S/2003/698, transmitting a statistical breakdown of alleged Israeli violations of Lebanese sovereignty during the month of June 2003 and stating that such acts posed a threat to the stability of the region by promoting a climate of tension.

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by France;³⁷ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1496 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of UNIFIL until 31 January 2004; and reiterated its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

Called on the parties to ensure that UNIFIL was accorded full freedom of movement in the discharge of its mandate throughout its area of operation as outlined in the Secretary-General's report; reiterated its call on the parties to continue to fulfil the commitments they had given to respect fully the withdrawal line identified by the United Nations, to exercise utmost restraint and to cooperate fully with the United Nations and UNIFIL;

Condemned all acts of violence, expressed great concern about the serious breaches and the air, sea and land violations of the withdrawal line, and urged the parties to put an end to those violations and to abide scrupulously by their obligation to respect the safety of UNIFIL and other United Nations personnel;

Requested the Secretary-General to continue consultations with the Government of Lebanon and other parties directly concerned on the implementation of the resolution and to report thereon to the Council before the end of the present mandate as well as on the activities of UNIFIL and the tasks carried out by the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization.

³⁷ S/2003/778.

33. The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

Decision of 7 October 2000 (4205th meeting): resolution 1322 (2000)

By letters dated 2 October 2000 to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Iraq, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States and on behalf of the members of the League of Arab States,¹ and the representative of Malaysia, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Islamic States and on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement,² requested an urgent meeting of the Council to discuss the Israeli aggression against Haram al-Sharif in occupied Jerusalem and subsequent wave of Israeli

attacks against Palestinian civilians in the occupied Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem. Similarly, in a letter of the same date, the representative of South Africa, in his capacity as Chair of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement, also requested an urgent meeting of the Council to respond to the critical situation in occupied East Jerusalem, other parts of the occupied Palestinian territory and parts of Israel.³

By a letter dated 2 October 2000 to the President of the Council, the Permanent Observer of Palestine called for an immediate meeting of the Council to consider the Israeli aggression against Haram al-Sharif

¹ S/2000/928.

² S/2000/929 and S/2000/935.

committed on 28 September 2000 and the continuing use of excessive lethal force against Palestinian civilians. He stated that this constituted a grave breach of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 1949, and called for Council action in fulfilment of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.⁴

At its 4204th meeting,⁵ held on 3, 4 and 5 October 2000 in response to the requests contained in the above-mentioned letters, the Council included the letters in its agenda. The President (Namibia) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 29 September 2000 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine,⁶ in which was reported that the “provocative” visit to Haram al-Sharif, the third holiest site of Islam, by the leader of Israel’s Likud party, Ariel Sharon, had aggravated existing tensions, resulting in serious clashes between Palestinian civilians and Israeli security forces, and proving detrimental to the ongoing Middle East peace process. The observer asked the Council to condemn the acts of violence by the Israeli security forces and compel those forces to withdraw from Haram al-Sharif and from the rest of East Jerusalem as well as from other Palestinian cities.

At the meeting, statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam and Yemen, as well as the Permanent Observer of Palestine, the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and the Permanent Observers for the League of Arab States (LAS), the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) and the Organization of African Unity.

The representative of Palestine stated that the “provocative” visit of Ariel Sharon had led to massive

protests by Palestinian civilians as well as by Arabs in Israel, which had been severely repressed by Israeli security forces, perhaps in order to force the Palestinian leadership to accept Israel’s demands regarding the peace process. He stressed that the Security Council had a very specific responsibility to put an immediate end to Israel’s brutal campaign and to the occupying Power’s violation of international law, including the Fourth Geneva Convention and relevant Security Council resolutions, as well as of the commitments undertaken in the peace accords.⁷

The representative of Israel commented that the escalation of hostilities had been initiated by the Palestinians through a series of earlier incidents. He added that during Ariel Sharon’s visit live fire emanated from the crowds and Israeli security only returned fire when absolutely necessary. Overall, he said that responsibility for the escalation of violence rested with the Palestinian Authority, as Palestinian security forces had violated agreements with Israel regarding the use of weapons.⁸

During the debate, speakers unanimously affirmed their support for the peace process, recognized that violence was weakening the process and called on the parties to exercise restraint. They expressed their hope that a meeting scheduled in the next few days between the President of the Palestinian Authority, Yasser Arafat, and the Prime Minister of Israel, Ehud Barak, in Paris and Sharm el-Sheikh would produce positive results.

Most speakers regretted the use of force against the Palestinians and reminded Israel of its obligation to respect the Fourth Geneva Convention. However, a large number of speakers openly denounced Israel’s violation of international humanitarian law,⁹ and

⁷ S/PV.4204, pp. 3-4.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

⁹ S/PV.4204, p. 7 (France); p. 10 (Malaysia); p. 15 (Tunisia); and p. 16 (Namibia); S/PV.4204 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Pakistan); p. 6 (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People); p. 8 (Kuwait); p. 9 (Qatar); p. 11 (Bahrain); p. 13 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 15 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 16 (Saudi Arabia); p. 17 (Cuba); p. 18 (Yemen); p. 19 (Iraq); p. 20 (Mauritania); and p. 22 (League of Arab States (LAS)); S/PV.4204 (Resumption 2), p. 3 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); p. 4 (Sudan); p. 6 (Oman); p. 7 (United Arab Emirates); p. 10 (Lebanon); and p. 14 (Malta).

³ S/2000/934.

⁴ S/2000/930.

⁵ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41 of the Charter.

⁶ S/2000/921.

stressed that the use of force against the Palestinians had been excessive and disproportionate.¹⁰ A majority of speakers also considered Ariel Sharon's visit a provocation, undermining the peace process, and many condemned it.¹¹

Many speakers also called for the implementation of all Council resolutions on the Israeli/Palestinian conflict, in particular resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) regarding the withdrawal of Israeli occupation from all Arab territory, and reaffirmed their support for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.¹²

Several speakers called for the establishment of an international commission or appropriate inquiry to establish facts of the events and determine responsibility.¹³ The representative of the United States

said that his country would chair a meeting of Israeli and Palestinian security officials for the purpose of fact-finding as soon as conditions permitted.¹⁴ The representative of Egypt called on the Council to investigate the events that had occurred.¹⁵

A number of speakers expressed their views on how the Council should respond. A few of them specifically evoked the Council's responsibility to put an end to Israeli actions and protect Palestinian civilians.¹⁶ Others emphasized that the Council should create an atmosphere conducive to the restoration of the peace process.¹⁷ Some requested a series of specific measures, including that the Council guarantee the non-entry by Israeli forces into Haram al-Sharif and Palestinians' freedom to carry out religious practices in Haram al-Sharif; condemn Ariel Sharon's provocation and Israeli actions in the Palestinian territories; hold the Israeli government accountable and call for compensation to Palestinian civilians for their losses; call on Israel to respect international humanitarian law; put pressure on Israel to engage seriously in the peace process; force Israel to withdraw from all occupied territories; call for an international investigation; reaffirm that Al-Quds is part of the Palestinian territories occupied in 1967, and adopt the draft resolution circulated by the Non-Aligned Movement.¹⁸

The representative of Kuwait made a specific reference to Israeli violations against Palestinian children, which were in contradiction with Council resolution 1261 (1999) on children and armed conflict.¹⁹

¹⁰ S/PV.4204, p. 7 (France); p. 8 (Bangladesh); p. 9 (Netherlands); p. 10 (Malaysia); p. 11 (Russian Federation, Ukraine); p. 12 (Argentina); p. 13 (Jamaica); p. 14 (China); p. 15 (Canada, Tunisia); p. 16 (Namibia); and p. 19 (South Africa); S/PV.4204 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Algeria); p. 5 (Pakistan); p. 6 (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People); p. 8 (Kuwait); p. 10 (Bahrain); p. 11 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 15 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 17 (Cuba); p. 21 (LAS); and p. 22 (Turkey); S/PV.4204 (Resumption 2), p. 4 (Indonesia); p. 9 (Morocco); p. 11 (Nepal, Viet Nam); p. 12 (Organization of African Unity); and p. 13 (Spain).

¹¹ S/PV.4204, p. 7 (France); p. 9 (Netherlands); p. 10 (Malaysia); p. 11 (Russian Federation); p. 14 (China); p. 15 (Tunisia); p. 16 (Namibia); p. 17 (Egypt); and p. 19 (South Africa); S/PV.4204 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Algeria); p. 4 (Pakistan); p. 5 (Jordan); p. 6 (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People); p. 8 (Kuwait); p. 9 (Qatar); p. 10 (Bahrain); p. 11 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 20 (Mauritania); p. 14 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 16 (Saudi Arabia); p. 17 (Cuba); p. 18 (Yemen); p. 19 (Iraq); and p. 21 (LAS); S/PV.4204 (Resumption 2), p. 4 (Sudan, Indonesia); p. 6 (Oman, United Arab Emirates); p. 8 (Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC)); p. 9 (Morocco); p. 10 (Lebanon); and p. 13 (Spain).

¹² In General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are defined as the right to self-determination without external interference; the right to national independence and sovereignty; and the right of Palestinians to return to their homes and property from which they had been displaced and uprooted.

¹³ S/PV.4204, p. 8 (European Union, Bangladesh); p. 16 (Tunisia, Mali); S/PV.4204 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Kuwait); p. 10 (Qatar); p. 17 (Saudi Arabia); p. 20 (Mauritania); p. 21 (LAS); and p. 22 (Turkey);

S/PV.4204 (Resumption 2), p. 7 (United Arab Emirates); p. 11 (Nepal); p. 13 (Spain); and p. 14 (Malta).

¹⁴ S/PV.4204, p. 7.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹⁶ S/PV.4204, p. 10 (Malaysia); p. 15 (Tunisia); and p. 18 (Egypt); S/PV.4204 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Kuwait); p. 13 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 15 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 16 (Saudi Arabia); p. 18 (Yemen); and p. 21 (LAS); S/PV.4204 (Resumption 2), p. 3 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); p. 4 (Sudan); and p. 10 (Lebanon).

¹⁷ S/PV.4204, p. 7 (United States); p. 11 (Russian Federation); p. 15 (Canada); and pp. 15-16 (Tunisia); S/PV.4204 (Resumption 2), p. 10 (Lebanon).

¹⁸ S/PV.4204, p. 18 (Egypt); S/PV.4204 (Resumption 1), pp. 8-9 (Kuwait); p. 10 (Qatar); and pp. 13-14 (Syrian Arab Republic); S/PV.4204 (Resumption 2), p. 4 (Sudan).

¹⁹ S/PV.4204 (Resumption 1), p. 8.

The representatives of Iraq and Cuba stated that the Council was one-sided on this issue and therefore it was unable to fulfil its responsibility to maintain international peace and security.²⁰

Finally, the representative of Algeria complained that Council members during previously held consultations had discussed at length whether to meet in public and whether to invite non-Council members to speak. He complained that there were attempts to restrict access to the Council despite the fact that any State had the right to speak in a Council debate.²¹

Towards the end of the debate, taking the floor a second time, the representative of Israel emphasized that his country was not solely responsible for the current situation. He also strongly refuted contentions that the visit of Ariel Sharon had been part of a plot by the Israeli government to assert sovereignty over Temple Mount. He said that Temple Mount was the foremost holy place in Judaism and that the visit had been in compliance with the principles of Israeli democracy.²²

The representative of Palestine contended that recent attempts to resume the peace process through meetings between the two sides in Paris and in Sharm el-Sheikh had not led anywhere in part because Israel had refused the creation of a commission of inquiry. He added that the exercise of Israeli democracy could not be used as an excuse on occupied land. He deplored the fact that Israel had not accepted responsibility in the killing of innocent civilians and that, consequently, a commission of inquiry needed to be established to reveal the truth.²³

At the 4205th meeting, on 7 October 2000, a draft resolution submitted by Bangladesh, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mali, Namibia, Tunisia and Ukraine²⁴ was put to the vote. It was adopted by 14 votes, with 1 abstention (United States), as resolution 1322 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Deplored the provocation carried out at Haram al-Sharif in Jerusalem on 28 September 2000, and the subsequent

violence there and at other Holy Places, as well as in other areas throughout the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, resulting in over 80 Palestinian deaths and many other casualties;

Called upon Israel, the occupying Power, to abide scrupulously by its legal obligations and its responsibilities under the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949;

Called for the immediate cessation of violence, and for all necessary steps to be taken to ensure that violence ceased, that new provocative actions were avoided, and that the situation returned to normality in a way which promoted the prospects for the Middle East peace process;

Stressed the importance of establishing a mechanism for a speedy and objective inquiry into the tragic events of the last few days with the aim of preventing their repetition, and welcomed any efforts in this regard; and called for the immediate resumption of negotiations within the Middle East peace process on its agreed basis with the aim of achieving an early final settlement between the Israeli and Palestinian sides.

**Decision of 18 December 2000 (4248th meeting):
rejection of a draft resolution**

By a letter dated 21 November 2000, the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States, stated that the continuing escalation by Israeli forces of their aggression against the Gaza Strip constituted collective punishment against Palestinians and threatened the stability of the region, and therefore requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the protection of Palestinians.²⁵

At its 4231st meeting,^{26,27} held on 22 November 2000 in response to that request, the Council included the above-mentioned letter in its agenda. Statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Cuba (in his national capacity and in his capacity as Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People), Egypt, Israel, Jordan, the Libyan Arab

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 17 (Cuba); and p. 19 (Iraq).

²¹ S/PV.4204 (Resumption 1), p. 3. For more information, see chap. I, part I, with regard to rules 1-5 of the provisional rules of procedure; and chap. III, part I, with regard to the basis of invitations to participate in the proceedings.

²² S/PV.4204 (Resumption 2), pp. 14-15.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

²⁴ S/2000/963.

²⁵ S/2000/1109.

²⁶ At the 4217th and 4218th meetings, both held in private on 10 November 2000, the Council members had constructive discussions with the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization and President of the Palestinian Authority, Yasser Arafat, and with the representative of Israel, respectively.

²⁷ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XII, part II, sect. A, case 18, with regard to Article 24 of the Charter.

Jamahiriya (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and South Africa (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement) and the Permanent Observer of Palestine.

The President of the Council (Netherlands) drew attention to a letter from the Permanent Observer of Palestine dated 20 November 2000,²⁸ denouncing the massive Israeli bombardments of Gaza that began on that date, emphasizing that Palestine had been calling on the Council since 25 October 2000 to end the Israeli campaign and protect Palestinians, and deploring the fact that the Council had not acted since the adoption of resolution 1322 (2000).

In his statement, the representative of Palestine described the serious escalation of violence by Israel, stating that those actions were in contravention of the Fourth Geneva Convention as well as previous Council resolutions. He denounced Israel for continuing the policy of settlements, thereby imposing a stalemate on the peace process. Israel had also tried to back out of the Sharm el-Sheikh agreement and had impeded the work of the fact-finding committee.²⁹ He then pleaded for the establishment of a United Nations observer force to provide international protection for Palestinian civilians under occupation, regardless of Israel's approval, and said that Yasser Arafat had already met with the Council and requested a force of 2,000 observers. He then welcomed a Council agreement

reached on 17 November 2000 to entrust the Secretary-General with conducting consultations on this issue.³⁰

The representative of Israel described a series of terrorist bombings which had killed Israeli civilians. He deplored the fact that Yasser Arafat had refused the peace proposed to him at Camp David in July 2000 and raised doubts about Palestinians' willingness to maintain their commitment to restrain terrorist elements. He also said that the international community was biased as it never expressed outrage at Palestinian violations. Finally, he emphasized that there was no need for an international force and that in calling for it, the Palestinians were merely seeking to depart from the bilateral track mandated by the Oslo agreement.³¹

During the meeting, a number of speakers openly deplored the violence committed by both sides,³² and most speakers urged the parties to end the current violence and return to peace negotiations. Some particularly emphasized the need for the parties to implement the agreement reached at the Sharm el-Sheikh summit.³³ While condemning the targeting of civilians on both sides, the representative of Egypt also said that the presence of Israeli settlers on Palestinian territory and the Israeli economic blockade imposed on the Palestinians were making the situation tenser and he called upon the Council to adopt a draft resolution to be introduced by the Non-Aligned Movement.³⁴

The deliberations also focused on following up on previous Council decisions, in particular implementation of resolution 1322 (2000), which was emphasized by a few speakers.³⁵ They also unanimously brought their support to the fact-finding committee mandated in resolution 1322 (2000) and

²⁸ S/2000/1107.

²⁹ For more details about the Sharm el-Sheikh summit meeting of the Prime Minister of Israel, Ehud Barak, and the President of the Palestinian Authority, Yasser Arafat, on 17 October 2000, and the agreement reached there, see the letter dated 17 October 2000 from the representative of the United States to the Secretary-General (S/2000/1001), transmitting the statement made by the President of the United States on the conclusion of the summit. The leaders had agreed that (1) both sides would issue public statements calling for an end to the violence and take concrete measures to immediately return to the situation which existed prior to the current crisis; (2) the United States would develop with the Israelis and Palestinians in consultation with the United Nations a committee of fact-finding on the recent violent events; and (3) that the United States would consult with the parties within two weeks about how to move forward. On 20 October 2000, the Foreign Minister of Israel addressed a letter to the Secretary-General (S/2000/1007) regarding Israel's compliance with the understanding reached at Sharm el-Sheikh.

³⁰ S/PV.4231, pp. 2-5.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 8 (United States); p. 9 (Russian Federation); p. 11 (Bangladesh); p. 12 (United Kingdom); p. 15 (Argentina, Ukraine); p. 17 (Canada, Netherlands); p. 20 (South Africa on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement); and p. 21 (Egypt).

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (United States); p. 10 (France on behalf of the European Union, Mali); p. 12 (United Kingdom, Jamaica); p. 15 (Argentina); and p. 17 (Canada).

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12 (Jamaica); p. 13 (Tunisia); p. 15 (Ukraine); p. 20 (South Africa on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement); and p. 23 (Cuba in the capacity of Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People).

presided over by United States Senator George Mitchell, and stressed the need for its speedy start. The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya stated that the conclusions reached by the committee should be submitted to the International Criminal Court.³⁶

Almost all speakers supported the efforts of the Secretary-General to consult with the parties and explore the proposal to deploy a United Nations observer or protection force, in particular the four priority objectives that he had defined at the Council meeting on 17 November 2000. The representative of Namibia pointed out that the establishment of an observer force was in line with Council resolution 904 (1994).³⁷ However, several speakers stressed the need for the consent of both sides.³⁸ The representative of the United States added that the parties had to come to an agreement on their own and then have the Council endorse it if necessary.³⁹ The representative of the Netherlands insisted that the activities of the Council must not be allowed to interfere with the work of the Secretary-General and of the fact-finding commission.⁴⁰

At its 4248th meeting,⁴¹ on 18 December 2000, statements were made by all Council members as well as the representative of Israel and the Permanent Observer of Palestine. The President of the Council (Russian Federation) drew attention to a letter from the Permanent Observer of Palestine dated 18 December 2000 requesting participation in the meeting.⁴² He then said that the Council had before it a draft resolution submitted by Bangladesh, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mali, Namibia and Tunisia,⁴³ by which the Council would

express its determination to establish a United Nations force of military and police observers in the occupied Palestinian territories, with the aim of contributing to implementation of the Sharm el-Sheikh agreement, the cessation of violence and enhancing security for Palestinian civilians.

At the outset, the representative of Israel expressed satisfaction at the recent renewal of contacts between Israel and the Palestinians, and their upcoming meeting in Washington, D.C. He then called the draft resolution a blatant attempt to abuse the goodwill of the international community and obscure the strategic choice made by the Palestinians. He stressed this resolution would send a message to the Palestinians that there was no need to negotiate with Israel. He added that a protection force was unnecessary because the Palestinian Authority had the means to protect its civilians, and he strongly urged Council members not to support the draft resolution.⁴⁴

The representative of Namibia, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, pointed to the urgent need to establish a protection force for Palestinians because of the continued violence. He believed that Council action was not subject to peace negotiations, and that a United Nations force would in fact be beneficial to the peace process. Finally, he said that the non-aligned caucus had had useful exchanges with France and the United Kingdom during negotiations on the draft resolution.⁴⁵ Most of these points were echoed by the sponsors of the draft resolution, with the representatives of China and the Ukraine also giving their support. The representative of the Ukraine, however, recognized that the deployment of such a force would be impossible without the cooperation of Israel.⁴⁶

Other members argued that the draft resolution was ill-timed, in the light of the ongoing efforts of the Secretary-General to have both parties accept the force and of the resumption of bilateral negotiations.⁴⁷ The representative of the Netherlands, in particular, expressed disappointment that the Council was being forced to vote on this text.⁴⁸ The representative of the

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

³⁷ By resolution 904 (1994), para. 3, the Council called for measures to be taken to guarantee the safety and protection of the Palestinian civilians throughout the occupied territory, including, inter alia, a temporary international or foreign presence, which was provided for in the Declaration of Principles (S/26560), within the context of the ongoing peace process.

³⁸ S/PV.4231, p. 8 (United States); p. 12 (United Kingdom); p. 16 (Malaysia); and p. 17 (Canada).

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

⁴¹ At the 4233rd and 4234th meetings, both held in private on 27 November 2000, the Council members had constructive discussions with the Ministerial Committee of the OIC and with the representative of Israel, respectively.

⁴² S/2000/1206.

⁴³ S/2000/1171.

⁴⁴ S/PV.4248, pp. 2-4.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7 (Malaysia); pp. 7-8 (China); p. 8 (Ukraine); p. 8 (Mali); and pp. 9-10 (Jamaica).

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (France); p. 7 (Netherlands); pp. 8-9 (Argentina); p. 10 (United Kingdom); pp. 10-11 (Canada); and p. 11 (United States, Russian Federation).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

United Kingdom said that his country remained ready to engage on a proposal that could find consensus.⁴⁹ The representative of the United States stressed that his country would have cast a veto if the draft resolution had had a chance of being adopted.⁵⁰

The representative of Palestine deplored the fact that the Council had been unable to protect Palestinian civilians. He pointed out that, although the sponsors of the draft resolution had been flexible and agreed to make changes in the text to gather a consensus, the position of Council members had not changed. He had therefore asked the sponsors to submit the draft resolution to a vote regardless of the result of the voting, in order to show the Council its responsibilities. He added that Israel's approval should never be a precondition for the Council's assumption of its responsibilities.⁵¹

The draft resolution was put to the vote and received 8 votes in favour (Bangladesh, China, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mali, Namibia, Tunisia, Ukraine) and 7 abstentions (Argentina, Canada, France, Netherlands, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, United States), and was not adopted, owing to the failure to obtain the required number of votes.

**Decision of 27 March 2001 (4305th meeting):
rejection of a draft resolution**

By a letter dated 13 March 2001,⁵² the representative of the United Arab Emirates, on behalf of the Group of Arab States, requested a meeting of the Council to examine the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories following the escalation of Israel's repressive tactics against the Palestinians, and to consider the establishment of a United Nations protection force.

At its 4295th meeting,⁵³ held on 15 and 19 March 2001 in response to that request, the Council included the above-mentioned letter in its agenda. Statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Egypt,

Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, New Zealand, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union), the United Arab Emirates and Yemen, the Permanent Observer of Palestine, the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the Permanent Observer of the OIC and the Deputy Permanent Observer of LAS.⁵⁴

The President of the Council (Ukraine) drew attention to two letters, dated 9 March and 12 March 2001, from the Permanent Observer of Palestine,⁵⁵ refuting Israel's allegations that the Palestinian Authority was violating commitments made in 1993 to renounce terrorism, denouncing the deteriorating situation, and calling for a meeting of the Council. The President also drew attention to a letter dated 14 March 2001 from the representative of Malaysia on behalf of the Group of Islamic States,⁵⁶ urging the Council to set up a force to protect Palestinian civilians.

In his statement, the representative of Palestine deplored the increasing Israeli campaign against the Palestinians in violation of resolution 1322 (2000) including, inter alia, the excessive use of force; deliberate killings of civilians in violation of international humanitarian law; destruction of the Palestinian economy; restrictions in the movement of persons and goods; collective punishment; and the non-transfer of taxes collected for the Palestinian Authority. He also stressed that the confiscation of territory and the building of settlements had continued even after the start of the peace process. He insisted that the Council had a responsibility to stop violence and save the peace process. He mentioned that the latest round of peace talks at Taba, Egypt, between the two sides had achieved reasonable progress, and regretted that the new Israeli government was now reluctant to negotiate from the point reached then, and he expressed alarm at Israel's preference for the

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 10.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 11.

⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 12-13.

⁵² S/2001/216.

⁵³ At the 4292nd and 4293rd meetings, both held in private on 14 March 2001, Council members had constructive discussions with the Permanent Observer of Palestine following a request made on 14 March in a letter to the Council (S/2001/222) and with the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel, respectively.

⁵⁴ The representative of Belgium was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

⁵⁵ S/2001/209 and S/2001/226.

⁵⁶ S/2001/231.

negotiation of interim arrangements, as opposed to focusing on a final settlement.⁵⁷

The representative of Israel again rejected the proposal for a United Nations protection force, contending that the presence of United Nations observers would create an incentive for the Palestinians to continue the violence. He noted that his country's repressive policies were in response to terrorism and that only a concerted effort to control Palestinian violence would enable Israel to work again to improve the quality of their mutual coexistence. Finally, he emphasized that the Council should not intervene but should rather support the parties in their quest for peace.⁵⁸

A majority of speakers strongly rejected Israel's policies and called on Israel to immediately put an end to them.⁵⁹ Almost all speakers demanded the end of the economic blockade against the Palestinian people, and a few specifically requested the international community to provide humanitarian and economic assistance to the Palestinians.⁶⁰

Speakers unanimously recognized that the renewed violence was jeopardizing the peace process and that its resumption was crucial, although the representative of Algeria pointed out that the peace process appeared unlikely to resume any time soon.⁶¹ Some specifically urged both parties to put an end to hostilities.⁶² Other speakers encouraged the Secretary-

General to continue supporting the peace process,⁶³ and emphasized that it was the role of the Council to think about proposals that would facilitate contacts between the parties, including confidence-building measures.⁶⁴

Most speakers called on the Council to reconsider the proposal to establish a protection force in the occupied territories which had been rejected by the Council in December 2000, and for the adoption of a Non-Aligned Movement draft resolution currently circulating.⁶⁵ They also argued that the death of Palestinians could have been prevented if a protection force had been established. The representative of Egypt stated in particular that Israel had escalated its brutal treatment of Palestinians since the new government took office, under the pretext of security threats. He mentioned a recent report of the Human Rights Commission on human rights violations in Palestinian territories⁶⁶ and urged the Council to consider the recommendations contained in it.⁶⁷ In the same vein, the representative of South Africa recalled that the United Nations Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process, in a report issued in February 2001, had found that repressive measures against the Palestinians had had dramatic consequences for the economy and increased the level of poverty.⁶⁸ Three

⁵⁷ S/PV.4295, pp. 3-6.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-6 (Palestine); p. 10 (United Arab Emirates); and p. 11 (Tunisia); S/PV.4295 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (France); p. 10 (Mali); p. 17 (Egypt); p. 19 (Jordan); p. 20 (Yemen, Saudi Arabia); p. 23 (Malaysia); p. 24 (Bahrain); p. 25 (Algeria); pp. 27-28 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); p. 29 (Qatar); p. 32 (Sudan); p. 33 (South Africa); p. 34 (Kuwait); and p. 35 (Iraq); S/PV.4295 (Resumption 2), p. 4 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 6 (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People); p. 8 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 12 (Lebanon, OIC); and p. 14 (LAS).

⁶⁰ S/PV.4295 (Resumption 1), pp. 10-11 (Mali); p. 13 (Bangladesh); p. 14 (Jamaica); p. 26 (Japan); and p. 30 (Sweden); S/PV.4295 (Resumption 2), p. 7 (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People).

⁶¹ S/PV.4295 (Resumption 1), p. 25.

⁶² S/PV.4295 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (France); p. 5 (China); p. 6 (United States, United Kingdom); p. 7 (Norway); p. 9 (Colombia); p. 12 (Singapore); p. 14 (Jamaica);

p. 15 (Ukraine); p. 26 (Japan); p. 30 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union); and p. 33 (South Africa on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement); S/PV.4295 (Resumption 2), p. 4 (New Zealand).

⁶³ S/PV.4295 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (France, China); p. 5 (United States); p. 7 (Norway); and p. 9 (Ireland).

⁶⁴ S/PV.4295 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (France); pp. 6-7 (United Kingdom); p. 7 (Norway); p. 8 (Ireland); p. 10 (Mali); and p. 11 (Mauritius).

⁶⁵ S/PV.4295, p. 10 (United Arab Emirates); and p. 11 (Tunisia); S/PV.4295 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Ireland); p. 10 (Colombia, Mali); p. 11 (Mauritius); p. 12 (Singapore); p. 14 (Jamaica); p. 18 (Egypt); p. 19 (Jordan); p. 21 (Yemen); p. 22 (Saudi Arabia, Malaysia); p. 24 (Bahrain); p. 25 (Algeria); p. 28 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); p. 29 (Qatar); p. 32 (Sudan); p. 33 (South Africa); and p. 34 (Kuwait); S/PV.4295 (Resumption 2); p. 3 (Pakistan); p. 5 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 7 (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People); p. 9 (Islamic Republic of Iran, Cuba); p. 10 (Mauritania); p. 11 (Morocco); p. 12 (Lebanon); p. 13 (OIC); p. 14 (LAS); and p. 15 (Indonesia).

⁶⁶ E/CN.4/2001/121, dated 16 March 2001.

⁶⁷ S/PV.4295 (Resumption 1), p. 17.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.

speakers stressed that Council resolutions on the protection of civilians in armed conflict needed to be implemented.⁶⁹

While almost all speakers were in favour of the proposal to establish a protection force in the occupied territories, some reiterated the argument made in December that preliminary support from both Israel and the Palestinians was necessary.⁷⁰ France in particular stated that the mechanism would be good to ease tensions, but could be effective only if it was part of a larger goal to reduce violence and resume negotiations.⁷¹ The representative of Singapore suggested that the Council could task the Secretary-General to consult with the parties to determine an implementation framework. He also suggested the Council dispatch a mission to the region in order to continue useful dialogue with the parties.⁷²

The representative of the United States insisted that the Council's role was to encourage the parties to end violence and restore confidence, especially since both sides said they wanted to resume dialogue. He stated that the establishment of a protection force was inopportune at that time and asserted that his country would ensure that the Council did not adopt a resolution that lacked the support of both parties.⁷³

Many speakers made reference to the private meeting of the Council held the previous day with the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel,⁷⁴ and welcomed Israel's new engagement with the Council,⁷⁵ as well as Israel's promise to ease economic restrictions on Palestinians.⁷⁶

At the 4305th meeting,⁷⁷ held on 27 March 2001, the President (Ukraine) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Bangladesh, Colombia, Jamaica, Mali, Mauritius, Singapore and Tunisia,⁷⁸ in which the Council, *inter alia*, would urge the resumption of negotiations within the Middle East peace process; express grave concern at Israeli settlement activities; call on the parties to end the closures of Palestinian territories and take additional confidence-building measures; request the Secretary-General to consult with the parties on steps to implement the resolution; and express its readiness to set up an observer force to protect Palestinian civilians. He also drew attention to two letters, dated 26 March and 27 March 2001, from the representative of Israel,⁷⁹ detailing terrorist acts recently perpetrated by Palestinians and calling on the President of the Palestinian Authority to restore security. At the meeting, the representatives of Bangladesh, China, France, Ireland, Norway, the Russian Federation, Ukraine, the United Kingdom and the United States made statements, as did the representative of Israel and the Permanent Observer of Palestine.

The draft resolution was put to the vote and received 9 votes in favour (Bangladesh, China, Colombia, Jamaica, Mali, Mauritius, Russian Federation, Singapore, Tunisia) to 1 against (United States), with 4 abstentions (France, Ireland, Norway, United Kingdom) and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member. The representative of Ukraine did not participate in the voting.

During the meeting, some Member States expressed support for the draft resolution,⁸⁰ while others said they agreed with the idea of a protection force in the region but explained that they had to abstain because unanimity had not been achieved on the text and the timing of the vote was therefore not appropriate. They however emphasized their readiness to continue working on the issue.⁸¹

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 12 (Singapore); p. 15 (Jamaica); and p. 24 (Bahrain).

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (Russian Federation); p. 4 (France, China); p. 5 (United States); p. 6 (United Kingdom); p. 7 (Norway); p. 16 (Ukraine); and p. 31 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union).

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

⁷⁴ 4293rd meeting.

⁷⁵ S/PV.4295 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Ireland); p. 12 (Singapore); p. 13 (Bangladesh); and p. 16 (Ukraine).

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Ireland).

⁷⁷ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. IV, part IV, sect. B, case 3, with regard to voluntary abstention, non-participation or absence in relation to Article 27 (3) of the Charter.

⁷⁸ S/2001/270.

⁷⁹ S/2001/278 and S/2001/280.

⁸⁰ S/PV.4305, pp. 3-4 (Bangladesh); p. 5 (China); and p. 7 (Russian Federation).

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (France); p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 8

The representative of Bangladesh stated that during negotiations European members of the Council had presented their own draft resolution, attempting to broaden the scope of the protection force in order to obtain more support. He added that, although discussions on that text were ongoing, the intention had been to adopt a resolution before the Arab summit to be held on 27 and 28 March 2001 so that the Secretary-General could start consultations with the parties; hence the decision by the Non-Aligned Movement to put its own draft to a vote.⁸²

The representative of the United States stressed that the draft resolution should not have been put to a vote because there had been no consensus. He also said that his country opposed it because it was unbalanced and unworkable, owing to a lack of agreement between the parties.⁸³

The representative of Israel reaffirmed his country's opposition to the establishment of a United Nations force in the region,⁸⁴ and the representative of Palestine expressed disappointment at the Council's failure to end the "current tragedy".⁸⁵

Deliberations of 20 and 21 August 2001 (4357th meeting)

The Council held its 4357th meeting on 20 and 21 August 2001 in response to a letter dated 15 August 2001 from the representatives of Mali and Qatar on behalf of the Group of Islamic States,⁸⁶ requesting an urgent Council meeting to consider the deteriorating situation in the occupied Palestinian territories following Israel's occupation and destruction of Palestinian buildings and killing of Palestinian civilians. The letter was included in the agenda.

During the meeting all Council members made statements, as did the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Belgium (on behalf of the European Union), Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa (on

(Norway); and p. 9 (Ireland).

⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁸⁶ S/2001/797.

behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), the Sudan (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Turkey and Yemen, the Permanent Observer of Palestine, the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the Deputy Permanent Observer of LAS and the Deputy Permanent Observer of OIC.

The President of the Council (Colombia) drew attention to four letters from the Permanent Observer of Palestine,⁸⁷ denouncing new crimes committed by Israel in violation of previous peace agreements between the two sides,⁸⁸ and calling on the Council to intervene and hold Israeli officials accountable for violations of international humanitarian law. He also drew attention to five letters from the representative of Israel,⁸⁹ drawing attention to Palestinian terrorist acts committed against Israelis; calling on the Council to condemn those; deploring the fact that the Palestinian Authority had made no effort to respect the ceasefire and security plan proposed on 1 June 2001 by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, George Tenet; and explaining that Israel conducted pre-emptive strikes against terrorist targets that had led to the death of civilians because the targets were situated within civilian areas. He further drew attention to two letters from the representative of Belgium,⁹⁰ transmitting European Union statements on the escalation of violence, urging the parties to quickly implement the recommendations in the report of the Sharm el-Sheikh Fact-finding Committee (the Mitchell report)⁹¹ and exhorting the Palestinian Authority to intensify its efforts against terrorism.

⁸⁷ S/2001/754, S/2001/783, S/2001/785 and S/2001/798.

The letters were dated 31 July, 13 August, 14 August and 16 August 2001, respectively.

⁸⁸ See Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements (S/26560), annex.

⁸⁹ S/2001/768, S/2001/770, S/2001/775, S/2001/780 and S/2001/787. The letters were dated 6 August, 7 August, 8 August, 9 August and 13 August 2001, respectively.

⁹⁰ S/2001/790 and S/2001/791. The letters were dated 8 August and 10 August 2001, respectively.

⁹¹ The Council in resolution 1322 (2000) supported the establishment of a mechanism for inquiry into the tragic events in the Palestinian territories of September 2000. In its report, the Fact-finding Committee, headed by former United States Senator George Mitchell, recommended that both parties halt violence, rebuild confidence and resume negotiations. In particular, the Palestinian Authority was required to take measures against terrorism, and the Israeli Government was

In his statement, the representative of Palestine regretted the Council's inability to act since the adoption of resolution 1322 (2000), despite having the issue of protection of civilians in armed conflict on its agenda.⁹² He also detailed Israeli "war crimes" including the closure of Palestinian institutions in Jerusalem in contravention with previous Council resolutions. He expressed the Palestinian Authority's full support for the Mitchell Committee's recommendations, but said that Israel's proposal to implement those in stages after a "cooling off" period was impractical. Finally, he expressed hope that the Council would succeed in stopping the bloodshed and even made some proposals to be included in a draft resolution currently before the Council.⁹³

The representative of Israel stressed that his country had accepted the Mitchell report, but deplored that his country's unilateral ceasefire had not been met with reciprocal gestures from the Palestinian Authority. He strongly condemned the recent suicide bombings that had killed multiple civilians and underlined Israel's right to self-defence. He strongly rejected the draft resolution before the Council because of its imbalance in favour of the Palestinians. He also recalled that the Mitchell report recommended an incremental series of steps to be implemented through a face-to-face approach, and that therefore there was no need to establish a monitoring mechanism such as the one in the draft resolution.⁹⁴

required, inter alia, to freeze all settlement construction; end closures and restrictions imposed on Palestinians; restore Palestinian Authority tax revenues; and ensure that security forces refrained from the destruction of infrastructure and that lethal means were not used against Palestinians. Both parties were also required to resume security cooperation, and an international protection force agreed by both parties was recommended. The report is available from <http://eeas.europa.eu/mepp/docs>.

⁹² S/PV.4357, pp. 3-6.

⁹³ Not issued as a document of the Council. According to the representative of Malaysia, the Council, inter alia, would call for the immediate cessation of all acts of violence, provocation and destruction; the return to positions prior to September 2000; the implementation of the recommendations in the Mitchell report; the establishment of a monitoring mechanism to implement the recommendations; and for Israel to reverse all actions taken against Palestinian institutions (S/PV.4357 (Resumption 1), p. 23).

⁹⁴ S/PV.4357, pp. 6-10.

During the debate, the Mitchell report received unanimous support as the only road map available. However, many expressed their concern at its lack of implementation, despite agreement by the parties. Most of the debate therefore focused on whether and how the Council could support implementation of the Committee's recommendations. Many speakers endorsed the idea of a third-party monitoring mechanism accepted by both parties, as was proposed by the Group of Eight in a statement adopted in Genoa on 21 July 2001.⁹⁵ Only a few speakers expressly called for the adoption of the draft resolution being circulated.⁹⁶

Other proposals included calls on the Council to renew its support for the peace process,⁹⁷ as well as for the Secretary-General to be more involved in bringing the parties together.⁹⁸ The representative of France acknowledged that the Council could not end the violence or seal peace between the parties, but emphasized that it could facilitate existing initiatives.⁹⁹ The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran also proposed that the Council establish an international criminal tribunal to prosecute Israeli criminals.¹⁰⁰

A majority of speakers condemned or strongly deplored Israel's repressive measures against the Palestinians, considering them violations of international humanitarian law and of agreements

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 12 (Jamaica); p. 18 (France, Bangladesh); p. 21 (Tunisia); p. 23 (Mauritius); p. 24 (Ireland); p. 25 (Norway); and p. 26 (Ukraine); S/PV.4357 (Resumption 2), p. 8 (Djibouti); p. 9 (South Africa); p. 15 (Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People); p. 17 (Belgium); p. 19 (Japan); p. 23 (Malaysia); and p. 24 (Egypt); S/PV.4357 (Resumption 2), p. 2 (Indonesia); p. 3 (Turkey); p. 8 (Cyprus); and p. 13 (Mexico).

⁹⁶ S/PV.4357 (Resumption 1), p. 12 (Pakistan); and p. 23 (Malaysia); S/PV.4357 (Resumption 2), p. 7 (Namibia); and p. 12 (Cuba).

⁹⁷ S/PV.4357, p. 11 (Jamaica); p. 15 (United Kingdom); and p. 27 (Colombia); S/PV.4357 (Resumption 1), p. 23 (Malaysia); and p. 24 (Egypt); S/PV.4357 (Resumption 2), p. 10 (Lebanon).

⁹⁸ S/PV.4357, p. 11 (Jamaica); p. 15 (China); p. 21 (Singapore); p. 23 (Mauritius); and p. 31 (Algeria); S/PV.4357 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Namibia); and p. 11 (LAS).

⁹⁹ S/PV.4357, p. 17.

¹⁰⁰ S/PV.4357 (Resumption 1), p. 10.

signed between the two parties.¹⁰¹ They also expressed particular concern at the Israeli occupation of Palestinian public facilities, and this was echoed by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Ukraine.¹⁰² Many speakers also referred to the deteriorating economic situation in the Palestinian territories provoked by Israeli blockades.¹⁰³ A majority of speakers also reiterated the need to establish a protection force or to send observers to the region and called for immediate Council action to pressure Israel into ending its “policy of terror”.¹⁰⁴ However, in response to several statements affirming the need for the Council to be united,¹⁰⁵ the representative of Bangladesh and the Deputy Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States emphasized that this argument should not be used to prevent Council action.¹⁰⁶ The representatives of Iraq and Cuba mentioned that the United States was responsible for the Council’s inaction so far.¹⁰⁷

The representative of the United States questioned the appropriateness and effectiveness of Council intervention. He emphasized that condemning one side or imposing unworkable ideas would not change the reality on the ground. Stressing the necessity for the Palestinian Authority to stop tolerating terrorist acts, and for the Israeli government to alleviate pressure on the Palestinians, he supported the Mitchell recommendations and insisted on the need to work with both sides.¹⁰⁸

In a further intervention, the representative of Israel took note of the urgent appeal for dialogue between Israelis and Palestinians. He however added that implementation of the recommendations in the Mitchell report could begin only if violence ceased, and affirmed that it was up to the Palestinians to do away with terrorism. International machinery was therefore not needed. He expressed hope for a new beginning in view of an upcoming meeting between the Foreign Minister of Israel and the President of the Palestinian Authority¹⁰⁹.

The representative of Palestine rejected the logic that a calmer situation would lead to implementation of the Mitchell report and stressed that it was more likely that implementing the recommendations would lead to calm. He also maintained that the announced Israeli-Palestinian meeting would probably not change the situation.¹¹⁰

Decision of 14 December 2001 (4438th meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

The Council held its 4438th meeting¹¹¹ on 14 December 2001 in response to a letter dated 13 December 2001 from the representative of Egypt on behalf of the League of Arab States,¹¹² requesting an immediate meeting of the Council to consider the extremely dangerous situation in the occupied Palestinian territory and to take action in that regard. The letter was included in the agenda.

At the meeting, the President (Mali) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Egypt and

¹⁰¹ S/PV.4357, p. 10 (Mali); p. 18 (Bangladesh); p. 20 (Tunisia); p. 24 (Ireland); p. 28 (Qatar); and p. 30 (Algeria); S/PV.4357 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Sudan); p. 4 (Saudi Arabia); p. 7 (Djibouti); p. 8 (South Africa); p. 9 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 11 (Pakistan); p. 12 (Bahrain); p. 14 (Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People); p. 15 (Morocco); p. 18 (Yemen); p. 21 (Mauritania); p. 22 (Malaysia); p. 24 (Egypt); p. 25 (Iraq); p. 27 (Oman); and p. 28 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); S/PV.4357 (Resumption 2); p. 2 (Indonesia); p. 4 (OIC); p. 6 (Namibia); p. 9 (Lebanon); and p. 10 (LAS).

¹⁰² S/PV.4357, p. 16 and p. 26, respectively.

¹⁰³ S/PV.4357, p. 19 (Bangladesh); p. 22 (Mauritius); p. 26 (Ukraine); S/PV.4357 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Djibouti); p. 19 (Japan); and p. 26 (Iraq).

¹⁰⁴ S/PV.4357, p. 11 (Mali); p. 12 (Jamaica); p. 20 (Tunisia); p. 28 (Qatar); and p. 31 (Algeria); S/PV.4357 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Jordan); p. 4 (Sudan); p. 6 (Saudi Arabia); p. 10 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 12 (Pakistan); p. 13 (Bahrain); p. 16 (Morocco); p. 18 (Yemen); p. 20 (Kuwait); p. 21 (Mauritania); p. 23 (Malaysia); and p. 27 (Oman); S/PV.4357 (Resumption 2), p. 5 (OIC); p. 7 (Namibia); p. 10 (Lebanon); and p. 11 (LAS).

¹⁰⁵ S/PV.4357, p. 15 (China, United Kingdom); p. 17 (France); p. 21 (Singapore); p. 25 (Norway); p. 27 (Colombia); S/PV.4357 (Resumption 2), p. 7 (Namibia).

¹⁰⁶ S/PV.4357, p. 19 and S/PV.4357 (Resumption 2), p. 11 respectively.

¹⁰⁷ S/PV.4357 (Resumption 1), p. 25, and S/PV.4357 (Resumption 2), p. 12, respectively.

¹⁰⁸ S/PV.4357, p. 13.

¹⁰⁹ S/PV.4357 (Resumption 2), pp. 13-15.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

¹¹¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter.

¹¹² S/2001/1191.

Tunisia,¹¹³ in which the Council would demand, inter alia, the immediate cessation of violence and the return to positions which existed prior to September 2000; condemn all acts of terror; call on the two sides to implement the recommendations in the Mitchell report and to resume peace negotiations; and encourage all concerned to establish a monitoring mechanism to help the parties implement those recommendations.

All Council members made statements, as did the representatives of Belgium (on behalf of the European Union), Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Egypt, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Malaysia and South Africa (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), the Permanent Observer of Palestine and the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

The representative of Palestine deplored a decision by Israel on 12 December 2001 to sever all contacts with the Palestinian Authority, affirming that this meant the end of the negotiation process and could lead to plunge the region into war. He emphasized that the Palestinian Authority had condemned terrorist acts, but recalled that its ability to fight terrorism depended on the capacity of its security apparatus and on the end to Palestinian suffering. He however reaffirmed that violence committed within the Palestinian territories were not acts of terrorism but of resistance against the occupier. Finally, he referred to Israel's grave breaches of international humanitarian law and deplored the Council's inability to act.¹¹⁴

The representative of Israel focused on the need to define terrorism by what one does as opposed to the goal one wants to achieve, and strongly deplored the failure and unwillingness of the Palestinian Authority to fight terrorism. He argued that this was the main obstacle to peace in the Middle East. He rejected the draft resolution because it was unbalanced, counterproductive and out of touch with reality.¹¹⁵

Speakers unanimously agreed that the only way forward was for the parties to return to the negotiating table and implement the recommendations in the Mitchell report. However, differences of views emerged as to whether the Council should play an active role to stop the current violence and provide support to the parties by establishing a monitoring

mechanism. All speakers supported the draft resolution except the representatives of Israel, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States. The representatives of Egypt and Tunisia affirmed in particular that a Council resolution was necessary to pressure Israel into resuming peace negotiations.¹¹⁶

Another focus of the discussion was security. Speakers unanimously condemned terrorist acts targeting innocent civilians. However, many representatives also criticized Israel's aggressive policies against Palestinians that contributed to further radicalization.¹¹⁷ The representative of the Russian Federation, in particular, stated that it was not in the interest of Israel to destroy the Palestinian Authority as it was the only legitimate interlocutor,¹¹⁸ which was echoed by several other speakers.¹¹⁹ While some speakers emphasized the urgent necessity for the Palestinian Authority to crack down on terrorist elements including Hamas and Islamic Jihad,¹²⁰ others reaffirmed that Palestinians had a legitimate right to resist the occupier.¹²¹ The majority of speakers called on both parties to stop the violence and exercise restraint.

The representative of the United States said that his country would reject the draft resolution because it failed to condemn Palestinian terrorist acts, and therefore was unbalanced. He also insisted that the focus should be on working with the parties on the ground to help them establish a ceasefire.¹²² Similar concerns were raised by the representative of the United Kingdom,¹²³ while the representative of

¹¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 6-8.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 6 (Egypt); p. 7 (Tunisia); p. 10 (Ukraine); p. 15 (Bangladesh); p. 20 (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People); p. 22 (Cuba); p. 23 (Malaysia); and p. 26 (Islamic Republic of Iran).

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 13.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 14 (Colombia); p. 16 (Norway); p. 23 (Malaysia); p. 27 (Belgium on behalf of the European Union); and p. 28 (France).

¹²⁰ Ibid., p. 9 (United Kingdom); p. 10 (Ukraine); p. 11 (United States); p. 13 (Russian Federation); p. 15 (Norway); p. 24 (Canada); p. 27 (Belgium on behalf of the European Union); and p. 29 (Ireland).

¹²¹ Ibid., p. 6 (Egypt); p. 22 (Cuba); and p. 27 (Islamic Republic of Iran).

¹²² Ibid., p. 11.

¹²³ Ibid., p. 10.

¹¹³ S/2001/1199.

¹¹⁴ S/PV.4438, pp. 3-5.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 17-20.

Norway evoked the lack of unanimity in the Council as the major obstacle to adopting the draft resolution.¹²⁴

The draft resolution was then put to the vote. It received 12 votes in favour to 1 against (United States), with 2 abstentions (Norway, United Kingdom), and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

**Decision of 12 March 2002 (4489th meeting):
resolution 1397 (2002)**

By letters dated 20 February 2002, the Permanent Observer of Palestine and the representative of Yemen in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of the Arab States, respectively, requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the dangerous situation in the Palestinian territories following the intensification of Israeli military raids against Palestinian cities.¹²⁵

At its 4474th meeting, held on 21 February 2002 in response to those requests, the Council included the letters in its agenda. During the meeting, the Council heard a briefing from the Secretary-General on the situation, following which the President of the Council (Mexico) made a statement in his capacity as President of the Council. The representatives of Israel and Yemen and the Permanent Observer of Palestine were invited to participate but did not make statements.

The President of the Council drew attention to four letters from the representative of Israel,¹²⁶ detailing terrorist attacks and the launching of rockets against Israelis, and holding the Palestinian Authority accountable for failing to react. He then referred to four letters from the Permanent Observer of Palestine,¹²⁷ concerning Israel's illegal policies and war crimes against Palestinians including blockades, settlement activities, extrajudicial killings, indiscriminate use of force, the military invasion of Palestinian cities and provocative statements.

The Secretary-General, observing that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict risked sliding towards a full-fledged war, contended that it was now necessary to

move beyond a discussion focused on how to implement the Tenet ceasefire plan and the Mitchell report. He reaffirmed the need to tackle security alongside key political issues such as land and economic and social deprivation. He further stressed that the lack of mutual confidence between the two sides made a third party role essential, and indicated that he had asked his Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process to intensify consultations with the parties, members of the Quartet,¹²⁸ and regional and international actors.¹²⁹

The President of the Council then stated that the Council supported the work and views of the Secretary-General. He announced that Council members had agreed to hold periodic consultations on the situation in the Middle East based on information provided by the Secretariat and that the Council would hold a public debate soon.¹³⁰

At the 4478th meeting, held on 26 and 27 February 2002, the President (Mexico) recalled his statement that the Council would hold a debate on the basis of the Secretary-General's statement and propose new initiatives. All Council members made statements, as did the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Egypt, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Morocco, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, the Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine and Yemen, the Permanent Observer of Palestine and the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.¹³¹

The representative of Palestine described the recent intensification of Israel's military campaign since September 2000, in particular the establishment of buffer zones around Palestinian cities and the building of a wall to separate East and West Jerusalem. He affirmed his support for the analysis of the situation made by the Secretary-General, recalled the need to implement the Madrid and Oslo peace agreements and urged the Council to react.¹³²

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹²⁵ S/2002/182 and S/2002/184, respectively.

¹²⁶ S/2002/155, S/2002/164, S/2002/174 and S/2002/185. The letters were dated 8, 11, 19 and 20 February 2002, respectively.

¹²⁷ S/2002/142, S/2002/146, S/2002/165 and S/2002/175. The letters were dated 1, 5, 13 and 15 February 2002, respectively.

¹²⁸ Composed of the United States, the Russian Federation, the European Union and the United Nations.

¹²⁹ S/PV.4474, pp. 2-3.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

¹³¹ The representative of Oman was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

¹³² S/PV.4478, pp. 3-4.

The representative of Israel recalled that his country remained committed to a peaceful settlement based on face-to-face negotiations. He however deplored the fact that his country's commitment to peace had been met by terrorism and urged the Council to exert pressure on the Palestinians to abandon terrorism.¹³³

During the debate there was unanimous agreement that both sides needed to stop violence and that a return to the peace process was urgent. Second, most speakers supported the Secretary-General and agreed that immediate progress on the political, security and economic front was needed. Third, there was consensus that the parties needed international assistance to reach these goals, and that all relevant international actors, including the newly established Quartet, as well as regional players had a role to play. A new proposal for a comprehensive peace between Israel and its Arab neighbours based on Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and on the principle of land for peace, that had been introduced by Crown Prince Abdullah of Saudi Arabia, was widely welcomed. Speakers largely supported the idea of a two-State solution, with the Israeli State and a viable Palestinian State existing side by side in peace and security and within internationally recognized borders.

Most speakers also reaffirmed the need for both parties to implement the Mitchell recommendations and Tenet understandings and to take immediate action to end violence, and many deplored Israel's policy of isolating the President of the Palestinian Authority, Yasser Arafat.

Almost all speakers called for some Council action in fulfilment of its responsibility in the maintenance of peace and security. The representative of Malaysia revived the idea of a United Nations mission to monitor the situation, ease tensions and maintain peace and security on the ground.¹³⁴ This was echoed by many other speakers, who added that a mission should also be tasked to protect Palestinian civilians.¹³⁵ The representative of Mexico stated that the United Nations could also explore confidence-building mechanisms, as well as promote humanitarian

activities.¹³⁶ The representative of the United States said that his country was committed to helping the parties move forward, but that Council action at this time would not be helpful.¹³⁷

At its 4488th meeting,¹³⁸ on 12 March 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Secretary-General. He stated that the situation in the region was the worst in 10 years, and urged the Palestinians to stop all acts of terror as it was harming their cause by weakening international support. He called on Israel to end the illegal occupation, stop the bombing of civilian areas, the assassinations and the daily humiliation of Palestinians. He also welcomed the Saudi Arabia peace initiative.¹³⁹

At its 4489th meeting, on 12 March 2002, the Council voted on a draft resolution submitted by the United States.¹⁴⁰ It was adopted by 14 votes, with 1 abstention (Syrian Arab Republic), as resolution 1397 (2002), by which the Council, inter alia:

Affirmed the vision of a region where two States, Israel and Palestine, lived side by side within secure and recognized borders, stressed the need for all concerned to ensure the safety of civilians, and welcomed the diplomatic efforts by the United States, the Russian Federation, the European Union and the United Nations Special Coordinator to bring about peace in the Middle East;

Demanded the immediate cessation of all acts of violence, including all acts of terror, provocation, incitement and destruction;

Called upon the Israeli and Palestinian sides and their leaders to cooperate in the implementation of the Tenet work plan and recommendations contained in the Mitchell report with the aim of resuming negotiations on a political settlement;

Expressed support for the efforts of the Secretary-General and others to assist the parties to halt the violence and to resume the peace process; and decided to remain seized of the matter.

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic stated that the draft resolution was weak because it did not address the Israeli occupation, nor did it call for the resumption of the peace process based on previous Council resolutions. It also failed to call on Israel to

¹³³ Ibid., pp. 20-22.

¹³⁴ S/PV.4478 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

¹³⁵ S/PV.4478, p. 6 (Mauritius); p. 28 (Algeria); and p. 35 (Morocco); S/PV.4478 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 15 (Yemen); and p. 11 (Iraq).

¹³⁶ S/PV.4478 (Resumption 1), p. 20.

¹³⁷ S/PV.4478, pp. 11-12.

¹³⁸ The representative of Israel and the Permanent Observer of Palestine both participated in the meeting.

¹³⁹ S/PV.4488, pp. 2-3.

¹⁴⁰ S/2002/259.

implement the principle of land for peace, and to respect the Fourth Geneva Convention¹⁴¹.

**Decision of 30 March 2002 (4503rd meeting):
resolution 1402 (2002)**

The 4503rd meeting of the Council was held on 29 and 30 March 2002 in response to the requests contained in letters dated 29 March 2002 from the representative of Jordan in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States and from the representative of Qatar in his capacity as Chairman of the Islamic Summit Conference,¹⁴² to consider the dangerous situation in the occupied Palestinian territories. The Council included the letters in its agenda.

The President of the Council (Norway) drew attention to a letter dated 29 March 2002 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine,¹⁴³ deploring the assault against the compound of the President of the Palestinian Authority, Yasser Arafat, and the military invasion of other Palestinian cities, and calling on the Council to take action. During the meeting, all Council members made statements, as did the representatives of Algeria, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Spain (on behalf of the European Union), Tunisia and Turkey, the Permanent Observer of Palestine and the Secretary-General.

The Secretary-General first welcomed the endorsement on 28 March 2002 by all Arab leaders, during the Arab League summit in Beirut, of the peace initiative of the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia. He also praised Council resolution 1397 (2002) as a significant resolution on the Middle East. He added that the parties could achieve the two-State vision through the implementation of the recommendations in the Mitchell report, and urged the Council to consider how to implement the resolution.¹⁴⁴

The representative of Palestine stated that the Palestinian Authority had condemned a recent terrorist action in Netanya and had acknowledged that terrorism did not serve the Palestinian cause. He pointed out that Yasser Arafat had declared his willingness to implement the Israeli-Palestinian ceasefire and the

Tenet security plan. He also called on the Council to demand that Israeli forces withdraw from Palestinian towns and referred to a text circulated to Council members from the Palestinian observer mission to that end.¹⁴⁵

The representative of Israel replied that his country had taken clear steps to implement the Mitchell report and had accepted a compromise proposal presented by the Special Envoy of the United States, Anthony Zinni, to implement the Tenet plan. He deplored the fact that the Palestinians were continuing to use terrorist tactics and expressed his country's intention to continue to uproot terrorist networks in the Palestinian territories.¹⁴⁶

Almost all Council members appealed for an immediate end of violence and reaffirmed the need to implement resolution 1397 (2002). They also supported efforts to bring about a resumption of negotiations by the United States Envoy, and called for a ceasefire and for the implementation of the Tenet and Mitchell plans. The representative of Spain said he remained convinced that a third party monitoring mechanism could help the parties and affirmed the European Union's readiness to participate.¹⁴⁷

Speakers unanimously affirmed their support for the Arab peace initiative and reiterated that President Arafat should not be harmed. The representative of the United States emphasized that terrorism had led to the current grave situation, but warned Israel to carefully consider the consequences of its military campaign.¹⁴⁸

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic said Israel's actions were the main cause for the current turmoil, and he called on the Council to condemn them.¹⁴⁹ This was echoed by many other speakers who expressed their hope that the Council would call on Israel specifically to exercise restraint and to withdraw from all Palestinian territory.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 20 (Algeria); p. 21 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Egypt); p. 23 (Qatar, Djibouti); p. 26 (Jordan, Iraq); p. 27 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 29 (Tunisia); p. 31 (Morocco); and p. 33 (Cuba, Saudi Arabia).

¹⁴¹ S/PV.4489, pp. 2-3.

¹⁴² S/2002/331 and S/2002/329, respectively.

¹⁴³ S/2002/330.

¹⁴⁴ S/PV.4503, pp. 2-3.

The Council then voted on a draft resolution submitted by Norway.¹⁵¹ It was adopted by 14 votes (the Syrian Arab Republic did not participate in the voting) as resolution 1402 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Expressed concern at the recent suicide bombings in Israel and the military attack against the headquarters of the President of the Palestinian Authority; and reiterated its demand in resolution 1397 (2002) for an immediate cessation of all acts of violence;

Called upon both parties to move immediately to a meaningful ceasefire;

Called for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Palestinian cities, including Ramallah; and called upon the parties to cooperate fully with the Special Envoy, Anthony Zinni, and others, to implement the Tenet security work plan as a first step towards implementation of the recommendations contained in the Mitchell report, with the aim of resuming negotiations on a political settlement.

Although the representative of Israel welcomed the reference to the Tenet and Mitchell plans, he maintained that the resolution asked his country to withdraw without also requesting the Palestinian Authority to eradicate terrorism.¹⁵² The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic explained that his country had not voted because the draft resolution did not take into consideration the outcome of the Arab League summit of 28 March 2002, and because his country had already abstained on resolution 1397 (2002).¹⁵³

Decision of 4 April 2002 (4506th meeting): resolution 1403 (2002)

The 4506th meeting of the Council^{154,155} was held on 3 and 4 April 2002 in response to requests contained in letters dated 1 April 2002 from the representative of Tunisia on behalf of the Group of Arab States¹⁵⁶ and dated 2 April 2002 from the representative of South Africa in his capacity as Chair

¹⁵¹ S/2002/333.

¹⁵² S/PV.4503, p. 35.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

¹⁵⁴ At the 4504th and 4505th meetings, both held in private on 2 April 2002, Council members had constructive discussions with the representative of Israel and the Permanent Observer of Palestine, respectively.

¹⁵⁵ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter; part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41; and part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51.

¹⁵⁶ S/2002/336.

of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement,¹⁵⁷ to respond to the critical situation in the occupied Palestinian territories. The Council included the letters in the agenda.

All Council members made statements, as did the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, New Zealand, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, the Sudan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen, as well as the Secretary-General, the Permanent Observer of Palestine, and the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

The representative of Palestine strongly objected to the fact that Israel had rejected a ceasefire, continued to kill Palestinians, reoccupied certain Palestinian cities and had not lifted the siege of President Arafat's headquarters. He referred to a draft resolution prepared by the Arab Group demanding immediate implementation of resolution 1402 (2002) and called on the Council to adopt it. He also said that an international third party presence to assist the two sides in implementing the resolution was desirable.¹⁵⁸

The representative of Israel responded that his country's concessions had been met with more Palestinian suicide bombings in Israel. He said that although his country had recognized the positive elements of resolutions 1397 (2002) and 1402 (2002) and of the Mitchell and Tenet plans, it had no choice but to exercise self-defence. He called for an immediate ceasefire and urged the Council to adopt a resolution calling on the Palestinians to cease bombings. He also said that his country was assessing the United States demand that Israeli troops be withdrawn from Palestinian cities.¹⁵⁹

Most speakers unanimously called for implementation of resolutions 1397 (2002) and 1402 (2002); called for an immediate ceasefire; urged the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied territories as a prerequisite for peace and outlined the need to

¹⁵⁷ S/2002/342.

¹⁵⁸ S/PV.4506, pp. 3-5.

¹⁵⁹ S/PV.4506, pp. 5-6 and S/PV.4506 (Resumption 2), p. 2.

restore freedom of movement for President Arafat; and called for cooperation of the parties with the United States Special Envoy. Recent initiatives by the Quartet were also expressly supported by a few speakers.¹⁶⁰ The representative of the United States emphasized that his country had introduced resolution 1397 (2002) and was supportive of other resolutions, and that his country continued to work on their implementation with the parties.¹⁶¹

In addition, several speakers specifically supported the establishment of a third party monitoring mechanism to monitor and guarantee implementation of agreements between the parties.¹⁶² Many others revived the idea of dispatching an international observer or a peacekeeping force to supervise Israeli withdrawal, separate the parties and provide protection to civilians.¹⁶³ The representative of South Africa suggested that the Council visit the region to obtain a first-hand impression of events on the ground,¹⁶⁴ which was echoed by the representatives of Malaysia, Bangladesh and Cameroon.¹⁶⁵ Finally, the representative of Mexico went a step further by suggesting that, once a ceasefire was in place and political dialogue had resumed, the Council consider, inter alia, the implementation of disarmament programmes and the collection of arms obtained by illicit groups; the verification of security arrangements;

the adoption of confidence-building measures; the establishment and protection of violence-free zones; and on-the-spot verification of implementation of provisions of international humanitarian law.¹⁶⁶

The Council then voted on a draft resolution;¹⁶⁷ it was adopted unanimously as resolution 1403 (2002), by which the Council, inter alia:

Demanded the implementation of resolution 1402 (2002) without delay;

Welcomed the mission of the United States Secretary of State to the region, as well as efforts by others, in particular the special envoys from the United States, the Russian Federation and the European Union, and the United Nations Special Coordinator, to bring about a comprehensive, just and lasting peace to the Middle East; and requested the Secretary-General to follow the situation and keep the Council informed.

Decision of 10 April 2002 (4511th meeting): statement by the President

The 4510th meeting of the Council^{168,169} was held on 8 and 9 April 2002 in response to the request contained in a letter dated 6 April 2002 from the representative of Tunisia in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States,¹⁷⁰ to consider Israeli criminal actions in the refugee camps of Jenin and Nablus. The Security Council included the letter in its agenda.

During the meeting, all Council members made statements, in addition to the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Canada, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, the Republic of Korea, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, Qatar, South Africa, Spain, the Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen, and the Permanent Observer of Palestine.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁰ S/PV.4506, p. 8 (Ukraine); p. 10 (Spain on behalf of the European Union); and p. 22 (United Arab Emirates); S/PV.4506 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Bangladesh); p. 22 (Cyprus); p. 29 (Ireland, United Kingdom); p. 30 (Singapore); p. 33 (France); p. 38 (Mexico); and p. 40 (Russian Federation); S/PV.4506 (Resumption 2), p. 5 (Secretary-General).

¹⁶¹ S/PV.4506 (Resumption 1), pp. 31-32.

¹⁶² S/PV.4506, p. 8 (Ukraine); p. 10 (Spain); p. 17 (South Africa); and p. 25 (Brazil); S/PV.4506 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Namibia); p. 7 (Bangladesh); p. 8 (Indonesia); p. 14 (Oman); p. 21 (New Zealand); and p. 22 (Cyprus); S/PV.4506 (Resumption 2), p. 6 (Secretary-General).

¹⁶³ S/PV.4506, p. 7 (Tunisia); p. 10 (Spain); p. 13 (Yemen); p. 19 (Saudi Arabia); pp. 23-24 (Malaysia); and p. 25 (Brazil); S/PV.4506 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Cuba, Jordan); p. 4 (Kuwait); p. 7 (Bangladesh); p. 8 (Indonesia); p. 9 (Morocco); p. 16 (Bahrain, Sudan); p. 20 (Qatar); p. 21 (New Zealand); p. 23 (Lebanon); p. 25 (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People); p. 33 (France); p. 37 (Mauritius); and p. 39 (Guinea).

¹⁶⁴ S/PV.4506, p. 16.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 24 (Malaysia); S/PV.4506 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Bangladesh); and p. 35 (Cameroon).

¹⁶⁶ S/PV.4506 (Resumption 1), p. 38.

¹⁶⁷ S/2002/347.

¹⁶⁸ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter; part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41; and part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51.

¹⁶⁹ At the 4508th and 4509th meetings, both held in private on 8 April 2002, the Council members had constructive discussions with the representative of Israel and the Permanent Observer of Palestine, respectively.

¹⁷⁰ S/2002/359.

¹⁷¹ The representative of Saudi Arabia was present but did

While the representative of Palestine urged Israel to end its military operations and withdraw from recently reoccupied cities as had been requested by the United States, and called again for an international presence on the ground, the representative of Israel responded that withdrawal would have to be accompanied by a Palestinian ceasefire and an end of terrorist tactics. They both referred to the need to implement resolution 1402 (2002).¹⁷²

The representative of the United States stated that his country's envoy had held talks with the parties and focused on the need for an immediate ceasefire, Israeli withdrawal and implementation of the Tenet security plan.¹⁷³ Most speakers reaffirmed the need for Israel to withdraw, and reiterated that Israel's fight against terrorism did not entitle it to violate international law in the name of self-defence.

New concerns were raised regarding the deteriorating humanitarian situation in the Palestinian territories. The representatives of France and Singapore specifically pointed out that medical assistance was not reaching Palestinians because of Israeli restrictions.¹⁷⁴ Other representatives focused on Israel's breaches of international humanitarian law and called on the Council to hold it accountable. The representative of Mauritius, in particular, urged Israel to comply with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to facilitate a fact-finding mission on human rights violations in the occupied Palestinian territories requested by the Commission on Human Rights.¹⁷⁵

While the representatives of Palestine and Kuwait supported another Council resolution,¹⁷⁶ the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom said it was more important to focus on implementing existing ones.¹⁷⁷

not make a statement.

¹⁷² S/PV.4510, pp. 2-5.

¹⁷³ Ibid., p. 6.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 13 and p. 17, respectively.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 11. For the request of the Commission on Human Rights, see *Officials Records of the Economic and Social Council, 2002, Supplement No. 3* (E/2002/23), chap. II, sect. A, resolution 2002/1.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 4 and p. 22, respectively.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 6 and p. 15, respectively.

At the 4511th meeting,¹⁷⁸ the President (Russian Federation) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁷⁹ by which the Council:

Supported the Joint Statement issued in Madrid on 10 April 2002 by the Secretary-General, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain and the High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union;¹⁸⁰ and called upon the Government of Israel, the Palestinian Authority and all States in the region to cooperate with the efforts to achieve the goals set out in the Joint Statement and insisted on the immediate implementation of resolutions 1402 (2002) and 1403 (2002).

**Decision of 19 April 2002 (4516th meeting):
resolution 1405 (2002)**

The 4515th meeting of the Council¹⁸¹ was held on 19 April 2002 in response to the request by the representative of Tunisia in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States contained in a letter dated 17 April 2002,¹⁸² to consider the lack of implementation of Council resolutions by Israel, and to take immediate measures. The Council included the letter in its agenda.

At the meeting, all Council members made statements, as did the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, the Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, the Sudan, Tunisia and the United Arab Emirates, as well as the Permanent Observer of Palestine.

The representative of Palestine referred to the continuing Israeli aggression and specifically to massacres of civilians in the Jenin refugee camp. He added that restrictions on access to humanitarian aid in the camp constituted a clear violation of international

¹⁷⁸ The representative of Israel and the Permanent Observer of Palestine participated in the meeting but did not make statements.

¹⁷⁹ S/PRST/2002/9.

¹⁸⁰ S/2002/369, annexed to the presidential statement.

¹⁸¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. X, part IV, with regard to the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter; chap XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39; and chap. XI, part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51.

¹⁸² S/2002/431.

humanitarian law. He called on the Council to adopt the draft resolution introduced by the Syrian Arab Republic and Tunisia.¹⁸³ He then referred to the briefing given by the Secretary-General on the same day, in which he supported the creation by the Council of a multinational force composed of States to be dispatched to the Palestinian territories under Chapter VII of the Charter. He supported this proposal over the one for sending in observers only. Finally, he welcomed the idea of an international conference, on condition that the Quartet participated, that the conference also tackled the Syrian-Israeli track, and that it was based on a comprehensive political vision of peace.¹⁸⁴

The representative of Israel reiterated that his country was completing the withdrawal from Palestinian cities but maintained that the Palestinians had not yet implemented a ceasefire. He then said that what had happened in Jenin was not a “massacre” but a gun battle between Israeli soldiers and Palestinian terrorists with unfortunate civilian casualties. Finally, he reaffirmed that his country supported the idea of a third-party mechanism composed of American monitors but would only consider an international presence in the context of a comprehensive settlement.¹⁸⁵

Most delegations supported elements of the draft resolution before the Council, including the demand for Israeli withdrawal, the need for Israel to respect the Geneva Conventions and the establishment of a fact-finding mission to investigate events in Jenin.

Almost all speakers also believed that a third party intervention was needed, and agreed that the only way to bring an end to the violence was to send a multinational force to the region as proposed by the Secretary-General. However, several representatives, including a majority of Council members, insisted that

both parties would have to agree to its presence.¹⁸⁶ Others simply stated that the proposal needed careful consideration.¹⁸⁷

The representative of the United States focused on the need to alleviate the humanitarian situation in Jenin and pressed Israel to allow humanitarian access. He however reiterated that further Council action was not the best way to meet this objective. He also said that the Secretary of State had obtained an Israeli commitment to wind down its military operations, and a Palestinian statement condemning recent terrorist attacks.¹⁸⁸

Speaking for the second time, the representative of Palestine pressed for a Council resolution addressing the humanitarian situation and expressed a willingness to set aside the idea of an international presence for the moment and leave the issue to the Secretary-General. He said he was ready to work on a new draft resolution presented by the United Kingdom.¹⁸⁹ The representative of Israel for his part reiterated that his country deeply regretted the death of civilians but maintained that the primary responsibility for their deaths lay with the terrorists.¹⁸⁹

At the 4516th meeting, on 19 April 2002, the President (Russian Federation) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by the United States;¹⁹⁰ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1405 (2002), by which the Council, inter alia:

Emphasized the urgency of access of medical and humanitarian organizations to the Palestinian civilian population; and welcomed the initiative of the Secretary-General to develop accurate information regarding the events in the Jenin refugee camp through a fact-finding team.

¹⁸³ S/2002/363, by which the Council would express concern at the humanitarian crisis among the Palestinian people; demand freedom of movement for medical and humanitarian organizations; express shock at the massacre in the Jenin refugee camp; demand the immediate implementation of resolution 1402 (2002) and the lifting of sieges; call for an international presence to provide better conditions on the ground; and request the Secretary-General to investigate the events that occurred in Jenin and report regularly to the Council.

¹⁸⁴ S/PV.4515, pp. 2-5.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

¹⁸⁶ S/PV.4515, p. 15 (Spain); S/PV.4515 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Guinea); p. 3 (Bulgaria); p. 4 (Cameroon); p. 6 (France); p. 11 (Ireland, United Kingdom); p. 17 (Norway); and p. 19 (Russian Federation).

¹⁸⁷ S/PV.4515, p. 35 (Japan); and p. 38 (Republic of Korea); S/PV.4515 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (China); p. 8 (Mauritius); p. 9 (Colombia); p. 11 (United Kingdom); p. 14 (Singapore); and p. 17 (Norway).

¹⁸⁸ S/PV.4515 (Resumption 1), pp. 18-19.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹⁹⁰ S/2002/471.

Decision of 18 July 2002 (4578th meeting): statement by the President

The Council held its 4525th¹⁹¹ and 4552nd^{192,193} meetings on 3 May and 13 June 2002 in response to requests contained in a letter dated 2 May 2002 from the representative of the Sudan in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States¹⁹⁴ and a letter dated 11 June 2002 from the representative of Bahrain,¹⁹⁵ to consider the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories. The letters were included in the agenda of the meetings.

All Council members made statements, as did the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Bahrain, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Morocco, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain (on behalf of the European Union), the Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates, the Permanent Observer of Palestine and the Vice-Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

At the meetings, the representative of Palestine strongly deplored the fact that Israel had refused to accept the Jenin fact-finding team which had been set up by the Secretary-General following resolution 1405 (2002). He said that the Secretary-General, in the absence of Israeli cooperation, had decided to disband the team.¹⁹⁶ He regretted that a draft resolution introduced by the Arab Group¹⁹⁷ aiming at imposing

measures on Israel had been rejected by the United States. He referred to a General Assembly resolution condemning Israel's refusal to cooperate with the fact-finding team and requesting the Secretary-General to report to the Assembly on the events in Jenin.¹⁹⁸ He also deplored the Israeli reoccupation of Ramallah and attack on President Arafat's headquarters, stating that Israel's goal was to go back to the situation that prevailed before the Oslo accords.¹⁹⁹

The representative of Israel said his country had objected to the fact-finding mission because it did not have clear objectives. He strongly criticized the Palestinian Authority's failure to establish a ceasefire and Yasser Arafat's invitation to Hamas and Islamic Jihad, both terrorist groups, to join his Cabinet, and justified Israel's sieges by the fact that Palestinian terrorists had taken over the locations.²⁰⁰

During the meetings, most speakers again deplored Israel's recent actions. Some even acknowledged that the Palestinian Authority could not be expected to take measures to combat terrorism while Israel was destroying the means necessary to implement those measures.²⁰¹ Speakers almost unanimously regretted Israel's refusal to cooperate with the fact-finding team and many, especially from the Arab Group, said that this contributed to diminishing the Council's credibility and called for the imposition of measures to force Israel to comply. Most representatives from Arab and non-aligned countries, in addition to the representatives of Spain and France,²⁰² added that this might indicate a desire on the part of Israel to cover up what really happened.

The representative of the United States stated that his country supported the Secretary-General's decision to disband the team (this was echoed by a majority of Council members), and regretted that the Council had been unable to adopt a draft resolution presented by his country expressing support for the Secretary-General. He added that there was no evidence of a massacre in Jenin and that in reality there had been movement

the fact-finding team; and request the Secretary-General to dispatch the team and keep the Council informed.

¹⁹⁸ General Assembly resolution ES-10/10 of 7 May 2002.

¹⁹⁹ S/PV.4525, pp. 2-4; and S/PV.4552, pp. 3-5.

²⁰⁰ S/PV.4525, pp. 4-7; and S/PV.4552, pp. 5-7.

²⁰¹ S/PV.4552, p. 9 (Norway); S/PV.4552 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Ireland); p. 4 (South Africa); and p. 8 (Mauritius).

²⁰² S/PV.4525 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Spain); and p. 34 (France).

¹⁹¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. X, part II, case 1, with regard to the investigation of disputes and fact-finding under Chapter VI of the Charter.

¹⁹² For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39.

¹⁹³ At the 4556th meeting, held in private on 20 June 2002, the Secretary-General and the members of the Council had a constructive discussion.

¹⁹⁴ S/2002/510.

¹⁹⁵ S/2002/655.

¹⁹⁶ See the letter from the Secretary-General, dated 1 May 2002 (S/2002/504), describing his efforts to implement Council resolution 1405 (2002) and announcing his intention to disband the team, deploring that the long shadow cast by recent events in Jenin would remain.

¹⁹⁷ S/2002/478, sponsored by the Syrian Arab Republic and Tunisia, by which the Council would demand the immediate implementation of resolutions 1402 (2002) and 1403 (2002); demand that Israel cooperate fully with

towards implementation of Council resolutions by the parties. Finally, he reaffirmed the goals of the Quartet: restoring security; addressing urgent humanitarian needs; and promoting negotiations towards a settlement.²⁰³

The discussion also centered on whether the Council should take further action to ensure implementation of previous resolutions. Many speakers said that the Council should not abdicate its moral responsibility to clarify what happened in Jenin and should still seek other ways to establish the facts.²⁰⁴ At the 4552nd meeting, several speakers said they looked forward to receiving the Secretary-General's report on Jenin pursuant to General Assembly resolution ES-10/10.²⁰⁵

At the 4578th meeting, on 18 July 2002, the President of the Security Council (United Kingdom) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁰⁶ by which the Council:

Supported the Joint Statement of the Quartet, which was issued in New York on 16 July 2002 by the Secretary-General, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Denmark, the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union and the European Commissioner for External Affairs;²⁰⁷

Called upon the Government of Israel, the Palestinian Authority and all States in the region to cooperate with the efforts to achieve the goals set out in the Joint Statement and stressed the importance of, and the need to achieve, a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, based on all its relevant resolutions, the Madrid terms of reference and the principle of land for peace.

²⁰³ S/PV.4525 (Resumption 1), pp. 22-25; and S/PV.4552 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

²⁰⁴ S/PV.4525, p. 7 (Sudan); and p. 9 (Tunisia); S/PV.4525 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Jordan); pp. 4-5 (Malaysia); pp. 7-8 (South Africa); p. 11 (United Arab Emirates); p. 14 (Morocco); p. 19 (Lebanon); p. 20 (Vice-Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People); p. 24 (Guinea); p. 26 (Colombia); p. 31 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 32 (Mexico); p. 33 (Norway); and p. 34 (France).

²⁰⁵ S/PV.4552, p. 3 (Palestine); p. 14 (Morocco); S/PV.4552 (Resumption 1), p. 18 (Singapore); p. 25 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 27 (Colombia); and p. 29 (Syrian Arab Republic).

²⁰⁶ S/PRST/2002/20.

²⁰⁷ Annexed to the statement of the President.

Decision of 24 September 2002 (4614th meeting): resolution 1435 (2002)

The Council held its 4588th meeting²⁰⁸ on 24 July 2002, in response to the request contained in a letter dated 23 July 2002 from the representative of Saudi Arabia in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States,²⁰⁹ to consider the continued Israeli military aggression against Palestinians and immediately adopt measures to implement previous Council resolutions.

All Council members made statements, as did the representatives of Bahrain, Chile, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the Sudan, Tunisia and Yemen, and the Permanent Observer of Palestine, the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States and the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.²¹⁰

The representative of Palestine complained that Israel had continued to escalate "war crimes", citing in particular the bombing of an apartment building in Gaza City, which had killed 15 civilians and wounded more than 150 people, and which Israel had declared a "targeted killing". He also objected to the continuing practice of collective punishment against Palestinians by Israel, in particular air strikes, the reoccupation of Palestinian cities, and severe restrictions on the movement of persons, all of which were creating a humanitarian crisis. He insisted that any talk about the restructuring of the Palestinian Authority in view of statehood was meaningless while Palestine was still under occupation. He also welcomed the international consensus on the two-State solution, reiterated the need for a comprehensive approach, and urged the Council to be more proactive.²¹¹

The representative of Israel reiterated that his country's actions were part of an ongoing effort to fight terrorism. He stressed that the target of the attack mentioned by the representative of Palestine was one

²⁰⁸ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter; and part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51.

²⁰⁹ S/2002/828.

²¹⁰ The representative of Tunisia participated in the meeting but did not make a statement.

²¹¹ S/PV.4588, pp. 3-5.

of the “most prolific and brutal terrorists in the history of the Middle East”. He expressed regret that Palestinian civilians had been killed, and stated that Israeli forces had not anticipated the extent of the collateral damage, and if they had the operation would not have been carried out. Nonetheless, he stressed that Palestinian terrorists continued, in contravention of international norms, to situate themselves among civilians in order to use them as human shields. He insisted that responsibility also lay with the Palestinian Authority for failing to curb terrorism and stated that Israel could not be expected to take any action that would increase the risk to Israeli civilians. He however assured the Council that an internal investigation was being conducted.²¹²

Speakers almost unanimously condemned the Israeli attack, emphasizing that air attacks against populated areas were unacceptable. Most representatives from the Arab Group described the attack as a “war crime” and said that this was a proof that Israel was not interested in the peace process.²¹³ Other speakers condemned Palestinian terrorism as well as Israel’s disproportionate use of force.²¹⁴

The representative of the United States, while calling on the need to address the action of Palestinian terrorist groups, expressed his country’s concern about Israeli actions that endangered civilians. He also expressed concern for the humanitarian situation and urged Israel to restore economic activity in the Palestinian areas. He finally stated that previous Council decisions already formed an adequate basis to achieve a negotiated solution and that at this point the focus should be on diplomatic efforts.²¹⁵

Some speakers reiterated the need to tackle political, security and humanitarian issues in parallel, as affirmed by the Quartet.²¹⁶ Another theme at the meeting was the civil and security reform of Palestinian institutions. Many speakers highlighted the

need for international support through the Task Force on Palestinian Reform and looked forward to the development of specific plans. They also insisted that Israel needed to take concrete steps to support the emergence of a viable Palestinian State including the easing of restrictions.²¹⁷ However, the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People said that the three-year programme for the establishment of a Palestinian State introduced by the President of the United States on 24 June 2002 gave no clear steps towards that goal and placed requirements on the Palestinians while failing to demand that Israel end the occupation.²¹⁸

At its 4613th meeting, on 20 September 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process. In his briefing, the Special Coordinator reported on the recent Quartet activities and on the mounting humanitarian crisis. He said that Quartet members intended to make it clear to Israel that freedom of movement for Palestinian people and goods needed to be insured, that it had to withdraw from areas occupied since September 2000, end targeted killings and freeze settlements activity. Without security improvements and humanitarian delivery, there could only be limited progress on institutional reform. Finally, the Quartet also agreed on a three-phased road map for achieving a two-State solution within three years, and on the establishment of a third-party mechanism to monitor progress.²¹⁹

The 4614th meeting of the Council²²⁰ was held on 23 and 24 September 2002 in response to requests contained in letters dated 20 September 2002 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine²²¹ and from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic²²² to consider the escalation of Israeli military aggression against Palestinians. The Council included the letters in its agenda.

²¹² Ibid., pp. 5-7.

²¹³ Ibid., p. 14 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 21 (Egypt); p. 22 (Jordan); p. 25 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 26 (LAS); pp. 27-28 (Iraq); p. 29 (Sudan); p. 24 (Indonesia); and p. 35 (Yemen).

²¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 8-9 (France); p. 9 (Ireland); p. 10 (Norway); p. 11 (Russian Federation); p. 20 (United Kingdom); pp. 21-22 (Chile); and p. 24 (Denmark).

²¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 16-17.

²¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 9-10 (Ireland); p. 12 (Singapore); p. 17 (Mexico); and p. 24 (Denmark).

²¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 10-11 (Norway); p. 11 (Russian Federation); p. 15 (Singapore); p. 16 (United States); p. 20 (United Kingdom); p. 24 (Denmark); and p. 29 (Japan).

²¹⁸ Ibid., p. 31.

²¹⁹ S/PV.4613.

²²⁰ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. I, part I, sect. A, case 1, with regard to special cases concerning the application of rules 1-5 of the provisional rules of procedure; and chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter.

²²¹ S/2002/1055.

²²² S/2002/1056.

At the meeting, all Council members made statements, in addition to the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union), Egypt, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the Sudan, Tunisia and Turkey, the Permanent Observer of Palestine, the Secretary-General, the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Permanent Observer of the African Union.

The President of the Council (Bulgaria) drew attention to a letter dated 19 September 2002 from the representative of Israel²²³ referring to new terrorist attacks against Israeli civilians and calling on the international community to strongly condemn the Palestinian terror campaign. He also drew attention to a letter from the Permanent Observer of Palestine dated 20 September 2002,²²⁴ protesting that Israel had reoccupied the compound of the President of the Palestinian Authority in Ramallah.

The Secretary-General strongly condemned the recent terrorist attacks and called on the Palestinians to bring an end to them. He also said that the Quartet had agreed that efforts to reform the Palestinian security apparatus should be done in the context of an overall plan that also addressed political, economic, institutional and humanitarian dimensions. However, he stressed the difficulty for the Palestinians to combat terrorism while their security infrastructures, institutions and basic services were being destroyed. He said that Israel needed to understand that there would be no lasting security without a political settlement, and that the Palestinians should know that there would be no settlement without lasting security for Israel.²²⁵

The representative of Palestine urged the Council to adopt a resolution demanding that Israel withdraw from President Arafat's headquarters and take action to end the humanitarian crisis. He added that the only way to end the tragedy was to pursue a comprehensive approach, which included a "genuine and effective"

²²³ S/2002/1049.

²²⁴ S/2002/1052.

²²⁵ S/PV.4614, pp. 2-4.

international presence on the ground that could be in the form of a sufficient group of official observers or in the establishment of a multinational force.²²⁶

The representative of Israel responded that the Palestinian Authority should resolutely combat terrorism and establish itself as the only party with the authority to use force. He added that Council resolutions that failed to request the dismantling of terrorist organizations and condemn suicide bombings were not just unhelpful but also counterproductive.²²⁷

The representative of the United States affirmed that his country was intensively engaged to calm the situation. He condemned terrorist bombings but also acknowledged that the further destruction of Palestinian civilian and security infrastructures would not improve Israel's security situation.²²⁸

All Council members in addition to Denmark (on behalf of the European Union) condemned terrorist attacks, urged Israel to immediately withdraw from Yasser Arafat's compound and put an end to the blockade on Palestinian cities.²²⁹ They emphasized that the current security context undermined progress on Palestinian reform. They expressed their strong support for the Quartet and the road map, and most agreed with the Secretary-General's point that progress should be based on the parallel pursuit of humanitarian, security, and political tracks (in particular, a return to peace negotiations), as well as reciprocity. In particular, some Council members reaffirmed the need to establish a third-party mechanism to insure implementation by both parties.²³⁰ The representative of Mauritius stated that the first priority after the Palestinian elections of January 2003 should be a declaration of statehood for the Palestinians, with provisional borders.²³¹

Most non-members of the Council also supported the work of the Quartet, but focused their statements on condemning Israeli actions. The representative of Egypt, in particular, stated that Israel could not overcome the will of the Palestinians to resist

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-7.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-23; S/PV.4614 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Denmark).

²³⁰ S/PV.4614, p. 12 (France); p. 16 (Mexico); and p. 21 (Singapore).

²³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

occupation.²³² A few of them reaffirmed the need to establish a civilian protection mechanism²³³ or a multilateral force.²³⁴

Speakers also unanimously expressed concern at the humanitarian situation as exposed in the report of the Personal Humanitarian Envoy of the Secretary-General Catherine Bertini, and some specifically called for the implementation of the recommendations contained in it, in particular that Israel facilitate immediate access by humanitarian agencies in the affected areas.²³⁵

Finally, many speakers mentioned a draft resolution introduced by the Syrian Arab Republic²³⁶ in which the Council would demand a complete cessation of violence and the withdrawal of Israel from Palestinian cities.²³⁷

At the end of the meeting, on 24 September 2002, a draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria, France, Ireland, Norway and the United Kingdom²³⁸ was put to the vote. It was adopted by 14 votes with 1 abstention (United States), as resolution 1435 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reiterated its demand for the complete cessation of all acts of violence, including all acts of terror, provocation, incitement and destruction;

Demanded that Israel immediately cease measures in and around Ramallah including destruction of Palestinian civilian and security infrastructure;

Demanded also expeditious withdrawal of Israeli occupying forces from Palestinian cities towards the return to the positions held prior to September 2000;

²³² *Ibid.*, p. 23.

²³³ S/PV.4614 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Malaysia); and p. 10 (Tunisia).

²³⁴ S/PV.4614, p. 24 (Egypt, Bangladesh); S/PV.4614 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 8 (Malaysia); p. 19 (Algeria); and p. 27 (African Union).

²³⁵ S/PV.4614, p. 11 (Norway); p. 14 (Ireland); pp. 15-16 (Colombia); p. 17 (Mauritius); p. 22 (Singapore, Bulgaria); S/PV.4614 (Resumption 1), p. 14 (Pakistan); p. 16 (India); p. 20 (Indonesia); and p. 23 (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People).

²³⁶ S/2002/1057.

²³⁷ S/PV.4614, p. 19 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 25 (South Africa). S/PV.4614 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Bahrain); p. 8 (Malaysia); p. 11 (Tunisia); p. 20 (Qatar); p. 25 (Iraq); and p. 28 (Mauritania).

²³⁸ S/2002/1063.

Called upon the Palestinian Authority to meet its commitment to ensure that those responsible for terrorist acts were brought to justice by it; called upon Israel and the Palestinian Authority to cooperate with the Quartet, recognizing the importance of the initiative endorsed at the Arab League Summit held in Beirut in March 2002.

After the adoption, the representative of the United States stated that, contrary to the draft resolution his country had previously introduced, the resolution had failed to explicitly condemn the terrorist groups and those who provided them with political cover, support and safe haven, which was why his delegation had abstained.²³⁹

Decision of 20 December 2002 (4681st meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

At its 4645th and 4668th meetings, on 12 November and 16 December 2002, the Council heard briefings by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs and the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process, respectively.

The Council was informed that, despite the formation of a new Palestinian Cabinet, Israeli-Palestinian violence was ongoing. Terrorist attacks were damaging to the Palestinian cause but, at the same time, Israel had to respect international humanitarian law in confronting terrorism. In particular, the killings of United Nations staff members by the Israel Defense Forces were strongly deplored. The humanitarian situation continued to deepen as Israel had made little efforts to implement its commitments to improve the situation. The expansion of settlements and the erection of a new security wall were detrimental to a peaceful solution, and the absence of an electoral legislative framework would certainly hamper the scheduled Palestinian elections in January 2003. Finally, the gap between the deteriorating situation on the ground and the growing consensus about the two-State solution constituted a paradox which needed to be tackled. To that end, a detailed plan on how to move forward, prepared by the Quartet, was expected.²⁴⁰

At the 4681st meeting, on 20 December 2002, the President of the Council (Colombia) drew attention to a draft resolution introduced by the Syrian Arab

²³⁹ S/PV.4614 (Resumption 2), p. 2.

²⁴⁰ S/PV.4645, pp. 2-6 and S/PV.4668, pp. 2-5.

Republic²⁴¹, by which the Council would condemn the killing of United Nations employees and destruction of a World Food Programme warehouse by the Israel Defense Forces; demand that Israel comply with the Geneva Conventions and refrain from the excessive and disproportionate use of force; and request the Secretary-General to inform the Council on any developments on that regard. During the meeting, the representatives of Bulgaria, France, Ireland, Israel, Norway, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United States, and the Permanent Observer of Palestine made statements.

The representative of the United States stated that, because the draft resolution did not urge action by all concerned to minimize threats to the United Nations, his country would veto it. He expressed regret that the sponsors of the draft resolution did not want to engage on the alternative proposal the United States had submitted.²⁴²

The representative of Bulgaria said his country would abstain because of a lack of unanimity. The representatives of Norway, France, and Ireland stated it would have been quite appropriate for the Council to adopt the draft resolution and remind Israel of the need to fully respect international humanitarian law.²⁴³ The representatives of Palestine and the Syrian Arab Republic deplored the fact that, despite international consensus on the issue, protection given to Israel by one permanent member of the Council was allowing Israel to flout international humanitarian law.²⁴⁴

The representative of Israel expressed regret at the killing, and said that his country was engaged in a thorough investigation and that the findings would be made available to the relevant authorities.²⁴⁵

The draft resolution was put to a vote and received 12 votes in favour to 1 against (United States), with 2 abstentions (Bulgaria, Cameroon), and was not adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

²⁴¹ S/2002/1385.

²⁴² S/PV.4681, pp. 2-3.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (Bulgaria, France, Norway); and pp. 3-4 (Ireland).

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5 (Palestine); and P. 6 (Syrian Arab Republic).

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

Deliberations of 16 January 2003 to 19 August 2003 (4885th, 4704th, 4722nd, 4741st, 4757th, 4773rd, 4788th and 4810th meetings)

At its 4685th, 4704th, 4722nd,²⁴⁶ 4741st, 4757th, 4773rd, 4788th and 4810th meetings, on 16 January, 13 February, 19 March, 16 April, 19 May, 13 June, 17 July and 19 August 2003 respectively, the Council heard briefings by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs,²⁴⁷ the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs,²⁴⁸ and the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process.²⁴⁹ No other statements were made during the meetings.

The briefings focused mainly on implementation by the parties of the Quartet's three-phase road map for achieving a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Under the road map's guiding principle of parallelism, progress was to be pursued on all issues at the same time and monitored on the basis of the parties' compliance with specific performance benchmarks. The first phase required the parties to implement a complete ceasefire, improve humanitarian conditions, promote Palestinian institution-building and halt all settlement construction. The road map was officially presented to the parties on 30 April 2003 but its broad lines had already been defined in December 2002.²⁵⁰

At the briefings, it was reported to the Council that the level of violence initially continued with Palestinian terrorist attacks and Israel's disproportionate use of force against Palestinian cities until a ceasefire was finally announced on 30 June 2003 with the help of the Egyptian government. In July the security situation slightly improved, but there were violations of the ceasefire in August.

Many remaining challenges were however highlighted and Israel was called on, *inter alia*, to remove settlement outposts and freeze settlement activities; put an end to the construction of the security

²⁴⁶ For more information on the discussion at the 4722nd meeting, see chap. XI, part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51 of the Charter.

²⁴⁷ At the 4685th, 4704th and 4773rd meetings.

²⁴⁸ At the 4741st and 4810th meetings.

²⁴⁹ At the 4722nd, 4757th and 4788th meetings.

²⁵⁰ The development of the road map was a lengthy process which began with the meeting of the Quartet Principals in New York in September 2002, at the initiative of the Secretary-General; for the text, see S/2003/529.

wall in the West Bank; stop demolishing Palestinian homes; release more Palestinian prisoners; and help strengthen the new Palestinian government by easing restrictions. The Palestinian Authority was urged to intensify efforts to achieve full security control over its areas; the fact that all security forces were yet to be regrouped under the authority of the Interior Minister, owing to restrictions on mobility imposed by Israel, was deplored. Travel restrictions, including on United Nations personnel, and periodic closures of the Rafah crossing into Gaza had also led to the deteriorating humanitarian and socio-economic situation in the Palestinian territories.

Some positive developments were noted, including on the reform of the Palestinian Authority with the designation of Mahmoud Abbas as the first Palestinian Prime Minister. In addition, the parties had both endorsed the road map during the summit meeting held at Aqaba on 4 June 2003 at the initiative of the United States. The peace process was then revived and Israeli and Palestinian leaders started to meet on a regular basis. The Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process emphasized that a resumption of negotiations on both the Syrian and Lebanese tracks as early as January 2004 would help the Palestinian-Israeli track.²⁵¹

Decision of 16 September 2003 (4828th meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

The 4824th meeting of the Council was held on 15 September 2003 in response to the request contained in a letter dated 12 September 2003 from the representative of the Sudan in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States,²⁵² to consider the continuing escalation against the Palestinian people. The Council included the letter in its agenda, the letter also contained a draft resolution reiterating the demand for the cessation of violence, demanding that Israel cease any threat to the safety of the President of the Palestinian Authority, expressing full support for the efforts of the Quartet and calling for implementation of the road map by the two sides.

During the meeting, all Council members made statements, as did the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy (on

behalf of the European Union), Japan, Jordan, Malaysia (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates, the Permanent Observer of Palestine, the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process, the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, and the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.²⁵³

The Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process first briefed the Council on the situation on the ground. He reported that the ceasefire had been broken with three suicide bomb attacks against Israelis, killing 38 people, and he called on the Palestinian Authority to bring the planners of those attacks to justice. While recognizing Israel's right to defend itself, he re-emphasized that Israel had to comply with international humanitarian law. Recent violence, coupled with lack of implementation of the road map, had resulted in the stalling of the peace process.²⁵⁴

The representative of Palestine called on the Council to take immediate measures against Israel's decision to "remove Yasser Arafat" and to help revive the road map with the establishment of a monitoring mechanism and the sending of international troops in the region.²⁵⁵ The representative of Israel reaffirmed that his country strongly believed that Yasser Arafat was an obstacle to peace because of his encouragement of terrorism.²⁵⁶

Council members unanimously deplored the renewed violence and a majority of them urged both parties to resume implementation of the road map. The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, echoed by the majority of other speakers, condemned Israel's continued policy of aggression, called on Israel to withdraw from occupied territories and recommit itself to the road map, and asked the Council to compel Israel to put an end to violations of international law.²⁵⁷ The Israeli decision to expel President Arafat was also widely rejected. Many specifically called on Israel to revoke this decision.²⁵⁸

²⁵¹ S/PV.4788, p. 6.

²⁵² S/2003/880.

²⁵³ The representative of Canada was also present but did not make a statement.

²⁵⁴ S/PV.4824, pp. 3-7.

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-12.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 13 (China); p. 17 (Mexico); p. 20 (Germany);

The representative of Spain focused on the fragility of the mechanism contained in the road map, and the need for it to be interpreted according to the context. He added that the political perspective of the road map was ambiguous and needed to be supported by both parties. He said that the Secretary-General needed to revitalize the end goals of the road map so that both Israel's security and the viability of the future Palestinian State would be included.²⁵⁹ This was echoed by the representative of Australia, who stated that credible guarantees for the security of Israelis were key to success of the road map.²⁶⁰

Several speakers proposed specific solutions to the crisis, including organizing an international conference,²⁶¹ establishing a monitoring mechanism,²⁶² deploying an interposition force,²⁶³ or sending observers to the region.²⁶⁴ A few speakers expressly supported the draft resolution presented by the Arab Group,²⁶⁵ and the representative of France said that his country was prepared to work on the basis of that text.²⁶⁶ The representative of Algeria called for the adoption of another draft resolution presented by Angola on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.²⁶⁷

The representative of the United States said that the Council had to take a clear stand against terrorist groups and that his country would only support a draft resolution that condemned terrorist acts and called for the dismantling of terrorist infrastructure. He added that his country did not support either the elimination of Yasser Arafat or his forced exile.²⁶⁸

p. 22 (Spain); p. 24 (Guinea); S/PV.4824 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Bangladesh); and p. 21 (Nepal).

²⁵⁹ S/PV.4824, pp. 22-23.

²⁶⁰ S/PV.4824 (Resumption 1), p. 13.

²⁶¹ S/PV.4824, p. 19 (France).

²⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 19 (France); S/PV.4824 (Resumption 1), p. 15 (South Africa); pp. 19-20 (Tunisia); and p. 21 (Norway).

²⁶³ S/PV.4824, p. 19 (France).

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 22 (Spain).

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 24 (Guinea); S/PV.4824 (Resumption 1), p. 13 (Italy).

²⁶⁶ S/PV.4824, p. 19.

²⁶⁷ S/PV.4824 (Resumption 1), p. 5.

²⁶⁸ S/PV.4824, p. 25.

At its 4828th meeting,²⁶⁹ on 16 September 2003, the Council again included in its agenda the letter dated 12 September 2003 from the representative of the Sudan. The President (United Kingdom) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Pakistan, South Africa, the Sudan and the Syrian Arab Republic,²⁷⁰ by which, *inter alia*, the Council would reiterate demand for the complete cessation of all acts of violence; demand that Israel desist from any act of deportation and cease any threat to the safety of the President of the Palestinian Authority; express its support for the Quartet; call for increased efforts to implement the road map by the two sides; and underline the importance of the next Quartet meeting in New York. The draft resolution was put to the vote and received 11 votes in favour and 1 against (United States), with 3 abstentions (Bulgaria, Germany, United Kingdom), and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

The representatives of Bulgaria, Chile, France, Germany, Israel, Pakistan, Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Kingdom and the United States and the Permanent Observer of Palestine then made statements.

The representative of the United States maintained that the draft resolution had failed to incorporate a robust condemnation of terrorism and of specific terrorist groups, and a call for the dismantlement of infrastructures that support these groups.²⁷¹ Likewise, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that the draft resolution was not sufficiently balanced.²⁷² The representative of Bulgaria said that the Council should have made more efforts to reach a consensus.²⁷³ The representative of Germany stated that despite the abstention his country's position remained that Israel's decision to expel Yasser Arafat was detrimental to the peace process.²⁷⁴

The remaining speakers expressed regret at the fact that the resolution had not obtained consensus and

²⁶⁹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. III, part II, sect. A, case 8, with regard to the stage at which those invited to participate are heard; and chap. VI, part I, sect. C, case 1, with regard to practice in relation to Article 12 of the Charter.

²⁷⁰ S/2003/891.

²⁷¹ S/PV.4828, p. 2.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

reaffirmed that the Israeli decision to expel Mr. Arafat was against the law and politically counterproductive.²⁷⁵

**Decision of 14 October 2003 (4842nd meeting):
rejection of a draft resolution**

The 4841st meeting of the Council²⁷⁶ was held on 14 October 2003 in response to the request contained in a letter dated 9 October 2003 from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States,²⁷⁷ to consider the illegal Israeli settlement activities and Israel's construction of an expansionist wall in the occupied Palestinian territories. The Council included the letter in its agenda; the letter included a draft resolution, by which the Council would, inter alia, reaffirm the two-State solution; reiterate its opposition to settlement activities in the occupied Palestinian territories; and decide that the construction of the wall was illegal under international law and that it must be ceased and reversed.

All Council members made statements, as did the representatives of Argentina, Bahrain, Brazil, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Italy (on behalf of the European Union), Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen, the Permanent Observer of Palestine, the Permanent Observer of LAS, the Deputy Permanent Observer of OIC, and the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

The President of the Council (United States) drew attention to two letters dated 9 October 2003 from the representatives of Malaysia²⁷⁸ and the Islamic Republic of Iran,²⁷⁹ conveying the support of the Non-Aligned Movement and OIC, respectively, to the Arab Group's request.

The representative of Palestine stressed that indiscriminate killings of Palestinians and the construction of an expansionist wall in the occupied Palestinian territories including East Jerusalem constituted war crimes. He deplored the confiscation of Palestinian land for that aim and asserted that Israel's goal was to conquer more land.²⁸⁰ The representative of Israel replied that the wall was intended to prevent, non-violently, the passage of terrorists into Israel and that this ultimately would lead to an atmosphere conducive to peaceful negotiations. He added that in the absence of Palestinian compliance with Council resolutions asking it to dismantle terrorist infrastructures, Israel had no other option. He pointed out that international humanitarian law allowed for territory to be requisitioned for security purposes and that compensation matching the property value was being provided.²⁸¹

Most Council members reiterated their condemnation of terrorist acts but also expressed their deep concern for the construction of the wall. They recognized that it was illegal, had negative humanitarian consequences, was contrary to the road map and called into question the two-State solution. Some Council members called for resolute Council action.²⁸² The representative of the Russian Federation specifically called for the adoption of a resolution that would approve the road map. The Russian Federation, France and China supported the convening of an international conference on the Middle East and the establishment of a monitoring mechanism to ensure implementation of the road map by the parties.²⁸³ The representative of Bulgaria however stated that condemning this specific aspect of the overall picture in the Middle East would not contribute to the resumption of the peace process.²⁸⁴ This was echoed by the representative of the United States, who also noted that ending terrorism must be the priority and that any resolution would have to take into account the bigger picture. He added that his country understood Israel's security concerns but urged it to consider the

²⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 3 (Pakistan); p. 4 (France, Chile, Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 5 (Spain).

²⁷⁶ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51 of the Charter.

²⁷⁷ S/2003/973.

²⁷⁸ S/2003/974.

²⁷⁹ S/2003/977.

²⁸⁰ S/PV.4841, pp. 3-6.

²⁸¹ Ibid., pp. 7-12.

²⁸² Ibid., p. 13 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 16 (Mexico, Chile); p. 17 (Guinea); p. 19 (France); p. 21 (Angola); and p. 22 (Pakistan).

²⁸³ Ibid., p. 15 (Russian Federation); p. 19 (France); and p. 20 (China).

²⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 15.

consequences of building the wall so that it did not prejudice the outcome of a peace agreement.²⁸⁵

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic reiterated that the construction of the wall was aimed at creating Palestinian enclaves and at consolidating Israel's annexation of vast areas of the West Bank and East Jerusalem. He called on the Council to condemn Israel and make it clear that these practices were contrary to international law. He expressed his fear that the absence of Council action would hurt the Council's credibility.²⁸⁶ This was echoed by the majority of other speakers and non-Council members.

Some other speakers, while expressing concern for the construction of the wall, also reiterated the need for the Palestinian Authority to resolutely fight terrorism.²⁸⁷

The representative of Palestine, speaking for the second time, rejected Israel's vision that Palestinian territories were not occupied but "disputed" and noted the failure to explain why the wall was being built deep inside Palestinian territory and not on the armistice line of 1949.²⁸⁸

At its 4842nd meeting, held on 14 October 2003, the Council again included in its agenda the letter dated 9 October 2003 from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. The President (United States) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Guinea, Malaysia, Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic,²⁸⁹ by which the Council would decide that the construction of the wall was illegal and had to be reversed.

The draft was put to a vote and received 10 votes in favour to 1 against (United States), with 4 abstentions (Bulgaria, Cameroon, Germany, United Kingdom), and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

Statements were then made by the representatives of the United States and Israel and the Permanent Observer of Palestine.

The representative of the United States stated that the draft resolution was unbalanced and asserted that a Council resolution focused on the fence would not further peace in the region.²⁹⁰ While the representative of Palestine deplored the fact that the Council had been unable to take a firm stand on the expansionist wall and said that it was urgent to find a way to redress this within the framework of the United Nations system, the representative of Israel contended that the draft resolution was biased as it failed to draw attention to Palestinian terrorism which was the very cause of Israeli defence measures.²⁹¹

Decision of 19 November 2003 (4862nd meeting): resolution 1515 (2003)

At its 4846th²⁹² and 4861st meetings, on 21 October 2003 and 19 November 2003, respectively, the Council heard briefings by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs.

The Under-Secretary-General noted that actions taken by both sides had the effect of deepening the sense of mistrust between them. As a result, violence continued and the peace process was stalled. He called on the parties to return to the negotiations with the help of the international community. He also reiterated his condemnation of terrorism and asked the Palestinian Authority, especially the newly appointed Prime Minister, to make more efforts to establish law and order. Likewise, he called on Israel to cease the use of disproportionate and indiscriminate force in civilian areas, to reverse its policy of settlement expansion, to implement a settlement freeze and halt the construction of the wall as requested by the General Assembly.²⁹³ Finally, he condemned the deterioration of the humanitarian situation due to severe restrictions on the movement of humanitarian goods and aid workers.²⁹⁴

At the 4862nd meeting, on 19 November 2003, the President (Angola) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria, Chile, China, France, Germany, Guinea, Mexico, the Russian Federation,

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33 (Japan); p. 37 (Argentina); p. 40 (Turkey); p. 42 (Italy); p. 43 (Norway); and p. 44 (New Zealand).

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

²⁸⁹ S/2003/980.

²⁹⁰ S/PV.4842, p. 2.

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

²⁹² For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51 of the Charter.

²⁹³ General Assembly resolution ES-10/13 of 21 October 2003.

²⁹⁴ S/PV.4846, pp. 2-5, and S/PV.4861, pp. 2-5.

Spain and the United Kingdom;²⁹⁵ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1515 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Endorsed the Quartet performance-based road map to a permanent two-State solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict;²⁹⁶

Called upon the parties to fulfil their obligations under the road map in cooperation with the Quartet and to achieve the vision of two States living side by side in peace and security.

Deliberations of 12 December 2003 (4879th meeting)

At its 4879th meeting, on 12 December 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process.

The Special Coordinator said that despite a lack of diplomatic progress there had been relative calm on the ground. He welcomed the reaffirmation by both parties of their commitments toward the implementation of the road map, applauded civil society initiatives aimed at bringing Israelis and

Palestinians together, and considered resolution 1515 (2003) an extremely positive step. He however cautioned against recent Israeli proposals to undertake a unilateral withdrawal of certain parts of the occupied Territories. He noted that while the Israeli withdrawal from southern Lebanon had been cited as a precedent, that withdrawal had not been carried out under Security Council supervision and with intense support from the United Nations Secretariat and in negotiation with both parties. On the other hand, a truly unilateral withdrawal would contain problematic elements, as it might be perceived by some that only terror and violence could create change, and that it was not necessary to arrive at a peaceful settlement through negotiations underpinned by international legitimacy. He reaffirmed the need for a step-by-step approach assisted by confidence-building measures and the need to address territory and terror as core issues. Finally, he referred to new proposals for providing financial assistance to the Palestinian Authority to compensate for economic losses and the dire humanitarian situation.²⁹⁷

²⁹⁵ S/2003/1100.

²⁹⁶ S/2003/529, annex.

²⁹⁷ S/PV.4879.

34. Items relating to Iraq

A. The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

Decision of 31 March 2000 (4123rd meeting): resolution 1293 (2000)

At its 4120th meeting,¹ on 24 March 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda a report of the Secretary-General dated 10 March 2000.² In his report, the Secretary-General observed that, at the outset of the implementation of the “oil-for-food” programme in 1997, the rate of deterioration of basic infrastructure had been accelerating, exacerbating the overall poor

nutritional status of the population and undermining public health. Consequently, this required efficient procurement and distribution systems and a broader range of inputs, financed at a much higher level than had been initially envisaged. However, the time frame required to halt deterioration of the humanitarian situation had proved to be much longer than anticipated because of the serious funding shortfall due to unexpectedly low oil prices. Despite the difficulties and shortcomings that had been identified in the report, the programme had provided substantial assistance in all sectors to address pressing humanitarian needs affecting the lives of the Iraqi people. However, a determined effort needed to be made by all parties concerned to collaborate effectively with a view to making further improvements in the implementation of the programme. To the end, he made a number of technical recommendations to the Government of Iraq and to the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between

¹ During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held a number of meetings in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sects. A and B. The meetings were held on 2 October 2001 (4386th), 2 October 2002 (4617th), 2 April 2003 (4733rd) and 1 July 2003 (4781st).

² S/2000/208, submitted pursuant to paragraphs 28 and 30 of resolution 1284 (1999) and paragraph 5 of resolution 1281 (1999).

Iraq and Kuwait. He noted that despite the measures adopted to improve the funding level and widen the scope of the programme, its full potential had not been attained because of the numerous difficulties encountered. Accordingly, he appealed again to all those concerned to intensify their efforts in order to enable the programme to address more effectively the difficult conditions under which the Iraqi people continued to live.

At the meeting, the President drew attention to a letter dated 22 March 2000 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990), concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, transmitting the report of the Committee pursuant to paragraph 10 of resolution 1281 (1999).³ Following a briefing by the Secretary-General on the humanitarian aspects of resolution 1284 (1999), statements were made by all members of the Council, as well as the Director of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).

In his briefing, the Secretary-General noted that while the original form of the oil-for-food programme had been subject to tight restrictions, as a result of decisions made by the Council over the previous three years, the list of items Iraq had been allowed to import had been considerably expanded and liberalized, and the ceiling on oil exports entirely eliminated. He stressed that although the recent rise in the price of oil had increased the value of exports, the oil industry in Iraq was seriously hampered by a lack of spare parts and equipment, which threatened the income of the programme in the long term. Therefore, he recommended a significant increase in the allocation of resources under the programme for the purchase of spare parts for the oil industry. He urged the Government of Iraq to take all necessary steps to ensure the effective and prompt distribution of the imported items. However, he stressed that even if the programme was implemented perfectly, it was possible that it would prove insufficient to satisfy the population's needs. The Council therefore needed to

³ S/2000/242. The report covers the Committee's major activities during the first 90-day period of phase VII of the oil-for-food programme, including information on the sale of petroleum and petroleum products; the processing of contracts for the supply of humanitarian products to Iraq; and efforts to expedite the approval process for contracts for sending oil spare parts and equipment to Iraq in accordance with existing procedures.

keep the effectiveness and impact of the programme constantly under review and take further steps to improve it if necessary. He concluded by saying that the humanitarian situation in Iraq posed a "serious moral dilemma" for the United Nations. He expressed particular concern over the report prepared by UNICEF and the Iraqi Ministry of Health that indicated that, in the centre and south of Iraq, infant mortality and morbidity had increased dramatically and reached unacceptable levels. In that context, he was happy to hear that the Committee was ready to give the Secretariat a list of drugs and other medical supplies which the Secretariat under resolution 1284 (1999) would be able to approve on its own authority. He maintained that while the Council needed to seek every opportunity to alleviate the suffering of the population, everyone needed to realize that the people of a State which was the object of sanctions would always, in some degree, be victims, both of their own Government and of the measures taken against it. The only satisfactory outcome of any such situation was for the State in question to return to full compliance with the decisions of the Council, so that the sanctions could be ended quickly.⁴

All speakers stressed the need to improve the deteriorating humanitarian situation in Iraq by improving the oil-for-food programme. Most speakers also stressed the need for Iraq to accept resolution 1284 (1999), which offered a path towards the suspension and lifting of sanctions. Most members of the Council expressed concern over the state of the oil infrastructure in Iraq and the resulting decline in production capability.

Several speakers endorsed the recommendation of the Secretary-General to increase the allocation to \$600 million to finance the procurement of oil spare parts and equipment for phases VI and VII to offset permanent damage to the oil-bearing structures in Iraq.⁵ A number of speakers stressed that every effort needed to be made to reduce the number and the length of holds on humanitarian and other contracts.⁶ Some

⁴ S/PV.4120, pp. 2-3.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20 (Canada); p. 21 (Tunisia); p. 24 (Ukraine); S/PV.4120 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Jamaica); p. 4 (United Kingdom); p. 6 (Namibia); p. 7 (Malaysia); p. 11 (Argentina); and p. 12 (Bangladesh).

⁶ S/PV.4120, p. 20 (Canada); p. 22 (Tunisia); p. 23 (Mali); p. 24 (Ukraine); S/PV.4120 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Jamaica); p. 7 (Malaysia); p. 11 (Argentina); and p. 12 (Bangladesh).

speakers called for regular and comprehensive assessments of the impact of sanctions.⁷ Several speakers also called for an end to the “no-fly zones”.⁸

The representative of the Netherlands noted that there was a striking contrast between the report of the Secretary-General, which provided information on the progress made in meeting the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people, and the alarming messages received from various quarters calling for swift and decisive action to halt and reverse the long-standing humanitarian emergency in Iraq. He asserted, however, that the two observations were not incompatible. The humanitarian programme was implemented within the context of a sanctions regime and should not be confused with a development programme. He maintained that the sanctions regime would come to an end as soon as the Government of Iraq met its obligations under the relevant Security Council resolutions. He observed that while it was “futile” to try to present the position of the Council as a “unified stand”, there was a remarkable degree of consensus on the fact that Iraq had yet to convince the international community that it had really abandoned its dream of developing weapons of mass destruction. He noted that Iraq was “the only country in modern history that had not only attempted to develop all categories of weapons of mass destruction — nuclear, biological and chemical” but had actually used such weapons against a foreign enemy and its own citizens. On the issue of the holds placed on contracts, he maintained that while credit was due to those delegations which possessed both the required resources and the political will to scrutinize all contracts for dual-use potential, his delegation considered the amount of applications placed on hold “intolerably high”, and stressed that a more sustained effort to reduce the amount was required.⁹

The representative of the Russian Federation averred that the report of the Secretary-General showed clearly that the scale of the “humanitarian catastrophe” in Iraq was inexorably leading to the “disintegration of the very fabric of civil society”. The “total impoverishment of the population” had led to a

situation where an entire generation of Iraqis had been “physically and morally crippled”. He maintained that the blocking by certain delegations of humanitarian contracts in the Committee continued to pose a serious threat to the implementation of the humanitarian programme. Completely “artificial pretexts” were being trumped up in order to place on hold contracts to deliver needed equipment to rehabilitate electrical power stations, medical equipment, vehicular transport and communications resources. He maintained that the artificial nature of the situation was illustrated by the fact that contracts from certain countries were put on hold, whereas requests for deliveries of similar goods from other countries were endorsed without problem. He called on the delegations concerned to review their approach. He also opined that the socio-economic and humanitarian situation in Iraq was worsening because civilian facilities in Iraq were constantly the targets of air strikes by the United States and the United Kingdom, in the unilaterally established “no-flight zones”. He stated that 42 per cent of the air strikes had resulted in human casualties, including a number of civilians. He asserted that the claims that the air strikes were not directed against civilian targets, or that they were in retaliation for actions by Iraqi anti-aircraft defences, did not “hold water”, as the data showed that facilities unrelated to anti-aircraft defence systems were being hit. The air strikes created a negative political backdrop for efforts to resume cooperation between the United Nations and the Government of Iraq, including on disarmament.¹⁰

The representative of the United States stressed that, given the long pattern of unacceptable behaviour by the Government of Iraq, including public rejection of resolution 1284 (1999), sanctions were the leverage that the international community had to get Iraq to comply with Security Council resolutions. He acknowledged that, because Iraq had continued to evade its obligations, sanctions had continued for an unimagined period. However, the Government of Iraq’s refusal to fulfil its responsibilities to care for and feed its own people had also been unimagined and still remained hard to comprehend. Iraq had consistently underspent on education, under-ordered foodstuffs and had never met the minimum calorie and protein targets set by the Secretary-General. While no one denied that poor oilfield management practices and lack of spare parts had resulted in critical circumstances for oil

⁷ S/PV.4120, p. 22 (Tunisia); S/PV.4120 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Namibia); p. 10 (Malaysia); and p. 12 (Bangladesh).

⁸ S/PV.4120, p. 19 (China); and S/PV.4120 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Malaysia).

⁹ S/PV.4120, pp. 3-5.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

production capacity, at the same time, Iraq had converted container ports into oil depots and had brought on line new facilities to export petroleum products in order to steal money via smuggling. He maintained that the abuses in Iraq, including warehousing of supplies, the wilful neglect of specific humanitarian sectors, the under-ordering of medicines and nutritional supplements, the siphoning off of goods to agents of the regime, the illegal re-exportation of humanitarian supplies, the establishment of front companies, the payment of kickbacks to manipulate and gain from oil-for-food contracts, were all well documented. Moreover, it was difficult to measure the impact of Iraqi obstruction on the broadest scale. For example, the fact that the Government of Iraq refused to divulge or make transparent financial figures and statistics made it difficult, if not impossible, to judge the general economic situation. He stressed that despite the manipulation by the Government of Iraq, the oil-for-food programme worked admirably, and about 90 per cent of the goods requested were approved. Describing his country's policy on reviewing and approving contracts, he stated that the review of contracts was guided by two principles: preventing Iraq from acquiring the means to again threaten regional stability and improving the humanitarian situation. He stated that the United States had about 1,000 contracts on hold out of more than 10,000 received, and for more than one third his delegation was waiting on information from the supplier about the goods, the end use or the end user. Other items were held because they had the potential for dual-use as components of weapons of mass destruction; were on the resolution 1051 (1996) list;¹¹ were linked to companies that have operated or were operating in violation of sanctions; or had irregular financial terms. He also admitted that there were 339 contracts on hold because his delegation had not yet reviewed additional information received, and stressed that the United States was tightening its procedures with a goal of quicker response times and examining the review criteria with the aim of focusing on holds on the items of most serious concern. However, he stressed that the best way to reduce the holds was to provide a guarantee that contracted goods went to approved purposes, which

¹¹ In resolution 1051 (1996), the Council referred to items to be notified by the United Nations Special Commission or the International Atomic Energy Agency under the plans for monitoring and verification approved by resolution 715 (1991).

could be achieved through better monitoring arrangements. Regarding the no-fly zones, the representative noted that they had been established to alleviate the most egregious examples of attacks by the Government of Iraq on the vulnerable population groups, including indiscriminate bombardment of civilian settlements, in the north and south, and that their enforcement had prevented wholesale genocide.¹²

The representative of France maintained that society in Iraq was "being destroyed", and, while the Government of Iraq bore a heavy share of the initial blame for the disastrous situation, the Council could no longer disregard its own responsibility in the matter, which was indisputable and increasingly condemned by international public opinion. He stressed that only the suspension of civilian sanctions, in the context of implementing resolution 1284 (1999), and then lifting them completely once conditions had been fulfilled, would allow the economy to start growing again. Meanwhile, the members of the Council had a responsibility to improve the Iraq programme. On the question of holds, while acknowledging that it was legitimate to ensure that goods were not used for prohibited purposes, the number of holds had become unacceptable. In particular, in certain vital sectors, such as electricity, water, agriculture and the oil industry, the rate of holds exceeded 50 per cent, which meant that the humanitarian programme could no longer function in those areas. He regretted the fact that few of the improvements to the programme envisaged in resolution 1284 (1999) that could reduce the number of holds had gone into force.¹³

The representative of China stressed that it was essential to maintain oil production and export capability in Iraq, because it was the basis for implementing the oil-for-food programme. Therefore, it was necessary to have the funds earmarked for the procurement of oil spare parts increased from \$300 million to \$600 million. He also stated that the serious problem of holds on contracts had exacerbated the deplorable humanitarian situation in Iraq. On the question of dual-use items, he asserted that while Council resolutions strictly prohibited the export of any materials or equipment to Iraq for military purposes, there had been no evidence of violations in that regard. Moreover, the Secretary-General, when

¹² S/PV.4120, pp. 7-14.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-17.

approving the distribution plans submitted by the Government of Iraq, also carried out a strict examination and check on all items to be procured. Therefore, his delegation believed that all contracts looked at by the Office of the Iraq Programme and submitted to the sanctions Committee should be considered as conforming to all the relevant United Nations stipulations. He complained that despite this, some members still asked exporters for additional information, but then did not respond in an efficient way, causing long delays. Therefore, he called on the relevant Committee members to expedite the release of holds, but also called for improvements in the efficiency of the sanctions Committee, and for enhancing the monitoring capability of the Office of the Humanitarian Coordinator for Iraq to reassure Council members as to the use of goods. He also stressed that the no-fly zones had not been authorized by the Council, and called on all countries concerned to cease all military actions. In conclusion, he maintained that the sanctions would not help solve the problem, and the fundamental solution was in “the timely lifting of sanctions”.¹⁴

The representative of the United Kingdom, noting the concerns about the number of holds on contracts for Iraq, stated that it was time to put the “problem in perspective”. He stressed that, although it was the “core collective responsibility” of the Council to ensure that Iraq did not import items it could use to rebuild its military or weapons of mass destruction capability, only a small minority of Council members assumed full responsibility for doing that, while the rest of the Council assumed that they would. While his delegation would process its examination contracts “quickly and objectively”, they would not be diverted from preventing Iraq from rearming. He stressed that the biggest cause of holds was simply a lack of information on contracts, as well as the lack of information about the end use. The latter problem could be improved by more effective monitoring and observation in Iraq, where, despite the tripling in size of the programme, the number of United Nations observers had not increased since the programme was created. He noted that the sanctions Committee had heard a briefing from the Multinational Interception Force on its operations in the Gulf and on the enforcement of the Council’s resolutions, which had presented clear evidence that since mid-1999

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 17-19.

smugglers had stepped up their activities to the point of exporting illegally over 400,000 tons per month of gas oil from Iraq, using the protection of Iranian territorial waters to transport oil to traders in the United Arab Emirates, as well as through other neighbouring States, including Turkey. He stressed that this impacted negatively on the revenues of the oil-for-food programme and urged the neighbouring States to take steps to prevent the trade. Regarding the no-fly zones, he maintained that they had been established in support of resolution 688 (1991), which called on Iraq to end its repression of the civilian population. In his view, the zones were justified under international law, in response to a situation of overwhelming humanitarian necessity. He reiterated that his country’s aircraft targeted only aircraft and ground facilities that target them, and that their actions were limited to proportionate responses and carefully targeted to avoid civilian casualties. He also accused Iraq of inflating military and civilian casualties for propaganda effect.¹⁵

The representative of Malaysia described the sanctions against Iraq as “the most comprehensive and punitive sanctions ever imposed on a people” and asserted that sanctions had destroyed Iraq as a modern State and decimated its people. The devastating effects of the sanctions testified to the failure of comprehensive sanctions as a policy tool, as such sanctions violated basic human rights. He argued that there should be no linkage between progress in disarming Iraq and the humanitarian efforts by the Council. Calling the continuation of the sanctions regime morally indefensible and incompatible with the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter, he called for the economic sanctions to be drastically overhauled, eased and de-linked from the military sanctions.¹⁶

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Director of UNICEF stated that sanctions had been a factor in the rise of child mortality, but not the only one, as the effects of two wars and the failure of the Government of Iraq to invest in social services had also contributed.¹⁷

At its 4123rd meeting, on 31 March 2000, the Council again included the report of the Secretary-General dated 10 March 2000 in its agenda. The

¹⁵ S/PV.4120 (Resumption 1), pp. 3-6.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 7-10.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 13.

President (Bangladesh) then drew attention to a draft resolution;¹⁸ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1293 (2000), by which, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided, pursuant to paragraphs 28 and 29 of resolution 1284 (1999), that from the funds in the escrow account produced pursuant to resolutions 1242 (1999) and 1281 (1999) up to a total of \$600 million might be used to meet any reasonable expenses, other than expenses payable in Iraq, which followed directly from the contracts approved in accordance with paragraph 2 of resolution 1175 (1998), and expressed its intention to consider favourably the renewal of that provision;

Expressed its willingness to consider expeditiously other recommendations contained in the Secretary-General's report of 10 March 2000, and the provisions of section C of resolution 1284 (1999).

**Decision of 8 June 2000 (4152nd meeting):
resolution 1302 (2000)**

At its 4152nd meeting,¹⁹ on 8 June 2000, the Council included in its agenda a report of the Secretary-General dated 1 June 2000 on the distribution of humanitarian supplies throughout Iraq²⁰ and a letter dated 5 June 2000 from the Chairman of the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) to the President of the Security Council, transmitting a report of the Committee on the implementation of the arrangements in paragraphs 1, 2, 6, 8, 9 and 10 of resolution 986 (1995).²¹

In his report, the Secretary-General provided an update on the implementation of the oil-for-food programme and made recommendations on how to achieve greater utilization of available resources. He noted that while the programme had been initially instituted as an exception to the sanctions, allowing Iraq to generate a limited amount of funds through the sale of oil for the importation of food and basic medicines, Iraq was currently authorized to export unlimited amounts of oil and to import a wide range of goods to meet the humanitarian needs of its population and to rehabilitate its civilian infrastructure. He maintained that the nutritional and health status of the

Iraqi people continued to be a major concern and reducing current malnutrition levels and improving the health status of the Iraqi people could be achieved by increasing the funding level in the food and health sectors and ensuring the timely contracting of all supplies in quantities sufficient to meet the requirements and targets previously recommended. He stressed that to assist Iraq in improving its distribution systems, it was essential that applications for contracts relating to distribution systems be approved by the Committee expeditiously. He welcomed the ongoing efforts by the Committee to improve its procedures and define its information requirements, which had already allowed for a significant number of contracts previously on hold to be approved. However, he underlined that much more needed to be done to bring about a drastic reduction in the number of holds placed on applications, which were seriously impairing the effective implementation of the programme. He appealed to the members of the Committee to further intensify efforts to review the applications placed on hold in the light of the additional information provided by the Office of the Iraq Programme. He also appealed to the Government of Iraq to provide expeditiously all additional information requested by members of the Committee. In conclusion, he stated that it needed to be borne in mind that the programme was never intended as a substitute for the resumption of normal economic activity, and could not be expected to address the whole range of needs of the Iraqi population.

At the meeting, statements were made by the representatives of China, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation, Tunisia, the United Kingdom and the United States. The President (France) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by France and the United Kingdom;²² it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1302 (2000), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided that the provisions of resolution 986 (1995), except those contained in paragraphs 4, 11 and 12 and subject to paragraph 15 of resolution 1284 (1999), should remain in force for a new period of 180 days beginning at 0001 hours eastern daylight time on 9 June 2000;

Further decided that from the sum produced from the import by States of petroleum and petroleum products originating in Iraq, including financial and other essential transactions related thereto, in the 180-day period referred to in

¹⁸ S/2000/266.

¹⁹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51 of the Charter.

²⁰ S/2000/520, submitted pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 1281 (1999).

²¹ S/2000/536.

²² S/2000/544.

paragraph 1 of the resolution, the amounts recommended by the Secretary-General in his report of 1 February 1998²³ for the food/nutrition and health sectors should continue to be allocated on a priority basis in the context of the activities of the Secretariat, of which 13 per cent of the sum produced in the period referred to above should be used for the purposes referred to in paragraph 8 (b) of resolution 986 (1995);

Further decided to conduct a thorough review of all aspects of the implementation of the resolution 90 days after the entry into force of paragraph 1 and again prior to the end of the 180-day period, and expressed its intention, prior to the end of that period, to consider favourably renewal of the provisions of the resolution as appropriate, provided that the reviews indicated that those provisions were being satisfactorily implemented;

Decided that from the funds produced pursuant to the resolution in the escrow account established by paragraph 7 of resolution 986 (1995), up to a total of US \$600 million might be used to meet any reasonable expenses, other than expenses payable in Iraq, that followed directly from the contracts approved in accordance with paragraph 2 of resolution 1175 (1998) and paragraph 18 of resolution 1284 (1999).

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of Tunisia noted that his delegation had voted in favour even though some provisions did not command complete support. He had hoped that the draft resolution would contain a clear and explicit request for a focused assessment of the sanctions imposed on the Iraqi people and of their effects.²⁴

The representative of China also stated that his delegation was not entirely satisfied with the resolution because it did not fully reflect an important element favoured by most States members of the Council, including his Government, which was a request that the Secretary-General conduct an assessment of the impact of the 10 years of sanctions against Iraq, and to submit to the Security Council an objective and comprehensive consolidated report. Noting the invitation in the resolution to the Secretary-General to appoint independent experts to prepare a report, he stated that the text was evasive on the key issue of whether the report should focus on an assessment of the impact of the sanctions and was rather vague about the mandate of the experts.²⁵

The representative of the Russian Federation expressed regret that the text of the resolution did not reflect a number of other important proposals to ease the humanitarian crisis in Iraq, such as restoring civil

air communications with Iraq and repaying the debt of Iraq to the United Nations and to other international organizations. Concurring with many other delegations about the need for an in-depth analysis of the impact of sanctions on the humanitarian situation in Iraq, he considered that the wording of the resolution in that connection was rather vague and detached from that specific goal. He stressed that the group of independent experts should deal precisely with the consequences of sanctions and also suggested that if the group of independent experts found that there were other things that did not directly relate to the sanctions issue, those issues needed to be considered as a whole, without any exceptions. In that case, the questions needed to include the negative impact of the bombings by the United States and the United Kingdom against civilian targets and the economic infrastructure of Iraq. He noted that the intensity of those bombings had grown by a factor of 30 since December 1998. Finally, he noted that his delegation also had problems with paragraph 2, which unjustifiably stressed the supply of food and medicine. While those were important goods, areas such as oil and energy and the development of the transport infrastructure were just as important.²⁵

The representative of the United Kingdom underlined that nobody was completely satisfied, but compromises were necessary in work on a subject as complex as Iraq. He stressed that the Secretary-General would be guided by the resolution in setting the task for the experts that the Council had asked them to perform, and not by national statements after the adoption of the resolution. Responding to the mention of the no-fly zones, he maintained, echoed by the United States,²⁶ that at no time had or would the United Kingdom bomb the civilian infrastructure in Iraq. The action that was taken in the no-fly zones was, following Security Council resolution 688 (1991), to protect the civilian population of Iraq from repression by the Government of Iraq. The military action that was taken was purely in response to attacks on the aircraft in the no-fly zones which were patrolling without intent to bomb anybody or anything. He explained that the increase in the use of ordnance over the past 18 months was due to the fact that the Iraqi ground forces and air force had attacked coalition aircraft more than 650 times in that period.²⁷

²³ S/1998/90

²⁴ S/PV.4152, p. 2.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 3.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 5.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 4.

The representative of the Netherlands expressed hope that an analysis by independent experts would shed light on some inexplicable actions on the part of the Iraqi authorities, such as the recurrent practice of the Government of Iraq adopting measures that harmed its own people.²⁷

Highlighting the need for a comprehensive consideration of all aspects of the Iraq situations, the representative of the Russian Federation asked the Secretariat to carry out an analysis of what was happening with regard to the implementation of Council resolutions on Iraq and whether what was happening generally in and around Iraq was in accordance with those resolutions. He further stressed that the Council could not continue to pretend, each time it extended the oil-for-food programme, that there was a humanitarian programme and there was the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC), while at the same time there were the no-fly zones, non-governmental organizations working in northern Iraq and diplomats crossing the borders of Iraq without visas. He held that, if the Council were to find out about all of those facts and do nothing to collate them, it would not be doing its job, which was to resolve problems relating to the maintenance of peace and security. He stated that the Secretariat had enough authority under the Charter to draw attention to the fact that the problem of Iraq was not being resolved by the Security Council. While the Council was trying to alleviate the symptoms of the disease, it was not addressing the heart of the problem.²⁸

The representative of China stressed that whether or not the bombing had deliberately targeted civilians of Iraq, it had brought them suffering and the independent experts appointed by the Secretary-General needed to take this factor into consideration.²⁹

**Decision of 5 December 2000 (4241st meeting):
resolution 1330 (2000)**

At its 4241st meeting, on 5 December 2000, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 29 November 2000.³⁰ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that, although

the humanitarian situation in Iraq had generally improved since the inception of the programme, the lives of ordinary Iraqis had not improved commensurately. Under the circumstances, he suggested that the Government of Iraq might wish to consider an increase in the targeting of resources to meet the needs of the most vulnerable groups, including children and the disabled. He also stressed that with increasing funding for the humanitarian component of the programme, the time had come to review the validity of applying procedures and practices originally designed to cover food and medicine to a vastly more complex array of infrastructure and equipment. The Secretary-General had therefore directed the Executive Director of the Iraq Programme to initiate consultations with the Committee and the Government of Iraq with a view to streamlining and improving procedures governing the submission, processing and approval of applications. In conclusion, he reiterated that while the sanctions regime had enjoyed considerable success in its disarmament mission, it had also been deemed responsible for the worsening of a humanitarian crisis as an unintended consequence. He regretted the continuing suffering of the Iraqi people, and expressed hope that the sanctions on Iraq could be lifted sooner rather than later. But that demanded that a way was found to move the Government of Iraq into compliance with Security Council resolutions.

During the meeting, statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Canada, China, France, Malaysia, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that, while there were measures that his delegation and others would have preferred to see included in the text, the draft resolution represented a reasonable balance of the collective interests of Council members and an important contribution to the work of the programme. He noted that there were a number of technical measures contained in the draft resolution, such as the extension of the so-called “green”, or pre-approved, lists that would ease and improve the implementation of the programme.³¹

The representative of Malaysia drew attention to the problem of holds in the Committee, which had become a major impediment to the smooth running of

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 5-6.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 6.

³⁰ S/2000/1132, submitted pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 1302 (2000).

³¹ S/PV.4241, p. 2.

the programme, with negative consequences on the ground. His delegation strongly supported the appeal of the Secretary-General to all parties concerned to fully cooperate and address the excessive number of holds placed on applications. He noted that many reasons had been given to explain the holds, but while some of them were plausible, many others clearly required the necessary political will on the part of Council members.³²

The representative of the United States maintained that the oil-for-food programme was meeting the needs of the Iraqi people while denying the Baghdad regime access to funds it would use to further threaten its neighbours. He acknowledged that the programme could be improved, and noted that the changes in the draft resolution his delegation had agreed to reflected their interest in making those improvements. But the most effective change would be for the regime to stop obstruction and implement the relevant humanitarian sections of resolution 1284 (1999), which were intended to improve the operation of the oil-for-food programme.³³

The representative of Argentina stated that his delegation was convinced that the progress contained in the draft resolution would be reflected in concrete improvement in the humanitarian situation.³⁴

The representative of China stressed that in certain areas the draft resolution did not fully reflect his delegation's requests and positions. He noted that the current oil industry situation in Iraq was extremely worrying and could not be sustained. He recalled that the Government of Iraq had proposed the use of a certain amount of cash components in order to maintain and improve oil-producing conditions. However, that had not been appropriately reflected in the draft resolution. He also maintained that many humanitarian projects had been put on hold despite the appeals of the Secretary-General and the cooperation of the contract-submitting countries. He opined that this had not been caused by purely technical reasons, and called upon the countries concerned to prove by their actions that they were sincere in reducing the holds. He stressed that only an early lifting of

sanctions could completely address the humanitarian sufferings of the Iraqi people.³⁵

The representative of Canada stated that, on the issue of how to manage the additional 5 per cent of revenue redistributed from the United Nations Compensation Commission,³⁶ his delegation would have liked to see a separate escrow account established to deliver targeted nutrition programmes to children and pregnant women. With respect to the payment by Iraq of its United Nations dues, he did not support the transfer of humanitarian funds for that purpose.³⁷

The representative of France noted that there were several shortcomings in the draft. No decision had been taken about the payment of the arrears of Iraq to the United Nations from the escrow account, which was not a humanitarian account but a bureaucratic instrument, nor had any concrete measures been included to decrease the high level of holds. Finally, he maintained that the Council would have to take a further decision to authorize Iraq to give financial aid to the Palestinians from the escrow account.³⁸

The representative of the Russian Federation stressed that the draft did not reflect any of the concerns contained in the report of the Secretary-General, most importantly the continuing problem of contract holds. He stressed that, as a fundamental resolution of the humanitarian crisis would be impossible as long as sanctions were maintained, his delegation was in favour of suspending or lifting the sanctions.³⁹

At the same meeting, the President (Russian Federation) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom;⁴⁰ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1330 (2000), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided that the provisions of resolution 986 (1995), except those contained in paragraphs 4, 11 and 12 and subject to paragraph 15 of resolution 1284 (1999), should remain in force for a new period of 180 days beginning at 0001 hours eastern standard time on 6 December 2000;

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 2-4.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

³⁶ For more information on the Compensation Commission, see chap. V, part I, sect. F.

³⁷ S/PV.4241, p. 6.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

⁴⁰ S/2000/1149.

Further decided that from the sum produced from the import by States of petroleum and petroleum products originating in Iraq, including financial and other essential transactions related thereto, in the 180-day period referred to in paragraph 1 of the resolution, the amounts recommended by the Secretary-General in his report of 1 February 1998 for the food/nutrition and health sectors should continue to be allocated on a priority basis in the context of the activities of the Secretariat;

Decided that from the funds produced pursuant to the resolution in the escrow account established by paragraph 7 of resolution 986 (1995), up to a total of US \$600 million might be used to meet any reasonable expenses, other than expenses payable in Iraq.

**Decision of 1 June 2001 (4324th meeting):
resolution 1352 (2001)**

At its 4324th meeting, on 1 June 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 18 May 2001.⁴¹ In his report, the Secretary-General provided a comprehensive report on the implementation of the oil-for-food programme. He appealed to the Security Council and the Committee to further streamline the cumbersome approval procedures and allow greater latitude so that a wider variety of medicine, health supplies, foodstuffs, as well as materials and supplies for essential civilian needs could be procured and supplied expeditiously. He stressed that such an approach would also reduce the excessive number of holds placed on applications. The Secretary-General provided a number of recommendations for how to streamline the process. He also stressed that it was essential for the Government of Iraq to prioritize its contracting, giving particular attention to the food, health and nutrition sectors. It was also essential for the Government of Iraq to address urgently the problems arising from inordinate delays in submissions of applications and from the submission of non-compliant applications. In conclusion, he stressed that it was incumbent on all parties concerned to take concerted measures to ensure the effective implementation of the humanitarian programme.

At the meeting, the President (Bangladesh) drew attention to a draft resolution;⁴² it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as

⁴¹ S/2001/505, submitted pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 1330 (2000).

⁴² S/2001/545.

resolution 1352 (2001), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the provisions of resolution 1330 (2000) until 3 July 2001;

Expressed its intention to consider new arrangements for the sale or supply of commodities and products to Iraq based on the following principles: (a) that such new arrangements would improve significantly the flow of commodities and products to Iraq, subject to review by the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990); (b) that such new arrangements would improve the controls to prevent the sale or supply of items prohibited or unauthorized by the Council and to prevent the flow of revenues to Iraq outside the escrow account established pursuant to resolution 986 (1995) from the export of petroleum and petroleum products from Iraq.

**Decision of 3 July 2001 (4344th meeting):
resolution 1360 (2001)**

By a letter dated 15 June 2001 to the President of the Security Council,⁴³ further to the discussion of the question of Iraq at the informal consultations of the Security Council on 14 June 2001, the representative of the Russian Federation requested, in accordance with rule 2 of the provisional rules of procedure, the convening of an open formal meeting of the Council on the item entitled "The situation between Iraq and Kuwait" in order to consider ways of improving the humanitarian situation in Iraq in the conditions of the negative effect of the sanctions on the population of that country, and also ways of implementing all the Security Council resolutions on Iraq and a post-conflict settlement in the Gulf region.

At its 4336th meeting,⁴⁴ on 26 and 28 June 2001, held in response to the request contained in the above-mentioned letter, the Council included the letter in its agenda. The President (Bangladesh) also drew attention to a letter dated 18 June 2001 from the representative of Iraq addressed to the Secretary-General,⁴⁵ transmitting a letter from the Deputy Prime Minister of Iraq concerning the extension of the memorandum of understanding of 20 May 1996 between the Government of Iraq and the Secretariat, which had laid the legal and operational groundwork for the implementation of the oil-for-food programme in a

⁴³ S/2001/597.

⁴⁴ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41 of the Charter; and part VIII, sect. B, with regard to Article 50.

⁴⁵ S/2001/603.

manner that fully respected the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq. The memorandum of understanding also affirmed that the Government of Iraq and the Secretariat were responsible for making any eventual modification to the framework and mode of implementation of the programme. He maintained that resolution 1352 (2001) did two things that were incompatible with these basic facts: it extended the oil-for-food programme for a period of only one month, in violation of the previous practice of six-month extensions; and it expressed the intention of the Council to make radical changes in the concept of the programme and in the operating mechanisms that had been in effect for more than four years. Therefore, Iraq had refused to have anything to do with resolution 1352 (2001), and would refuse to have anything to do with any future resolution of the same nature. He suggested that the circumstances indicated that the United States and the United Kingdom were endeavouring to terminate the memorandum of understanding and the humanitarian programme and replace them with a “so-called regime of smart sanctions” that would impose international tutelage on Iraq for decades to come, would prevent it from using its resources and would ultimately lead to a further deterioration in the humanitarian situation in Iraq. He expressed the hope that the Secretary-General would oppose attempts to use the extension of the humanitarian programme as a facade for securing the adoption of schemes that sought to strengthen the embargo under the cover of the oil-for-food programme, and he stated that Iraq would have nothing to do with any resolution adopted that incorporated the provisions of the draft resolution proposed by the United States and the United Kingdom, regardless of which country sponsored it.

At the meeting, statements were made by all Council members, the representatives of Australia, Bahrain, Canada, Germany, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union⁴⁶), the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey

⁴⁶ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

and Yemen, as well as the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States (LAS).⁴⁷

While expressing concern at the humanitarian problems in Iraq and stressing the need to improve the oil-for-food programme, most speakers noted the need for the Government of Iraq to cooperate on weapons inspections and other issues. Most speakers also noted the unresolved issues of missing nationals and property of Kuwait, and stressed the importance of resolving those outstanding issues. They also stressed the importance of the involvement of the neighbouring countries of Iraq. Many speakers noted the necessity of an effective monitoring programme in Iraq. Several representatives also expressed concern, *inter alia*, over the large numbers of holds on contracts in the Committee, and on the lack of a clear pathway for the lifting of sanctions.

Many representatives called for a comprehensive approach to the question of Iraq and reforms to the oil-for-food programme, which included, *inter alia*, modifying the sanctions regime to reduce restrictions on civilian imports through a goods review list, a “cash component” in all sectors, as well as reduce restrictions on investment and air travel.⁴⁸ Several representatives called for the removal or reconsideration of the no-fly zones.⁴⁹

The representative of the United Kingdom stressed that resolution 1284 (1999) remained the policy of the Council and the “only credible way forward”. He stated that there was no good reason to alter that framework, and emphasized that the only reason the resolution had not yet been implemented was because Iraq had refused to do so. He insisted that the series of proposals his delegation had set out were not intended to replace resolution 1284 (1999), but to liberalize the flow of goods and to examine ways to make sure that military-related items were not exported to Iraq. The proposals would move from a situation where no export was allowed unless approved by the Committee to a situation where every export was

⁴⁷ The representatives of Austria, Qatar and South Africa were invited to participate but did not make statements.

⁴⁸ S/PV.4336 and Corr.1, p. 12 (Tunisia); pp. 13-15 (Norway); pp. 15-16 (Colombia); pp. 16-17 (Ukraine); and pp. 18-19 (Mali); S/PV.4336 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Germany); and p. 10 (Italy).

⁴⁹ S/PV.4336 and Corr.1, p. 11 (China); p. 12 (Tunisia); and p. 33 (Malaysia); S/PV.4336 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); and p. 4 (India).

allowed except for a limited range of items that needed to be reviewed by the Committee on the basis of criteria related to their potential military use. He argued that the changes would improve the flow of goods and dramatically reduce the number of holds, leading to an immediate improvement in the lives of ordinary Iraqis.⁵⁰

The representative of the Russian Federation stated that resolution 1352 (2001) clearly defined the main goal of possible changes in the Iraqi humanitarian programme, which was facilitating trade and economic ties between Iraq and the rest of the world. His delegation had considered various proposals, including the draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom, but their doubts had grown as to the feasibility of the concept in that draft and its political viability vis-à-vis the prospects for a lasting settlement in Iraq. Specifically, the key elements of the United Kingdom draft appeared to lead, not to easing the very harsh economic situation in Iraq, but rather to tightening sanctions. He noted that many questions had been raised by the proposal for a goods review list for deliveries to Iraq. He stated that the so-called 1051 list was already in effect and a procedure in place for its regular review. However, the authors of the new concept regarded the 1051 list as inadequate and wanted to include in their goods review list goods from the Wassenaar Arrangement on Export Controls for Conventional Arms and Dual-Use Goods and Technologies. While that Arrangement, which brought together a limited group of countries on a voluntary basis, was already being applied in practice, inter alia, in respect of Iraq, he held that giving the Arrangement “sanctions status” under Chapter VII would have very serious legal and political consequences. Noting that other aspects of the proposed goods review list would be more prohibitive than the current system, he suggested that its approval could undermine prospects for the industrial development of Iraq. He also pointed out that there was “total silence” on the memorandum of understanding between Iraq and the United Nations, which suggested that the scheme was to be introduced without the consent of the Government of Iraq, which was “utterly unrealistic”. Overall, the concept of the goods review list politicized the humanitarian programme and turned it and UNMOVIC into an instrument for applying sanctions pressure. Moreover, as the proposed draft resolution would be “detrimental

⁵⁰ S/PV.4336 and Corr.1, pp. 4-6.

to averting the humanitarian catastrophe, devastate the Iraqi economy and work again a post-conflict settlement in the Gulf region”, the Russian Federation could not support it. However, the status quo was also unacceptable as resolution 1284 (1999) had too many gaps and ambiguity, which made it unimplementable in its current form. Therefore, his delegation had introduced a proposal that contained clear criteria for suspending and lifting sanctions that were tied to the deployment of an ongoing monitoring and verification system.⁵¹

The representative of France, noting that his delegations had been proposing reforms of the oil-for-food machinery for more than three years, expressed support for a transfer of jurisdiction from the Committee to the Secretariat, which should reduce the number of holds. However, as easing restrictions on trade would not enable the economy to recover sufficiently, he proposed that foreign investment be authorized. He also stressed the importance of working closely with the neighbouring countries of Iraq by setting up means for cooperation rather than “imposing Chapter VII obligations on them”. In his view, a resolution also needed to liberalize air traffic, require payment by Iraq of arrears to all organizations, and determine rates of assessment on oil sales by Iraq for the benefit of the Compensation Commission. He concluded by stating that his delegation was looking for a way for the Council to regain unity on Iraq and wanted speedy agreement on a system that would enjoy the support of the international community, particularly the neighbours of Iraq.⁵²

The representative of the United States remarked that the United Kingdom draft resolution would lift the sanctions on regular civilian commercial trade with the Iraqi people and questioned why at the moment when his Government and others were prepared to make a radical shift, they were attacked by others who despite having pressed for change to the system, sought to “perpetuate the status quo”. He stressed that the review list would not be a “denial list” and goods for civilian use would be approved. In conclusion, he argued that instead of changing the approach of the Council, based on resolution 1284 (1999), the proposals expanded the range of goods available to the civilian population and promoted future implementation by showing the

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-4.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

Government of Iraq that it had no alternative to cooperation.⁵³

The representative of China noted that some Council members had put forward draft resolutions on the new arrangements for Iraq and stressed that the Council needed to seriously consider the drafts in the context of a comprehensive resolution of the Iraq issue. He commented that, during the discussions, his delegation had emphasized that a goods review list should be drawn up based on resolution 1051 (1996) so that, with the exception of the goods on that list, Iraq would be able to import any civilian goods it needed. In addition, the financial controls against Iraq should be relaxed and Iraq allowed to use the funds in the escrow accounts to pay its contributions to international organizations. Foreign companies should be allowed to invest in Iraq; countries should be free to sign service contracts with Iraq; and civil aviation flights should be allowed to resume. He stressed that there needed to be clearly defined criteria for terminating sanctions in order to motivate Iraq to resume its cooperation with the United Nations. Finally, he also stressed that no new arrangement should have a further negative impact on the neighbours of Iraq.⁵⁴

The representative of Ireland noted that the Council needed to ensure that nothing in the measures adopted prevented the development of the normal economic infrastructure in Iraq. In that context, it was important that the list of goods that would be reserved for review by the Committee under the envisaged system was as short and precise as possible. Furthermore, any contract containing an item on the list needed to be carefully reviewed from the point of view of its overall economic importance.⁵⁵

The representative of Kuwait referred to a number of areas in which the Government of Iraq had not worked to ensure the success of the oil-for-food programme, including delays in submission of applications for humanitarian supplies and visas for international personnel. He stated that it was clear that Iraq was “indifferent” to the issues of missing people and property from Kuwait and noted that, at the Arab summit held in Jordan in March 2001, Iraq had rejected

the inclusion of a paragraph in the final declaration guaranteeing the security and sovereignty of Kuwait.⁵⁶

The representative of Jordan noted that his country was one of the countries that continued to endure severe economic consequences as a result of the Security Council sanctions against Iraq, a fact which, in and of itself, should prompt work to eliminate the adverse impact on his country. He informed the Council that his Government had submitted a memorandum to the Secretary-General showing the “gigantic repercussions” for Jordan if the existing agreements between Jordan and Iraq were interrupted. He stressed that any revision of the oil-for-food programme needed to be implementable and enjoy the agreement of all concerned, including Iraq. In conclusion, he maintained that the only way out of the crisis was the lifting of sanctions by the Council, and reviving a comprehensive dialogue between Iraq and the United Nations in order to settle all the outstanding issues from the invasion of Kuwait.⁵⁷

The representative of Malaysia argued that the situation did not justify the continuation of comprehensive sanctions. As the oil-for-food programme was not able to adequately mitigate the effects of the sanctions, a new approach that did not link progress and disarmament with humanitarian efforts was necessary.⁵⁸

The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya declared that the sanctions against Iraq had become “a crime of genocide” against the Iraqi people and the States that objected to the lifting of the sanctions were also guilty. He noted that, despite the fact that Iraq had largely cooperated with the United Nations and the Council, the sanctions had not been lifted, suspended or lessened. Therefore, calls on Iraq to cooperate with the United Nations, as well as the proposals to modify the sanctions regime, were merely “empty pretext” to maintain those sanctions. He, therefore, called for the immediate lifting of sanctions.⁵⁹ The representatives of Yemen and the Syrian Arab Republic also called for an end to sanctions.⁶⁰

The representative of Canada urged all members of the Council to support the draft resolution proposed

⁵³ Ibid., pp. 8-10.

⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 10-11.

⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 20-21.

⁵⁶ Ibid., pp. 24-28.

⁵⁷ Ibid., pp. 28-29.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 32.

⁵⁹ S/PV.4336 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 11 (Yemen); and p. 12 (Syrian Arab Republic).

by the United Kingdom, and stressed that a united stand by the Council would send a clear message that compliance with sanctions remained the only solution, while divisions in the Council had only encouraged intransigence by Iraq. He noted that Article 24 of the Charter specified that Council members were to act on behalf of the entire United Nations membership,⁶¹ so a threat to veto the draft resolution on the basis of acknowledged national, economic or political consideration damaged the credibility of the Council.⁶²

The Permanent Observer of LAS stated that the League called for the lifting of sanctions, but also stressed the need to guarantee the security and stability of Kuwait. The League believed that any solution had to be based on respect for all relevant Security Council resolutions. That did not mean that the sanctions imposed on Iraq would continue “forever” or that they would not be reviewed. The League therefore called for the use of dialogue as a means of dealing with the crisis.⁶³

The representative of Iraq stated that the obligations imposed on Iraq under Security Council resolutions were extremely harsh and went beyond customary legal measures to restore international peace and security. This was despite the fact that Iraq had implemented all the obligations enshrined in the relevant resolutions, particularly resolution 687 (1991). In that respect, Iraq had recognized the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Kuwait; fully implemented its commitments concerning the deployment of United Nations observer units; and met the requirements concerning disarmament. He asserted that Iraq had returned all the Kuwaiti properties that it could find and all prisoners of war, as well as continued to cooperate in investigating the fate of missing persons. Moreover, Iraq had also condemned all forms of international terrorism. Despite all of those efforts, the representative maintained that Iraq had faced “all forms of unusual measures”, including the involvement of the Council in the question of the borders between Iraq and Kuwait and an “astoundingly punitive” mechanism for reparations. Regarding disarmament, he maintained that the two bodies involved, the United Nations Special Commission and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), had served as an

instrument to “realize United States and United Kingdom policies”, which were to perpetuate the blockade imposed on Iraq, although Iraq had implemented its obligations. He criticized the Council for not reacting to the no-fly zones that had been imposed without a Council resolution and that violated the official ceasefire stipulated by resolution 687 (1991). The representative then responded to those who had accused the Government of Iraq of being the principal reason for the failure of the oil-for-food programme to achieve its goals. He stated that the failure to achieve the humanitarian objectives of the programme had been caused by, inter alia, the complexity of the measures adopted by the Council; interference by the United Kingdom and United States, including the use of holds on contracts; “objectionable bureaucracy” in the way contracts were submitted; and inadequate financial management. He continued to detail a number of other “grossly inadequate conditions” in the humanitarian programme, which had come to be the “fat pot for so many parasites”. He then formally called on the Security Council to undertake an appropriate investigation and to publish the results, as well as undertake an external audit of the accounts of the Iraq Programme, as well as the agencies, offices and committees linked to the oil-for-food programme since its inception. Regarding the draft resolution, he stated that the fundamental content entailed a de facto new regime for blockading Iraq. The so-called free trade in civilian goods had been subject to many restrictions and conditions, as well as oversight by a number of bodies, including UNMOVIC, the Committee, and the Office of the Iraq Programme in a way that changed the conditions of the memorandum of understanding. Furthermore, the proposed regime took control of all of Iraq’s financial resources, placed them under United Nations control and disbursed them without any role for the Government of Iraq. He stressed that the rejection of the plan rose “to the level of struggle for national independence, whatever the sacrifices involved”. In conclusion, he declared that from the beginning the goal of the “unjust embargo” had been to change the national political regime in Iraq.⁶⁴

At its 4344th meeting, on 3 July 2001, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 18 May 2001.⁶⁵ Statements

⁶¹ For more information, see chap. XII, part II, sect. A, case 19, with regard to Article 24.

⁶² S/PV.4336 (Resumption 1), p. 14.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-31.

⁶⁵ S/2001/505, submitted pursuant to paragraph 5 of

were made by the representatives of Tunisia, the United Kingdom and the United States. The President (China) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁶⁶ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1360 (2001), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, inter alia:

Decided that the provisions of resolution 986 (1995), except those contained in paragraphs 4, 11 and 12 and subject to paragraph 15 of resolution 1284 (1999), should remain in force for a new period of 150 days beginning at 0001 hours, eastern daylight time on 4 July 2001;

Further decided that from the sum produced from the import by States of petroleum and petroleum products originating in Iraq, including financial and other essential transactions related thereto, in the 150-day period referred to in paragraph 1 of the resolution, the amounts recommended by the Secretary-General in his report of 1 February 1998 for the food/nutrition and health sectors should continue to be allocated on a priority basis in the context of the activities of the Secretariat, of which 13 per cent of the sum produced in the period referred to above should be used for the purposes referred to in paragraph 8 (b) of resolution 986 (1995);

Decided to conduct a thorough review of all aspects of the implementation of the resolution 90 days after the entry into force of paragraph 1 and again prior to the end of the 150-day period, and expressed its intention, prior to the end of the 150-day period, to consider favourably renewal of the provisions of the resolution as appropriate;

Requested the Secretary-General to provide a comprehensive report to the Council 90 days after the date of entry into force of the resolution on its implementation and again at least one week prior to the end of the 150-day period.

The representatives of the United Kingdom and United States expressed regret that the Council had been unable to agree on a new set of arrangements to improve the humanitarian programme, in particular by freeing up the flow of goods into Iraq. They recalled that the principles of the new approach had been endorsed unanimously in resolution 1352 (2001), and that four permanent members of the Council had agreed to the goods review list. They expressed hope that the time the rollover provided would be used to restore the Council consensus on the new approach.⁶⁷ The representative of Tunisia also stressed the

importance of using the rollover period to find a comprehensive solution to the problem.⁶⁸

Decision of 29 November 2001 (4431st meeting): resolution 1382 (2001)

At its 4431st meeting, on 29 November 2001, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 19 November 2001.⁶⁹ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that despite its shortcomings the oil-for-food programme continued to make a considerable difference in the daily life of the average Iraqi citizen. However, the programme had continued to suffer because of a number of factors, including the cumbersome procedures involved in formulating the distribution plan; slow contracting for essential supplies by both the Government of Iraq and the United Nations agencies and programmes; and the inordinate delays and irregularities in the submission of applications for such contracts to the Secretariat by both the suppliers and the agencies and programmes concerned. Other difficulties involved delays in the issuance of approval letters for approved applications; in the opening of letters of credit for a large number of approved applications; in the delivery of goods to Iraq by the suppliers; and in granting the required visas and delays in the clearance of imports of essential supplies and equipment, particularly those for the three northern governorates. Programme implementation had also suffered considerably because of the substantial reduction in revenues from oil exports, both because the volume of oil exports under the programme was reduced or suspended by the Government of Iraq and because of the comparatively lower price of oil on the international markets. The Secretary-General also noted that “the unacceptably high level of holds” placed by the Committee had remained almost unchanged. He appealed to all parties to refrain from politicizing the implementation of the programme and instead to concentrate on maximizing its benefits to the people of Iraq.

At the meeting, the President (Jamaica) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution,⁷⁰ and read out a revision to the text. The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1382 (2001), by which the

resolution 1330 (2000).

⁶⁶ S/2001/652.

⁶⁷ S/PV.4344, pp. 2-3 (United Kingdom); and p. 3 (United States).

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

⁶⁹ S/2001/1089, submitted pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 1360 (2001)

⁷⁰ S/2001/1123.

Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided that the provisions of resolution 986 (1995), except those contained in paragraphs 4, 11 and 12 and subject to paragraph 15 of resolution 1284 (1999), and the provisions of paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 to 13 of 1360 (2001) should remain in force for a new period of 180 days beginning at 0001 hours eastern standard time on 1 December 2001;

Stressed the obligation of Iraq to cooperate with the implementation of the resolution and other applicable resolutions, including by respecting the security and safety of all persons directly involved in their implementation;

Reaffirmed its commitment to a comprehensive settlement on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, including any clarification necessary for the implementation of resolution 1284 (1999);

Decided that, for the purposes of the resolution, references in resolution 1360 (2001) to the 150-day period established by that resolution should be interpreted to refer to the 180-day period established pursuant to paragraph 1 of the present resolution.

**Decision of 14 May 2002 (4531st meeting):
resolution 1409 (2002)**

At the 4531st meeting,⁷¹ on 14 May 2002, the President (Singapore) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria, China, France, Norway, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States.⁷²

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made a statement, in which he noted that his delegation had made a number of proposals on the draft resolution with the goal of, *inter alia*, ensuring that Iraq was not denied the means for self-defence, or rebuilding its infrastructure. However, despite the fact that those proposals had not been adopted and that his delegation and Arab public opinion supported the lifting of sanctions, he would vote for the resolution out of real concern for the unity of the Council and in an attempt to regain and rebuild its credibility.⁷³

The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1409 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided that the provisions of resolution 986 (1995), except paragraphs 4, 11, 12, and the provisions of paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 to 13 of resolution 1360 (2001), and subject to paragraph 15 of resolution 1284 (1999) and the other provisions of the present resolution, should remain in force for a new period of 180 days beginning at 0001 hours, eastern daylight time on 30 May 2002;

Decided to adopt the revised Goods Review List⁷⁴ and the revised procedures for its application as a basis for the humanitarian programme in Iraq;

Authorized States to permit the sale or supply of any commodities or products other than commodities or products referred to in paragraph 24 of resolution 687 (1991) as it related to military commodities and products, or military-related commodities or products covered by the Goods Review List;

Decided that the funds in the escrow account established pursuant to paragraph 7 of resolution 986 (1995) might also be used to finance the sale or supply to Iraq of those commodities or products that were authorized for sale or supply to Iraq under paragraph 3 of present resolution;

Decided to conduct regularly thorough reviews of the Goods Review List and the procedures for its implementation;

Decided that for the purpose of the resolution, references in resolution 1360 (2001) to the 150-day period established by that resolution should be interpreted to refer to the 180-day period established pursuant to paragraph 1 of the present resolution.

**Decision of 8 November 2002 (4644th meeting):
resolution 1441 (2002)**

By a letter dated 10 October 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁷⁵ the representative of South Africa, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement stressed the urgent need for a peaceful solution to the issue of Iraq in a way that preserved the authority and credibility of the Charter and international law, as well as peace and stability in the region. Noting that consultations were under way in the Council, particularly among the five permanent members, he requested the Council to convene an emergency open debate on Iraq to allow the Council to hear the views of the wider United Nations membership.

⁷⁴ S/2002/515, annex.

⁷⁵ S/2002/1132.

⁷¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51 of the Charter.

⁷² S/2002/532.

⁷³ S/PV.4531, pp. 2-3.

At its 4625th meeting,⁷⁶ on 16 and 17 October 2002, the Council included the above-mentioned letter in its agenda. Statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica,⁷⁷ Cuba, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union⁷⁸), Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen and Zimbabwe, as well as the Permanent Observers of Palestine, the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), LAS and the Deputy Secretary-General.

The Deputy Secretary-General read a statement by the Secretary-General informing the Council of the decision made by Iraq to allow the return of the United Nations weapons inspectors without conditions. Since then, the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director General of IAEA had met with an Iraqi delegation to discuss practical arrangements for the resumption of inspections. He stressed that inspectors needed to have unfettered access, and that a new resolution strengthening the inspectors' hands, so that there were no weaknesses or ambiguities, would be appropriate. He encouraged Council members to work in unison, which would give a greater chance of achieving a comprehensive solution that included the suspension and ending of sanctions, as well as the

timely implementation of other provisions of Council resolutions.⁷⁹

During the course of the meeting, most speakers acknowledged that they were participating in the current debate against the sombre backdrop of potential of war with Iraq. A war, which, they stressed, would have a direct and grave impact on international peace and security. They expressed hope that the debate would lead to a positive and effective consensus on how to move forward on the Iraq question and bring about lasting peace. Recalling the obligation of all States, under the Charter of the United Nations, to implement the decisions of the Council, they agreed that Iraq should immediately implement its obligations and commitments as stipulated by Council resolutions and cooperate fully with UNMOVIC to ensure an effective inspections process.

Many speakers welcomed the decision of the Government of Iraq of 16 September 2002 to accept the unconditional return of United Nations inspectors to its territory. Similarly, they welcomed the agreements reached during the talks in Vienna on 30 September and 1 October 2002. In their view, the Council should seize upon such positive developments by authorizing the immediate return of inspectors to Iraq. They expressed hope that this would open the way for the full implementation of all Council resolutions on Iraq, including those concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, and bring about the lifting of sanctions against Iraq.

Nevertheless, most speakers emphasized that collective international security depended on the commitment of Member States to multilateral cooperation. They stressed that Member States should pursue ways to address the Iraq issue through the United Nations, and seek to preserve international unity. Multilateralism and multilateral institutions remained the best hope for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Some speakers underlined the need for the Council alone to decide what to do should Iraq not comply with the Council resolutions, as only the United Nations could confer international legitimacy on any action, particularly the use of force, against Iraq.⁸⁰ Only if it turned out that the inspectors had been

⁷⁶ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter; part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41; part IV, sect. B, with regard to Article 42; and part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51; and chap. XII, part I, sect. A, with regard to Article 1 (2) and sect. E, case 9, with regard to Article 2 (7); and part II, sect. A, case 19, with regard to Article 24 and sect. B, case 20, with regard to Article 25.

⁷⁷ In the capacity of Acting Secretary of the Rio Group.

⁷⁸ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁷⁹ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, pp. 3-4.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Kuwait); p. 16 (Algeria); and p. 18 (Pakistan); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Islamic

prevented from doing their job, and when that had been communicated to the Council should the Council decide on a position to adopt in the face of such a situation.⁸¹ Similarly, several speakers emphasized that no unilateral action would be acceptable.⁸²

Regarding the use of force against Iraq, most speakers stressed that it should be considered as a last resort, if at all.⁸³ A number of other speakers rejected any military action against Iraq.⁸⁴ A number of representatives expressed serious concern with concepts such as “regime change” and “pre-emptive strikes”, which had been used by some members, and which they argued posed a fundamental threat to the international security order.⁸⁵ In this context, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran noted that the concept of “regime change” ran counter to “peoples’ right to self-determination”, and the concept

Republic of Iran); p. 12 (Chile); p. 17 (New Zealand); p. 19 (Argentina); p. 20 (Nigeria); p. 22 (Canada); and p. 26 (Senegal); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 2 (Morocco); p. 3 (Brazil); p. 5 (Switzerland); p. 10 (India); p. 12 (Viet Nam); p. 13 (Djibouti); p. 14 (Liechtenstein); p. 16 (Angola); p. 18 (Belarus); p. 25 (Qatar); and p. 27 (Nepal); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, p. 9 (China); p. 15 (Norway); and p. 20 (Ireland).

⁸¹ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 5 (South Africa); p. 14 (Yemen); p. 16 (Algeria); p. 23 (Tunisia); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 4 (Ukraine); p. 7 (League of Arab States); and p. 12 (Chile); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 3 (Morocco); and p. 5 (Switzerland); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, p. 5 (Mexico), p. 10 (China); p. 13 (France); and pp. 19-20 (Ireland).

⁸² S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 5 (South Africa); and p. 18 (Pakistan); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Islamic Republic of Iran); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 8 (Lebanon); p. 11 (India); p. 16 (Angola); p. 18 (Belarus); p. 22 (Jamaica); and p. 27 (Nepal).

⁸³ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 11 (Kuwait); and p. 18 (Pakistan); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 12 (Chile); p. 13 (Indonesia); and p. 19 (Argentina); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 4 (Brazil); p. 13 (Djibouti); p. 16 (Angola); p. 21 (Cambodia); and p. 27 (Nepal).

⁸⁴ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 14 (Yemen); p. 20 (United Arab Emirates); and p. 23 (Tunisia); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 23; S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 9 (Lebanon); p. 17 (Palestine); and p. 20 (Organization of the Islamic Conference).

⁸⁵ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 14 (Yemen); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Islamic Republic of Iran); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 7 (Malaysia); p. 12 (Viet Nam); and p. 23 (Zimbabwe).

of “pre-emptive strike” distorted the conventional understanding of the right of self-defence as codified in the Charter.⁸⁶

On the question of adopting a new resolution on Iraq, several representatives expressed support for a new resolution that would clearly set out the functions and powers of UNMOVIC and provided the strongest possible basis for unconditional and unfettered inspections in Iraq. They argued that only through such inspections could the international community be completely satisfied that Iraq no longer posed a threat to international peace and security.⁸⁷ Several speakers stressed that the resolution needed to make clear that non-compliance with the inspection regime would have serious consequences.⁸⁸ Other representatives, however, opposed the adoption of any new resolution as Iraq had already agreed to the return of inspectors, and a new resolution would only complicate the issue.⁸⁹ The representative of Kuwait requested that the Council ensure that the question of Kuwaiti and third country prisoners held in Iraq be a key element in any Council resolution, arguing that it was the “most propitious” time to break the deadlock on that humanitarian question.⁹⁰ The representative of Cuba noted that the draft resolution that was being promoted would make war with Iraq “unavoidable”, as it included an automatic mechanism that would trigger the use of force. The text also included “unworkable” procedures such as having United Nations security forces accompany the inspectors; having representatives of the permanent members of the Security Council participate in the inspection teams, with the same rights accorded other members of the team; the establishment of no-fly/no-drive zones; and an obligation on Iraq to allow inspectors to take out of

⁸⁶ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

⁸⁷ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 22 (Japan); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 11 (Australia); p. 12 (Chile); p. 15 (Denmark); p. 17 (New Zealand); p. 22 (Canada); p. 14 (Liechtenstein); and p. 26 (Senegal); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, p. 4 (Costa Rica); p. 5 (Mexico); p. 15 (Norway); p. 20 (Ireland); p. 25 (Bulgaria); p. 26 (Mauritius); and p. 28 (Cameroon).

⁸⁸ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 15 (Denmark on behalf of the European Union); p. 16 (Turkey); p. 19 (Argentina); and p. 22 (Canada).

⁸⁹ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 14 (Yemen); and p. 24 (Tunisia); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); p. 20 (Oman); p. 25 (Sudan); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), and p. 23 (Zimbabwe).

⁹⁰ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, pp. 10-13.

the country Iraqi nationals they wish to interview, along with their families.⁹¹ A number of representatives stressed that if any new resolution was adopted, it should primarily reinforce resolution 1284 (1999) and be focused on the implementation of previous resolutions, and should not include any threat of the use of force, or include “impossible demands” that made implementation less, rather than more, likely.⁹² The representative of India also added that while there was a case for tightening the inspections regime, there was also a case for the creation of an enabling environment for compliance within the current framework.⁹³ The representative of Mexico stressed that the Council needed to preserve its authority to determine the composition, mandate and rules of operation of the inspection teams, as well as the supervision of the implementation of the enforcement measures adopted pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter. He argued that the “militarization of inspections” could prove to be counterproductive, since it would have the potential to generate situations of confrontation or other kinds of unforeseen incidents. Moreover, the missions should not have armed escorts or the “assistance of representatives of permanent members of the Council”. Since the inspectors would report to the Council, the representative deemed it inappropriate that the inspections regime should be determined exclusively by the five permanent members.⁹⁴ The representative of China stressed that a new resolution needed to call for support for UNMOVIC and IAEA, and its contents should be “practical and feasible, in the interests of an appropriate settlement”.⁹⁵

Several speakers drew attention to the Council’s responsibility to apply its decisions evenly and impartially, and not to practice “double standards”. In that regard, they juxtaposed the Iraq question with the situation in the Middle East, including the continued aggression against the Palestinian people by Israel, its failure to implement the resolutions of the Council, and its unhindered possession of weapons of mass destruction. A number of these speakers also noted that any military action against Iraq would undermine

progress in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.⁹⁶ Other representatives expressed regret that the decisions on Iraq were being taken when other Council resolutions, including on the Middle East, remained unimplemented.⁹⁷ The representative of Israel responded that the “double standard” was in fact directed against Israel, stressing the differences between the “binding” resolutions adopted on Iraq under Chapter VII and the “interdependent recommendations or statements of principle, adopted under Chapter VI”, that were designed to “move all parties forward in the Middle East”.⁹⁸ He noted a number of instances where Israel had “taken significant steps” to implement Council resolutions, despite the fact that the Palestinian Authority had “totally ignored” its obligations in many cases.⁹⁹

A number of speakers commented on the roles of the five permanent members of the Council. The representative of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, noted that on the question of a possible resolution on Iraq the significant consultations had been limited to the permanent members of the Council and their capitals, and that there had been suggestions that those members be given new and exclusive roles in dealing with the resolution of the Iraqi issue. He underlined the “special role” the elected members had to play in the Council’s deliberations, bringing “credibility and balance” to decision-making within the Council. Exclusion of the 10 elected members from consultations would only lead to the erosion of the authority and legitimacy of the Council as a whole.¹⁰⁰ This was echoed by a number of speakers who noted that the fact that the 10 non-permanent members had become “mere

⁹¹ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 23.

⁹² S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 6 (Malaysia); p. 11 (India); and p. 17 (Palestine).

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁹⁴ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, pp. 4-5.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁹⁶ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 13 (Yemen); p. 15 (Algeria); p. 17 (Egypt); p. 19 (Pakistan); p. 20 (United Arab Emirates); and p. 21 (Jordan); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 7 (League of Arab States); and p. 24 (Sudan); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2); p. 8 (Malaysia); p. 9 (Lebanon); p. 17 (Palestine); pp. 18-19 (Saudi Arabia); p. 20 (Organization of the Islamic Conference); p. 24 (Zimbabwe); and p. 25 (Qatar); and S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, p. 7 (Syrian Arab Republic).

⁹⁷ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 18 (New Zealand); p. 21 (Nigeria); and p. 26 (Senegal).

⁹⁸ For more information on the discussion at this meeting regarding the binding nature of Council resolutions, see chap. XII, part II, sect. B, case 20.

⁹⁹ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, pp. 2-3.

¹⁰⁰ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, pp. 4-6.

spectators” was wrong and stressed the importance of all members of the Council being involved in deliberations.¹⁰¹ Referring to “a suggestion to give a special role in the inspection regime” to the permanent members of the Council, the representative of New Zealand argued that despite the permanent members voting privileges and responsibilities, they were not distinct from other members, and introducing a distinction would be “neither constructive nor acceptable”.¹⁰²

The representative of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, stated that the situation between Iraq and Kuwait should be addressed comprehensively by the United Nations. Iraq needed to comply with relevant Council resolutions and no Member State should be exempted from carrying out obligations as determined by the Council. He welcomed Iraq’s decision to allow inspectors to return without conditions, and urged the Council to allow their return as soon as possible. Noting that the Non-Aligned Movement had firmly rejected any type of unilateral action against any Member State, he stressed that it would be inconsistent with the Charter if the Council was to authorize the use of military force against Iraq at a time when Iraq had indicated its willingness to abide by Council resolutions.¹⁰³

The representative of Iraq stated that the United States administration had declared “unabashedly” its intentions to invade Iraq, changing the map of the region and “putting their hands on the sources of energy there”. The United States wanted the Council to give it a blank cheque to occupy Iraq as part of a plan to subject the entire world to American hegemony. He maintained that everyone knew that Iraq no longer possessed nuclear, chemical or biological weapons of mass destruction, a fact which had been recognized by IAEA and the Special Commission. He then elaborated on his country’s compliance with resolution 687 (1991) over the years. Nevertheless, he continued, ever since the United States had instructed the Special Commission to leave Iraq in 1998, the people of Iraq had been subjected to military aggression, no-fly zones in blatant violation of the Charter, and sanctions, the

impact of which had been nothing short of a “humanitarian catastrophe”, and which violated Articles 1 (1, 2 and 3), 2 (7), 24 and 55 of the Charter. He recalled that in spite of the declaration by his Government that it would allow the unconditional return of inspectors, the United States had increased its threats against Iraq and called for the imposition of “unfair, impossible and arbitrary conditions on Iraq”, against a background of “war hysteria” in the Government of the United States. He called on the international community to loudly voice their objections to the “aggressive” designs of the United States against Iraq, in order to prevent it from using the Council as a tool to carry out its policy of aggression. Not to do so would have serious repercussions for international peace and security, and would be “the beginning of the end” of the collective security system set out in the Charter and other instruments. He reiterated that Iraq had pledged to cooperate fully with the inspectors and had taken all the necessary practical measures and arrangements to facilitate their return. There was, therefore, “absolutely no need for the adoption of a new Council resolution”.¹⁰⁴

The Permanent Observer of LAS recalled that Article 2 (4) of the Charter stated that all Member States shall refrain in their international relations from the use of force, and stressed that LAS had completely rejected any strike against Iraq or any threat against the safety and security of any Arab country. He maintained that war with Iraq would open a Pandora’s box — violence and civil war would sweep the entire country, fragmenting it, which would then undermine the entire Arab region. Moreover, it would annul the current world order, the Charter and international law, exposing States “to the danger of attacks on the pretext of preventive measures, leading the entire world back to the era of the League of Nations”.¹⁰⁵

The representative of the Russian Federation stated that, like all “unbiased observers”, his country had not seen any persuasive evidence that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq or programmes to develop them. However, he stressed that the only way of making sure that weapons of mass destruction had been eliminated was to return the inspectors to Iraq, to which Iraq had agreed. Everything was in place for their return and there was no need for delay or for

¹⁰¹ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); p. 23 (Cuba); and p. 24 (Sudan); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 7 (Malaysia); p. 11 (India); and p. 22 (Jamaica).

¹⁰² S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 18.

¹⁰³ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, pp. 4-6.

¹⁰⁴ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, pp. 6-10.

¹⁰⁵ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), pp. 7-8.

“new decisions”. If the Council wanted to provide further support to UNMOVIC or IAEA, his delegation would be prepared to look at proposals. However, if the proposals were about creating a legal basis for the use of force or for “regime change”, he did not see how the Council could give its consent.¹⁰⁶

The representative of Nigeria noted that the courage and willingness of the parties to bring their difference to the Council for “deliberation and eventual determination” demonstrated recognition of Article 2 (3), which stipulated that all Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means.¹⁰⁷

The representative of France noted that, while his country did not possess irrefutable proof, there were indications that Iraq had used the absence of weapons inspectors since 1998 to pursue or resume its prohibited programmes, including in the chemical and biological areas. He stated that while France was willing to support measures strengthening the inspection regime if it was necessary to facilitate the work of the inspectors, his country rejected measures that would multiply the risk of incidents without improving effectiveness. He also underlined the importance of the multinational, independent nature of the inspectors. He proposed a two-stage approach: in the first stage the Council would adopt a resolution defining the inspection regime and warn Iraq that new violations would not be tolerated; in the second stage, if UNMOVIC or IAEA observed that Iraq was refusing to cooperate fully, the Council would meet immediately to decide on the appropriate measures to take, “without ruling out anything a priori”. He underlined that only a two-stage approach would preserve the unity of the Council, and any kind of “automaticity” in the use of force would be divisive. Finally, he stressed that the Council also needed to demonstrate fairness by showing Iraq that war was not inevitable if it fulfilled its obligations.¹⁰⁸ The representatives of Switzerland and Mexico also expressed support for the “two-stage” approach.¹⁰⁹

The representative of Australia stressed that his delegation remained convinced that the Government of Iraq still had ambitions to acquire weapons of mass

destruction, and that it had made continuing attempts to advance its weapons programme, including chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, as well as to extend the range of its ballistic missiles. Noting that Iraq had used weapons of mass destruction in the past, the representative expressed concern that Iraq could threaten its neighbours, or provide terrorist groups with chemical, biological or nuclear weapons.¹¹⁰

The representative of Albania agreed that the production of weapons of mass destruction by Iraq continued to be a menace to the international community. He also recalled the difficult position of the Security Council in deciding on the intervention of the international community against the “genocide committed by the criminal regime of Milosevic against the Kosovar Albanians”. He noted that, despite the fact that many States had been undecided on the intervention in a sovereign State, the action of the international community had proved to be right. He stressed that that intervention had not been meant to demonstrate “dominance or a unilateral stand” but to defend “the right of people to live in freedom”. Similarly, the current situation was one where the pre-emptive action of the international community was necessary in order to avert a possible world catastrophe precipitated by the use of weapons of mass destruction by an uncontrolled regime.¹¹¹

The representative of the United Kingdom stressed that his country’s firm objective was the complete disarmament of Iraq in the area of weapons of mass destruction by peaceful means. He maintained that analysis by the United Kingdom, backed up by reliable intelligence, showed that Iraq still had chemical and biological materials, sought to weaponize them, and had active military plans for the deployment of those weapons, as well as had tried to buy multiple components needed for the production of nuclear bombs. He expressed great concern at the evidence that Iraq was trying to hide its weapons and “fool the inspectors” again. His delegation wished to see a strong resolution adopted by the Council that gave Iraq an unequivocal choice between disarmament and inevitable consequences. An essential component of the resolution needed to be giving inspectors the “penetrating strength” to ensure disarmament. He noted that the recent letter from Iraq on practical

¹⁰⁶ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, pp. 21-22.

¹⁰⁷ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), pp. 20-21.

¹⁰⁸ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, pp. 12-14.

¹⁰⁹ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 5 (Switzerland); and S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, p. 5 (Mexico).

¹¹⁰ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), pp. 9-11.

¹¹¹ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), pp. 19-20.

arrangement for inspections had “brought back the obfuscations of the past” and reinforced the need for strengthened inspections and for practical arrangements to be made legally binding. He promised that any reports from UNMOVIC or IAEA of non-cooperation on the part of Iraq would be discussed in the Council. Finally, responding to the concerns that non-permanent members had been “kept in the dark”, he stressed that none of the permanent members had been in a position to bring a draft resolution and had done no negotiating on a text in New York. He stated that once there was a draft with a prospect of broad acceptance, no Council member would be excluded.¹¹²

The representative of the United States stressed that there could be no more “toothless resolutions” that Iraq would ignore and that the Council needed to unite in adopting a resolution that made clear the obligations on Iraq, the types of access and authorities that UNMOVIC and IAEA needed to have and the consequences to non-compliance. He noted that there had been clear signs that Iraq was reverting to form, as Iraq had invited inspectors to return without conditions, and then immediately placed conditions, as well as responded to requests for clarity on practical arrangements from UNMOVIC and IAEA with obfuscation. He noted that the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director General of IAEA had stated that they would welcome a new resolution that strengthened their hands and allowed for more effective inspections. In conclusion, he recalled that the previous week the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States had passed a joint resolution that expressed support for the administration’s diplomatic efforts in the Council, and authorized the use of United States armed forces should diplomatic efforts fail. He expressed hope that the Council would succeed, but stressed that if Iraq did not give up its weapons of mass destruction, the United States would lead a global coalition to disarm Iraq.¹¹³

At the 4644th meeting,¹¹⁴ on 8 November 2002, at which statements were made by all members of the Council and the Secretary-General, the President (China) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted

by the United Kingdom and the United States;¹¹⁵ it was adopted unanimously as resolution 1441 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided to afford Iraq a final opportunity to comply with its disarmament obligations under relevant resolutions of the Council; and accordingly decided to set up an enhanced inspection regime with the aim of bringing to full and verified completion the disarmament process established by resolution 687 (1991) and subsequent resolutions of the Council;

Decided that, in order to begin to comply with its disarmament obligations, in addition to submitting the required biannual declarations, the Government of Iraq should provide to UNMOVIC, IAEA, and the Council, not later than 30 days from the date of the resolution, a currently accurate, full, and complete declaration of all aspects of its programmes to develop chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, ballistic missiles and other delivery systems such as unmanned aerial vehicles and dispersal systems designed for use on aircraft, including any holdings and precise locations of such weapons, components, sub-components, stocks of agents and related material and equipment, the locations and work of its research, development and production facilities, as well as all other chemical, biological, and nuclear programmes, including any which it claimed were for purposes not related to weapons production or material;

Decided that Iraq should provide to UNMOVIC and IAEA immediate, unimpeded, unconditional, and unrestricted access to any and all, including those underground, areas, facilities, buildings, equipment, records, and means of transport which they wished to inspect.

The Secretary-General noted that the resolution set out the obligations of Iraq in clear terms and left no doubt as to how they needed to be fulfilled. He called on Iraq to seize the opportunity and stressed that the manner in which the crisis was resolved would affect the course of peace and security in the coming years throughout the world.¹¹⁶

All members of the Council welcomed the unanimous vote and expressed hope that Iraq would comply with the resolution. They noted that the resolution gave UNMOVIC and IAEA stronger authority to carry out their mandate. Many speakers stressed that UNMOVIC and IAEA would carry out their duties with the necessary objectivity and impartiality.

The representatives of the United States and United Kingdom noted that the resolution, which

¹¹² S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, pp. 7-9.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

¹¹⁴ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter; part IV, sect. B, with regard to Article 42; and part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51.

¹¹⁵ S/2002/1198.

¹¹⁶ S/PV.4644 and Corr.1, p. 2.

would significantly strengthen the inspection regime, also confirmed that Iraq remained in “material breach” of its disarmament obligations. They confirmed that the resolution contained no “hidden triggers” and no “automaticity” with respect to the use of force, as any breach reported by UNMOVIC, IAEA or a Member State would be taken up by the Council for discussions. However, they stressed that if Iraq chose defiance and concealment they, along with other members of the Council, would ensure that the task of disarmament was completed.¹¹⁷

A number of speakers noted that the resolution did not contain any element of “automaticity” with regard to the use of force, and left the response to a failure by Iraq to be decided by the explicit authorization of the Council.¹¹⁸ The representatives of France, Mexico and China noted that the resolution reflected the “two-stage approach” that they had supported.¹¹⁹

The representative of the Russian Federation also noted the following clarifying points: that more than 30 days would probably be needed for Iraq to submit information on non-military programmes in the chemical and biological areas, however, any delay there would not constitute a violation; that nothing in the resolution affected the status of UNMOVIC, of IAEA or of members of their staff, as independent international personnel and the cooperation of Member States with UNMOVIC and with IAEA would be carried out fully in accordance with the status and mandates of those organizations; and that the reference in paragraph 8¹²⁰ was to personnel of the United Nations, those of IAEA and to any other personnel whom Members of the United Nations might provide to UNMOVIC or to IAEA on the request of those organizations.¹²¹

¹¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 3-4 (United States); and pp. 4-5 (United Kingdom).

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 5 (France); pp. 6-7 (Mexico); p. 7 (Ireland); p. 8 (Russian Federation); p. 9 (Bulgaria); p. 10 (Syrian Arab Republic, Norway); p. 11 (Colombia, Cameroon); and p. 13 (China).

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 5 (France); pp. 6-7 (Mexico); and p. 12 (China).

¹²⁰ Paragraph 8 of resolution 1441 (2002) reads: “*Decides also that Iraq shall not commit or threaten hostile acts directed against any representative or personnel of the United Nations or the Agency or of any Member State taking action to uphold any Council resolution.*”

¹²¹ S/PV.4644 and Corr.1, p. 9.

Decision of 25 November 2002 (4650th meeting): resolution 1443 (2002)

At its 4650th meeting, on 25 November 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 12 November 2002 on the implementation of the humanitarian programme in Iraq.¹²² In his report, the Secretary-General provided detailed information on the implementation of the oil-for-food programme. He noted the programme could be further enhanced if all parties took the concerted measures necessary for removing the difficulties faced in its implementation, in particular the difficulties stemming from the “dire funding shortfall”. Noting that discussions in the Council were focused on the weapons inspection regime, he, nevertheless, appealed to all to focus attention on the humanitarian dimension.

At the meeting, the President (China) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria and the United Kingdom;¹²³ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1443 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*, decided to extend the provisions of resolution 1409 (2002) until 4 December 2002, and to remain seized of the matter.

Decision of 4 December 2002 (4656th meeting): resolution 1447 (2002)

At its 4656th meeting, on 4 December 2002, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 12 November 2002.¹²² The President (Colombia) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹²⁴ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1447 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided that the provisions of resolution 986 (1995), except those contained in paragraphs 4, 11 and 12, and the provisions of paragraphs 2, 3 and 6 to 13 of resolution 1360 (2001) and subject to paragraph 15 of resolution 1284 (1999) and the other provisions of the present resolution, should remain in force for a new period of 180 days beginning at 0001 hours eastern standard time on 5 December 2002;

¹²² S/2002/1239, submitted pursuant to paragraphs 7 and 8 of resolution 1409 (2002).

¹²³ S/2002/1293.

¹²⁴ S/2002/1330.

Decided to consider necessary adjustments to the Goods Review List¹²⁵ and the procedures for its implementation, for adoption no later than 30 days from the adoption of the resolution and thereafter to conduct regular, thorough reviews;

Decided that, for the purposes of the resolution, references in resolution 1360 (2001) to the 150-day period established by that resolution should be interpreted to refer to the 180-day period established pursuant to paragraph 1 of the present resolution.

**Decision of 30 December 2002
(4683rd meeting): resolution 1454 (2002)**

At the 4683rd meeting,¹²⁶ on 30 December 2002, at which statements were made by the representatives of China, France, the Russian Federation and the Syrian Arab Republic, the President (Colombia) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria, the United Kingdom and the United States;¹²⁷ it was put to the vote and adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic) as resolution 1454 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII, inter alia:

Approved, for implementation beginning at 0001 hours eastern standard time on 31 December 2002, the adjustments to the Goods Review List specified in annex A to the resolution and the revised procedures for its implementation set forth in annex B;

Decided to conduct a thorough review of the Goods Review List and the procedures for its implementation, and, in this connection, requested the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) to review the List and recommend the Council necessary additions to, and/or deletions from, the List and procedures;

Directed the Secretary-General, within 60 days, to develop consumption rates and use levels for the implementation of paragraph 20 of annex B to the resolution;

Appealed to all States to continue to cooperate in the timely submission of technically complete applications and the expeditious issuing of export licences.

The representative of the Russian Federation stated that, while it was of key importance that the resolution provided for the possible lifting of sanctions, the consultations on the draft resolution had not enabled the Council to take the proposals of the

¹²⁵ S/2002/515, annex.

¹²⁶ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41 of the Charter.

¹²⁷ S/2002/1330.

Russian Federation fully into account. His delegation felt that the wording in the Goods Review List imposed too many restricted and affected goods that were exclusively civilian in nature. In particular, he argued that the limitations on trucking and transport vehicles were unjustifiably harsh. He stated that his delegation had decided not to object to the adoption of the resolution as the List was not a “denial list” but only one that provided for the adoption in the sanctions Committee of decisions on specific contracts.¹²⁸

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic stated that the cooperation by Iraq with the weapons inspectors and its positive approach to resolution 1441 (2002) should inevitably lead to the lifting of the sanctions, and not to the sanctions regime being complicated by the addition of further restrictions under the pretext that certain goods could be of dual use. In addition, the haste of the negotiations had not allowed his delegation to study the Goods Review List to ensure that it would not have a negative impact on the Iraqi population.¹²⁹

The representatives of France and China expressed support for the resolution, but noted that if there had been more time for negotiations the Council might have been able to come to a unanimous decision. They noted that the Goods Review List might need to be further adjusted so as to better meet the humanitarian needs of Iraq.¹²⁹

**Deliberations of 27 January to 27 March 2003
(4692nd, 4701st, 4707th, 4709th, 4714th,
4717th, 4721st and 4726th meetings)**

At the 4692nd meeting, on 27 January 2003, the President (France) invited the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director General of IAEA to brief the Council.

The Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC stated that Iraq had cooperated “rather well” with UNMOVIC on matters related to the procedures, mechanisms, infrastructure and practical arrangements to pursue inspections and seek verifiable disarmament. Access had been provided to all sites, although there had been some issues relating to air operations. On the question of substantive cooperation of Iraq in declaring all the programmes of weapons of mass destruction, he noted

¹²⁸ S/PV.4683, pp. 2-3.

¹²⁹ Ibid., p. 3.

that, while Iraq had submitted a 12,000-page declaration, a number of unresolved disarmament issues, relating to chemical and biological weapons, as well as missile technology, had not been addressed. The declaration, most of which was a reprint of earlier documents, did not seem to contain any new evidence that would eliminate the questions or reduce their number.¹³⁰

The Director General of IAEA provided an update on the activities of IAEA in Iraq and, while noting that Iraq had not provided new information on certain outstanding questions, concluded that to date they had found no evidence that Iraq had revived its nuclear weapons programme. He stated that barring exceptional circumstances and provided there was proactive cooperation by Iraq, IAEA should be able to provide credible assurance that Iraq had no nuclear weapons programme in the next few months.¹³¹

Both speakers noted that while resolution 1441 (2002) had given IAEA and UNMOVIC the authority to determine modalities and venues for conducting interviews, all of the people they wished to speak to had refused to be interviewed unless a representative of the Government of Iraq was present. They also stressed the need for more proactive cooperation from the Government of Iraq.

At its 4701st meeting,¹³² on 5 February 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Secretary of State of the United States, following which statements were made by all Council members¹³³ and the representative of Iraq.¹³⁴

In his briefing, the Secretary of State of the United States provided additional information on what the United States knew about Iraq's weapons of mass

destruction as well as Iraq's involvement in terrorism. In that respect, he provided evidence, including tapes of telephone conversations and satellite images, which, he maintained, showed that Saddam Hussein and his regime were concealing their efforts to produce more weapons of mass destruction. He stated that intelligence had indicated that Iraq was carrying out a systematic effort not only to keep key materials and people from the inspectors but also to conceal actual weapons of mass destruction, both biological and chemical, as well as missiles and other delivery systems banned under Council resolutions. He also maintained that the Government of Iraq had never abandoned its nuclear weapons programme and was actively trying to develop the ability to produce fissile material. He also provided information on the "sinister nexus between Iraq and the Al-Qaida terrorist network" and noted the ongoing human rights violations by the regime. Recalling that resolution 1441 (2002) stated that the failure of Iraq to cooperate with inspectors would constitute a further material breach of Iraq's obligations, he argued that Iraq had clearly failed the test and had placed itself in danger of the serious consequences called for in the resolution.¹³⁵

Most speakers called on Iraq to cooperate fully with the inspectors. Many speakers stressed that only UNMOVIC and IAEA could say to what extent Iraq was complying with the demands of the Council, and suggested continuing inspections. They stressed that the main focus of the Council needed to be on facilitating the inspections process, including by strengthening the inspections regime if necessary.¹³⁶ Several speakers welcomed the presentation by the United States but suggested that the information needed to be handed over to UNMOVIC and IAEA for processing, as well as to ask any other States with relevant information to provide it.¹³⁷

The representative of the Russian Federation, responding to the idea that "time was running out for a settlement" stressed that while resolution 1441 (2002) aimed to quickly achieve results, it did not set out any

¹³⁰ S/PV.4692, pp. 2-8.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-12.

¹³² For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter.

¹³³ Bulgaria, Chile, China, France, Germany, Mexico, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and Spain were represented by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs; the United Kingdom by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Cameroon by the Minister of State in charge of External Relations; and Angola by the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs.

¹³⁴ The Secretary-General, the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director General of IAEA were also present at the meeting.

¹³⁵ S/PV.4701, pp. 2-17.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18 (China); p. 21 (Russian Federation); p. 22 (Cameroon); p. 24 (France); p. 25 (Mexico); p. 26 (Bulgaria); p. 28 (Pakistan); p. 30 (Chile); p. 32 (Angola); p. 33 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 35 (Guinea); and p. 36 (Germany).

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 21 (Russian Federation); p. 23 (Cameroon); p. 27 (Pakistan); and p. 33 (Syrian Arab Republic).

concrete time frame.¹³⁸ The representative of Cameroon suggested that the Council should ask the Secretary-General to go to Iraq to speak with President Saddam Hussein on ways and means to find a peaceful resolution to the crisis.¹³⁹ The representative of France proposed strengthening inspections, by, *inter alia*, doubling or tripling the number of inspectors; establishing a body to keep areas already inspected under surveillance; and substantially enhancing the capabilities for coordination and information-processing. He also recommended establishing, with the consent of the inspections team, a realistic time frame for the assessment and elimination of problems.¹⁴⁰

The representative of the United Kingdom agreed that Iraq was in “material breach” of resolution 1441 (2002), as it had made false statements claiming that it did not have weapons of mass destruction and had provided a veneer of superficial cooperation masking wilful concealment. He stressed that while the United Kingdom did not want war, the logic of resolution 1441 (2002) was inescapable, and if non-cooperation continued, the Council would need to fulfil its responsibilities.¹⁴¹ The representatives of Bulgaria and Spain noted that the presentation by the United States showed that Iraq remained in “material breach” of Council resolutions.¹⁴² The representative of Spain maintained that the real issue was the lack of will on the part of Iraq to fulfil its obligations, and urged Iraq to take advantage of the last chance that had been offered under resolution 1441 (2002).¹⁴³

The representative of Iraq denied all of the allegations made in the statement by the United States. He reiterated that Iraq possessed no weapons of mass destruction programme, and that it had submitted an accurate declaration. He noted that UNMOVIC and IAEA had found no evidence of any weapons or programme anywhere in Iraq. He also mentioned that analysts at the Central Intelligence Agency had complained that the United States Administration had exaggerated reports on weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and that the United Kingdom had ignored intelligence reports from its own Government stating

that there was no relationship between Iraq and Al-Qaida. He concluded by stressing that the main point of the presentation was to “sell the idea of war”, without legal, moral or political justification.¹⁴⁴

At its 4707th meeting,¹⁴⁵ on 14 February 2003, the Council heard briefings by the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director General of IAEA, following which statements were made by all members of the Council and the representative of Iraq.¹⁴⁶

The Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC briefed the Council on progress made in the inspections in Iraq. He noted that UNMOVIC had conducted more than 400 inspections covering more than 300 sites. All inspections were performed without notice and access was almost always provided promptly, with no evidence that Iraq knew when inspectors were coming. UNMOVIC had found no weapons of mass destruction, only a small number of empty chemical munitions that should have been destroyed. However, he noted that many proscribed weapons and items remained unaccounted for, and Iraq had a responsibility to provide credible evidence that they had been destroyed. He called on Iraq to provide the necessary cooperation to answer all remaining questions. He also requested that the intelligence agencies of Member States cooperate with UNMOVIC by sharing information that would allow for more effective inspections.¹⁴⁷

The Director General of IAEA informed the Council that the focus of inspections had moved from the reconnaissance phase into the investigative phase, focused on understanding the activities of Iraq over the past four years. He stressed that to date IAEA had found no evidence of ongoing prohibited nuclear or nuclear-related activities in Iraq, although a number of issues were still under investigation.¹⁴⁸

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 18-20.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 26-27 (Bulgaria); and p. 29 (Spain).

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 37-39.

¹⁴⁵ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter; and part IV, sect. B, with regard to Article 42.

¹⁴⁶ Chile, China, France, Germany, Mexico, Russian Federation, Spain and the Syrian Arab Republic were represented by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs; the United Kingdom by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs; and the United States by the Secretary of State.

¹⁴⁷ S/PV.4707, pp. 2-6.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9.

Most speakers argued that as substantial progress had been made in the work of the inspectors, the Council needed to continue to support them and give them sufficient time to undertake their task, as set out in resolution 1441 (2002). A number of speakers stressed the importance of strengthening the inspections regime as necessary, and of greater cooperation from Iraq on outstanding issues.¹⁴⁹ Several speakers cautioned that any war in Iraq would have grave consequences for the unity and territorial integrity of Iraq, and would threaten the entire region. Most argued that the use of force was not justified at the present time.¹⁵⁰

The representative of Spain stated that neither more inspections nor an increase in the means available to inspectors were needed, as the problem was primarily the lack of political will in Iraq. Her delegation was in favour of a solution being found within the Security Council, but if there was not a change of political attitude by Iraq, then the Council would be obliged to assume its responsibilities in the interest of peace and security.¹⁵¹

The representative of the United Kingdom maintained that it was clear that Iraq had failed to fully and actively comply with resolution 1441 (2002). He argued that if the Council backed away from a credible threat of force, and if it was not ready to use that force, then the disarmament of Iraq and the maintenance of peace and security by the international community would be much harder.¹⁵²

The representative of the United States stressed that resolution 1441 (2002) was about disarmament and compliance and not “merely a process of inspections that goes on forever without ever resolving the basic problem”. He argued that Iraq had failed to comply with resolution 1441 (2002), and stressed that in the near future the Council would have to consider

“serious consequences” of the kind intended by resolution 1441 (2002).¹⁵³

On the question how much time to allow for inspections, the representative of France noted that war might seem swifter, but that even after the war was won, it would be necessary to build a peace, which would be longer and more difficult than inspections were likely to be.¹⁵⁴

The representative of Iraq stated that, following the return of inspectors to Iraq, his country had provided everything that might fall within the concept of proactive cooperation, and had been discussing the outstanding issues with UNMOVIC and providing new documentation. However, he emphasized that if the “proactive cooperation” called for by some Council members meant that Iraq had to show weapons of mass destruction, his delegation would have to respond that Iraq did not have such weapons and therefore could not dismantle them. He concluded by appealing to the Council to allow the inspectors to fulfil their role, which would lead to peace and not war, and for the lifting of the embargo on Iraq.¹⁵⁵

The 4709th meeting of the Council^{156,157} was held on 18 and 19 February 2003 in response to the request in a letter dated 6 February 2003 from the representative of South Africa, in his capacity as the Chairman of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement,¹⁵⁸ to hold an open debate on the reports presented at the 4707th meeting by the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director General of IAEA. The Council included the letter in its agenda. At the meeting, the President (Germany) drew attention to a letter dated 14 February 2003 from the representative of South Africa to the President of the Security Council.¹⁵⁹

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 10 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 11 (France); p. 14 (Chile); p. 15 (China); p. 22 (Russian Federation); p. 23 (Mexico); p. 24 (Guinea); p. 25 (Pakistan); p. 28 (Angola); p. 29 (Bulgaria); and p. 30 (Germany).

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 10 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 11 (France); p. 15 (Chile); p. 22 (Russian Federation); p. 25 (Pakistan); p. 26 (Cameroon); p. 28 (Angola); and p. 30 (Germany).

¹⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 16-17.

¹⁵² Ibid., pp. 17-18.

¹⁵³ Ibid., pp. 18-21.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 11-13.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 30-32.

¹⁵⁶ At its 4708th meeting, held in private on 14 February 2003, the Council had a constructive exchange of views with the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director General of IAEA.

¹⁵⁷ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter; part IV, sect. B, with regard to Article 42; and part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51.

¹⁵⁸ S/2003/153.

¹⁵⁹ S/2003/183, informing the Council that Iraq had accepted the offer by South Africa to send to Iraq the

Statements were made by the representatives of Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, the Gambia, Georgia, Greece (on behalf of the European Union¹⁶⁰), Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, the Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Saint Lucia (on behalf of the Caribbean Community), the Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen and Zimbabwe, as well as the Permanent Observers of the League of Arab States and the Holy See.

Most speakers maintained that the inspection process was working, Iraq was cooperating with UNMOVIC and IAEA, and, as there was no fixed timetable for inspections, they should be continued. They stressed that no information provided thus far would seem to justify the Council abandoning the inspections process and immediately resorting to the threatened “serious consequences”. Most speakers paid tribute to the work done by the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director General of IAEA. They also underlined the central role of the Security Council in dealing with Iraq, particularly the exclusive responsibility of the Council in authorizing the use of force or sanctions. Many speakers expressed concern that any military action in Iraq would have far-reaching, destabilizing consequences in the Middle East, and that all diplomatic channels and forms of negotiation should be explored. They also voiced concern about the devastating impact of an armed conflict on the humanitarian situation of the civilian population of Iraq as well as to the regional and global economy.

Several speakers voiced support for strengthening the inspections through an increase in the number of

experts who led the successful South African programme to destroy nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, as well as the missiles for the delivery of those weapons.

¹⁶⁰ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

inspectors, a stronger mandate or other approach.¹⁶¹ The representative of Malaysia noted that the Council had never authorized the use of force on the basis of a potential threat of violence. All past authorizations had been in response to actual invasions. Therefore, an attack against Iraq without any credible evidence provided to the international community of the imminent threat it posed was illegal and unjustified.¹⁶²

At the same time, a number of speakers expressed the view that Iraq had not met its obligations pursuant to resolution 1441 (2002) and needed to do so or the Council would have an obligation to act.¹⁶³ Several of these delegations stressed, however, that military force needed to be a last resort and used under international legality and with the approval of the Security Council.¹⁶⁴

Several delegations underlined the importance of the implementation of paragraph 14 of resolution 687 (1991) which called for the declaration of the Middle East as a region free from weapons of mass destruction, a declaration that needed to include the nuclear arsenal of Israel, or otherwise called for the regulation of nuclear weapons programmes in Israel.¹⁶⁵ A number of delegations underlined the need for Baghdad to release prisoners of war, property and missing persons from the time of the invasion of Kuwait.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶¹ S/PV.4709, p. 4 (South Africa); p. 12 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 14 (Algeria); p. 16 (Jordan); and p. 22 (Brazil); S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 5 (Costa Rica); p. 6 (Switzerland); p. 8 (Indonesia); p. 9 (Malaysia); and p. 12 (Uruguay).

¹⁶² S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1), and Corr.1, p. 10.

¹⁶³ S/PV.4709, p. 8 (Kuwait); p. 19 (Australia); p. 23 (Peru); and p. 24 (Japan); S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 6 (Switzerland); p. 7 (Republic of Korea); p. 18 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); p. 20 (Nicaragua); p. 21 (Albania, Uzbekistan); p. 27 (Iceland); pp. 29-30 (Georgia); p. 31 (Serbia and Montenegro); and p. 32 (Latvia).

¹⁶⁴ S/PV.4709, p. 8 (Kuwait); and p. 23 (Peru); S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 6 (Switzerland); p. 27 (Iceland); and p. 32 (Latvia).

¹⁶⁵ S/PV.4709, p. 15 (Algeria, Bahrain); p. 26 (League of Arab States); p. 29 (Yemen); S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 11 (Saudi Arabia); p. 24 (United Arab Emirates); and p. 30 (Lebanon).

¹⁶⁶ S/PV.4709, p. 9 (Kuwait); p. 18 (Gambia); p. 29 (Yemen); p. 32 (Argentina, Sudan); and p. 36 (India); S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 3 (Qatar); p. 9 (Malaysia); p. 11 (Saudi Arabia); p. 14 (Libyan Arab

The representative of Japan considered it desirable that the Council adopt a new resolution that clearly demonstrated the determined attitude of the international community.¹⁶⁷ The representative of Canada suggested that a deadline for Iraq's compliance be established, as well as for the Government of Iraq to fully implement all its international obligations in accordance with other relevant Council resolutions, which would allow the Council to judge whether Iraq was cooperating on substance and not just on process.¹⁶⁸ The representative of Mauritius maintained that in the event that no tangible progress was seen in the next UNMOVIC report, the Council would have to assume its responsibility and take whatever action necessary.¹⁶⁹

The representative of Australia held the view that the Council should not wait forever to confront the issue, and that it should move quickly to consider a further resolution that dealt decisively with Iraq's failure to comply with resolution 1441 (2002).¹⁷⁰ The representatives of Albania and the Marshall Islands stated that their delegations understood and supported the commitment of the United States and other nations to avoid the threats of weapons of mass destruction and international terrorism.¹⁷¹

The representative of Switzerland reported that his country had recently held a meeting in Geneva to suggest a platform for humanitarian dialogue in the event of armed conflict in Iraq, which would act as a forum for the exchange of views aimed at strengthening existing coordinating mechanisms.¹⁷²

The representative of Iraq reiterated that, as a result of his country's active cooperation with inspectors, all allegations made by the United States and the United Kingdom had been refuted, proving that Iraq possessed no weapons of mass destruction. He called upon all Member States to put an end to the unjust embargo, eliminate the no-fly zones imposed unilaterally by the United States and the United Kingdom, and to heed the call for peace expressed by

millions of people around the world over the past few days.¹⁷³

At its 4714th meeting,¹⁷⁴ on 7 March 2003, the Council included in its agenda the note by the Secretary-General dated 28 February 2003, transmitting the twelfth quarterly report of the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC.¹⁷⁵ The Executive Chairman concluded that, during the period of time covered, Iraq could have made greater efforts to find any remaining proscribed items or provide credible evidence showing the absence of such items.

At the meeting, the Council heard briefings by the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director General of IAEA; statements were made by all members of the Council and representative of Iraq.¹⁷⁶

In his briefing, the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC noted that since the resumption of inspections, UNMOVIC had faced relatively few difficulties in matters relating to process and had been able to perform "no-notice" inspections all over the country and to increase aerial surveillance. He believed, however, that Iraq should be able to provide more documentary evidence about its proscribed weapons programmes. Responding to claims from intelligence services about mobile weapons of mass destruction capacity, he noted that no evidence of such proscribed activities had been found so far, nor had any underground facilities for chemical and biological weapons production. He reported some tangible progress on unresolved disarmament tasks, highlighting in particular the destruction of Al-Samoud 2 missiles, which had been found to exceed the permissible range determined by the Council, and the efforts to clarify issues related to the quantity of

Jamahiriya); pp. 23-24 (United Arab Emirates) and pp. 30-31 (Lebanon).

¹⁶⁷ S/PV.4709, p. 24.

¹⁶⁸ S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1 p. 29.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

¹⁷⁰ S/PV.4709, p. 19.

¹⁷¹ S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 21 (Albania); and p. 22 (Marshall Islands).

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹⁷³ S/PV.4709, pp. 5-6; and S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, pp. 34-35.

¹⁷⁴ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter; and part IV, sect. B, with regard to Article 42.

¹⁷⁵ S/2003/232; the report was submitted pursuant to paragraph 12 of resolution 1284 (1999).

¹⁷⁶ Chile, China, France, Germany, Guinea, Mexico, the Russian Federation, Spain and the Syrian Arab Republic were represented by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Angola by the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, the United Kingdom by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, and the United States by the Secretary of State.

biological and chemical weapons, which Iraq claimed to have unilaterally destroyed in 1991. Against the background of what he termed an acceleration of initiatives “since the end of January”, he stated that Iraq’s efforts, while proactive, could not be said to constitute immediate cooperation. He noted that, pursuant to its mandate under resolution 1284 (1999), UNMOVIC would be ready to submit a draft programme of work to the Council with key remaining disarmament tasks in March, and that the complete list of clustered issues would be ready at the request of Council members. In conclusion, he stated that, even with a proactive Iraqi attitude, induced by continued pressure, verified disarmament would take months to achieve.¹⁷⁷

The Director General of IAEA reported that the Agency had seen no indication that Iraq had resumed nuclear activities in the buildings identified through satellite imagery, nor any indication that it had attempted to import uranium, aluminium tubes and magnets for use in a centrifuge enrichment programme. In summing up, he stated that IAEA had found no evidence or plausible indication of the revival of a nuclear weapons programme in Iraq.¹⁷⁸

A number of Council members stated that the inspectors’ report demonstrated that progress had been achieved in implementing resolution 1441 (2002), although several representatives noted that cooperation still needed to be improved. They saw no need for a new resolution, but instead spoke in favour of strengthening inspections. In that regard, it was noted that France, the Russian Federation and Germany had presented a memorandum proposing “a tough regime of intensive inspection”, and that a time frame needed to be prescribed for each outstanding issue to be addressed.¹⁷⁹ The representative of France also proposed that the inspectors be asked to establish a hierarchy of disarmament tasks to establish priority issues and be required to submit a progress report every three weeks. The Council would then establish a schedule for assessing the implementation of the work programme, and noted that resolution 1284 (2002) provided for a time frame of 120 days, which could be shortened if the inspectors considered it feasible. He

further underlined that the military agenda must not dictate the calendar of inspections, noting that he could not accept an ultimatum as long as inspectors were reporting progress in terms of cooperation, and would not, as a permanent member of the Council, allow a resolution to pass that authorised the automatic use of force.¹⁸⁰ Deploring the divergence of opinions in the Council on how to secure the elimination of Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction, the representative of Pakistan believed that an agreed approach could and had to evolve through consultations among Council members and United Nations inspectors. Once ways to credibly achieve the disarmament of Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction were established, the Council could also agree on a relatively short time frame. He added that his delegation did not believe there was an imminent threat to international peace and security.¹⁸¹

The representative of Mexico stated that he wished to broaden the range of formulas for achieving an effective disarmament of Iraq and to open the space to more ideas that would preserve the diplomatic option. He also insisted on the importance of working towards a consensus position on future actions to be taken by the Council.¹⁸² The representatives of Chile, Cameroon and Guinea noted that the cooperation by Iraq was inadequate, but that inspections, subject to a time limit, should continue and that the use of force could only be invoked, by the Council, when all peaceful means had been exhausted.¹⁸³ The representative of Angola agreed that Iraq had not fully cooperated with inspectors, but also held that the Council needed to exhaust all peaceful and diplomatic means before force could be considered.¹⁸⁴

The representative of the United States maintained that, despite some of the progress that had been mentioned, he considered the briefing by the inspectors to show “a catalogue of non-cooperation” by Iraq. He reiterated that Iraq had not made a strategic decision to disarm and that the Council needed to step up to its responsibilities. He maintained that, while nobody wanted war, it was clear that the limited progress that had been achieved had come from the presence of a large military force and from the

¹⁷⁷ S/PV.4714, pp. 2-6.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10 (Germany); pp. 10-12 (Syrian Arab Republic); pp. 17-18 (Russian Federation); and pp. 18-21 (France).

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 18-21.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 22 (Chile); p. 29 (Cameroon); and pp. 33-34 (Guinea).

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 28 (Angola).

willingness to use that force. He noted that the draft resolution put forward was appropriate and encouraged the Council to bring it to a vote.¹⁸⁵ The representatives of Spain, the United Kingdom and Bulgaria stressed that the Government of Iraq had given no sign of a credible will to disarm and the Council needed to assume its responsibility to disarm Iraq, including by adopting a new draft resolution to put greater pressure on the regime.¹⁸⁶ The United Kingdom added that his delegation was introducing an amendment that would specify a further period beyond the adoption of a resolution for Iraq to take the final opportunity to disarm and to bring itself into compliance. He stressed, however, that the Council would need to send Iraq the clear message that they would resolve the crisis on United Nations terms, the terms that the Council had established in resolution 1441 (2002).¹⁸⁷

The representative of Iraq stated that the possibilities of launching a war of aggression against his country had become imminent, despite demands for a peaceful solution, illustrated by the positions of France, Germany, the Russian Federation and China, the most recent Arab and Non-Aligned Movement summits, as well as the meeting of Heads of State of Islamic countries. He held that the United States and the United Kingdom were unable to prove the existence of weapons of mass destruction in his country, and were only interested in advancing their private agenda in the region. The representative stressed that his Government would continue to provide proactive and rapid cooperation with UNMOVIC and IAEA and was grateful to those opposing the proposed draft resolution.¹⁸⁸

By a letter dated 7 March 2003 to the President of the Security Council,¹⁸⁹ the representative of Malaysia requested the holding of an open debate on the reports presented at the 4714th meeting by the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director General of IAEA and on the new proposals that had been introduced.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-17.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 23-25 (Spain); pp. 25-26 (United Kingdom); and pp. 30-31 (Bulgaria).

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 34-36.

¹⁸⁹ S/2003/283.

At its 4717th meeting,¹⁹⁰ held on 11 and 12 March 2003, in response to the above-mentioned letter, the Council included the letter in its agenda. Statements were made by the representatives of Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Georgia, Greece (on behalf of the European Union¹⁹¹), Nigeria, Iceland, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Japan, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, the Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe, as well as the Permanent Observers of LAS and OIC.

During the debate, most speakers underlined the need for the peaceful disarmament of Iraq, as reflected in the conclusions of recent summits of the League of Arab States, the Non-Aligned Movement, and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, as well as the decisions of the European Union and Africa Union. They voiced opposition to the prospect of an imminent military action against Iraq outside the multilateral framework of the United Nations and the Security Council. Many speakers also observed that Iraq was cooperating in the implementation of resolution 1441 (2002), citing, as proof of Baghdad's willingness to disarm, the recent destruction of various Al-Samoud 2 missiles, as well as the recent statement of the Director General of IAEA that there was no indication of the resumption of nuclear activities. Nevertheless, they reaffirmed calls on Baghdad to continue to cooperate with United Nations inspectors. While some speakers

¹⁹⁰ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter; part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41; part IV, sect. B, with regard to Article 42; and part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51; and chap. XII, part III, sect. B, with regard to encouragement or calls by the Security Council for action by regional arrangements in the pacific settlement of disputes.

¹⁹¹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

stressed that Iraq had not cooperated unconditionally, most expressed the view that the inspections were making concrete progress towards a genuine resolution of the situation and voiced support for giving inspectors the few additional months they had requested in order to complete their work, before establishing a deadline. Many speakers asked if it was reasonable, given the progress in inspections, that war should now be threatened, particularly when the requested period of time was so short. A number of speakers expressed concern about the possible devastating humanitarian consequences of such a conflict, and maintained that any conflict would have destabilizing consequences for the Middle East and for international peace and security. Several speakers also underlined that how the Council considered the issue of Iraq would mark a defining moment in its history and would impact the manner in which the international community approached future conflict situations. Several speakers emphasized the importance of a speedy resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict or called for a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East in accordance with paragraph 14 of resolution 687 (1991).

In terms of what action the Council needed to take, while agreeing that progress was being made, several speakers believed that the Council should strengthen the inspections process by, *inter alia*, endorsing a work programme for inspections, including the key remaining disarmament tasks or strengthening their mandate.¹⁹²

A number of speakers agreed that there was no need for the revised draft resolution¹⁹³ being considered by the Council, which set a deadline of 17 March for compliance by Iraq.¹⁹⁴ The representative of South Africa held that any timetable developed without taking into account the programme of work of the inspectors could only lead to an unnecessary ultimatum for war, and furthermore would be counterproductive and contradict both resolutions 1284 (1999) and 1441 (2002).¹⁹⁵

¹⁹² S/PV.4717, p. 9 (South Africa); p. 13 (Algeria); p. 15 (India); p. 19 (Canada); p. 30 (Indonesia); and p. 32 (Viet Nam).

¹⁹³ S/2003/215.

¹⁹⁴ S/PV.4717, p. 26 (Cuba); and p. 34 (Lebanon); S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Sudan); and p. 18 (Malawi).

¹⁹⁵ S/PV.4717, p. 9.

Several representatives maintained that Iraq had not fulfilled its obligations under resolution 1441 (2002) and had only taken small and belated steps under pressure. They held that the best and perhaps last hope of achieving a peaceful solution was for the Council to send a clear message to Iraq through a new resolution, which set deadlines and included concrete demands that it must fully disarm. In appealing to Council members to support a new resolution, speakers stated clearly that it was time that the Council faced its responsibilities, adding that the unity of the Council, particularly if force was required, needed to be maintained.¹⁹⁶ Several speakers noted that it was clear that Iraq had not complied and that a clear deadline was necessary to guarantee its disarmament and expressed hope that the Council would act in a way that preserved its unity.¹⁹⁷ The representative of the Philippines stated that Iraq was in material breach of its obligations and remarked that, while his delegation shared the hopes for peace, it was necessary to be ready to take decisive action to preserve and maintain a meaningful peace.¹⁹⁸

The representative of Canada, recalling his Government's proposal of 18 February, held that a message of absolute clarity should be sent by the Council to Baghdad on what was required by requiring the leadership of Iraq to publicly direct all levels of the Government to take all necessary disarmament decisions; asking UNMOVIC to bring forward the programme of work urgently, within a week, including the list of key remaining disarmament tasks; setting a deadline of three weeks for Iraq to demonstrate conclusively that it was implementing those tasks; and authorizing Member States to eventually use all necessary means to force compliance, unless, on the basis of ongoing inspectors reports, the Council concluded that Iraq was complying.¹⁹⁹

The representative of Switzerland invited Council members to see to it that any decision taken on the

¹⁹⁶ S/PV.4717, pp. 5-6 (Kuwait); pp. 18-19 (Australia); and p. 31 (Albania); S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Japan); p. 8 (Dominican Republic); p. 9 (Latvia); p. 10 (El Salvador); p. 11 (Georgia, Nicaragua); p. 17 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); and p. 23 (Colombia).

¹⁹⁷ S/PV.4717, p. 28 (Singapore); and pp. 28-29 (Republic of Korea); S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Thailand).

¹⁹⁸ S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), p. 4.

¹⁹⁹ S/PV.4717, p. 20.

basis of Chapter VII included the unconditional demand that all parties respect international humanitarian law.²⁰⁰

The representative of Iraq noted, *inter alia*, that the goal of the United States and the United Kingdom was not disarmament but to acquire Iraqi oil, control the region and redraw its borders to ensure the continuation of their vital interests in the long-term. He affirmed that Iraq had taken the strategic decision to rid itself of weapons of mass destruction, and he called upon the international community to prevent a “catastrophe” that had become imminent. He rejected the allegations that had been presented by the United States and others, noting the lack of evidence and the use of forged documents and other faulty intelligence. At the close of the meeting, the representative noted that the majority of speakers had expressed support for the cooperation being shown by his Government for the inspection process. While reiterating that Iraq possessed no weapons of mass destruction, he stressed that “only time” was needed to provide proof to the international community.²⁰¹

At its 4721st meeting,²⁰² on 19 March 2003, the Council heard briefings by the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and a representative of the Director General of IAEA; statements were made by all members of the Council,²⁰³ the representative of Iraq and the Secretary-General.

The Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC expressed sadness that three and a half months of work carried out by UNMOVIC in Iraq had not brought the assurances needed about the absence of weapons of mass destruction or other proscribed items in Iraq; that no more time was available for the inspectors; and that armed action now seemed imminent. At the same time, he felt a sense of relief that it had been possible to withdraw all United Nations international staff, including that of UNMOVIC and IAEA, safely from Iraq, with the cooperation of the Iraqi authorities. He also noted that Iraq had submitted several more letters

on unresolved issues and those efforts should be acknowledged. At the same time, his experts had found that in substance only limited new information had been provided that would help to resolve the remaining questions. Regarding the programme of work UNMOVIC had submitted, he stated that it was possible for the Council to single out a few issues for resolution within a specific time, although whatever approach was followed, results would depend on the active cooperation of Iraq on substance.²⁰⁴

The representative of the Director General of IAEA informed the Council that the work programme for IAEA had been transmitted, that it was self-explanatory and the Director General would be available any time to discuss it if the Security Council so wished.²⁰⁵

Council members expressed regret that it had not been possible to reach an agreement that would have allowed the continued peaceful disarmament of Iraq, and that the situation on the ground had brought the work of United Nations inspections to a standstill. At the same time, members took note of the Secretary-General’s decision to withdraw all United Nations staff on the basis of the need to ensure the continued safety and security of all personnel. Most speakers stressed that the United Nations and the Security Council needed to continue to play a central role in the Iraq conflict, as it bore the primary responsibility for world peace and international security. A number of speakers also expressed concern over the humanitarian consequences of war in Iraq. Most speakers emphasized that inspections within the framework of the United Nations would continue to be an important tool to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The representatives of Germany, France, the Russian Federation and China believed that it was still possible to disarm Iraq peacefully, specifically by adhering to the deadlines outlined in the work programme of UNMOVIC, whose approach they endorsed.²⁰⁶ The representative of Chile stated that nothing could be more serious than suspending the inspections process, as that could create doubts concerning the validity of that instrument for

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

²⁰¹ S/PV.4717, pp. 3-5; S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), pp. 24-25.

²⁰² For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter; and part IV, sect. B, with regard to Article 42.

²⁰³ France and Germany were represented by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs.

²⁰⁴ S/PV.4721, pp. 2-3.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4 (Germany); p. 5 (France); p. 8 (Russian Federation); and p. 19 (China).

international peace and security. He expressed concern that if confidence in disarmament institutions eroded, those institutions would lose their value and would no longer be a guarantor of peace.²⁰⁷

The representatives of Germany and the Russian Federation stressed that the policy of military intervention had no credibility, and that there was no basis in the Charter for regime change by military means.²⁰⁸ The representative of Mexico added that the Council was the only organ which the international community had entrusted the right to use force.²⁰⁹ The representative of France maintained that the respect for law was the keystone of the international order and it needed to apply under all circumstances, particularly when it was a question regarding the use of force. He also believed that the example of UNMOVIC should serve as a model for the establishment of a permanent disarmament body under the auspices of the United Nations, aimed at resolving similar crises in the future.²¹⁰ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic noted that the majority of the members of the Council had rejected the idea of adopting a draft resolution authorizing the use of force, thus rendering the use of the veto unnecessary by any country. He also noted that the verbatim record of the meeting of the Council included comments by those members that were hastening to wage war, confirming their belief that resolution 1441 (2002) did not permit a strike against Iraq without reverting to the Council.²¹¹

The representative of Spain stated that Saddam Hussein was responsible for the suspension of the inspections, due to his ongoing policy of deceit, concealment and delaying tactics, having decided to “openly opt for the path of confrontation”, in contravention of the demands of the Security Council. As for the legitimacy of the use of force against Iraq, he maintained that a new resolution was not legally necessary as it had already been established based on the logical linking of resolutions 660 (1990), 678 (1990), 687 (1991) and 1441 (2002), adopted under Chapter VII. He explained that in resolution 660 (1990) the Council had considered the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait a breach of the peace and international security and, while by resolution 687 (1991) it had declared a

ceasefire, that had been subordinated to compliance with a number of conditions mostly relating to the disarmament of weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, resolution 687 (1991) had left in abeyance resolution 678 (1990), by which the use of force had been authorized, but had not abolished it. The content of resolution 678 (1990) continued to be perfectly valid, and had been recalled in resolution 1441 (2002), by which the Council recognized that the non-compliance of Iraq constituted a threat to international peace and security, recalled that peace had not been restored to the region, and decided that Iraq had failed to comply and continued to fail to comply most seriously with the demands imposed by the international community.²¹² The representative of Bulgaria maintained that, in refusing to cooperate fully, actively and without condition with the inspectors, Iraq had failed to seize its last chance to comply with the relevant resolutions.²¹³ The representative of the United Kingdom stressed that any action which his country took would be in accordance with international law and based on relevant resolutions of the Council.²¹³

The representative of Cameroon, expressing concern at the de facto suspension of the oil-for-food programme, suggested that the Committee meet as soon as possible so that it could adopt any emergency measures needed at the humanitarian level.²¹⁴

The representative of the United States noted that consideration of the draft programmes of work, which represented the agenda for the meeting, was incompatible with the issue of non-compliance of Iraq with resolution 1441 (2002) and the “current reality on the ground”. He expressed concern over the humanitarian needs of Iraq and stated that his country had been planning across all relevant United States agencies and in support of United Nations efforts to anticipate likely requirements and to be prepared to administer necessary relief as quickly as possible. He also noted the importance of keeping the oil-for-food programme running, and informed the Council that his delegation would present a draft humanitarian resolution that would ensure the continuity of the programme.²¹⁵

²⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 17.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., pp. 3-4 (Germany); and p. 8 (Russian Federation).

²⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 12.

²¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 6-7 (France).

²¹¹ Ibid., p. 9.

²¹² Ibid., pp. 15-16.

²¹³ Ibid., p. 19.

²¹⁴ Ibid., p. 14.

²¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 13-14.

The representative of Iraq reiterated that his country no longer possessed weapons of mass destruction and that the United States and the United Kingdom had failed to prove any allegations to the contrary since the adoption of resolution 1441 (2002). He believed that those countries' true motives, namely the occupation of Iraq and taking control of its oil wells, had now been exposed, and that the forthcoming conflict would show that. Highlighting the dire humanitarian effects of any conflict, the representative called on the Council to renew the work of the oil-for-food programme, specifically to ensure that the agreed-upon shipment of humanitarian goods on their way to Iraq, amounting to \$10 billion, was not further delayed.²¹⁶

The Secretary-General shared the regrets of Council members on the failure to reach a common position on Iraq. Recalling the sufferings of the Iraqi people over the past two decades brought about by two major wars and more than a decade of debilitating sanctions, he stated that in the short term the conflict about to get under way could worsen the situation. He further expressed the hope that members of the Council would agree that everything should be done to mitigate the "imminent disaster". He recalled that under international law the responsibility for protecting civilians in conflicts fell on the belligerents and, in any area under military occupation, respect for the welfare of the population fell on the occupying power. However, the Secretary-General emphasized that the United Nations would do whatever it could to help, and had in fact been preparing for some time for that contingency. He also indicated that he would be preparing proposals for the Council's consideration on how to adjust the oil-for-food programme to enable its resumption.²¹⁷

By a letter dated 24 March 2003 to the President of the Council,²¹⁸ the representative of Iraq, in his capacity as the Chairman of the Group of Arab States for the month of March 2003 and on behalf of the States members of LAS, with the reservation of Kuwait, requested the convening of an urgent session of the Security Council with regard to halting the American-British aggression and the immediate withdrawal of the invading forces outside the international boundaries of Iraq and reconfirming its

sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity and preventing all States from interfering in its internal affairs.

By a letter dated 24 March 2003 to the President of the Council,²¹⁹ the representative of Malaysia, in his capacity as Chairman of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement, requested the Security Council to consider convening urgently an open debate on the situation between Iraq and Kuwait.

The 4726th meeting of the Council²²⁰ was held on 26 and 27 March 2003 in response to the requests contained in the above-mentioned letters, which were included in the agenda. Statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, the Federated States of Micronesia, Georgia, Greece (on behalf of the European Union²²¹), Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malaysia (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), the Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yemen, as well as the Secretary-General and the Permanent Observers of LAS and Palestine.

In his introductory statement the Secretary-General expressed regret that intense efforts to achieve

²¹⁹ S/2003/363.

²²⁰ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to Article 39 of the Charter; part IV, sect. B with regard to Article 42; and part IX, sect. B, with regard to Article 51; and chap. XII, part I, sect. A, case 3, with regard to Article 1 (2); part I, sect. B, case 5, with regard to Article 2 (4); part I, sect. E, case 9, with regard to Article 2 (7); and part II, sect. A, case 19, with regard to Article 24.

²²¹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

²¹⁸ S/2003/362.

a peaceful solution, through the Council, had not succeeded. He stressed that the inability of the Council to agree earlier on a collective course of action placed an even greater burden on the Council now. He declared that the international community wanted to see the war brought to an end as soon as possible. Nevertheless, while it continued, it was essential that everything be done to protect the civilian population, as well as the wounded and the prisoners of war, on both sides, in accordance with international humanitarian law, in particular the Fourth Geneva Convention. He also reiterated the need to reach an agreement among Council members on how to adjust the oil-for-food programme. With regard to the future, he pointed out that the Council would also need to determine how it would address the many needs of the Iraqi people, whatever the outcome of the war, and what the United Nations itself might be asked to undertake. For anything beyond strictly humanitarian relief, the United Nations needed a mandate from the Council. In conclusion, the Secretary-General urged the Council to rediscover its “unity of purpose”, fearing that the deep divisions, if not healed, could have grave consequences for the international system and relations between States.²²²

The representative of Iraq informed the Council that “the American-British full-scale military aggression” had commenced on 20 March 2003 and the President of the United States had declared that the goal of the action was the occupation of Iraq and the change of its political regime. He recalled that the Security Council had not authorized the use of force by the United States and Britain and that resolution 1441 (2002) did not allow the use of force at all, a fact which both the United Kingdom and the United States had confirmed when it was adopted by stating that it did not contain “a hidden agenda, trigger or automatic use of force”. He held that the military invasion constituted a blatant material breach of international law and of the Charter, particularly Article 2 (4 and 7), as well as the relevant Council resolutions, all of which obliged Member States to respect the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of Iraq. He argued that the world was well aware that the real reason for the aggression and invasion was “the occupation of Iraq, to recolonize it and control its oil wealth”. He further called on the United Nations, and the Council in particular, to condemn the invasion and

²²² S/PV.4726, pp. 3-4.

aggression and call for an unconditional and immediate end to it. Drawing attention to the Council members’ deliberations on the “humanitarian” as opposed to the “military” aspects of the aggression, he held that the Council should first and foremost pay attention to the cessation of the war of aggression as it was the cause of the humanitarian problems. In conclusion he stressed that the people of Iraq would resist and would “pay the price in blood in order to get the United States out of Iraq.”²²³

During the course of the debate, most speakers expressed strong disappointment that the efforts to avert war in that country had failed. They also underlined the need to address the humanitarian situation in Iraq and for all parties to the conflict to comply with their obligations under international humanitarian law. Most speakers also reiterated the need to respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, emphasizing in particular the right of the people of Iraq to choose their own political destiny and form of governance, as well as their right to control their country’s natural resources. A majority of speakers reaffirmed the central role of the United Nations as the institution to ensure international peace and security. They underlined the need for the United Nations to continue to play a central role during and after the current crisis, noting that the United Nations system had a unique capacity and practical experience in coordinating assistance in post-conflict States. Most speakers stressed that the war should not be allowed to lead to the erosion of the principles and values that were set out in the Charter. Some highlighted the disunity in the Council and the need for it to reunite so as to ensure that the Council and the United Nations could respond quickly and meet the needs of the Iraqi people.

A large number of speakers argued that the inspections should have been allowed to continue as they had been producing results and that Iraq had indeed been actively cooperating with the inspectors.²²⁴ A number of delegations stressed that the

²²³ S/PV.4726, pp. 4-6; and S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), pp. 35-36.

²²⁴ S/PV.4726, p. 7 (Malaysia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement); pp. 8-9 (League of Arab States); pp. 10-11 (Algeria); p. 12 (Egypt); pp. 13-14 (Yemen); pp. 17-18 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); pp. 19-20 (Indonesia); pp. 20-21 (South Africa); p. 22 (Cuba); p. 24 (India); p. 32 (Jamaica); p. 33 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 35

war had been carried out without the authorization of the Security Council, in violation of the principles of international law and the Charter, and called on the Council to use its authority to stop the military action and revert to the multilateral process in an effort to resolve the issue. Many of those delegations reiterated the importance of the principles of the non-use of force and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. Several speakers also noted that the doctrine of “pre-emptive strikes” had no foundation in international law.²²⁵ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic stressed that the war was not justifiable because it was not aimed at the elimination of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, as the inspectors had maintained that there was no evidence of such weapons. The objective was to occupy Iraq, to subject the region to hegemony and exploitation, and to help Israel, which did possess weapons of mass destruction.²²⁶

Other speakers maintained that Iraq had not voluntarily disarmed and given up its weapons of mass destruction or abided by the provisions of resolution 1441 (2002), which had contained a warning of “grave consequences” in case of non-compliance, based on Chapter VII of the Charter, and noted the responsibility of the Government of Iraq for any consequences.²²⁷

(Lebanon); p. 36 (Tunisia); and p. 37 (Mauritius); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (United Republic of Tanzania); p. 17 (Kenya); p. 20 (Pakistan); p. 26 (Russian Federation); p. 28 (China, France); and p. 32 (Syrian Arab Republic).

²²⁵ S/PV.4726, p. 7 (Malaysia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement); pp. 8-9 (League of Arab States); pp. 10-11 (Algeria); p. 12 (Egypt); pp. 13-14 (Yemen); pp. 17-18 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); pp. 19-20 (Indonesia); pp. 20-21 (South Africa); p. 22 (Cuba); p. 28 (Brazil); p. 30 (Switzerland); p. 31 (Sudan); p. 32 (Viet Nam); pp. 32-33 (Jamaica); p. 33 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 35 (Lebanon); p. 36 (Tunisia); pp. 37-38 (Mauritius); p. 38 (Belarus); p. 46 (Venezuela); and p. 47 (Lao People’s Democratic Republic); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Liechtenstein); pp. 7-8 (Saudi Arabia); p. 9 (United Republic of Tanzania); p. 10 (Palestine); p. 16 (Kyrgyzstan); pp. 26-27 (Russian Federation); p. 28 (China, France); and pp. 32-33 (Syrian Arab Republic).

²²⁶ S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 32.

²²⁷ S/PV.4726, p. 24 (Poland); pp. 25-26 (Singapore); pp. 34-35 (Republic of Korea); p. 39 (Japan); pp. 39-40 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); p. 41 (Georgia, Uzbekistan); p. 42 (Latvia, Nicaragua); p. 45 (Albania); p. 46 (Iceland); and p. 47 (Mongolia); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (El Salvador); p. 8

Several delegations argued that the failure to take action against the Iraqi regime would have been tantamount to tolerating non-compliance with Council resolutions. They stressed that failure to take action to effectively disarm the Iraqi regime would be a serious political and military mistake and would lead to the further undermining of the authority of the United Nations.²²⁸ A number of speakers opined that the actions of the coalition were in accordance with international law, they noted, pointing out that resolutions 678 (1990), 687 (1991) and 1441 (2002) provided authority for the use of force to disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction and to restore international peace and security to the region.²²⁹ The representative of Singapore stated that, while his delegation would have preferred that the Council had explicitly authorized military action, it had felt that, given the long history of Iraq flouting Council resolutions, the inability to reach consensus could not be taken as a reason for inaction.²³⁰ The representative of the Marshall Islands expressed support for the ultimate goals of the operation in Iraq, which were to ensure Iraqi compliance with its disarmament obligations and to restore the sovereignty of the country to its people.²³¹ The representative of Argentina stated that, while the use of force was a last resort, and within the United Nations system it needed to be authorized by the Council, his delegation believed that in the current situation, legal and political debate on the legality of the armed conflict would “divide and paralyse” the Council and divert attention from the humanitarian situation of the people of Iraq.²³²

Several speakers also noted the need to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe in Iraq and therefore called, *inter alia*, for the immediate resumption of the oil-for-

(Federated States of Micronesia); p. 11 (Timor-Leste); p. 13 (Uganda); p. 14 (Sri Lanka); p. 15 (Ethiopia); p. 23 (United Kingdom); p. 29 (Spain); and p. 31 (Bulgaria).

²²⁸ S/PV.4726, p. 25 (Poland); p. 27 (Australia); pp. 34-35 (Republic of Korea); p. 30 (Japan), pp. 39-40 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); p. 41 (Georgia); and p. 46 (Iceland); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Lithuania); and p. 8 (Federated States of Micronesia).

²²⁹ S/PV.4726, p. 27 (Australia); and p. 40 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Federated States of Micronesia); and p. 23 (United Kingdom).

²³⁰ S/PV.4726, p. 26.

²³¹ S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 4.

²³² S/PV.4726, p. 37.

food programme, or for its amendment to allow an uninterrupted flow of humanitarian supplies.²³³ In contrast, the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya argued that the people of Iraq did not need the humanitarian assistance that was being requested by some States that were trying to provide it “from the wealth and resources of Iraq”, despite the fact that they had stopped the oil-for-food programme.²³⁴ The representative of South Africa cautioned that, while the Council had a role to play in ensuring that provisions were in place to assist with the delivery of humanitarian relief, the Council should not be drawn into drafting a resolution that would “provide tacit or implied approval of the military operations”.²³⁵ This was echoed by the representative of Cuba, who noted that the aggression and the occupation of territories should not be legalized or endorsed under humanitarian pretexts.²³⁶ The representative of Albania declared that the humanitarian situation had been caused by the “dictatorial policies” of the Government of Iraq and called on the regime to step aside and spare the people of Iraq from further danger.²³⁷

A number of speakers noted the importance of the Arab-Israel conflict and the lack of progress there. They opined, *inter alia*, that the real threat to the safety and security of the Arab nation was the possession by Israel of weapons of mass destruction; its ongoing occupation of the Arab territories; its policy against the Palestinian people; and its refusal to comply with numerous Council resolutions.²³⁸ Other speakers

reiterated their commitment to the road map and progress in the Arab-Israeli peace process.²³⁹

The representative of the United Kingdom noted that the coalition action, which encompassed over 40 States, was under way to enforce Council decisions on complete disarmament by Iraq. He stressed that the action was being directed only at the regime, and that the coalition partners were doing everything possible to minimize the effect on civilians, leave infrastructure intact, and ensure the rapid delivery of humanitarian assistance. He also stated that his country accepted in full all its obligations under international humanitarian law.²⁴⁰

The representative of the United States expressed regret that the Government of Iraq had not taken advantage of the final opportunity provided in resolution 1441 (2002) and reiterated that the coalition’s response was legitimate and not unilateral. He recalled that resolution 687 (1991) imposed a series of obligations on Iraq that were the conditions of the ceasefire. A material breach of those obligations removed the basis of the ceasefire and revived the authority to use force under resolution 678 (1990). By resolution 1441 (2002) the Council explicitly found Iraq in continuing material breach. Therefore, in view of additional material breaches by Iraq, the basis for the existing ceasefire had been removed and the use of force was authorized under resolution 678 (1990). The representative also provided an overview of efforts to provide rapid assistance to the Iraqi people. He expressed support for the Secretary-General’s request for the necessary authorities to ensure the continuity of the oil-for-food programme and noted that the Council was close to an agreement on a resolution. He stressed that if the Council failed to adopt such a resolution there would be serious humanitarian implications. On the future of Iraq, he listed five principles that guided the Government of the United States. First, his country would demonstrate to the people of Iraq and the world

²³³ S/PV.4726, p. 11 (Algeria); p. 15 (Kuwait); p. 19 (Greece on behalf of the European Union); pp. 20-21 (South Africa); p. 23 (New Zealand); p. 24 (India); p. 26 (Singapore); p. 27 (Australia); p. 29 (Turkey); p. 30 (Switzerland); p. 32 (Viet Nam); p. 35 (Republic of Korea); p. 37 (Argentina); p. 40 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); p. 40 (Colombia); p. 41 (Georgia, Uzbekistan); p. 42 (Latvia, Nicaragua); p. 43 (Norway); p. 45 (Albania); p. 46 (Venezuela); pp. 47-48 (Mongolia); p. 48 (Guatemala); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Liechtenstein); p. 3 (Canada); p. 4 (Uruguay); p. 5 (Thailand); p. 6 (Slovakia, El Salvador); p. 15 (Ethiopia); p. 16 (Jordan); p. 18 (Slovenia); p. 19 (Mexico); pp. 21-22 (Pakistan); p. 24 (Cameroon); p. 28 (China); p. 29 (France, Spain); p. 31 (Chile, Bulgaria); pp. 33-34 (Germany); and pp. 34-35 (Guinea).

²³⁴ S/PV.4726, p. 17.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (League of Arab States); p. 13 (Yemen); p. 17

(Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); p. 34 (Islamic Republic of Iran); and p. 44 (Morocco); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), pp. 7-8 (Saudi Arabia); p. 9 (United Republic of Tanzania); p. 10 (Palestine); p. 12 (Timor-Leste); pp. 13-14 (Uganda); pp. 14-15 (Sri Lanka); p. 16 (Jordan); p. 22 (Pakistan); and p. 32 (Syrian Arab Republic).

²³⁹ S/PV.4726, p. 19 (Greece on behalf of the European Union); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 23 (United Kingdom); p. 29 (Spain); and p. 31 (Chile).

²⁴⁰ S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 23.

that the United States and the coalition aspired to liberate, not to occupy. Second, Iraq needed to be disarmed of all nuclear, chemical and biological weapons production capabilities and the means to deliver such weapons. Third, the “terrorist infrastructure” in Iraq needed to be eliminated. Fourth, Iraq needed to be preserved as a unified State, with its territorial integrity intact. Stressing that concern for the safety of the people of Iraq had been “foremost in our minds”, he said that the United States and the coalition would “provide security to prevent chaos and retribution”. Fifth, a process of economic and political reconstruction needed to be started. He noted the commitment of his Government to working in close partnership with international institutions, including the United Nations. Finally, he reiterated that his country wanted to return control over the sovereignty of Iraq to its people as soon as possible.²⁴¹

The representative of the Russian Federation maintained that the military action undertaken by the United States and the United Kingdom in violation of Security Council resolutions could not be justified in any way. He noted that those countries had been unable to provide any proof to justify their allegations regarding the possession of weapons of mass destruction and support for international terrorism by Iraq. He also noted that no proof had been found in the course of the ongoing military action to sustain such accusations. Bearing in mind the exceptional, his delegation was prepared, to resolve the issue of temporary amendments to the procedures followed in the oil-for-food programme in order to meet the humanitarian needs of Iraqis. However, his delegation would not support the proposal to restructure the mechanism for the humanitarian programme in the light of the military scenario, which was a technical matter. He stressed that there was no more urgent task than to halt the war and return to the path of a political settlement within the context of the Security Council. To that end, his delegation would continue to oppose both direct and indirect attempts to legitimize the use of force against Iraq or to shift the responsibility for that action to the international community through the United Nations.²⁴²

The representative of Kuwait stated that the operations against Iraq had resulted from that country’s

²⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 25-26.

²⁴² Ibid., pp. 26-28.

persistent refusal to comply with relevant Security Council resolutions concerning the elimination of weapons of mass destruction. He reaffirmed that his delegation’s position on the military operations was in conformity with relevant Council resolutions and with the legal obligations on Iraq that proceeded from them. He stressed that his Government would not participate in any military measures against Iraq and that all measures taken were aimed at protecting the security, safety and territorial integrity of Kuwait. He added that the attacks by Iraq against civilian targets in Kuwait constituted a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and called on the Council to condemn them.²⁴³

The representative of Turkey noted that it was common knowledge that elements of the armed forces of Turkey had been stationed in northern Iraq for years in the context of Operation Northern Watch, which had been conducted from the territory of Turkey and which provided protection and humanitarian relief to Kurds in northern Iraq. However, he underlined that his country had no intention of entering into Iraq, but “should that need occur”, his country would not enter Iraq to fight but to monitor a refugee crisis if it unfolded and to respond to immediate concerns of security on the border. He stressed that Turkey could not allow another influx of refugees, as in 1991. Any refugee movement needed to be contained inside Iraq and the people in distress provided with shelter, food and security. He also stressed that his country could not allow Kurdish armed terrorists marauding in parts of northern Iraq to instigate terrorism and provocation that would set in motion a vicious circle hampering his country’s efforts to provide assistance.²⁴⁴

**Decision of 28 March 2003 (4732nd meeting):
resolution 1472 (2003)**

At the 4732nd meeting, on 28 March 2003, statements were made by a majority of Council members,²⁴⁵ and the Secretary-General. The President (Guinea) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by Angola, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, China, France, Germany, Guinea, Mexico, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Spain, the United

²⁴³ S/PV.4726, pp. 14-15.

²⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 29.

²⁴⁵ The representatives of Angola, Cameroon, Chile, China, Mexico and the United Kingdom did not make statements.

Kingdom and the United States;²⁴⁶ it was adopted unanimously as resolution 1472 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, inter alia:

Authorized the Secretary-General: (a) to establish alternative locations for the delivery, inspection and authenticated confirmation of humanitarian supplies and equipment provided under the oil-for-food programme; (b) to review the approved funded and non-funded contracts concluded by the Government of Iraq to determine the relative priorities of the need for adequate medicine, health supplies, foodstuffs and other materials and supplies for essential civilian needs; (c) to contact suppliers of those contracts to determine the precise location of contracted goods; (d) to negotiate and agree on necessary adjustments in the terms or conditions of those contracts and their respective letters of credit; (e) to negotiate and execute new contracts for essential medical items under the programme; (f) to transfer unencumbered funds between the accounts created pursuant to paragraphs 8 (a) and (b) of resolution 986 (1995) on an exceptional and reimbursable basis as necessary to ensure the delivery of essential humanitarian supplies to the people of Iraq;

Decided that all applications outside the programme submitted for distribution or use in Iraq of emergency humanitarian supplies and equipment, other than medicines, health supplies and foodstuffs, should be reviewed by the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990), under a 24-hour no-objection procedure;

Decided that the provisions contained in paragraph 4 of the resolution should remain in force for a period of 45 days following the date of adoption of the resolution.

During the debate, most speakers welcomed the adoption of a resolution to provide humanitarian relief to the people of Iraq by restarting the oil-for-food programme, and noted that its adoption was a positive signal that the Council could return to a path of unity.

The representative of Pakistan underlined the principles guiding his delegation's position, namely, respect for the inalienable right of the people of Iraq over their natural resources and ensuring that the people of Iraq were not called upon to pay additional costs which the conflict might impose on the oil-for-food programme. Noting that his delegation accepted the fact that the Secretary-General would have to coordinate with whomever was in actual control of Iraq, he reiterated that the acceptance did not imply any position on the legality of the situation.²⁴⁷

²⁴⁶ S/2003/381.

²⁴⁷ S/PV.4732, pp. 2-3.

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic stressed that his vote should not be construed as an acceptance of the "American-British occupation". He noted that the contents of the resolution, including the references in paragraphs 4 and 5 to the Secretary-General's taking certain measures as an urgent first step and performing additional functions as a second step, meant only that his delegation was trying to cooperate with the current Government of Iraq.²⁴⁸

The representative of the Russian Federation reiterated that the adoption of the resolution in no way signified any type of legitimization of the military action being carried out by the coalition in violation of the Charter of the United Nations. The resolution clearly called the participants in the coalition "occupying Powers", whose actions on the occupied territory needed to be guided strictly by all norms of international humanitarian law, without exception. He stressed that any humanitarian problems needed to be dealt with primarily by those who began the war, as they bore responsibility for meeting the civilian population's humanitarian needs under the Fourth Geneva Convention. With regard to the United Nations humanitarian programme for Iraq, the resolution's adjustments to the programme had "a technical and provisional nature" and made it possible to use contracts that had been signed but not yet implemented in order to solve individual practical humanitarian issues caused by the war. The resolution did not change the essence of the humanitarian programme, and it fully retained the control of the Security Council over the United Nations special account that was accumulating revenue from the export of Iraqi oil.²⁴⁸

The representative of France also noted that it was important that the text recalled principles, humanitarian law instruments, in particular the Geneva Conventions, humanitarian access to the populations and the sovereignty of Iraq over its resources.²⁴⁹

**Decision of 24 April 2003 (4743rd meeting):
resolution 1476 (2003)**

At the 4743rd meeting, on 24 April 2003, the President (Mexico) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;²⁵⁰ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1476 (2003), by which the

²⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 3.

²⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 4-5.

²⁵⁰ S/2003/465.

Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided that the provisions contained in paragraph 4 of resolution 1472 (2003) should remain in force until 3 June 2003 and might be subject to further renewal by the Council;

Decided to remain seized of the matter.

**Decision of 22 May 2003 (4761st meeting):
resolution 1483 (2003)**

At the 4761st meeting,²⁵¹ on 22 May 2003, statements were made by most members of the Council.²⁵² The President (Pakistan) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States;²⁵³ it was put to the vote and adopted by 14 votes²⁵⁴ as resolution 1483 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided that all Member States should take appropriate steps to facilitate the safe return to Iraqi institutions of Iraqi cultural property and other items illegally removed from the Iraq National Museum, the National Library, and other locations in Iraq;

Decided that, with the exception of prohibitions related to the sale or supply to Iraq of arms and related materiel, all prohibitions related to trade with Iraq and the provision of financial or economic resources to Iraq established by resolution 661 (1990) and subsequent relevant resolutions, including resolution 778 (1992), should no longer apply;

Decided to terminate within six months from the adoption of the resolution, the operations of the oil-for-food programme;

Decided to terminate the Committee established pursuant to paragraph 6 of resolution 661 (1990) at the conclusion of the six-month period called for above;

Decided that all export sales of petroleum, petroleum products, and natural gas from Iraq following the date of the

adoption of the resolution should be made consistent with prevailing international market best practices;

Decided further that 5 per cent of the proceeds referred to in paragraph 20 should be deposited into the Compensation Fund established in accordance with resolution 687 (1991);

Decided that, until 31 December 2007, unless the Council decided otherwise, petroleum, petroleum products and natural gas originating in Iraq should be immune from legal proceedings against them and not be subject to any form of attachment, garnishment or execution;

Decided that all Member States in which there were (a) funds or other financial assets of the previous Government of Iraq or (b) funds or other financial assets that had been removed from Iraq should freeze without delay those funds and, unless those funds were themselves the subject of a prior judicial, administrative or arbitral lien or judgement, immediately should cause their transfer to the Development Fund for Iraq;

Decided to review the implementation of the resolution within 12 months of its adoption and to consider further steps that might be necessary.

During the discussion, speakers noted the importance of the resolution and of the fact that it, *inter alia*, provided a framework under Chapter VII for the Coalition Provisional Authority; reaffirmed the obligations of the occupying Powers; affirmed the commitment of the Council to the development of an internationally recognized representative Government of Iraq; created a mandate for a Special Representative of the Secretary-General and otherwise set out a post-conflict role for the United Nations; established a framework for an orderly phase-out of the oil-for-food programme while providing for humanitarian needs; and the lifting of sanctions on Iraq, with the exception of trade in arms. Several speakers also noted the outstanding issues that would still need to be dealt with by the Council, including the role for UNMOVIC and IAEA in the longer-term monitoring of disarmament.

However, several representatives also stressed that the resolution had been a “compromise”. The representative of France noted that the resolution substantiated the essential role of the United Nations in a variety of areas. He also expressed the belief that the process of political transition in Iraq would gain in credibility if a precise procedure and timetable for establishing a representative and internationally recognized Government of Iraq were defined.²⁵⁵ The representative of Mexico noted that the resolution did not authorize the establishment of long-term

²⁵¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41 of the Charter.

²⁵² The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic did not make a statement.

²⁵³ S/2003/556.

²⁵⁴ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic did not participate in the voting. At the 4762nd meeting of the Council, also on 22 May 2003, he stated that he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution if granted more time, despite the fact that it failed to rise to the expectations and aspirations of the Iraqi people (S/PV.4762, p. 20). See also chap. IV, part IV, sect. B, case 4.

²⁵⁵ S/PV.4761, pp. 3-4.

commitments that would alienate the sovereignty of the people of Iraq over the petroleum resources.²⁵⁶ The representative of the Russian Federation, affirming that his delegation was looking forward to receiving information on efforts to find the weapons of mass destruction programmes, expressed hope that the resolution would make it possible to reach closure on that issue.²⁵⁷ The representative of Pakistan stated that while his delegation had agreed to the delegation of certain powers by the Council to the occupying Powers, represented by the Authority, he expected that the responsibilities entrusted would be exercised in the interest of the people of Iraq.²⁵⁸

**Decision of 3 July 2003 (4783rd meeting):
resolution 1490 (2003)**

At its 4768th meeting, on 5 June 2003, the Council included in its agenda a note by the Secretary-General dated 10 May 2003;²⁵⁹ transmitting the thirteenth quarterly report of the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC, which provided an update on the work of UNMOVIC leading up to the evacuation of inspectors and noted that, despite the alteration of the situation resulting from the occupation of Iraq, UNMOVIC was still a subsidiary body of the Council until another decision was taken. The Council was briefed by the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC, who noted that, while proscribed items remained unaccounted for, UNMOVIC had not found any evidence during the inspections of the continuation or resumption of programmes of weapons of mass destruction or significant quantities of proscribed items.²⁶⁰

At its 4783rd meeting, on 3 July 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM)²⁶¹ following the suspension of its mandate owing to the deteriorating security situation in the demilitarized zone prior to the invasion of Iraq by coalition forces on 20 March 2003.

In his report, the Secretary-General noted that the Government of Kuwait had informed him that the delicate situation regarding the border between Kuwait and Iraq was ample reason for the maintenance of the mandate until such time as the situation became clearer and peace and security were restored to the area. In the altered conditions, he recommended that the residual peacekeeping presence of UNIKOM be maintained for a final three months, until 6 October 2003, when the Mission would be closed. During that period UNIKOM would, *inter alia*, scale down its military presence to a minimum, and make appropriate arrangements for handing over its activities in assisting humanitarian operations to other entities remaining in the area.

At the meeting, the President (Spain) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;²⁶² it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1490 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided to continue the mandate of UNIKOM for a final period until 6 October 2003;

Directed the Secretary-General to negotiate the transfer of the Mission's non-removable property and of those assets that could not be disposed otherwise to the States of Kuwait and Iraq, as appropriate;

Decided to end the demilitarized zone extending 10 kilometres into Iraq and 5 kilometres into Kuwait from the Iraq-Kuwait border at the end of the Mission's mandate on 6 October 2003;

Requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council on the completion of the Mission's mandate.

**Decision of 14 August 2003 (4808th meeting):
resolution 1500 (2003)**

At its 4791st meeting, on 22 July 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 17 July 2003 on the work of his Special Representative with respect to the implementation of resolution 1483 (2003).²⁶³ In his report, the Secretary-General recommended an overall approach and structure for the United Nations presence in Iraq for the remainder of 2003. He noted that the Special Representative had met people representing a large and diverse spectrum of society. The response

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

²⁵⁹ S/2003/580; the report was submitted pursuant to paragraph 12 of resolution 1284 (1999).

²⁶⁰ S/PV.4768, pp. 2-4.

²⁶¹ S/2003/656.

²⁶² S/2003/684.

²⁶³ S/2003/715, submitted pursuant to paragraph 24 of resolution 1483 (2003).

had included an overwhelming demand for the early restoration of sovereignty, as well as concerns over the process of de-Baathification, the dissolution of the army of Iraq; the lack of improvement in daily living conditions and the precarious security situation. The unanimous concern among political groups was the urgent establishment of an Iraqi provisional government, by an Iraqi process, which could help to address some of the immediate practical challenges. The Secretary-General also laid out the proposal for a United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI), which would incorporate the Office of the Special Representative, as well as other offices. In conclusion, he stressed that, if some of the concerns that had been relayed were to be allayed, it was important that the people of Iraq be able to set a clear timetable leading to the full restoration of sovereignty and the end of military occupation.

At the meeting, the Council heard briefings by the Secretary-General, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Iraq, and the head of the delegation for the Governing Council of Iraq, following which all members of the Council made statements.

The Secretary-General welcomed the formation of the Governing Council as a first step towards restoring the sovereignty of Iraq. He also stressed that the establishment of the Governing Council needed to be followed by a constitutional process run by the people of Iraq.²⁶⁴

In his briefing, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Iraq provided an overview of the situation in Iraq and the initial work of the United Nations. He stressed that the Governing Council possessed credible executive authority and that it was broadly representative of the various constituencies in Iraq. However, the Governing Council would need to be empowered to deliver tangible improvements while not becoming an object of criticism due to the legal obligations of the Coalition Provisional Authority. He noted that, while the United Nations did not have a clear mandate, the situation in Iraq was exceptional and the lack of clarity allowed for the United Nations role in Iraq to develop as the situation evolved. Some of the key areas in the programme of action would be the reform of key institutions and the establishment of electoral and constitutional processes. Nonetheless, it

was essential that the population of Iraq set the agenda and that the United Nations support its implementation as required.²⁶⁵

The head of the delegation of the Governing Council of Iraq maintained that Iraq had rid itself of the “oppressive tyrannical regime” that had oppressed the Iraqi people, and that, despite the ongoing suffering due to current security and living conditions, the people of Iraq had “a taste of freedom”. He noted that resolution 1483 (2003) did not set out in “a clear and precise manner” the function of the interim administration, which allowed for expansion of the powers of the Governing Council so all aspects of government could be covered. The primary goal was to put together an elected Government under a constitution to be endorsed in free elections. The draft constitution would be examined by a constitutional congress representing all political, social and religious groups. He suggested that the United Nations could help draw up legislation to prepare for the congress and subsequent elections. He indicated that some of the pressing issues to be addressed by the Governing Council were the need to appoint ministers and personnel not implicated in the previous regime; reopen the embassies of Iraq abroad and appoint representatives to international organizations, including the United Nations; establish institutions that could rebuild the national police and army; re-examine legislation enacted by the previous regime; consider special tribunals for those who had committed criminal acts under the previous regime; and revive the national economy. He also noted that the Governing Council had decided to train and employ 30,000 police officers, establish at least 1,500 schools and clinics throughout Iraq, pay back salaries and start a programme to reabsorb more than 200,000 demobilized soldiers into civilian employment.²⁶⁶

Most speakers expressed support for the efforts of the Special Representative and welcomed the formation of the Governing Council. They stressed the importance of quickly establishing an elected national Government and fully restoring sovereignty, on the basis of a clear timetable. They also expressed deep concern with the security situation in Iraq, as well as the lack of basic services such as electricity and fuel. A number of speakers called for an active and effective

²⁶⁴ S/PV.4791, pp. 2-3.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-9.

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-11.

role for the United Nations in Iraq and supported the creation of UNAMI. Several speakers also highlighted the importance of the regional dimension and of the need to work with the neighbours of Iraq on reconstruction. Most speakers also drew attention to the importance of establishing the rule of law and respect for human rights in Iraq.

The representative of France noted that resolution 1483 (2003) remained an imperfect and limited framework and underlined the need for a genuine international partnership as prolonged instability in Iraq would be harmful to all.²⁶⁷

The representative of the United States expressed support for the Governing Council, and opined that the fragile security situation was a manifestation of the minority of those who opposed political freedom. Acknowledging that the security situation was complex, he stated that the approach of the coalition was multifaceted, including enabling Iraqis to ultimately provide for their own security. He informed the Council that the coalition was moving quickly to establish police forces, and would shortly begin recruiting and training the first members of the new Iraqi army.²⁶⁸

The representative of Cameroon maintained that the Security Council would need to have informal discussions on the best way for the United Nations to make a decisive contribution to solving the issue of insecurity. He commented that although UNAMI would not have a military or police component, it would be desirable for the approach selected not to close the door to such a possibility.²⁶⁹

The representative of Pakistan noted that in promoting security, operations needed to be conducted in ways that were sensitive to the welfare and sentiments of the people of Iraq and to their cultural and religious values.²⁷⁰

At its 4808th meeting,²⁷¹ on 14 August 2003, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 17 July 2003.²⁷² Statements

were made by the representatives of China, France, Mexico, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The President (Syrian Arab Republic) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Angola, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, Guinea, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States;²⁷³ it was put to the vote and adopted by 14 votes, with 1 abstention (Syrian Arab Republic), as resolution 1500 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the establishment of the broadly representative Governing Council of Iraq on 13 July 2003, as an important step towards the formation by the people of Iraq of an internationally recognized, representative government that would exercise the sovereignty of Iraq;

Decided to establish UNAMI to support the Secretary-General in the fulfilment of his mandate under resolution 1483 (2003) in accordance with the structure and responsibilities set out in his report of 15 July 2003, for an initial period of 12 months.

Following the adoption of the resolution, most speakers welcomed the establishment of UNAMI and reiterated their support for the Governing Council of Iraq. Several speakers requested that in the future non-permanent members be given more time to consider draft resolutions and that there be more transparent and comprehensive consultations, particularly on important topics such as Iraq.²⁷⁴

The representative of France reaffirmed the conviction that the success of the reconstruction of Iraq required the United Nations to play a dynamic role in the post-conflict management of the country, but resolution 1500 (2003) was not intended to do that. In particular, he reiterated the need for a timetable to be established with regard to the sequence of the political transition.²⁷⁵

The representative of Mexico noted that welcoming the establishment of the Governing Council did not constitute legal recognition, “nor should it be interpreted as endorsement”, as the Governing Council

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

²⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 18-20.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

²⁷¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XII, part I, sect. A, case 3, with regard to Article 1 (2) of the Charter.

²⁷² S/2003/715.

²⁷³ S/2003/812.

²⁷⁴ S/PV.4808, p. 4 (Pakistan, Spain); pp. 4-5 (Germany); p. 5 (Mexico); and pp. 6-7 (Syrian Arab Republic).

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

was still under the authority of the occupying Powers.²⁷⁶

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic explained that he had abstained in the vote to reflect the Arab position endorsed by the Foreign Ministers of Arab States members of the Arab follow-up committee that had met in Cairo on 5 August 2003 on the question of Iraq. At that meeting, the Foreign Ministers had stressed that the Governing Council would gain credibility from the fact that it was paving the way for the formation of a national Government that represented the full spectrum of society in Iraq. He expressed regret that the sponsors of the resolution had not taken into account a number of important recommendations made by the Secretary-General in his report.²⁷⁷

**Decision of 16 October 2003 (4844th meeting):
resolution 1511 (2003)**

At its 4812th meeting, on 21 August 2003, the Council heard briefings by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom; statements were made by all other members of the Council.

In his briefing, the representative of the United States expressed sympathy to the victims of the attack on the United Nations headquarters in Iraq and for the death of Sergio Vieira de Mello, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Iraq. He noted that, while the identities of the attackers was not known, their motives were likely to restore the Saddam regime and the Baath party, to terrify those who wanted to work with the international community and to prevent the emergence of a new Iraq. He then provided an overview of the situation in Iraq and the activities of the Coalition Provisional Authority. He highlighted several important markers of progress including projects to improve economic conditions, develop capacity to foil the saboteurs who were targeting electrical infrastructure, the oil industry and other key infrastructure; promote a secure environment; and start training the new army.²⁷⁸

The representative of the United Kingdom also began by expressing his shock at the attack and sympathy of the victims, including Sergio Vieira de Mello. In his briefing, he focused on humanitarian

activities, the contributions made by the Coalition Provisional Authority to efforts to establish local institutions for representative governance and human rights and legal and judicial reform. He stated that the food distribution systems had been fully restored, but there was a need to look beyond the end of the oil-for-food programme. He also noted the progress made in restoring health care services, the education system and the water sector.²⁷⁹

All representatives expressed their shock at the attack against the United Nations in Baghdad on 19 August, and their condolences for the deaths of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and other United Nations and local employees. Most speakers emphasized that the terrorist attack showed that security remained the priority problem in Iraq, and called for a review of security measures for United Nations staff both in Iraq and elsewhere. Several speakers called for the process of restoring sovereignty to be accelerated and the strengthening of a local role for the Iraqi people.

The representatives of France and Mexico noted that the restoration of security and public order were the responsibility of the occupying Powers pursuant to international law, particularly the Geneva Conventions.²⁸⁰

The representative of France recalled that the Council still did not have any details on weapons of mass destruction that the regime of Saddam Hussein was said to have held. He underlined the importance of reconsidering the mandate of UNMOVIC within a reasonable time. He maintained that the joint mobilization of the entire international community was a basic requirement for the successful reconstruction of Iraq. He also commented that the International Advisory and Monitoring Board of the Development Fund for Iraq, a key instrument provided for in resolution 1483 (2003) to ensure ongoing international monitoring of the use of the resources of Iraq, needed to be established without delay. That would be possible only if the coalition authorities acknowledged that they could not succeed alone and if they played their role in a completely transparent manner. He stressed that sharing burdens and responsibilities also meant sharing information and authority.²⁸¹ The representative of

²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

²⁷⁸ S/PV.4812, pp. 2-3.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (France); and p. 16 (Mexico).

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

Cameroon also appealed to the Coalition to be more transparent, and to clarify its activities and purposes in Iraq.²⁸² The representative of Angola commented that the Coalition Powers had no option but to carry on with their task, no matter the price they would be obliged to pay and the difficulties they would encounter “on that hard, rocky and treacherous road”.²⁸³

At the 4844th meeting,²⁸⁴ on 16 October 2003, statements were made by the Secretary-General, the representatives of Bulgaria, Chile, China, France, Germany, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States. The President (United States) drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Cameroon, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States;²⁸⁵ it was adopted unanimously as resolution 1511 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Authorized a multinational force under unified command to take all necessary measures to contribute to the maintenance of security and stability in Iraq, including for the purpose of ensuring necessary conditions for the implementation of the timetable and programme as well as to contribute to the security of UNAMI, the Governing Council and other institutions of the Iraqi interim administration, and key humanitarian and economic infrastructure;

Urged Member States to contribute assistance under this United Nations mandate, including military forces, to the multinational force referred to above;

Decided that the Council would review the requirements and mission of the multinational force referred to above not later than one year from the date of adoption of the resolution, and that in any case the mandate of the force should expire upon the completion of the political process as described in paragraphs 4 to 7 and 10 of the resolution, and expressed readiness to consider on that occasion any future need for the continuation of the multinational force, taking into account the views of an internationally recognized, representative government of Iraq;

Urged Member States and international and regional organizations to support the Iraq reconstruction effort initiated at the United Nations technical consultations of 24 June 2003, including through substantial pledges at the international donors conference to be held in Madrid on 23 and 24 October 2003;

²⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 13.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

²⁸⁴ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XII, part I, sect. A, case 3, with regard to Article 1 (2) of the Charter.

²⁸⁵ S/2003/992.

Called upon Member States and concerned organizations to help to meet the needs of the Iraqi people by providing resources necessary for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Iraq’s economic infrastructure.

The Secretary-General stated that he would do his utmost to implement the mandate established by the Council bearing in mind the constraints on building up the required capacity and his obligations for the safety of United Nations staff. He expressed gratitude to the Council for the flexibility the resolution gave him. He reiterated that, despite having only a skeletal presence on the ground, the United Nations was determined to help the people of Iraq, from both inside and outside the country, primarily in providing humanitarian assistance.²⁸⁶

Most speakers welcomed the adoption of the resolution as an important step towards the return of sovereignty for Iraq. They also noted the importance of its unanimous adoption.

The representative of the Russian Federation pointed to several positive aspects of the resolution, including the elaboration of a specific timetable for the political process and giving the Secretary-General the right to take decisions regarding timetable and modalities for forming the membership of a constitutional conference and the holding of elections. He also noted that the mandate for the multinational force was subordinate to the task of promoting the restoration of sovereignty, and once that was restored, only if a “legitimately elected Government of Iraq” requested security assistance would the Council consider a request to extend the mandate. The resolution also called for the swift establishment of the International Advisory and Monitoring Board, which had been delayed too long without any convincing reason. Nonetheless, he stressed that the resolution was not ideal and the result was a compromise.²⁸⁷

The representative of Germany stated that the integration of the amendments proposed by Germany, France and the Russian Federation could have led to a better resolution. He deplored the lack of a clear signal that the transfer of sovereignty to the Iraqis would be accelerated, and suggested that the role of the United Nations and the Secretary-General could have been strengthened. Finally, he had also wanted to see clearer guidelines with regard to timing. As a result, he noted

²⁸⁶ S/PV.4844, p. 2.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

that Germany could not envisage any military commitment.²⁸⁸

The representative of the United Kingdom declared that it was quite right that the resolution did not prescribe artificial schedules for the transfer of power. Instead, it set a deadline of two months by which time the Governing Council needed to provide a timeline and the programme leading to a constitution and democratic elections, and it engaged the Council in that process.²⁸⁹

The representative of China agreed that the text of the resolution was a marked improvement over the original draft presented by the United States and would have a positive impact on accelerating the transfer of power from the Coalition Provisional Authority to the Iraqi people and increase transparency in the economic reconstruction of Iraq. Nonetheless, his delegation was not fully satisfied with its contents.²⁹⁰

The representative of Pakistan explained that his delegation had supported the resolution because “despite the complexity and contradictions of parts of the text”, its fundamental objectives were the restoration of sovereignty, the improvement of the security environment and the promotion of economic reconstruction. His delegation would have preferred a clearer process for the early restoration of sovereignty. He noted that the political process would have gained in credibility if it had been conducted under the authority and auspices of the United Nations. Regarding the multinational force, he recalled that Pakistan had advocated that it have an identity separate and distinct from the occupation forces and that its deployment be a result of an invitation from the people of Iraq, with the concurrence of the other States in the region. As those considerations were not reflected in the resolution, he stressed that Pakistan would not be able to contribute troops to the multinational force in Iraq.²⁹¹

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic stated that although the resolution did not meet all of his delegation’s expectations, he hoped that it would represent a step along the road to freedom and independence for Iraq and that the commitments set out

in the resolution would be fulfilled in order to accelerate the transfer of sovereignty.²⁹²

The representative of the United States noted that the resolution confirmed Iraqi leadership by establishing a political horizon for the transfer of power and made clear that the interim leadership embodied Iraqi sovereignty during the transition. He maintained that his Government’s careful consideration of the text during the previous weeks reflected its commitment to a multilateral approach.²⁹³

Decision of 20 November 2003 (4868th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4851st meeting, on 28 October 2008, the Council heard a briefing by the Executive Director of the Office of the Iraq Programme, following which statements were made by all members of the Council.

In his briefing, the Executive Director stressed that the United Nations would terminate the oil-for-food programme on 21 November 2003, as called for in resolution 1483 (2003), and would continue to facilitate a smooth handover to the Coalition Provisional Authority, in close coordination with the relevant Iraqi authorities. Nonetheless, he stressed that handing over a multi-billion dollar programme of such complexity in the mandated six-month period would have been difficult under any circumstances, but under the conditions of insecurity and reduced on-site staffing would require a degree of realism and flexibility from all parties concerned. He set out the actions identified and taken to meet the goals that had been set and listed the activities that remained to be undertaken by the United Nations, the Authority and the relevant Iraqi authorities.²⁹⁴

Most Council members welcomed the briefing and stressed the importance of maintaining a high-level of transparency and continuity in the transition of the programme. A number of members expressed concern at the pace of work and made technical suggestions for improving the process.

Several speakers emphasized the importance of identifying and amending all of the priority contracts by the deadline,²⁹⁵ while other representatives stressed

²⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 3-4.

²⁸⁹ Ibid., pp. 4-5.

²⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 5-6.

²⁹¹ Ibid., pp. 6-8.

²⁹² Ibid., p. 8.

²⁹³ Ibid., pp. 9-10.

²⁹⁴ S/PV.4851, pp. 2-9.

²⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 11 (Bulgaria); p. 12 (Russian Federation); p. 16

the need to be flexible with the deadlines as it seemed unlikely that all of the work would be completed before then, negatively affecting suppliers who had not had their contracts amended through no fault of their own.²⁹⁶

A number of representatives observed that, to avoid delivery disruptions, the Coalition Provisional Authority needed to come forward with clear information on how the programme would be continued as soon as possible.²⁹⁷ The representative of France suggested that as a practical solution, the United Nations agencies, with the agreement of the Coalition Provisional Authority and the relevant Iraqi authorities, could continue the process for a few more weeks. This approach would not be an extension of the programme, but simply a technical arrangement between the Authority and the agencies that would not contradict the terms of resolution 1483 (2003).²⁹⁸ The representative of the Russian Federation declared that the entire issue needed to be reviewed regularly in the Council and the sanctions Committee.²⁹⁹

The representative of the United Kingdom stressed that Coalition and Iraqi ministry officials were engaged in developing an effective transition strategy to ensure the efficient delivery of goods as well as adequate warehousing and inventory management and that measures were in hand for the uninterrupted authentication of deliveries after 21 November. He also confirmed that the Coalition Provisional Authority would continue to honour its existing commitment to support the fulfilment of all prioritized contracts.³⁰⁰ The representative of the United States said that his Government continued to devote significant resources to ensuring a smooth transition of the oil-for-food programme after 21 November.³⁰¹

At its 4868th meeting, on 20 November 2003, the Council heard a statement by the Secretary-General. In his statement, the Secretary-General noted that the Council was meeting to mark the completion of the oil-for-food programme, one of “the largest, most complex

and most unusual tasks” ever entrusted to the Secretariat. He remarked that in its seven years of operation, the oil-for-food programme had been required to meet an “almost impossible series of challenges”, using some \$46 billion of Iraqi export earnings on behalf of the people of Iraq and delivering food rations sufficient to feed all 27 million residents of Iraq and reducing the malnutrition rate among children by 50 per cent. He stated that all of the responsibilities, as well as the remaining funds and assets, would be handed over to the Coalition Provisional Authority on the next day. However, the actual delivery of items would continue into the next year and any unspent or undisbursed amounts would be transferred to the Development Fund for Iraq after the programme closed.³⁰²

At the same meeting, the President (Angola) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁰³ by which the Council, inter alia:

Underlined the exceptionally important role of the Iraq Programme in providing humanitarian assistance to the people of Iraq under the regime of sanctions imposed by the Security Council;

Emphasized the need for continued international efforts aimed at the reconstruction of Iraq and, in this context, took note with satisfaction of the statements made by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom on the measures which the Coalition Provisional Authority intended to take in order to continue the payment mechanisms and the deliveries under the Programme;

Recognized the important role of the United Nations in coordinating the termination of the Programme, including the transfer at the earliest possible time of all surplus funds in the escrow accounts to the Development Fund for Iraq;

Recalled the vital role foreseen for the United Nations in resolutions 1483 (2003), 1500 (2003) and 1511 (2003), as circumstances permitted, inter alia, in the areas of humanitarian assistance, facilitation of economic rehabilitation and reconstruction.

Decision of 24 November 2003 (4872nd meeting): resolution 1518 (2003)

At its 4869th meeting, on 21 November 2003, the Council heard briefings by the representatives of the United States and United Kingdom on the situation in Iraq; all the other members of the Council made statements.

(Chile); and p. 17 (Cameroon).

²⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 10 (Germany); p. 15 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 16 (Mexico).

²⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 10 (Germany); p. 11 (Spain); and p. 12 (Russian Federation).

²⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 19.

²⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 12.

³⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 13.

³⁰¹ Ibid., pp. 20-21.

³⁰² S/PV.4868, pp. 2-4.

³⁰³ S/PRST/2003/24.

The representative of the United States noted that, despite the continuing violence, Iraqis were taking on increasing responsibility for their security and were working to rebuild a strong Iraqi police force and army. Iraqis were also continuing to take over administrative responsibilities and to provide for the delivery of basic services. He stated that the announcement by the Governing Council of Iraq on 15 November of an agreement on political process had been a dramatic step forward. Under that process, a transitional national assembly would be formed to elect an executive branch, select ministers and serve as a legislative body. By 30 June 2004, this new transitional administration would assume full responsibility for governing Iraq, and the Coalition Provisional Authority and the Governing Council would be dissolved. There was also a timeline for the direct election of a constitutional convention no later than 15 March 2005, to draft a permanent constitution for Iraq, which would be ratified through a popular referendum. A new Iraqi Government would be elected under that constitution no later than 31 December 2005. Stressing the importance of security, he observed that despite the killings, bombings and other attacks witnessed in the media, much of Iraq was calm and the strategy of enabling Iraqis to assume responsibility for their own security was achieving success, with major increases in the number of police and military. On the question of the disarmament of Iraq, he informed the Council that on 16 June the Iraq Survey Group, which included personnel from the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia, as well as experts from the former Special Commission, had assumed responsibility of searching and eliminating Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, prohibited missile-delivery systems and related infrastructure. The Survey Group had been investigating suspect sites and in October issued a report that detailed the numerous violations by Iraq of its mandated obligations under Council resolutions. Those included deliberate efforts to conceal equipment and programme activities related to weapons of mass destruction from the United Nations during the inspections beginning late in 2002.³⁰⁴

The representative of the United Kingdom briefed the Council on the provision of basic services, economic and reconstruction issues and human rights and justice. He stated that the Coalition Provisional Authority had worked to ensure the rapid restoration of

distribution networks and basic services. He further outlined the improvements and repairs being done on the power grid, the airport, mobile phone network, hospitals and schools. He also noted that unemployment remained a major challenge in Iraq and reforms were being initiated to transition Iraq to a liberalized market-based economy. He commented on the newly formed Ministry of Human Rights, stressing that those responsible for atrocities needed to be brought before an Iraqi-led process of justice. More generally, he noted that a central criminal court was up and running and the penal code had been amended to include new rights, including the absolute exclusion of evidence obtained through torture.³⁰⁵

Following the briefings, most members of the Council welcomed the new approach contained in the agreement between the Governing Council and the Coalition Provisional Authority signed in Baghdad on 15 November, and stressed the importance of a rapid restoration of Iraqi sovereignty and the establishment of a fully responsible Government. While welcoming the progress made in the restoration of basic services and other areas, Council members expressed concern that the continuation of violence and the lack of security threatened any gains. Most members also stressed that the United Nations needed to have a strong role in Iraq and expressed hope that international staff would be able to return as the situation improved. A number of representatives also recalled the importance of the involvement of Iraq's neighbours.

The representatives of France, Germany and the Russian Federation stated that the idea of a national conference, under United Nations auspices, which would bring together all Iraqi groups, as well as countries from the region, should be carefully considered.³⁰⁶ The representative of the Russian Federation added that his Government was not ruling out holding the conference outside of Iraq, and suggested that the conference could be used to form the transitional Government of Iraq, which could, together with the Secretary-General and his representatives, elaborate specific steps in order to implement the political process.³⁰⁷ The representative of Mexico stressed that there needed to be an international follow-

³⁰⁴ S/PV.4869, pp. 2-5.

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-8.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (France); p. 10 (Germany); and p. 12 (Russian Federation).

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

up mechanism to strengthen legitimacy and give transparency to the process of the election of a Transitional National Assembly.³⁰⁸

The representative of Germany noted that the plan for creating an interim Government still needed to be clarified and evaluated, and that there was a need to examine how the legitimacy of the process of transferring sovereignty could be strengthened.³⁰⁹

The representative of France stated that once a fully responsible transitional Government was established, the Iraqi people would be able to define permanent constitutional arrangements and organize elections at their own pace. He underlined that it was essential that the United Nations be allowed, with full independence, to lend its legitimacy and support to each stage of the transition in Iraq. Responding to the concerns expressed by the Secretary-General regarding the security of United Nations staff, he proposed that initially a special envoy of the Secretary-General be appointed who would not reside permanently in Iraq, but would help to engage Iraqis and countries in the region in the transition process.³¹⁰

The representative of the Russian Federation asked why the agreement of 15 November had not been transmitted officially to the Security Council, and expressed disappointment that there was no mention in it of the United Nations. He stressed that in order to successfully resolve the Iraq problem, the active participation of the international community was necessary. On the question of disarmament, he also wondered why UNMOVIC and IAEA had not tried to obtain more information about the efforts of the Coalition and why the report prepared in October by a survey group could not be sent to UNMOVIC and IAEA experts. On the question of the timeline for the elections, he expressed the belief that it would be better if the date of the election for the constitutional convention and the date of the general election for the permanent Government were decided on by the Transitional Government and the Transitional National Assembly. He also expressed concern that the current timeline was a bit of a stretch, particularly the expectation that the constitutional convention would be held on 15 March and the general elections by the end of 2005. He also argued that there were certain

contradictions between parts of the agreement with respect to the proposal to form organizational committees that could affect future elections. He noted that the agreement stated that the Governing Council of Iraq would not play any formal role in selecting members of the National Assembly, but it also stated that the Governing Council would nominate five of the representatives of each provincial organizational committee. That meant that it would be playing a very real role and might lead to a situation where certain segments of the population were left out of the process.³¹¹

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic stressed that any measure that might lead to a division of Iraq needed to be rejected, and Iraq's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity respected.³¹²

Responding to a question from the Russian Federation on the proposal to conclude, by the end of March 2004, an agreement on security between the Coalition and the Governing Council, including on the status of forces, the representative of the United Kingdom noted that the new force would not be the multinational force envisaged in resolution 1511 (2003), but would be something else, operating at the invitation of an Iraqi Government. He further expressed hope that it would be recognized in some way by the Council.³¹³

At the 4872nd meeting,³¹⁴ on 24 November 2003, the President (Angola) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria, Chile, Guinea, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States.³¹⁵ Statements were made by the representatives of France, Germany, Mexico and the Russian Federation.³¹⁶

The representative of France noted that the draft resolution created a new committee to take over from the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) and ensure follow-up of the implementation of freezes and transfers of the financial assets of the Government

³⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 17.

³⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 9.

³¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 8-9.

³¹¹ Ibid., pp. 12-13.

³¹² Ibid., p. 16.

³¹³ Ibid., p. 23.

³¹⁴ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41 of the Charter.

³¹⁵ S/2003/1107.

³¹⁶ The Secretary-General was present at the meeting but did not make a statement.

of Saddam Hussein and of high officials in his regime, as provided for in resolution 1483 (2003). Such a provision was particularly important for ensuring the continuity of the monitoring of the implementation of financial sanctions.³¹⁷

A number of speakers emphasized that the new Committee should also be entrusted with monitoring for any possible violations of the arms embargo to Iraq, which remained fully in force under resolution 1483 (2003). They also stated that in the meantime it would be up to the Council to supervise the arms embargo.³¹⁸ The representative of the Russian Federation asked why the authors of the resolution had refused to entrust the Committee with monitoring the embargo at a time when the Council regularly heard statements on the illegal flow of arms into Iraq.³¹⁹ The representatives of France and Germany concurred that there were strong reasons of principle for wanting the Committee to monitor compliance.³²⁰

The representative of Mexico noted that his delegation had joined the consensus based on the understanding that the adoption of the guidelines and definitions for the implementation of the provisions of paragraphs 19 to 23 of resolution 1483 (2003), stipulated in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, would be done on Mexican territory in accordance with Mexican law and in strict compliance with the principle of legality.³²¹

The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1518 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided to establish a Committee to continue to identify individuals and entities referred in paragraph 19 of resolution 1483 (2003), including by updating the list of individuals and entities already identified by the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990), and to report on its work to the Council;

Decided to adopt the guidelines and definitions previously agreed by the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) to implement the provisions of paragraphs 19 and 23 of resolution 1483 (2003), and decided that the guidelines and definitions could be amended by the Committee in the light of further considerations;

³¹⁷ S/PV.4872, p. 3.

³¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 2 (Russian Federation); pp. 2-3 (Germany); and p. 3 (France, Mexico).

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3 (Germany); and p. 3 (France).

³²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

Decided that the mandate of the Committee would be kept under review and to consider the possible authorization of the additional task of observing fulfilment by Member States of their obligations under paragraph 10 of resolution 1483 (2003);

Decided to remain seized of the matter.

Deliberations of 16 December 2003 (4883rd meeting)

On 5 December 2003, the Secretary-General submitted a report on the situation in Iraq,³²² in which he described the key developments in Iraq from 17 July to 19 August 2003; set out the events of 19 August 2003, when the United Nations headquarters in Baghdad was attacked and the actions taken by the United Nations in the aftermath; detailed the United Nations relief and reconstruction planning activities that had continued; summarized key political developments in Iraq since 19 August; and outlined a plan of action with regard to security, the deployment of UNAMI and the conduct of United Nations relief, recovery and reconstruction activities in Iraq. In laying down the way forward for the United Nations in Iraq, he stated that the fact that a sovereign transitional Government of Iraq was to be established by 30 June 2004 required him to consider which United Nations activities were appropriate immediately and which needed to wait for the new Government. He stressed that humanitarian assistance and emergency rehabilitation could not wait. In addition, as civil society had an essential role to play in the political dialogue and the United Nations had a great deal of experience in supporting civil society, ways needed to be found for UNAMI and the agencies to play such a role as quickly as possible. However, on the political front it had yet to be established what role, if any, Iraqis and the Coalition Provisional Authority wanted the United Nations to play in the formation of the Transitional National Assembly. He noted that in a letter dated 10 November the President of the Governing Council had urged him to appoint a new Special Representative for Iraq, who would not be resident but would go to Iraq for consultations as needed, and that he intended to do so. He also informed the Council that he had established an advisory group on Iraq, composed of neighbouring countries, Egypt and members of the Security Council,

³²² S/2003/1149, submitted pursuant to paragraph 24 of resolution 1483 (2003) and paragraph 12 of resolution 1511 (2003).

for the purpose of initiating an informal dialogue to develop a common basis for approaching the situation. On the subject of UNAMI, he indicated that it was impossible to predict when circumstances would permit its full deployment to Iraq. Therefore, he had decided to start an incremental process of establishing UNAMI by setting up the core of the Mission outside of Iraq, with the bulk of UNAMI staff located in Nicosia. Additional staff would be deployed to a small office in Amman and to other locations in the region. He envisaged a core team of around 40 international staff in total by early 2004, which would increase to 60, once the new Special Representative had been appointed. In conclusion, he noted that, while real progress had been made in many areas, including the advancement of basic human rights, the dangers posed by insurgents were real. He listed several steps that could be taken to deal with the insurgency, including the need to act on the recognition that the insecurity problem could not be solved through military means alone, but that required a political solution that made the political transition process more inclusive and empowered Iraqi institutions to take key decisions. He also stressed that intensified efforts by Coalition forces were needed to demonstrate that they were adhering strictly to international humanitarian law and human rights instruments even in the face of provocative terrorist attacks. In that connection, the use of lethal force by Coalition forces needed to be proportionate and discriminating in accordance with international humanitarian law, and all detainees needed to be protected in accordance with Iraqi law and the Geneva Conventions.

At its 4883rd meeting, on 16 December 2003, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.³²² The President (Bulgaria) also drew the attention of the Council to several documents.³²³ At the meeting, the Council heard statements by the Secretary-General and the representative of Iraq.

³²³ Letter dated 2 December 2003 from the President of the Security Council to the representative of Iraq, acknowledging the receipt of a letter dated 24 November 2003 from the President of the Iraqi Governing Council, regarding the timetable agreed upon with the Coalition Provisional Authority in accordance with paragraph 7 of Security Council resolution 1511 (2003) (S/2003/1169); and letter dated 11 December 2003 from the interim President of the Iraqi Governing Council regarding that timetable (S/2003/1170).

The Secretary-General noted that the Council was meeting three days after the capture of Saddam Hussein by Coalition forces, which was an opportunity for a new beginning in the vital task of helping Iraqis to take control of their destiny. He stated that it was right that Hussein be held to account for past deeds through a procedure that met the highest international standards of due process. He reiterated that the task of restoring the effective exercise of sovereignty to Iraq was urgent, and while there might not be time to organize credible elections, it was essential that the process leading to the formation of a provisional Government be fully inclusive and transparent. He also underlined that much greater clarity was needed on what was expected of the United Nations, by Iraqis and by the Coalition, in terms of assistance to the political transition. He stressed that the end of the occupation and formation of a provisional Government would not bring about an end to insecurity, but a credible and inclusive transition offered the best hope of stability and the mobilization of Iraqis against the violence.³²⁴

The representative of Iraq welcomed the capture of Saddam Hussein, who would have to answer to the Iraqi people for his crimes against humanity, and thanked the Coalition for its role in delivering him into the hands of the people. He then presented the Council the timetable set out in the Agreement on Political Process signed on 15 November by the Governing Council and the Coalition Provisional Authority in accordance with paragraph 7 of resolution 1511 (2003). He stated that the plan spelled out the steps needed to rightfully restore full sovereignty to Iraq, ultimately in a new constitution. He observed that the Governing Council had unanimously agreed on the timetable and stressed that progress would continue to depend on the security situation. The representative underlined the need to see an expanded United Nations role in Iraq on many levels: humanitarian relief, capacity and nation-building, promoting sustainable development and advancing the electoral and political process. Therefore, he urged the appointment of a Special Representative and stressed that the help and expertise of the United Nations could not be effectively delivered from Cyprus or Amman. He underlined Iraq's willingness to help provide whatever security was required to see the United Nations return to Iraq. He also called upon the Members of the United Nations to look beyond their differences over the decision to go to

³²⁴ S/PV.4883, pp. 2-3.

war in Iraq and come together to forge an international consensus. Finally, he maintained that while Iraq was reaching out to its neighbours and the international community, his country insisted on playing a full part in any initiatives that concerned its future. He also strongly disagreed with those views that questioned the legitimacy of the present Iraqi authorities and argued that the Governing Council was “the most representative and democratic governing body in the region”. For that reason, members of the Council should be reaching out and engaging his Government to encourage their nascent democracy in “a region well known for its authoritarian rule”.³²⁵

Decision of 18 December 2003 (4887th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4887th meeting,³²⁶ on 18 December 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 9 December 2003 on the compliance by Iraq with its obligations regarding the repatriation and return of all Kuwaiti and third-country nationals, or their remains and all Kuwaiti property seized by Iraq.³²⁷ In his report, the Secretary-General noted that, after years of denial by the previous Government of Iraq, the discovery of mass graves in Iraq containing the remains of Kuwaitis was a devastating development. He stressed that those responsible for the horrendous crimes, particularly those who had ordered the executions, needed to be brought to justice. He expressed regret that the Kuwaiti

archives and military equipment had not yet been returned, and trusted that the Governing Council, the Coalition Provisional Authority and the special group established by the United States would maintain their commitment to the search and return of Kuwaiti property. He concluded that there was further room for progress towards a satisfactory conclusion of the remaining humanitarian concerns of Kuwait and that more time and effort would be required before the questions could be settled. He also noted that Kuwait had requested that the mandate of the High-level Coordinator be extended in accordance with paragraph 14 of resolution 1284 (1999). Noting that he had previously suggested that the Council bring the Coordinator’s mandate to a close,³²⁸ he stated that the Council would have to determine whether it would wish the mandate to continue.

At the same meeting, the Council invited the representative of Kuwait to participate in the discussion. The President (Bulgaria) then made a statement on behalf of the Council,³²⁹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Strongly condemned the killing of Kuwaiti and third-country nationals by the previous Iraqi regime in violation of international law;

Stressed the importance of the work of the Coalition Provisional Authority, the International Committee of the Red Cross, the Tripartite Commission and its Technical Subcommittee, and called on all parties concerned to continue to work towards a satisfactory solution to all of the outstanding humanitarian aspects covered by the mandate of the High-level Coordinator.

³²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-6.

³²⁶ At the 4884th meeting, held in private on 16 December 2003, the members of the Council and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq had a constructive exchange of views.

³²⁷ S/2003/1161, submitted pursuant to paragraph 14 of resolution 1284 (1999).

³²⁸ S/2003/813, para. 39.

³²⁹ S/PRST/2003/28.

B. Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq

Initial proceedings

Deliberations of 22 May 2003 (4762nd meeting)

At its 4762nd meeting, on 22 May 2003, the Council adopted as its agenda the item entitled "Response to the humanitarian situation in Iraq". The Council heard briefings by the Deputy Secretary-General; the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); the Executive Director of the World Food Programme (WFP); the Executive Director for Sustainable Development and Health Environments and Senior Policy Adviser to the Director General of the World Health Organization (WHO); the Director of Emergency Programmes of UNICEF; and the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). Following the briefings, most Council members and the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator made statements regarding the humanitarian situation in Iraq.³³⁰

At the meeting, the Deputy Secretary-General explained that, although a major humanitarian crisis had been averted in Iraq, the situation was still precarious. She described the various efforts that United Nations agencies had undertaken to provide food, water, medicine and other emergency assistance throughout the country. She stressed that the general lack of law and order had had a wide variety of humanitarian consequences: many ministries, water treatment plants, hospitals and warehouses were devastated; many facilities were repaired or restored only to be looted again, as were many of the archaeological sites, historical buildings, monuments and museums in Iraq; and unexploded ordnance and mines had continued to threaten the civilian population.³³¹

The Administrator of UNDP reported that the Programme had been coordinating closely with other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, especially in the construction of electricity facilities, sewage treatment plants, medical facilities and a dredging project in the port of Umm Qasr. He explained that the activities in each of these

areas had been accelerated by access to contracts from the oil-for-food programme.³³²

The Executive Director of WFP reported that tremendous progress had been made in the distribution of foodstuffs to Iraq. He stated that over 200,000 tons of food had been delivered to the country already, and that after a five-month period the Iraqi authority would likely have the capacity to take over the programme. The Executive Director stressed that although there had been no food crisis in Iraq, there were a number of challenges which needed to be addressed: the issue of security for staff, warehouses, silos, mills and offices, and the pressing issue of the payment of salaries for Ministry of Trade staff. He further emphasized the importance of food rations, as the entire population of Iraq depended on the rations to some degree. Until there was political stability and broad economic recovery, the food rations would continue to provide basic household food security and act as a stabilizing force in that volatile period.³³³

The representative of WHO reported that the people of Iraq had faced a mix of health hazards which were generally associated with longstanding deprivation, such as heart and kidney disease, cancer and diabetes. He explained that those people were heavily dependent on functioning health services and that the security situation in Iraq had been hampering their access to such services. He also enumerated several other problems with the health system in Iraq and noted that it had been running at between 20 and 40 per cent of its pre-war capacity.³³⁴

The Director of Emergency Programmes of UNICEF emphasized the high priority that the Fund had placed upon the need for law and order throughout Iraq. He explained that a proper security environment was essential to getting all children back to school as soon as possible. While 80 per cent of the primary schools had reopened, many families had continued to refuse to send their children to school due to security concerns. He also declared that water facilities and sanitation needed to be improved and that breast-milk

³³⁰ The President of the Council (Pakistan) did not make a statement in his capacity as representative of Pakistan.

³³¹ S/PV.4762, pp. 2-4.

³³² *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

³³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

³³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

substitutes, which were ascertained to be hazardous to a child's health when mixed with contaminated water, should no longer be provided to the population in the food basket. He concluded by noting some steps that UNICEF had taken to protect children from various forms of abuse and exploitation.³³⁵

The President of ICRC stressed that ICRC had been active in Iraq since 1980 and that it had been focusing on priorities such as visits to all persons deprived of their liberty; the protection of vulnerable groups, including children and internally displaced persons; the re-establishment of family links; emergency repair and rehabilitation of vital structures such as water, health and sewage facilities; the provision of medical emergency consumables and equipment; and awareness-raising activities related to unexploded ordnance. He further warned that although there was no "general humanitarian catastrophe" in Iraq, things could still go wrong if security was not improved and if the infrastructure and specific sectors, such as hospitals, did not receive due attention.³³⁶

Most speakers paid tribute to the humanitarian efforts of the various United Nations agencies and ICRC and expressed the view that the primary challenge in Iraq was the security environment and the general lack of law and order in the country. Several speakers enumerated the various aid packages that their countries had given to Iraq in order to provide humanitarian relief and/or facilitate the reconstruction effort.³³⁷

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic stressed that looting was still commonplace in Iraq, especially in the educational institutions.³³⁸ The representative of Germany cautioned that although the Deputy Secretary-General's briefing had assured the Council that there was no humanitarian catastrophe in Iraq at present, the situation was still grave and required immediate assistance programmes to prevent a dramatic deterioration of the situation. He also identified looting as a problem which prevented normal economic activity from resuming and stated that it was the responsibility of the "occupying Powers" to make

the country's vital infrastructures safe. He further brought to the attention of the Council the allegation that some hospitals which had experienced less looting were receiving protection from Shiite or Sunni militias, which led to the wrong perception among the population of Iraq that the only way to provide for security was to follow religious groups.³³⁹

The representative of the United States agreed that security was the key problem and explained that his country had been making every effort to bring stability to Iraq. He explained that the United States had been deploying additional military police, promoting disarmament programmes and providing micro-grants to build confidence among the diverse population of Iraq. The representative stated that although difficulties had persisted in Iraq, economic activities of the most basic form — money and barter — were beginning to resume, and that progress had been made in a variety of other issues such as investigations into mass graves, the fortification of flour with vitamins and minerals, which had been missing from the average Iraqi diet, and the restoration of power lines and the southern marshes.³⁴⁰

The representative of the Russian Federation expressed concern with the ongoing instability in Iraq and stressed that the coalition forces had the responsibility of ensuring the safety of United Nations staff and of the personnel of other humanitarian organizations. He stated that the humanitarian situation remained alarming as there were shortages of drinking water, medical staff, equipment and electricity. He concluded by noting that the oil sector in Iraq was the engine for further development of the entire country's economy.³⁴¹

The representative of the United Kingdom reported on the situation in the United Kingdom's area of operation. He stated that the humanitarian situation was getting better, although security remained a challenge. He explained that basic services, such as the sewage system, had improved and that there was no food crisis in Iraq.³⁴²

The representative of Mexico pointed out the unprecedented nature of the collapse of the state of Iraq and the resultant economic and social consequences. He noted that looting was commonplace

³³⁵ Ibid., pp. 8-10.

³³⁶ Ibid., pp. 10-11.

³³⁷ Ibid., p. 12 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 14 (Bulgaria); S/PV.4762 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-4 (United States); pp. 5-7 (United Kingdom); and pp. 9-10 (Spain).

³³⁸ S/PV.4762, p. 12.

³³⁹ Ibid., pp. 12-13.

³⁴⁰ S/PV.4762 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-4.

³⁴¹ Ibid., p. 5.

³⁴² Ibid., p. 6.

in Iraq and that certain segments of civil society had managed to organize and were filling the void created by the collapse of state institutions.³⁴³

The representative of China stated that the Council should fully implement the oil-for-food programme and fully utilize its resources.³⁴⁴ The representative of France reiterated that, although there was no humanitarian catastrophe per se in Iraq, the situation remained nonetheless extremely fragile.³⁴⁵

³⁴³ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

³⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 8-9.

³⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 10-11.

Following the statements, the representatives of UNDP, WHO, UNICEF and ICRC and the Under-Secretary-General responded to questions from Council members.³⁴⁶

³⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 12-15 (Administrator of UNDP); pp. 15-16 (Executive Director of WHO); pp. 16-18 (Director of UNICEF); p. 18 (President of ICRC); and pp. 18-19 (Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator).

35. Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Initial proceedings

Deliberations of 5 October 2003 (4836th meeting)

By a letter dated 5 October 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹ the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic requested an emergency meeting of the Council to consider the violations of Syrian and Lebanese airspace committed on 5 October 2003 by the Israeli air force and the missile attack carried out by the latter on the same day against a civilian site situated inside Syrian territory.

By a letter dated 5 October 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,² the representative of Lebanon also requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider a situation threatening the stability along the Israeli-Lebanese border. The representative of Lebanon requested the Council to meet immediately and consider the measures that needed to be taken to deter Israel from further violating the airspace of Lebanon.

¹ S/2003/939.

² S/2003/943.

At the 4836th meeting, held on 5 October 2003 in response to the requests contained in the above-mentioned letters, which the Council included in its agenda, statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Egypt, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Tunisia and Yemen, as well as the Permanent Observers of the League of Arab States and Palestine.³

At the meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic stated that the air strike by Israel was a violation of the Charter of the United Nations, of international law and of the Agreement on Disengagement of 1974. He maintained that the "Israeli aggression" was no isolated incident, but had been preceded by another violation by Israel, on 2 January 2003, that had resulted in the death of a soldier of the Syrian Arab Republic. He requested the Council to

³ The representatives of Djibouti, Oman, Somalia and the United Arab Emirates were invited to participate but did not make statements.

condemn the air strike and noted that he had submitted a draft resolution⁴ which reflected the positions usually adopted by the Council in the face of similar acts of aggression and threats.⁵

The representative of Israel stated that on 4 October 2003 a Palestinian suicide bomber had killed 19 civilians and wounded 60 others in a restaurant in Haifa. Islamic Jihad, which had “headquarters in Damascus” had claimed responsibility. He noted that the massacre was the latest of over 40 “terrorist atrocities” committed by Islamic Jihad in the past few years. The representative maintained that the Syrian Arab Republic provided “safe harbour and training facilities” for “terrorist organizations” such as Islamic Jihad, Hamas and Hizbullah, both in separate facilities and in army bases in the Syrian Arab Republic. He gave a number of examples of the extent and nature of the involvement of the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic in the “deliberate murder of innocent civilians”. He argued that each of those acts constituted a grave violation of international law and resolutions of the Council including resolution 1373 (2002), as well as a threat to international peace and security. The representative described the target of the air strike at the village of Ein Saheb as a “terrorist” facility sponsored by the Syrian Arab Republic and the Islamic Republic of Iran, and explained that the “measured defensive response” of Israel to the suicide bombing of the previous day was a clear act of self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter.⁶

The representative of Pakistan stated that the attack perpetrated by Israel against the Syrian Arab Republic had not met the strict requirements set out in the Charter with regard to the use of force. It had been an arbitrary attack, and in legal and political terms it was clearly a violation of the Charter and of resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973), 350 (1974), 1397 (2002) and others.⁷

The representative of the United States called on all sides to avoid heightening the tension in the Middle East and to think carefully about the consequences of their actions. He noted that his Government had been

notified of the Israeli action after the event. He asserted that the Syrian Arab Republic was “on the wrong side of the war on terrorism” and stressed the need for it to cease harbouring terrorist groups.⁸

The representative of Lebanon maintained that “mixing up” the Haifa bombing with an action against the Syrian Arab Republic or linking it with the “State terrorism” practised by Israel was a contravention of the norms of international law. He requested the Council to meet its responsibilities and take the proper measures to condemn Israel and deter it from committing acts of aggression.⁹

The representatives of Morocco and Jordan stressed that Article 51 did not apply in this matter, as the Israeli attack could not be considered legitimate self-defence. Therefore the attack was in violation of Article 2(4), which called on Member States to refrain from the use of force against the territorial integrity of any State.¹⁰

Most of the members of the Council expressed regret at the situation and urged both sides to observe restraint in their relations with one other. They also condemned both the suicide bombing of 4 October 2003 and the air strike of the following day. Several speakers also expressed a commitment to the road map peace plan for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.¹¹

Most other speakers strongly condemned the air strikes and denounced them as in contravention of the Charter and international law. They also traced the root of the dispute to the situation in the Palestinian territories.¹² A number of speakers also condemned the suicide bombing.¹³

⁸ Ibid., pp. 13-14.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 15-16.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 17 (Morocco); and pp. 17-18 (Jordan).

¹¹ Ibid., p. 9 (United Kingdom); pp. 9-10 (Russian Federation); p. 10 (Germany); pp. 10-11 (France); p. 11 (Chile); pp. 11-12 (Mexico); p. 12 (Angola); pp. 12-13 (Guinea); and p. 13 (Cameroon).

¹² Ibid., pp. 14-15 (League of Arab States); pp. 15-16 (Lebanon); pp. 16-17 (Algeria); pp. 17-18 (Jordan); p. 19 (Tunisia); pp. 19-20 (Kuwait); pp. 20-21 (Saudi Arabia); pp. 21-22 (Islamic Republic of Iran); pp. 22-23 (Bahrain); p. 23 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); pp. 23-24 (Yemen); p. 24 (Qatar); and pp. 24-25 (Sudan).

¹³ Ibid., p. 17 (Morocco); p. 18 (Egypt); p. 19 (Palestine); and p. 21 (Cuba).

⁴ Not issued as a document of the Council.

⁵ S/PV.4836, pp. 2-4.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 5-7.

⁷ Ibid., pp. 8-9.

Thematic issues

36. Items relating to the International Tribunals

A. International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991

International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994

Deliberations of 2 June 2000 (4150th meeting)

At its 4150th meeting, on 2 June 2000, the Security Council heard a briefing by the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia (International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia) and of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994 (International Tribunal for Rwanda), following which statements were made by most members of the Council,¹ as well as by the representative of Rwanda.

The Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, in her briefing, speaking on the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, reported that there had been literally no cooperation of Yugoslavia with her Office since the NATO air campaign against Yugoslavia in 1999. She pointed out that such a situation hampered her ability to conclude investigations involving Serbian victims. While lauding the cooperation of the new Government of Croatia with the Tribunal, she stated that she could not yet report that Croatia was in full compliance with its

obligations, owing to some outstanding issues. On another matter, she pointed out that the length of the proceedings of the Tribunal had become a problem, since its statute guaranteed all accused the right to be tried without undue delay. She therefore supported the proposals of the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, to be presented to the Council shortly, to request additional resources to deal with the workload of the Tribunal in a timely manner.

On a different issue, she reported that the prosecution had assessed complaints and allegations that NATO might have committed crimes that fell within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal during its air campaign against Yugoslavia in 1999. She announced that after an examination of all facts and a detailed legal analysis, she had come to the conclusion that, although some mistakes had been made, there had been no deliberate targeting of civilians or of unlawful military targets and that there was no basis for opening an investigation into any of those allegations or other incidents related to the NATO bombings.

Speaking in respect of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, the Prosecutor reported that relations with the Government of Rwanda had improved after the reversal of a decision by the Appeals Chamber to release the accused in the Barayagwiza case, and that cooperation with the Government was now excellent. She reported on plans by the Government of Rwanda to introduce a traditional form of justice called *gachacha* to alleviate the overcrowding of prisons.²

¹ The representatives of Namibia, Tunisia and Ukraine did not make statements at the meeting.

² S/PV.4150, pp. 2-6.

In their statements following the briefings, most speakers expressed their support for the work of the Tribunals, called for all States to cooperate with the Tribunals, especially the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and emphasized that the remaining fugitives, especially high-ranking political and military leaders must be arrested and handed over to the Tribunals. Some speakers also held that the work of the two Tribunals was of great importance for the future work of the International Court.³

The representative of the Russian Federation held that while his Government attached great importance to the work of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, it had not had a serious impact on the normalization of the political processes within Rwanda or on combating war crimes in other parts of the world. While he attributed the lack of speed and effectiveness in the work of the Tribunal partly to the lack of a proper level of cooperation from States, he also criticized its organizational structures and working methods. He supported the efforts of the United Nations to overcome those difficulties as well as the request to increase the number of judges. While expressing his Government's intention to cooperate with the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, he stated that the Russian Federation had some serious problems with the work of that organ. He expressed the view that the work of the Tribunal had been politicized, that its work was partial and biased, especially vis-à-vis Yugoslavia and that it had adopted a clear anti-Serbian stance. He expressed concern at the use of sealed indictments and the cooperation — not authorized by the Council — between the Tribunal and NATO; at the use of the Stabilization Force to arrest persons indicted by the Tribunal; and at the continuing unjustified increase in the budget of the Tribunal and the inflated staffing table. In addition, he expressed his belief that the decision to halt investigations into the NATO air strikes against Yugoslavia was premature. In concluding, he stated that his Government had come to consider the Tribunal less and less as an impartial judicial body.⁴ In response, the Prosecutor of the Tribunals stated that she completely rejected the accusation of politicization, and expressed regret that she had not been able in the previous 10 months to establish contacts with the authorities of the Russian

Federation to discuss the work of the Tribunal.⁵ The representative of China shared the view that the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia should conduct investigations into allegations of serious violations of international humanitarian law during the bombings of Yugoslavia by NATO and emphasized that the decision to halt those investigations should be supported by convincing evidence.⁶

The representative of Rwanda underlined the willingness of his Government to cooperate with the International Tribunal for Rwanda. Nevertheless, he requested the recruitment of better qualified investigators to match the highly qualified defence lawyers. He also requested that more Rwandan nationals from a variety of social groups be recruited, and pointed out that of those recruited so far, including witnesses, many already had files opened on genocide charges, or were relatives or friends of persons indicted by the Tribunal.⁷

Decision of 30 November 2000 (4240th meeting): resolution 1329 (2000)

At its 4229th meeting, on 21 November 2000, the Council heard briefings by the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda and the Prosecutor of the two Tribunals, following which statements were made by all members of the Council.

The President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, in his briefing, concentrated on the reform proposals that he had presented to the Council at the 4161st meeting. He expressed his gratitude that the Council had swiftly set up a working group to examine his proposals. He held that a consensus appeared possible and asked the Council to give priority to the issue. Speaking in respect of the cooperation of States with the Tribunal, he applauded progress made after increased cooperation by Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia, but expressed concern that the highest-ranking political and military officials indicted by the Tribunal remained at large. In that regard, he appealed to the Council to use all its influence over Member States, especially the successor States of the former Yugoslavia, to persuade them to

³ Ibid., p. 8 (Argentina); and p. 13 (Netherlands, Canada).

⁴ Ibid., pp. 14-15.

⁵ Ibid., p. 22.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 15-16.

⁷ Ibid., pp. 19-20.

arrest and bring before the Tribunal all the accused in their territories.⁸

The President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda described a period of intensive judicial effort on the part of the Tribunal, which had cleared a backlog of pretrial proceedings and which would allow a number of trials to commence. She assured the Council that there was a reasonable possibility that the Tribunal would complete the cases of all 35 persons currently awaiting trial within the period of its mandate, but cautioned that it was impossible at this stage to predict the number of new suspects that might be indicted.⁹

The Prosecutor of the Tribunals, speaking in respect of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, stated that since the prosecution had now reached a sufficiently advanced stage in its information-gathering activities, a longer-term plan for investigations could be prepared and submitted to the President of the Tribunal as a basis for strategic forward planning with regard to the completion of the mandate of the Tribunal. She also emphasized that to make the work of the Tribunal more relevant to the people of Rwanda, she would ask the Trial Chambers to hold hearings in Rwanda instead of at the seat of the Tribunal in Arusha, and suggested that it might even be possible to contemplate moving the entire Tribunal to Rwanda. On a related issue, she regretted that the statute of the Tribunal made no provision for the participation of victims during trial and included only minimal provisions for compensation and restitution to victims. Since her Office had considerable success in tracing and freezing large amounts of money in the personal accounts of the accused, she held that the money could be applied by the Tribunal to the compensation of victims or towards the costs of the prosecution, and suggested to the Council to consider changing the statute in that regard. Speaking in respect of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, she stated that cooperation with the Government of Croatia had made significant progress, but was undermined by obstruction on a few key issues, including those relating to the 1995 Croatian campaign against Serbs in Croatia, known as Operation Storm. On a different matter, she expressed concern over the slowing rate at which indicted persons were arrested and over the

results of the recent elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which, in her opinion, would not lead to any improvement in the cooperation of some local authorities with the Tribunal. In addition, she warned against too much optimism about increased cooperation of Yugoslavia with the Tribunal after the removal of President Slobodan Milošević from office, demanding that Milošević be brought to trial before the Tribunal. Referring to a number of passionate pleas her Office had received to investigate allegations of continuing ethnic cleansing against Serb and Roma populations in Kosovo after the deployment of the Kosovo Force (KFOR), she formally requested the Council to extend the jurisdiction of the Tribunal in that respect.¹⁰

In their statements following the briefings, most speakers expressed support for the reform proposals made by the Presidents of the two Tribunals, including the creation of a pool of ad litem judges and the addition of two judges to the Appeals Chamber. Some speakers emphasized that the selection of ad litem judges should be done by elections and should take into account the principle of equitable geographic distribution, as well as the representation of a variety of legal systems.¹¹

The representative of the Russian Federation reiterated his serious concerns with regard to the work of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, adding that the Tribunal had closed its eyes to cases of non-observance of international humanitarian law by other parties to the conflict, including the halting of the investigation into the NATO air strikes against Yugoslavia. He held that the Tribunal had repeatedly amended and interpreted the norms of international humanitarian law. In that regard, he questioned whether the international community should be financing the activities of the Tribunal that exceeded its mandate, called for an exhaustive review of its activities and insisted that it was time to establish more clearly the temporary nature of its jurisdiction. Nevertheless, he expressed support for the proposal to enhance the effectiveness of the Tribunal and create a pool of ad litem judges.¹² In response, the Prosecutor again rejected those accusations, as offensive and without foundation and again expressed her regret that

⁸ S/PV.4229, pp. 2-4.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 4-7.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 7-11.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 22 (Jamaica); p. 24 (Ukraine); and p. 26 (Tunisia).

¹² S/PV.4229, pp. 18-20; see also S/PV.4150, pp. 14-15.

the Government of the Russian Federation had not responded to her requests to visit Moscow to discuss the work of the Tribunal.¹³ The representative of China also reiterated his serious reservations about the decision to halt an investigation into allegations of serious violations of international humanitarian law during the bombings of Yugoslavia by NATO. He held that in view of the major political changes in the former Yugoslavia, the Council should determine the ending date of the temporal jurisdiction of the Tribunal, and suggested that cases concerning lower-level persons should, where conditions permitted, be transferred to national courts in the countries of the former Yugoslavia. He also suggested exploring the possibility of resorting to some sort of truth and reconciliation process.¹⁴ However, other speakers cautioned about the proposal to set a time limit to the jurisdiction of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.¹⁵

At its 4240th meeting, on 30 November 2000, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 7 September 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,¹⁶ transmitting a letter dated 12 May 2000 from the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and a letter dated 14 June 2000 from the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda.

The President (Netherlands) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution.¹⁷ Before the vote, the President made a statement, as agreed among the members of the Council. He stated that during the consultation on the draft resolution it had become apparent that four urgent issues remained to be addressed by the informal working group of the Council on the Tribunals, namely, the issue of equitable geographical distribution; the issue of compensation of victims; the issue of persons unlawfully arrested or detained; and the issue of gender balance.

The draft resolution was then put to the vote; it was adopted unanimously and without debate as

¹³ S/PV.4229, pp. 10-11; see also S/PV.4150, p. 22.

¹⁴ S/PV.4229, pp. 21-22.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12 (United States); p. 14 (France); and p. 17 (United Kingdom).

¹⁶ S/2000/865; see deliberations of 20 June 2000 (4161st meeting).

¹⁷ S/2000/1131.

resolution 1329 (2000), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided to establish a pool of *ad litem* judges in the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and to enlarge the membership of the Appeals Chambers of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda, and to that end decided to amend articles 12, 13 and 14 of the statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and to replace those articles with the provisions set out in annex I to the resolution, and decided also to amend articles 11, 12 and 13 of the statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda and to replace those articles with the provisions set out in annex II to the resolution;

Decided also that two additional judges shall be elected as soon as possible as judges of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, and decided, without prejudice to article 12, paragraph 4, of the statute of that Tribunal, that, once elected, they should serve until the date of the expiry of the terms of office of the existing judges, and that for the purpose of that election the Council should, notwithstanding article 12, paragraph 2(c), of the statute, establish a list from the nominations received of not less than four and not more than six candidates;

Decided further that, once two judges had been elected, the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda should take the necessary steps as soon as practicable to assign two of the judges elected or appointed in accordance with article 12 of the statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda to be members of the Appeals Chambers of the Tribunals.

Deliberations of 27 November 2001 (4429th meeting)

At its 4429th meeting, the Council heard briefings by the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda and the Prosecutor of the two Tribunals, following which statements were made by most members of the Council and by the representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Rwanda and Yugoslavia.¹⁸

The President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, in his briefing, stressed that major reforms had been implemented, were successful in expediting proceedings and were leading to a substantial increase in the activities of the Tribunal. He held that those reforms would enable the Tribunal to complete the Trial Chamber proceedings in 2007-2008,

¹⁸ The representatives of Bangladesh, Jamaica and the United States did not make statements at the meeting; Rwanda was represented by the Minister for Justice.

provided that indicted persons continued to be arrested at a sustained rate and that the necessary resources were granted to the Tribunal. Nevertheless, he suggested that lesser cases could be prosecuted by the States of the region, taking into account the political developments in the region, provided that their judicial systems would be reconstructed on democratic foundations.¹⁹

The President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda also reported on the reforms implemented, but emphasized that if the current capacity of judges remained unchanged, the Tribunal would not be able to complete the trials of the existing detainees before the year 2007. In addition, she pointed to the fact that the prosecution anticipated indicting up to 136 new persons by the year 2005. She drew the attention of the Council to a proposal she had submitted on 9 July 2001 for the creation of a pool of *ad litem* judges, similar to the solution found for the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, and projected that if the judicial capacity was increased accordingly and if the Prosecutor drastically revised her investigative programme, the International Tribunal for Rwanda could complete its work by 2007, rather than a previously projected date of 2023. She suggested that other avenues of justice be pursued as well, such as the encouragement of trials at the national level.²⁰

The Prosecutor, in connection with the exit strategy of the Tribunals, outlined her future prosecution policy in order to give the Council an understanding of how much work the Tribunals would have to do before they could complete their respective mandates. She stated that she intended to focus on the leaders in both Rwanda and Yugoslavia, but stressed that local leaders had also played an important role as organizers and motivators of major crimes. She held that the figures she had given for the remaining investigations — 36 for the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and 136 for the International Tribunal for Rwanda — were only a fraction of the potential number of crimes or suspects. In respect of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, she estimated that the end of 2008 might be a realistic date for the end strategy for the trials in that Tribunal. In respect of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, she held that the referral of some cases to national

courts in Yugoslavia was an interesting possibility, but that she would not be ready to hand over prosecution of cases to the national courts as they were operating at that time. As the majority of cases were from Bosnia and Herzegovina, she had suggested to the Government the idea of designing a special court that would have an international component, or of developing an existing State court to perform that special task, and that her Office stood ready to assist in the development process. On State cooperation, she expressed her disappointment at the non-apprehension of General Ante Gotovina in Croatia. She asked the Council to insist upon the arrest of Radovan Karadžić and Ratko Mladić, whose continuing liberty, in her view, was an affront to the authority of the Council and mocked the entire process of international criminal justice.²¹

The representative of Rwanda emphasized that it was essential to bring to trial those suspected of genocide and held that it was not the time to reduce the capacities of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, but to build them up. As to areas of improvements for the Tribunal, he suggested that the programme of information of the Tribunal could be improved, assistance to witnesses should be increased and access to AIDS medication should be provided for those who were victims of rape at the time of the genocide. In addition, he encouraged the recruitment of Rwandans for the Tribunal, but appealed for greater care in the choice of persons recruited to prevent the abusive sharing of fees among defence counsels and detainees and the hiring of individuals suspected of genocide. He urged for compensation of victims and for a fuller participation of victims in the activities of the Tribunal. He also argued for the seat of the Tribunal to be relocated to Rwanda.²²

The representative of Yugoslavia held that his country was well aware of its international obligations and was committed to fulfilling them. He held that his country had adopted in the past year a constructive and cooperative approach towards the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and pointed to the transfer of Slobodan Milošević as an example of that. In addition, he referred to his remarks in the General Assembly the day before on improving the functioning of the Tribunal, in which he identified a number of issues to be addressed, *inter alia*, the use of sealed

¹⁹ S/PV.4429, pp. 3-6.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-14.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

indictments; the frequent changing of the Tribunal's rules of procedure and evidence; and compensation for those who were acquitted.²³ He also expressed the view that the Tribunal should make a contribution in dealing with cases of crimes committed against Serbs and other non-Albanians in Kosovo and Metohija since the deployment of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo and KFOR in 1999.²⁴

The representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina underlined the important role of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in the process of reconciliation and the maintenance of peace and stability. He expressed his disappointment and serious concern that 26 publicly indicted war criminals still remained at large. He welcomed the initiative of the Tribunal to process some of the cases by the local judicial structures under the auspices of the Tribunal.²⁵

Most speakers welcomed the improvement in the performance of the Tribunals, but expressed concern at the continuing heavy workload. Speakers generally agreed with the intention of the Prosecutor to concentrate on the main offenders with high-level responsibility and with the proposals to transfer cases of lesser offenders to local courts. Most speakers expressed a willingness to consider the proposal to establish a pool of ad litem judges for the International Tribunal for Rwanda. Nevertheless, several speakers expressed concern with the high number of future indictments envisaged by the Prosecutor.²⁶ In addition, the representatives of the Russian Federation and China emphasized that the Tribunals had been established as temporary judicial bodies and that they could not exist indefinitely.²⁷ The representative of the Russian Federation further emphasized that a final deadline for the jurisdiction of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia should be established. He stressed that the primary responsibility for punishing war criminals remained with States and that his delegation would strive for a more active involvement of the national court systems of the States of the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda.²⁸

²³ A/56/PV.62, pp. 11-12.

²⁴ S/PV.4429, pp. 15-16.

²⁵ Ibid., pp. 17-18.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 20 (Ireland); p. 22 (Russian Federation); p. 23 (China); and p. 27 (France).

²⁷ Ibid., p. 22 (Russian Federation); and p. 23 (China).

²⁸ Ibid., p. 22.

**Decision of 17 May 2002 (4535th meeting):
resolution 1411 (2002)**

At the 4535th meeting, on 17 May 2002, the President (Singapore) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;²⁹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without a debate as resolution 1411 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, inter alia:

Decided to amend article 12 of the statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and to replace that article with the provisions set out in annex I to the resolution;

Decided also to amend article 11 of the statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda and to replace that article with the provisions set out in annex II to the resolution.

**Decision of 18 December 2002 (4674th meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4674th meeting,³⁰ on 18 December 2002, the President (Colombia) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³¹ by which the Council, inter alia:

Reaffirmed its support for the International Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia;

Recalled the mandatory obligations of all States, including the Governments of Rwanda and Yugoslavia, pursuant to its resolutions 827 (1993) and 955 (1994) and the statutes of the Tribunals, to cooperate fully with the Tribunals and their organs;

Stressed the importance it attached to full cooperation by all States, particularly those directly concerned, with the Tribunals;

Also stressed the importance of constructive dialogue between the Tribunals and the Governments concerned to resolve any outstanding issues affecting the work of the Tribunals, but insisted that such dialogue or lack of dialogue must not be used by States as an excuse for failure to discharge their obligations to cooperate fully with the Tribunals.

²⁹ S/2002/544.

³⁰ At its 4637th meeting, held in private on 29 October 2002, the Council heard briefings by the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the President of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the Prosecutor of the two Tribunals.

³¹ S/PRST/2002/39.

**Decision of 28 August 2003 (4817th meeting):
resolution 1503 (2003)**

At the 4817th meeting,³² on 28 August 2003, the President (Syrian Arab Republic) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a letter dated 28 July 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,³³ containing a proposed amendment to the statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda for adoption by the General Assembly and the Council; and to a letter dated 5 August 2003 from the representative of Rwanda addressed to the President of the Council.³⁴ The Secretary-General, in his letter, reported that the term of office of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and of the International Tribunal for Rwanda would come to an end on 14 September 2003. In that regard, he suggested that it was time to split the positions of the Prosecutor of the two Tribunals, previously held by the same person, so that they were occupied by two different people. In his letter, the representative of Rwanda transmitted a proposal for the appointment of a separate prosecutor for the International Tribunal for Rwanda, in which the Government of Rwanda welcomed the recommendation of the Secretary-General, urged the Council to approve the proposal and, reiterating various concerns about the work of the Tribunal, urged the Council also to consider other necessary reforms that would make the Tribunal more efficient and accountable.

The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;³⁵ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1503 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Requested the Presidents of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda and their Prosecutors, in their annual reports to the Council, to explain their plans to implement the completion strategies of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda;

Called upon the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda to take all possible measures to complete investigations by the end of 2004, to complete all trial activities at first instance by the end of 2008, and to complete all work in 2010 (the completion strategies);

Decided to amend article 15 of the statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda and to replace that article with the provision set out in annex I to the resolution, and requested the Secretary-General to nominate a person to be the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for Rwanda.

**Decisions of 4 September 2003 (4819th
meeting): resolutions 1504 (2003) and
1505 (2003)**

At the 4819th meeting, on 4 September 2003, the President (United Kingdom) drew the attention of the Council to two draft resolutions;³⁶ they were consecutively put to the vote and adopted as resolutions 1504 (2003) and 1505 (2003), by which, respectively, the Council appointed Carla del Ponte as Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and Hassan Bubacar Jallow as Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, each for a four-year term with effect from 15 September 2003.

**Deliberations of 9 October 2003
(4838th meeting)**

At its 4838th meeting, on 9 October 2003, the Council heard briefings by the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for Rwanda. Following the briefings, statements were made by the representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, China, Croatia, France, Germany, Guinea, Mexico, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Serbia and Montenegro and the United Kingdom

At the outset of the meeting, the President (United States) drew the attention of the Council to a note by the Secretary-General dated 20 August 2003, transmitting the tenth annual report of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia³⁷ and a letter dated 3 October 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council, transmitting a letter

³² At its 4806th meeting, held in private on 8 August 2003, the Council heard a statement by the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda.

³³ S/2003/766.

³⁴ S/2003/794.

³⁵ S/2003/835.

³⁶ S/2003/846 and S/2003/847.

³⁷ S/2003/829 and Corr.1.

from the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda enclosing a report on the completion strategy of the Tribunal.³⁸

In the annual report of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the President of the Tribunal reported that the pace of activities had reached an all-time high. At the same time, the Tribunal had pressed forward with plans to bring its efforts to an orderly close in the foreseeable future and had continued internal reforms to improve the efficiency of proceedings. In the spring of 2003, the Tribunal had reached an agreement with the Office of the United Nations High Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina concerning the establishment of a special chamber for prosecution of war crimes in the State Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was projected to enable the Tribunal to begin transferring some cases of mid- and lower-level accused by the end of 2004 or early 2005. According to the report, the Prosecutor remained committed to ceasing investigations by the end of 2004. It was also reported that the invigorated law enforcement efforts of the Government of Serbia and Montenegro in the wake of the assassination of Prime Minister Zoran Djindjić had led to the arrest and transfer to the Tribunal of several important accused, but that nearly 20 indictees, including some high-ranking military and political officials, notably Radovan Karadžić and Ratko Mladić, remained at large.

In his report, the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda projected, on the basis of experience gained in the conduct of trials to date and in the light of information supplied by the former Prosecutor regarding ongoing investigations and possible future indictments, how the Tribunal's trial activities were likely to evolve in the future. In view of resolution 1503 (2003) of 28 August 2003, in which the Council called on the Tribunals to take all possible measures to complete all trial activities at first instance by the end of the year 2008, the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda projected that, if its judicial capacity were to remain unchanged, it would take until 2011 for the Tribunal to complete the trials of all of those persons who were currently being, or who might in the future be prosecuted before it. He therefore requested that the Council amend the statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda so that the

Tribunal would be authorized to make use of up to nine ad litem judges at any one time, instead of the existing maximum of four, in which case the Tribunal would most probably be able to complete all trial activities at first instance by the target date of the end of 2008, or would at least be able to come very close to achieving that target. He recalled that with nine ad litem judges, the Tribunal would then enjoy the same judicial capacity for conducting trials at first instance as the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

In his briefing, the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia noted that internal reforms, an increase in the number of guilty pleas and the advancement of a plan to create a special war crimes chamber in the State Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina had given the completion strategy a major boost. He emphasized that, despite those efforts, it was not possible to predict the completion date of judicial proceedings with scientific accuracy. While he believed that the trials of all individuals in custody would be completed within the 2008 deadline, he held that trying the cases of all fugitives, including those of highest priority, Radovan Karadžić and Ratko Mladić, would probably require trials at least through 2009. Emphasizing the prerogative as well as the intention of the Prosecutor to file new indictments, he maintained that new indictments would inevitably cause significant additional slippage in the target dates of the completion strategy, up to as much as two years beyond the estimated time for current trials. Nevertheless, he emphasized, that a strict application of the target dates for the completion strategy must not result in impunity, particularly for the most senior leaders, and that once indictments had been submitted and the legal process started, it would have to run its course.³⁹

The President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda reported that the number of trials had doubled in the second mandate of the Tribunal. Nevertheless, with regard to the completion strategy, the President noted that with four ad litem judges, the Tribunal would not be in a position to bring to trial all of the indictees who were still at large and who might be indicted in the future until the target date of 2008. The Tribunal had therefore requested the Council to

³⁸ S/2003/946.

³⁹ S/PV.4838 and Corr.1, pp. 3-7.

increase the number of ad litem judges from four to nine, and to allow them to do pretrial work.⁴⁰

The Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia assured the Council that the necessary measures were being taken to complete all remaining investigations by 2004, and expressed confidence that the remaining most senior leaders suspected of being responsible for crimes falling within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal would be indicted by that date. Other investigations that had not involved the most senior perpetrators had been suspended and were expected to be referred to domestic courts in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia and Montenegro. She suggested that after investigations were completed at the end of 2004, it would be possible to decide, in close cooperation with the President of the Tribunal, and on the basis of the guidance provided by the Council, which cases could responsibly be referred back to the domestic jurisdictions. Arguing that her investigations should not be stopped outright, she expressed her belief that referring cases already indicted by the Tribunal to the domestic jurisdictions offered better guarantees that those cases would actually be tried. She held that the completion strategy necessarily depended on full cooperation by the States of the former Yugoslavia and on reforms and support of national courts. She reported that Croatia, Serbia and Montenegro, the Republika Srpska and the Bosnian Croat party to the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina had not so far achieved full cooperation with the Tribunal.⁴¹

The Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for Rwanda reported that he had begun reviewing cases of all those awaiting trial to assess their level of responsibility, with a view to referring to national jurisdictions those cases in which the accused did not fall within the category of those bearing the greatest responsibility. He was convinced that States that had agreed to prosecute those cases would need assistance from the international community.⁴²

In their comments following the briefing, most speakers welcomed the completion strategies of the Tribunals. Most speakers also welcomed the intended referral of lower-level cases to national jurisdictions, recognizing that the relevant States would need

assistance with regard to strengthening their judicial systems. Most speakers also expressed a willingness to consider the request by the International Tribunal for Rwanda to authorize the use of more ad litem judges. Several speakers pointed to the importance of cooperation of States with the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, and held that the fugitives Radovan Karadžić and Ratko Mladić needed to be brought to trial. The representative of Germany suggested that cases that could not be tried by the Tribunals within the given time frame could be referred to the International Court, a procedure that would be much more cost-efficient than extending the mandate of the Tribunals.⁴³

The representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina noted progress in the restructuring of his country's court system, which would enable the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia to begin transferring some cases of mid- and low-level accused by the end of the following year. He expected, nevertheless, that the apprehension and trial of the most notorious offenders would remain the continuing responsibility of the United Nations and the international community.⁴⁴

The representative of Rwanda reiterated his Government's serious concerns with the functioning of the International Tribunal for Rwanda. In addition, he held that the Prosecutor had failed to indict and apprehend large numbers of prominent genocide suspects and recommended that the proposed completion strategy should urgently address that problem. He also pointed to the financial implications of the transfer of cases to the jurisdiction of Rwanda and recommended that the completion strategy should make provisions as to how the financial resources required to assist Rwanda would be raised.⁴⁵

The representative of Serbia and Montenegro appreciated the assessment of the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia that the cooperation of his country with the Tribunal had improved, but acknowledged that more needed to be done. Referring to the assessment of the Prosecutor of the Tribunal, however, he pointed out that a former President, a former head of State Security and several

⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 7-9.

⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 9-13.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 13-16.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 17.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 23.

⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 24-26.

army officers had surrendered voluntarily and that he could not understand the Prosecutor's suggestion that voluntary surrenders of the accused were somehow of lesser value than arrests.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 26-27.

The representative of Croatia held that with the exception of the Gotovina case, where the indicted person remained at large, Croatia had fulfilled all its obligations towards the Tribunal.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 28.

B. International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991

Deliberations of 20 June 2000 (4161st meeting)

At its 4161st meeting, on 20 June 2000, the Council heard a briefing by the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, following which statements were made by most members of the Council.⁴⁸ The President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 14 June 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,⁴⁹ transmitting the report of the Expert Group to Conduct a Review of the Effective Operation and Functioning of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda,⁵⁰ as well as comments and observations of the two Tribunals and the comments of the Secretary-General on the report. The President also drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 12 May 2000 from the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia addressed to the Secretary-General and a letter dated 14 June 2000 from the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda.⁵¹

In his letter dated 14 June 2000, the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia reviewed the current situation regarding the conduct of trials before the Tribunal and projected ways in which the Tribunal's activities were likely to evolve in the future, on the basis of experience gained in the conduct of trials to that date and in the light of information supplied by the Prosecutor regarding probable future

⁴⁸ The representative of Mali did not make a statement at the meeting.

⁴⁹ S/2000/597.

⁵⁰ Established pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 53/212 and 53/213 of 18 December 1998.

⁵¹ Subsequently issued as S/2000/865, annexes I and II; see decision of 30 November 2000 (4240th meeting).

indictments. The President concluded that, should the Tribunal maintain its current structure, it was likely to require a considerable period of time to complete all trials. The President therefore proposed to confer on senior legal officers of the Trial Chambers certain powers that were currently vested in the judges to take decisions regarding the conduct of the pretrial process, to create a pool of ad litem judges on which the Tribunal could draw when needed and to enlarge the Appeals Chambers of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda by the addition of two further judges, drawn from the Trial Chambers of the International Tribunal for Rwanda.

In his letter dated 12 May 2000, the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda reported that the judges of the Tribunal had agreed to the recommendation to enlarge the Appeals Chamber and that they intended to address long-term plans of the Tribunal once they received the criminal prosecution projection from the Prosecutor.

At the meeting, the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, in his briefing, stated that the political changes in the Balkan region, the ever more active cooperation with regard to arrests and the intention of the Prosecutor to make almost 200 new indictments would in the future lead to a heavy workload for the Tribunal. Referring to the already lengthy pretrial detentions, he expressed the view that the Tribunal owed the accused, the victims and the international community trials that were not only fair, but also expeditious. He projected that if no changes were made, the four-year mandate of the Tribunal would have to be extended at least three or four more times. He therefore believed that the solutions proposed in his report were flexible and pragmatic and

that the period of the mandate assigned to the Tribunal, insofar as first instance trials were concerned, could thereby be shortened to conclude at the end of 2007, instead of 2016. He stated that the proposed changes would require an amendment to its statute. He held that this opportunity could also be used to introduce into the statute several other modifications, including a recommendation by the Expert Group to reinforce the Appeals Chamber with two additional ad hoc judges, provision of compensation for persons unjustly detained or prosecuted and the suggestion by the Prosecutor to fund compensation for victims by the seizure of revenues of the convicted.⁵²

In their statements following the briefing, most speakers welcomed the report by the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and generally supported its recommendations, while reserving the right to examine them in more detail. The representative of Jamaica expressed concern that the practice of drawing judges for the Appeals Chamber from the Trial Chambers created a situation in which the Appeals Chamber might find it difficult to operate with impartiality.⁵³ The representative of the United States stated that it must be ensured that efforts to streamline the Tribunal would not complicate the ability of the Prosecutor to apprehend those at large.⁵⁴ The representative of the Russian Federation reiterated his serious reservations concerning the work of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. He nevertheless expressed his readiness to consider the proposal of the President of the Tribunal, but emphasized that it needed to be addressed on the basis of a comprehensive analysis of the work of the Tribunal and bearing in mind the need to redress its deficiencies.⁵⁵ The representative of Canada categorically rejected claims that the work of the Tribunal was biased.⁵⁶ The representative of Ukraine expressed his concern at the absence of judges from Eastern Europe on the Tribunal.⁵⁷ The President, speaking in his national capacity as the representative of France, stated that his delegation had suggested that an informal working group be established to examine

the existing ideas and recommendations and to submit its conclusions to the Council in the near future.⁵⁸

**Decision of 19 January 2001 (4260th meeting):
letter from the President to the Secretary-
General**

At its 4260th meeting, on 19 January 2001, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 11 January 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,⁵⁹ by which the Secretary-General, pursuant to article 13 bis of the statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, forwarded 24 nominations for permanent judges for the Tribunal that he had received from Member States. He noted in that connection that the number of candidates whose nominations he had received was short of the minimum number of 28 which, pursuant to the statute of the Tribunal, should appear on the list that the Council was to establish for transmission to the General Assembly.

At the meeting, the President (Singapore) drew the attention of the Council to a draft letter, prepared in reply to the above-mentioned letter, by which the Council would inform the Secretary-General of its decision to extend the deadline for nominations of judges of the Tribunal until 31 January 2001. The Council decided that the President should send the letter as drafted to the Secretary-General.⁶⁰

**Decision of 8 February 2001 (4274th meeting):
resolution 1340 (2001)**

At its 4274th meeting, on 8 February 2001, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Establishment of the list of candidates for permanent judges".

The President (Tunisia) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁶¹ it was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1340 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*, forwarded nominations to the General Assembly in accordance with article 13 bis, paragraph 1 (d), of the statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

⁵² S/PV.4161, pp. 2-7.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁵⁹ S/2001/61.

⁶⁰ S/2001/63.

⁶¹ S/2001/108.

Decision of 27 April 2001 (4316th meeting): resolution 1350 (2001)

At its 4316th meeting, on 27 April 2001, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Establishment of the list of candidates for ad litem judges". The President (United Kingdom) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 19 April 2001 from the Secretary-General, addressed to the President of the Council,⁶² by which the Secretary-General, pursuant to article 13 ter, paragraph 1 (c), of the statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, forwarded to the Council 60 nominations received from Member States.

The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁶³ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1350 (2001), by which the Council, inter alia, forwarded nominations to the General Assembly in accordance with article 13 ter, paragraph 1 (d), of the statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

Decision of 23 July 2002 (4582nd meeting): statement by the President

At the 4582nd meeting,⁶⁴ on 23 July 2002, the President (United Kingdom) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁶⁵ by which the Council, inter alia:

Welcomed the report on the judicial status of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the prospects for referring certain cases to national courts⁶⁶ submitted by the President of the Tribunal on 10 June 2002;

Recognized that the Tribunal should concentrate its work on the prosecution and trial of the civilian, military and

paramilitary leaders suspected of being responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law committed in the territory of the former Yugoslavia since 1991, rather than on minor actors;

Endorsed the broad strategy of the report for the transfer of cases involving intermediary and lower-level accused to competent national jurisdictions as likely to be in practice the best way of allowing the Tribunal to achieve its current objective of completing all trial activities at first instance by 2008.

Decision of 19 May 2003 (4759th meeting): resolution 1481 (2003)

At its 4759th meeting,⁶⁷ on 19 May 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 7 May 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,⁶⁸ transmitting a letter from the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, in which he renewed a request to the Council by his predecessor to amend the statute of the Tribunal so that, during the period for which an ad litem judge was appointed to serve in the Tribunal for a trial, he or she could also adjudicate in pretrial proceedings in other cases, arguing that the restriction on the mandate of the ad litem judges prevented the Tribunal from making the most efficient use of their time.

The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁶⁹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1481 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, inter alia, decided to amend article 13 quater of the statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and to replace that article with the provisions set out in the annex to the resolution.

⁶² S/2001/391.

⁶³ S/2001/414.

⁶⁴ At its 4581st meeting, held in private on 23 July 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

⁶⁵ S/PRST/2002/21.

⁶⁶ S/2002/678.

⁶⁷ The President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia was present at the meeting.

⁶⁸ S/2003/530.

⁶⁹ S/2003/546.

C. International Tribunal for the prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994

Decision of 30 March 2001 (4307th meeting): resolution 1347 (2001)

At its 4307th meeting, on 30 March 2001, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled “Establishment of the list of candidates for Judges on the International Tribunal for Rwanda”.

The President (Ukraine) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁷⁰ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1347 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*, forwarded the following nominations to the General Assembly in accordance with article 12, paragraph 2 (d), of the statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda: Mr. Mouinou Aminou (Benin), Mr. Frederick Mwela Chomba (Zambia), Mr. Winston Churchill Matanzima Maqutu (Lesotho), Mr. Harris Michael Mtegha (Malawi) and Ms. Arlette Ramaroson (Madagascar).

Decision of 14 August 2002 (4601st meeting): resolution 1431 (2002)

At the 4601st meeting, on 14 August 2002, the President (United States) drew the attention of the Council to three letters addressed to the President of the Council: a letter dated 26 July 2002 from the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda;⁷¹ a

letter dated 26 July 2002 from the representative of Rwanda;⁷² and a letter dated 8 August 2002 from the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda.⁷³

At the same meeting, the President (United States) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁷⁴ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1431 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided to establish a pool of *ad litem* judges in the International Tribunal for Rwanda, and decided to amend articles 11, 12 and 13 of the statute of the Tribunal, and decided also to amend articles 13 bis and 14 of the statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and to replace

Tribunal could fulfil its mandate.

⁷² S/2002/842, reply of the Government of Rwanda to the report of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for Rwanda to the Council: (a) explaining to the members of the Council the shortcomings of the Tribunal, including inefficiency, corruption, nepotism, lack of protection of witnesses, harassment of witnesses, employing *genocidaires* as members of defence teams and investigators, mismanagement, slow pace of trials, insufficient staff and lack of competent staff, negligence and false allegations concerning the Government of Rwanda; and (b) recommending, *inter alia*, creation of an Office of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for Rwanda separate from that of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia; development of a plan to transfer the International Tribunal for Rwanda to Rwanda and, pending transfer, arrangements to conduct some trials in Rwanda; and the establishment of mechanisms for better treatment and protection of witnesses.

⁷³ S/2002/923, transmitting a note, jointly endorsed by the three organs of the Tribunal, on the reply of the Government of Rwanda to the report of the Prosecutor of the Tribunal, which provided, *inter alia*, a factual recapitulation of events that constituted a failure by the Government of Rwanda to issue travel documents for witnesses in a timely manner and clarifying, for information purposes only, statements in the reply of the Government of Rwanda on a number of issues concerning the functioning of the Tribunal.

⁷⁴ S/2002/922.

⁷⁰ S/2001/294.

⁷¹ S/2002/847, referring to article 28 of the statute of the Tribunal, under which the President of the Tribunal has the discretion to formally bring to the attention of the Council concerns that might exist regarding the cooperation of States; drawing the attention of the Council to a report of 23 July 2002 from the Prosecutor concerning the lack of cooperation from Rwandan authorities, in particular the lack of availability of witnesses, which was likely to hamper the judicial work of the Tribunal, and to decisions of two Trial Chambers pointing out the failure of the Government of Rwanda to issue travel documents in a timely manner so that witnesses could appear before the Tribunal; and highlighting the need for the Council to use such measures as it thought appropriate to ensure that the

those articles with the provisions set out in annex II to the resolution;

Requested the Secretary-General to make practical arrangements for the election as soon as possible of 18 ad litem judges in accordance with article 12 ter of the statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda.

Decision of 11 October 2002 (4621st meeting): letter from the President to the Secretary-General

At its 4621st meeting, on 11 October 2002, at which no statements were made, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 26 September 2002 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,⁷⁵ by which the Secretary-General, pursuant to article 12, paragraph 1 (c), of the statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, forwarded 17 nominations for permanent judges for the Tribunal received from Member States, and noted in that connection that the number of candidates whose nominations he had received was short of the minimum number of 22 which, pursuant to the statute of the Tribunal, should appear in the list that the Council was to establish for transmission to the General Assembly.

At the meeting, the President (Cameroon) drew the attention of the Council to a draft letter, prepared in reply to the above-mentioned letter, by which the Council informed the Secretary-General of its decision to extend the deadline for nominations of judges of the Tribunal until 15 November 2002. The Council decided that the President should send the letter as drafted.⁷⁶

Decision of 13 December 2002 (4666th meeting): resolution 1449 (2002)

At its 4666th meeting, on 13 December 2002, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Establishment of the list of candidates for Judges on the International Tribunal for Rwanda". The Council extended an invitation to the representative of Rwanda to participate in the meeting.

The President (Colombia) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁷⁷ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1449 (2002), by which the Council, inter alia, forwarded to the General Assembly nominations

⁷⁵ S/2002/1106.

⁷⁶ S/2002/1131.

⁷⁷ S/2002/1356.

for permanent judges of the International Tribunal for Rwanda in accordance with article 12 bis, paragraph 1 (d), of the statute of the Tribunal.

Decision of 28 March 2003 (4731st meeting): letter from the President to the Secretary-General

At its 4731st meeting, on 28 March 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 6 March 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,⁷⁸ by which the Secretary-General, pursuant to article 12, paragraph 1 (c), of the statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda, forwarded 26 nominations for permanent judges for that Tribunal received from Member States, and noted in that connection that the number of candidates whose nominations he had received was short of the minimum number of 36 which, pursuant to the statute of the Tribunal, should appear on the list which the Council was to establish for transmission to the General Assembly.

At the meeting, the President (Guinea) drew the attention of the Council to a draft letter, prepared in reply to the above-mentioned letter, by which the Council would inform the Secretary-General of its decision to extend the deadline for nominations of judges of the Tribunal until 15 April 2003.⁷⁹ The Council decided that the President should send the letter as drafted.

Decision of 29 April 2003 (4745th meeting): resolution 1477 (2003)

At its 4745th meeting, on 29 April 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 21 April 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,⁸⁰ by which the Secretary-General forwarded 35 nominations received pursuant to article 12, paragraph 1 (c), of the statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda. He stated that the number of candidates received fell short of the minimum number of 36 that should appear on the list to be established by the Council for transmission to the General Assembly.

⁷⁸ S/2003/290.

⁷⁹ S/2003/382.

⁸⁰ S/2003/467.

The President (Mexico) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁸¹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1477 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*, forwarded to the General Assembly nominations for *ad litem* judges of the International Tribunal for Rwanda in accordance with article 12 *ter*, paragraph 1 (d), of the statute of the Tribunal.

**Decision of 19 May 2003 (4760th meeting):
resolution 1482 (2003)**

At its 4760th meeting, on 19 May 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 16 April 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,⁸² transmitting a letter from the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda in which she requested the extension of the term of office of four non-elected permanent judges to allow them to dispose of ongoing cases.

The President (Pakistan) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁸³ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1482 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided, in response to the request by the Secretary-General, that:

(a) Judge Dolenc, once replaced as a member of the Tribunal, finish the *Cyangugu* case which he had begun before expiry of his term of office;

(b) Judge Maqutu, once replaced as a member of the Tribunal, finish the *Kajelijeli* and *Kamuhanda* cases which he had begun before expiry of his term of office;

(c) Notwithstanding article 11, paragraph 1, of the statute of the Tribunal and on an exceptional basis, Judge Ostrovsky, once replaced as a member of the Tribunal, finish the *Cyangugu* case which he had begun before expiry of his term of office;

(d) Judge Pillay, once replaced as a member of the Tribunal, finish the *Media* case which she had begun before expiry of her term of office;

Took note, in that regard, of the intention of the Tribunal to finish the *Cyangugu* case before the end of February 2004 and the *Kajelijeli*, *Kamuhanda* and *Media* cases before the end of December 2003;

⁸¹ S/2003/505.

⁸² S/2003/431.

⁸³ S/2003/549.

Requested the President of the Tribunal to provide it, by 1 August 2003, 15 November 2003 and 15 January 2004, respectively, with reports on the progress of the above-mentioned cases.

**Decisions of 27 October 2003 (4849th meeting):
resolution 1512 (2003) and statement
by the President**

At its 4849th meeting, on 27 October 2003, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 12 September 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,⁸⁴ transmitting a letter from the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda addressed to the Secretary-General, in which he requested that the Council amend the statute of the Tribunal so that, during the period during which an *ad litem* judge was appointed to serve on the Tribunal for a trial, he or she could also adjudicate in pretrial proceedings in other cases. The Secretary-General recalled that, earlier the same year, the Council had acceded to an identical proposal by the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. The Council also included in its agenda a letter dated 3 October 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council,⁸⁵ transmitting a letter from the President of the International Tribunal for Rwanda requesting an increase in the number of *ad litem* judges from four to nine and enclosing a report on the completion strategy of the Tribunal.

The President (United States) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁸⁶ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1512 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*, decided to amend articles 11 and 12 *quater* of the statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda and to replace those articles with the provisions set out in the annex to the resolution.

At the same meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁸⁷ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Noted the invitation of the General Assembly contained in paragraph 7 of resolution 57/289 that it address uncertainties

⁸⁴ S/2003/879.

⁸⁵ S/2003/946.

⁸⁶ S/2003/1033.

⁸⁷ S/PRST/2003/18.

regarding the power of the International Tribunal for Rwanda under its statute to finance the upgrading of prison accommodations;

Confirmed that it was within the lawful powers of the Tribunal under its statute to fund the renovation and

refurbishment of prison facilities in States that had concluded agreements with the United Nations for the carrying out of prison sentences of the Tribunal. Such funds should be used to bring up to international minimum standards the prison accommodation to be occupied or used pursuant to those agreements.

37. Items relating to the maintenance of international peace and security

A. The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security

Decision of 6 December 2000 (4243rd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4242nd meeting, on 6 December 2000, the Security Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs. Statements were made by a majority of members of the Council.¹

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General highlighted the actions taken by the Council, the General Assembly and the Secretariat with regard to the significant developments in international law pertaining to acts of terrorism that had taken place in the previous decade. With regard to the Council, he recalled that the efforts undertaken by the Council began in 1992 and culminated in October 1999, with the adoption of resolution 1269 (1999) which, *inter alia*, called upon States to implement fully the anti-terrorism conventions and to consider adhering to those to which they were not parties. With regard to the Assembly, he referred in particular to the development of a legal framework of conventions, most notably the 1997 International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings and the 1999 International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. Recalling that, in September 2000, a Working Group of the Sixth Committee, on the basis of a draft text prepared by the representative of India, had embarked on the elaboration of a comprehensive convention on international terrorism, he pointed out that delegations expressed support for the work begun, although expressing divergent views on the elaboration of such a comprehensive convention. More specifically, he explained that some delegations believed that the instrument should be truly comprehensive in scope, containing a definition which

distinguished between terrorist acts and the legitimate struggle for national liberation and other forms of alien domination and foreign occupation, while others held that the future convention should complement and complete the existing sectoral anti-terrorism conventions rather than replace them. Turning to the role of the Secretariat, he mentioned, in particular, the submission of annual reports by the Secretary-General to the Assembly, including information on the status and implementation of existing multilateral, regional and bilateral agreements on terrorism, as well as on relevant incidents and criminal prosecutions, and recalled that the Secretary-General was also entrusted with the preparation of a compendium of national laws and regulations regarding the prevention and suppression of international terrorism. In concluding, the Under-Secretary-General stressed that the fight against terrorism required better international cooperation, acknowledging at the same time that obstacles were standing in the way of enhanced international cooperation, such as the definition of terrorism, the political element, the links between terrorist groups and organized crime groups, and the perceived relationship between religion and terrorism in some parts of the world.²

Recognizing that international terrorism posed a serious threat to peace and security, Council members commended the continuing efforts of the Organization, through the Council, the Assembly and the Secretariat, seriously to address such a threat and, in that regard, stressed the importance of a coordinated international approach. They welcomed, in particular, the adoption of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings and the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

¹ The representative of Mali did not make a statement.

² S/PV.4242, pp. 2-8.

They also expressed their support for the draft comprehensive convention on terrorism and the ongoing efforts to complete a draft international convention for the suppression of acts of nuclear terrorism, proposed by the Russian Federation, and hoped that that work could be brought to completion as soon as possible.

While most delegations concurred that terrorism was never justifiable, for whatever purpose and by whomever committed, several representatives highlighted the need to distinguish between terrorism and the legitimate struggle of peoples exercising their right to self-determination.³ In that regard, the representative of Malaysia called for a clear and universally agreed definition of terrorism. He further believed that in taking security measures, States must be guided by the principle of proportionate response and not cross the threshold beyond which such security measures might descend to the level of terrorism.⁴ Although acknowledging that the fight against increasingly sophisticated terrorists might require increasingly harsher means, the representative of the Netherlands cautioned that the response to terrorism had to be proportionate and limited to the requirements of the maintenance of public order.⁵

The representative of the United States stressed that sanctions constituted the primary tool against terrorism, emphasizing the need for Member States to follow through on the commitments imposed on them by the Council.⁶ Similarly, the representative of the United Kingdom supported the imposition of measures by the Council against those who failed to bring to

justice those responsible for terrorist acts.⁷ Giving as an example the sanctions imposed against the Taliban and Osama bin Laden, the representative of Canada stressed that such measures demonstrated that there could be no impunity for terrorism and could also serve as a deterrent to future terrorist acts.⁸ The representative of China urged the Council to avoid or minimize resort to sanctions, which sometimes not only failed to resolve the problem satisfactorily, but could also have very serious humanitarian consequences.⁹

At the 4243rd meeting, on 6 December 2000, the President (Russian Federation) made a statement on behalf of the Council.¹⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Was deeply concerned by the increase, in many regions of the world, of acts of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations;

Reiterated its condemnation of all acts of terrorism, irrespective of motive, wherever and by whomever committed;

Welcomed the efforts of the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations in the field of combating international terrorism;

Called on all States that had not done so to consider, as a matter of priority, becoming party to the existing anti-terrorism conventions;

Reaffirmed its resolution 1269 (1999) of 19 October 1999 and called upon all States to implement its provisions fully and expeditiously;

Reiterated its readiness to take necessary steps in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations in order to counter terrorist threats to international peace and security.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Tunisia); p. 15 (Malaysia); and p. 20 (Namibia).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹⁰ S/PRST/2000/38.

B. Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peacebuilding

Decision of 23 March 2000 (4119th meeting): statement by the President

On 11 February 2000, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council the report on the role of United Nations peacekeeping in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration.¹¹ The Secretary-

General presented an overview of the evolution of the involvement of United Nations peacekeeping in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, identifying key elements that favoured the success of those processes, highlighting ways in which peacekeeping had assisted in them in the past and suggesting ways in which the United Nations could better support future disarmament, demobilization and reintegration efforts.

¹¹ S/2000/101, submitted pursuant to the presidential statement of 8 July 1999 (S/PRST/1999/21).

The Secretary-General noted that past experience suggested that the basis for a successful disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme should be laid within the peace agreement that provided for the end of a conflict. Where relevant, the role of children in armed conflict should be acknowledged and children's rights should be identified as an explicit priority in peacemaking, peacebuilding and conflict resolution processes, both in the peace agreement and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration plans. The Secretary-General announced that, where appropriate, future peacekeeping operations would include personnel with appropriate training in international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law, including child- and gender-related provisions.

He observed that the process of disarmament might require access to considerable technical skills and institutional knowledge. Stressing the danger posed by the flow of weapons across borders, the Secretary-General noted that if disarmament was to be undertaken effectively, it might be necessary to impose local arms embargoes and targeted sanctions. In that respect, peacekeeping operations should be given the capacity to monitor and control regional arms traffic, while the international community should focus on the economic dimension of arms flows.

With regard to demobilization, the review revealed the importance of a strong political role and ample resources for peacekeeping operations, including, at times, a deterrent capacity. In addition, it had sometimes been useful to provide funding within the assessed budget of a peacekeeping operation to allow the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process to begin. He suggested that the Council might wish to consider demobilization exercises, or at least their initial stages, as an integral part of the mandate for peacekeeping operations, when such elements played a crucial part in ensuring peace, so that they could be supported by the assessed contributions for the operation.

With respect to reintegration, the Secretary-General observed that while a peacekeeping operation might make direct contributions to reintegration and assist in fostering an appropriate political and socio-economic framework, further efforts were necessary to enhance access by the United Nations to the skills and resources required in that regard. Moreover, the ability of peacekeeping operations to advance reintegration could also be strengthened

through the enhancement of institutional coordination within the international community.

The Secretary-General noted that the ultimate success of a disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process might require efforts long after the withdrawal of a multidisciplinary peacekeeping operation. The deployment of a follow-on mission, in the form of a peacekeeping operation organized around police or a political mission, might help to support advances made and enable further progress. Recalling that the role of a peacekeeping operation in post-conflict disarmament, demobilization and reintegration was rooted in and fed into a broader search for peace and development, the Secretary-General observed that that the international community's key role in the process was to provide clear, consistent and determined support to an overall peace process and to offer long-term assistance with development.

At its 4118th meeting, on 23 March 2000, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report.¹¹ The Council was briefed by the Secretary-General and statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Egypt, Guatemala, Indonesia, Japan, Mongolia, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union¹²), Singapore and South Africa.

In his briefing, the Secretary-General emphasized that while primary responsibility for reintegration fell outside peacekeeping, peacekeeping operations could nonetheless play a key role in that element of post-conflict reconstruction by ensuring that all factions viewed the political process as fair and a legitimate alternative to violence. For peacekeeping operations to succeed in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, he believed that the range of tools available to them should be extended. For example, the focus on the needs of child soldiers should be strengthened, and a more flexible approach by the Council was needed in assessing funding for critical elements of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, so that the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process could go ahead even while funding through voluntary sources was being

¹² Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

mobilized. Furthermore, the ability to locate experienced disarmament experts and trainers for service within peacekeeping operations in the field had to be improved. He concluded that the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process was only one part of the multifaceted approach necessary for peacekeeping to be successful in the twenty-first century.¹³

In their statements, speakers, *inter alia*, expressed support for the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General; stressed the need for the Council to learn from its past experiences in peacekeeping and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and to continue to attach importance to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration as an important bridge from the cessation of hostilities to sustainable peace; and noted that the individual stages of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration were mutually supportive, with the overall success of the process depending on the success of each of its stages. They underscored the need for coordination among all the actors involved in the implementation of a disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process and the importance of the political will of the parties for the success of the process. Speakers also agreed on the need to incorporate disarmament, demobilization and reintegration into the planning of peacekeeping missions and peace agreements and pointed out the necessity for a clear mandate for peacekeeping missions. Representatives drew attention to the need to provide sufficient resources to peacekeeping operations, stem the flow of small arms and light weapons to an area of conflict and enhance the implementation of arms embargoes for an effective disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process.

Speakers, in general, stressed the need for guaranteeing sufficient resources. Several delegations stressed the need to strike a balance between assessed and voluntary contributions for an effective implementation of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes, as well as the need for sustained support by the international community and financial institutions.¹⁴ Noting that a lack of financial resources too often caused the failure of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, the representative of France believed that, at least in the early stages, such

programmes should be able to draw on the budgets of peacekeeping operations. In that respect, the Secretary-General's initiatives regarding seed money for quick impact projects within the assessed budgets of peacekeeping operations deserved encouragement.¹⁵ The representative of Algeria held that reintegration should be given greater attention and in the future be financed through United Nations mission resources and no longer on the basis of voluntary contributions, which were unpredictable and often fell short of the requirements of operations.¹⁶

In the view of the representative of the United States, reintegration work was distinct from the traditional peacekeeping activities of disarmament and demobilization. While their implementation had been at times shared by humanitarian agencies, disarmament and demobilization fell within the purview of the Council and were often part of peacekeeping operations. Reintegration, however, had to be viewed as a post-conflict peacebuilding or development activity.¹⁷

Many speakers also touched upon the issue of former child soldiers and war-affected children in the context of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. Some delegations expressed appreciation for the inclusion of child protection advisers in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes of the United Nations missions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sierra Leone.¹⁸ A number of speakers called attention to similar needs of women ex-combatants, who were particularly vulnerable in the post-conflict phase.¹⁹ Several representatives believed that the commitment to guarantee the security of former combatants who decided to lay down their weapons should be an integral part of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes.²⁰

The representatives of Malaysia and Croatia stressed that all ex-combatants should be reintegrated,

¹³ S/PV.4118, pp. 2-3.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (China); p. 7 (United States); p. 10 (Malaysia); and p. 13 (Jamaica).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Namibia); p. 18 (Ukraine); and p. 29 (Japan); S/PV.4118 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Singapore).

¹⁹ S/PV.4118, p. 7 (United States); p. 9 (Namibia); p. 19 (Bangladesh); and p. 24 (South Africa).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 19 (Bangladesh); p. 24 (South Africa); and p. 28 (Norway); S/PV.4118 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Bahrain).

with the exception of those responsible for war crimes.²¹

The representative of New Zealand cautioned against defining detailed policy approaches to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration applicable to all situations, as no two post-conflict peacebuilding situations were the same. Nevertheless, drawing from his country's experience in East Timor, he stated that the timeliness of the response was one of the key principles that had general applicability.²² That view was shared by the representative of Canada, who advised that a swift and substantive United Nations peacekeeping action lent credibility to the Organization's efforts and to national initiatives, and that in order to include a meaningful disarmament, demobilization and reintegration component in the mandate of peacekeeping operations, the Council had to show a genuine will to build a capacity for rapid and adequate deployment.²³

In regard to the execution of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes, the representatives of Algeria and Mongolia highlighted the need to respect the principles of political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States concerned, as established in the Charter.²⁴ A number of delegations also drew attention to the role

played by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes.²⁵

At its 4119th meeting, on 23 March 2000, at which the Council again included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General,²⁶ the President (Bangladesh) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁷ by which, the Council, inter alia:

Underlined that the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants were mutually supportive;

Stressed that the political commitment of the parties involved in a peace process was a precondition for success of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes;

Reaffirmed that disarmament and demobilization must take place in a secure and safe environment, which would give ex-combatants the confidence to lay down their arms;

Underlined in particular the importance of disarming, demobilizing and reintegrating child soldiers, as well as taking into account the problems faced by war-affected children in mission areas;

Welcomed the initiative of the Secretary-General to include within all peacekeeping operations personnel with appropriate training in international, humanitarian, human rights and refugee law, including child- and gender-related provisions;

Recognized that adequate and timely funding for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration was critical to the successful implementation of a peace process.

²¹ S/PV.4118, p. 10 (Malaysia); S/PV.4118 (Resumption 1), pp. 5-6 (Croatia).

²² S/PV.4118 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

²³ S/PV.4118, p. 17.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 23 (Algeria); S/PV.4118 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Mongolia).

²⁵ S/PV.4118, p. 5 (Russian Federation); and p. 23

(Algeria); S/PV.4118 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Bahrain); and p. 14 (Egypt).

²⁶ S/2000/101.

²⁷ S/PRST/2000/10.

C. Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council

Initial proceedings

Decision of 9 March 2000 (4110th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4109th meeting, on 9 March 2000, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council". At the meeting, statements were made by the Secretary-General; by all Council members, the representatives of Austria (as Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe), Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria,

Colombia, Egypt, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union²⁸) and South Africa, as well as the Permanent Observer of Switzerland.

In his opening statement, the Secretary-General observed that the experiences of the past decade, from

²⁸ Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

Africa to the Balkans to Asia, had drawn attention to the fact that a humanitarian mission held both greater promise and greater peril than almost any other part of the United Nations work. He drew attention to how humanitarian action could save lives and at the same time how it could be exploited and abused by parties unwilling to abide by humanitarian principles and thus subvert such action to further their own inhumane policies. He emphasized three major issues facing humanitarian action: (a) how such action could make a positive contribution to efforts to restore and maintain peace and security; (b) how to continue to make progress in integrating humanitarian and political-military elements of peace operations; and (c) how to ensure that the legal and principled basis of humanitarian action was respected and strengthened. He stressed the importance of giving humanitarian concerns early consideration when comprehensive peace agreements were negotiated, as well as in peacekeeping missions, to ensure sufficient advance planning on the humanitarian side for operations undertaken to implement a peace agreement. He mentioned three ways in which the Council could strengthen its support for humanitarian action. First, the Council could press Member States to commit themselves fully to providing the financial support needed for humanitarian programmes. Second, the Council could consider including in peacekeeping mandates provisions for financing the early stages of post-conflict reconstruction and the restoration of the rule of law. Third, the Council should address the fact that post-conflict peacebuilding activities were routinely hampered by the failure to sustain the flow of resources, leading to gaps between the provision of direct humanitarian assistance and the restoration of longer-term reconstruction and development. In conclusion, he expressed hope that humanitarian concerns would be fully integrated into the Council's efforts to foster peace and security.²⁹

Speakers generally concurred with the observations of the Secretary-General, especially the fact that the Council should deal with humanitarian crises in a timely manner to prevent further complications in finding solutions for such issues. Some representatives advocated the importance of adopting comprehensive and flexible approaches that integrated political, security, humanitarian, human rights and development dimensions to solve the causes

of crises. Other representatives pointed out that addressing humanitarian aspects of crises was not a substitute for political action and stressed the importance of the use of preventive measures in addressing the root causes of conflicts.

Most speakers stressed the importance of the Council ensuring the safe and unimpeded access of humanitarian assistance to war-affected civilians and the safety, security and freedom of movement of the United Nations and associated humanitarian personnel. A number of representatives underlined the importance of the cooperation of all the parties to a given conflict, as well as the need to secure the consent of the Governments of the affected countries in addressing humanitarian emergencies. Some delegations recognized the need to incorporate the humanitarian dimension at the earliest stage in the formulation of clear and viable peacekeeping mandates, and also cautioned that care should be taken to keep a clear distinction between peacekeeping and humanitarian activities. Other speakers observed the need for the Council to develop better coordination with relevant bodies of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, which would enhance a comprehensive and integrated approach in alleviating the hardships suffered by civilians during humanitarian crises.

The representative of France argued that humanitarian crises could reach such degrees of seriousness that the response could be only a political one, which, in certain circumstances, would also require the use of force to put an end to large-scale violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. Those violations in themselves threatened international peace and security and therefore fully justified the use of such action, in accordance with the Charter.³⁰ That view was supported by the representative of Portugal, who agreed that massive and systematic breaches of international humanitarian and human rights law could constitute a threat to peace and security, and in the case of massive and ongoing abuses the consideration by the Council of appropriate enforcement measures, based on clear and identifiable criteria, might be necessary.³¹

In contrast, the representative of Norway noted that while a difficult humanitarian situation might be part of the Council's assessment of whether a situation

²⁹ S/PV.4109, pp. 3-4.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

³¹ S/PV.4109 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

was a threat to peace and security, it was not in itself a sufficient legal basis for the threat or use of force.³² The representative of the Russian Federation underlined that violations of international humanitarian law could not be ended by actions that themselves violated the Charter. He added, echoed by China and Pakistan, that arbitrary military measures that sidestepped the Council, including those taken under the pretext of preventing humanitarian catastrophes, were not acceptable and could only worsen crises. He noted that his country was open to the idea of developing criteria and legal frameworks for activities of the international community, including enforcement in cases of extreme humanitarian situations.³³ Similarly, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran pointed out that in the process of furthering humanitarian causes, the international community might employ coercive measures, including the use of military force, but this could be done only in strict conformity with the Charter and pursuant to a decision by the Council. He expressed the belief that enforcement actions without Council authorization and in contempt of the Charter tended to undermine the current international security system.³⁴ The representative of Belarus also stressed that the concept of “humanitarian intervention” was illogical and was fraught with unforeseeable dangers.³⁵

The representative of Egypt commented on the wording of the agenda item and stated that it provided a very loose framework for discussion, making it difficult for many Member States to address the issue accurately or to speak about it in specific or definitive terms. He noted that the term “humanitarian aspects” could be used to raise various subjects and ideas and involved too many concepts and measures which made it difficult to deal with the various dimensions or component parts of the question with any reasonable degree of confidence.³⁶ The representative of India noted that the fact that 15 members of the Council had so clearly been unable to agree even on the wording of the agenda item showed that the underlying concept was controversial. He pointed out that since there was no comparable legal framework for humanitarian

relief, it might seem to be a greyer area, but it was the sovereign right of a State to determine whether it needed humanitarian assistance or not, and therefore the use of force by the Council would be wrong in law, violating Article 2 (7) of the Charter.³⁷

At the 4110th meeting, on 9 March 2000, the President (Bangladesh) made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁸ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Recalled its primary responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security;

Affirmed that timely consideration of humanitarian issues contributes to the prevention of escalation of conflicts and to the maintenance of international peace and security;

Reaffirmed its concern for the well-being and rights of war-affected civilians and reiterated its call to all parties to ensure safe and unimpeded access of humanitarian personnel to those civilians;

Noted that full and timely support for humanitarian components could be critical in ensuring and enhancing the sustainability of any peace agreement and post-conflict peacebuilding;

Noted that in some instances the integration of humanitarian components into peacekeeping operations would contribute effectively to the fulfilment of their mandate, and, in that regard, noted the importance of adequate training for peacekeeping personnel in, *inter alia*, international humanitarian law and human rights;

Underlined the importance of effective coordination among relevant United Nations organs and agencies, regional bodies and other humanitarian actors in the field;

Recognized the role played by international humanitarian organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations in providing humanitarian assistance and alleviating the impact of humanitarian crises;

Noted with concern the inadequate financial support for humanitarian activities, and called for adequate funding;

Encouraged the Secretary-General to continue to include the humanitarian situation in his regular briefings to the Council on countries under review, as well as the funding status of the United Nations consolidated appeals, where appropriate.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³³ S/PV.4109, p. 15 (Russian Federation); and p. 16 (China) and S/PV.4109 (Resumption 1), and p. 9 (Pakistan).

³⁴ S/PV.4109 (Resumption 1), pp. 18-19.

³⁵ S/PV.4109, p. 23.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

³⁸ S/PRST/2000/7.

D. The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations

Decision of 17 July 2000 (4172nd meeting): resolution 1308 (2000)

At its 4172nd meeting,³⁹ on 17 July 2000, the Council was briefed by the Executive Director of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). Statements were made by a majority of Council members,⁴⁰ and the representatives of Indonesia, Malawi, Uganda and Zimbabwe.

The President (Jamaica) drew attention to a letter dated 5 July 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council, transmitting a note prepared by UNAIDS, summarizing actions taken to date in follow-up to the Council meeting on HIV/AIDS in Africa held on 10 January 2000.⁴¹

In his briefing, the Executive Director of UNAIDS described the recently concluded International Conference on AIDS, held in Durban, South Africa in July 2000, as a “conference of hope”. He underlined the value of prevention and improving the treatment and care offered to people living with the virus, and noted that the main theme of the Conference had been access to treatment. On the strides made since the Council first discussed the subject of HIV/AIDS in January 2000,⁴² he drew attention to (a) the efforts made to increase ease of access to information on the epidemic, pointing to the country response monitoring project; (b) the substantial progress being made by the International Partnership against AIDS in Africa; (c) the country-level efforts to fight the spread of the disease; and (d) the action plan endorsed by an Inter-Agency Standing Committee working group in May 2000, which emphasized the importance of incorporating HIV/AIDS into humanitarian action. He

announced that to facilitate the implementation of the proposals of the working group, a humanitarian coordination unit had been established by the UNAIDS secretariat and a number of countries had been identified for the first phase of the effort. He further welcomed the draft resolution under consideration,⁴³ in particular its recognition that HIV/AIDS posed a threat to human security and could be a destabilizing force worldwide.⁴⁴

Speakers concurred that HIV/AIDS had risen beyond a health crisis to a global one. Referring to the Durban Conference, they noted that the most contentious issue had been access to care and treatment of HIV/AIDS, and welcomed the dialogue that had begun between pharmaceutical companies and United Nations agencies with the goal of accelerating and improving care and access to treatment in developing countries. In the battle against HIV/AIDS, speakers underlined the importance of setting international targets, noting the reference in the resolution that aimed to reduce the rate of infection by 25 per cent by the year 2010. Other areas of concern addressed by the speakers included better coordination and partnership among the relevant bodies and within the United Nations system, and the need for bold national responses to the pandemic. In that context, speakers recalled the role played by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in addressing HIV/AIDS.⁴⁵

Speakers also drew attention to the focus of the resolution on the need to train peacekeepers and other international workers in HIV/AIDS prevention, noting that without adequate training in prevention, peacekeepers could expose themselves to infection and

³⁹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. VI, part I, sect. F, case 3, with regard to relations with subsidiary organs established by the General Assembly; chap. VI, part II, sect. B, case 5, with regards to the constitutional discussion arising in connection with the Economic and Social Council; and chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 39 of the Charter.

⁴⁰ The representatives of China and the Russian Federation did not make statements.

⁴¹ S/2000/657.

⁴² See S/PV.4087.

⁴³ S/2000/696.

⁴⁴ S/PV.4172, pp. 2-4.

⁴⁵ For more information on the relationship between the Council and the Assembly in addressing HIV/AIDS, please see chapter VI, part I, sect. F, case 3, with regard to relations with subsidiary organs established by the General Assembly; and for the relationship between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, see chapter VI, part II, sect. B, case 5, with regard to the constitutional discussion arising in connection with the Economic and Social Council.

spread HIV/AIDS inadvertently. The representative of Tunisia emphasized that peacekeepers, in addition to providing means of protection for themselves and others, had an important role to play in raising awareness of HIV/AIDS.⁴⁶

Speaking on behalf of the European Union,⁴⁷ the representative of France described AIDS as a “massive killer” which in 1999 had caused more deaths on the continent of Africa than all the conflicts raging there combined.⁴⁸ The representative of Zimbabwe, noting that the Secretary-General had stressed in his millennium report⁴⁹ the desperate need for a vaccine against HIV/AIDS, expressed the hope that the Council could make decisions and proposals that could stimulate the desperately needed investment in the area of research or treatment of HIV.⁵⁰

Several speakers called for affordable vaccines against HIV.⁵¹ The representative of Tunisia deemed it unacceptable that the majority of humanity was denied the benefits of medical progress or drugs merely as a result of living in developing countries.⁵²

Responding to comments, the Executive Director of UNAIDS noted that the fact that HIV/AIDS was being conceptualized as a security and development problem and not simply a health problem would change dramatically the kinds of resources that could be used to tackle the problem, which would help UNAIDS tremendously in its very difficult work.⁵³

The President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁵⁴ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1308 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Expressed concern at the potentially damaging impact of HIV/AIDS on the health of international peacekeeping personnel, including support personnel;

Encouraged all interested Member States which had not already done so to consider developing, in cooperation with the international community and UNAIDS, where appropriate, effective long-term strategies for HIV/AIDS education, prevention, voluntary and confidential testing and counselling, and treatment of their personnel, as an important part of their preparation for participation in peacekeeping operations;

Requested the Secretary-General to take further steps towards the provision of training for peacekeeping personnel on issues related to preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS and to continue the further development of pre-deployment orientation and ongoing training for all peacekeeping personnel on these issues;

Encouraged UNAIDS to continue to strengthen its cooperation with interested Member States to further develop its country profiles in order to reflect best practices in and country policies on HIV/AIDS prevention education, testing, counselling and treatment.

Decision of 28 June 2001 (4339th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4259th meeting,⁵⁵ on 19 January 2001, the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations and the Executive Director of UNAIDS. Statements were made by a majority of Council members,⁵⁶ and by the representatives of Canada, Costa Rica, India, Nigeria and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union⁵⁷).

The Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations noted that while there was undeniably a risk of peacekeepers transmitting HIV or contracting it while they were on mission, the means were not yet available to quantify the extent to which that had already occurred or could occur in the future. First, there was generally a lack of reliable data on HIV/AIDS in places where peacekeepers were deployed and, second, reliable data was not available on the prevalence of HIV among contingents. He noted that the first step in mitigating future risks was to increase the awareness of peacekeepers, and those with whom they came into contact locally, about the causes

⁴⁶ S/PV.4172, p. 9.

⁴⁷ Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁴⁸ S/PV.4172, pp. 18-19.

⁴⁹ A/54/2000.

⁵⁰ S/PV.4172, pp. 20-21.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Tunisia); p. 15 (Mali); p. 17 (Bangladesh); and p. 21 (Indonesia).

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-26.

⁵⁴ S/2000/696.

⁵⁵ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 39 of the Charter.

⁵⁶ The representatives of China, Mali and the Russian Federation did not make statements. Singapore was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Norway by its Minister of International Development.

⁵⁷ Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

and prevention of HIV/AIDS. He elaborated on concrete steps taken and new initiatives contemplated by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. On particular points, he reported that the Department had recently put forward a proposal to Member States for the United Nations to reimburse contributors for the costs of conducting HIV testing for their personnel, both predeployment and upon return. While recognizing that it remained the prerogative of Member States to apply their respective policies on testing, he stated that the Department strongly recommended voluntary and confidential counselling and testing. The Under-Secretary-General further stated that the Department was seeking funding for making prophylactics readily available in all missions. The Department, he indicated, would continue to evaluate the effectiveness of all its programmes and activities and would also examine the necessary staffing levels related to HIV-related issues. He announced that the Department and UNAIDS had recently signed a memorandum of understanding, which further developed and institutionalized the cooperative relationship between the respective organizations.⁵⁸

The Executive Director of UNAIDS paid tribute to the Council for helping to transform the way in which AIDS was viewed by characterizing the global epidemic as a fundamental issue of human security. He maintained that much of the global agenda on AIDS was unfinished, especially the continuing inequities in access to effective care and treatments and even to life-saving materials such as condoms. He noted that in 2000 there has been increasing acceptance by Governments and industry of the moral legitimacy of equity pricing — the idea that poorer countries should be able to buy essential drugs at lower prices than wealthy countries. He also announced that as the role of HIV testing in peacekeeping operations was a complex issue, he had decided to establish, in conjunction with the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, a senior expert panel to analyse and formulate a comprehensive position on the issue of HIV testing for peacekeepers and humanitarian personnel.⁵⁹

Speakers expressed their gratitude to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and UNAIDS for their work, despite insufficient staffing and

resources, to curb the spread of HIV/AIDS, especially in hardest-hit Africa, and encouraged them to continue their efforts to train peacekeepers on issues relating to the prevention of HIV/AIDS. Reiterating their conviction that the HIV/AIDS pandemic was a threat to international peace and security and underscoring its long-term social and economic impact, as well as its potentially damaging impact on the health of international peacekeeping personnel, many speakers underlined the need for efforts to ensure the implementation of resolution 1308 (2000). Speakers also looked forward to the special session of the General Assembly on HIV/AIDS, to be held in June 2001.

The representative of the United Kingdom expressed support for the development by UNAIDS of a United Nations system strategic plan and stressed the need to mainstream HIV/AIDS in all relevant work on international peace and security, especially in Africa.⁶⁰

Several speakers stressed the importance of making medication affordable to people in developing countries.⁶¹ The representative of Ireland held that clarity was needed on such issues such as tiered pricing, compulsory licensing, parallel imports and the rights and obligations of both patent holders and signatories to international patent protection agreements.⁶²

Many speakers emphasized the need to raise awareness of HIV/AIDS among peacekeepers and increase the training afforded to peacekeepers before deployment. The representative of Canada suggested that the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and UNAIDS meet soon with troop-contributing countries to assess the progress made in undertaking the requirements of resolution 1308 (2000). He underlined that care should be taken not to demonize peacekeepers, as no one believed they were the heart of the problem, while HIV/AIDS was a serious security challenge.⁶³

The representative of Jamaica emphasized the critical role of the Department of Peacekeeping

⁵⁸ S/PV.4259, pp. 2-6.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16 (Norway); p. 18 (Tunisia); and pp. 22-23 (France); S/PV.4259 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Mauritius); p. 10 (Costa Rica); p. 12 (Nigeria); and p. 15 (Singapore).

⁶² S/PV.4259 (Resumption 1), p. 4.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

Operations in ensuring the development of adequate policy guidelines on acceptable behaviour in relation to HIV/AIDS.⁶⁴ The representative of Norway recommended that all United Nations peacekeeping personnel be offered voluntary confidential counselling and testing, both pre- and post-deployment; that every peacekeeping operation have a focal point for HIV/AIDS; that resident coordinators ensure that United Nations dispensary staff receive regular training on all aspects of HIV/AIDS prevention; and that male and female condoms be freely available on all United Nations premises.⁶⁵ The representative of Nigeria held that the Department should embark upon a massive information campaign to educate United Nations peacekeepers on the HIV pandemic before their deployment. He further proposed that the Secretariat and the Council, during their consultations with troop-contributing countries, could provide data on the prevalence of HIV/AIDS in a particular field of operation before the troops were deployed. He added that the information would facilitate the taking of preventive measures by those countries before the departure of their troops.⁶⁶

The representative of Sweden, speaking on behalf of the European Union, held that the United Nations should support the creation of national HIV/AIDS programmes wherever they were not already in place.⁶⁷

The representative of the United States stated that HIV/AIDS was the most important and biggest problem in the world today. In regard to the efforts made by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations in implementing resolution 1308 (2000), he admitted that the Department was understaffed, but described its HIV/AIDS handbooks as technical, wordy, not clear-cut and out of date, and devoid of any reference to resolution 1308 (2000). He believed they should be rewritten and made clearer and more useful. He suggested that the Department establish a separate unit to deal specifically with HIV/AIDS and include the cost of pre- and post-deployment HIV tests as a standard line item in the regular peacekeeping budget. Referring to the resistance he had encountered when trying to bring a health issue to the Council, he called on the United Nations to put outcome over process to accomplish more. He expressed the view that putting

the issue on the agenda would help to save lives from HIV/AIDS, as the stigma attached to it and its long incubation period would kill more people than even the worst conflicts before the Council.⁶⁸

The representative of India held that AIDS was not and had not been a cause of conflict and, disputing the provision in resolution 1308 (2000) that the HIV/AIDS pandemic was also exacerbated by conditions of violence and instability, stated that the countries with the highest prevalence of HIV/AIDS were, without exception, democracies with stable recent histories, either completely or largely free of conflict. Citing a recent study regarding the Democratic Republic of the Congo, he concluded that there was no organic link between conflict and AIDS. He noted that India would find unfortunate the imputation that peacekeepers were either necessarily at risk or carriers of the disease. He further held that singling out HIV/AIDS awareness for peacekeepers, as the Council had done in its recent resolutions, was not only needless, but presented a misleading picture of the problems that peacekeepers faced and for which they must prepare. He stated that if the Council believed that HIV/AIDS was a threat to international peace and security, it had not only the right but also the duty to rule that article 73 of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) be invoked to urgently provide affordable medicines that help in the treatment of the epidemic.⁶⁹

At the 4339th meeting, on 28 June 2001, in which the Executive Director of UNAIDS was invited to participate, the President (Bangladesh) made a statement on behalf of the Council.⁷⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the fact that the Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS, adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth special session, contained a number of practical measures at the national and international levels, to be met within given time frames, to reduce the impact of conflict and disasters on the spread of HIV/AIDS;

Noted the progress made in the implementation of resolution 1308 (2000) and commended the increased cooperation in this regard between the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and UNAIDS;

⁶⁴ S/PV.4259, pp. 21-22.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

⁶⁶ S/PV.4259 (Resumption 1), p. 12.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁶⁸ S/PV.4259, pp. 10-13.

⁶⁹ S/PV.4259 (Resumption 1), pp. 13-14.

⁷⁰ S/PRST/2001/16.

Recognized that further efforts were necessary to reduce the negative impact of conflict and disasters on the spread of HIV/AIDS;

Encouraged continued efforts with regard to relevant training for peacekeeping, predeployment orientation and increased international cooperation in areas such as prevention, voluntary and confidential testing and counselling, treatment for personnel, and the exchange of best practices and country policies in this regard;

Expressed its intention to contribute within its competence to the attainment of the relevant objectives in the Declaration adopted by General Assembly at the twenty-sixth special session of the General Assembly.

Deliberations of 17 November 2003 (4859th meeting)

At its 4859th meeting,⁷¹ on 17 November 2003, the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations and the Executive Director of UNAIDS. Statements were made by all Council members.

The Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations recalled that the focus of resolution 1308 (2000) had been on the vulnerability to HIV/AIDS of uniformed services and international peacekeeping personnel, which included civilian staff. Among the measures instituted by the United Nations since the resolution's adoption, he drew attention to the establishment of the HIV/AIDS trust fund; the appointment of the HIV/AIDS advisers and focal points in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and in the major peacekeeping missions; and advances in HIV/AIDS awareness training, including updated publications and predeployment and in-mission training programmes. Noting that, with 92 countries contributing military personnel and civilian police, it presented an immense challenge to making training culturally specific, the Under-Secretary-General appealed to countries to mainstream HIV/AIDS awareness in their national training programmes. In addition, he hoped that the following year, Member States would accept the Secretariat's proposal that the United Nations reimburse troop-contributing countries for the cost of voluntary confidential counselling and testing. He further reiterated the Department's zero-tolerance stance regarding sexual abuse and exploitation by peacekeeping personnel. He added that

⁷¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 39 of the Charter.

the Department was seeking to capitalize on the positive potential of peacekeepers as agents of change who could share their knowledge about HIV with local populations and respond to sexual violence and exploitation. The Department was also working to assist host countries at the strategic level, providing guidance to national armed forces on ways to mainstream awareness programming.⁷²

The Executive Director of UNAIDS asserted that the Council's consideration of AIDS in January 2000 and its subsequent adoption of resolution 1308 (2000) had reshaped the global landscape of the fight against AIDS and laid the groundwork for the prominence given to AIDS as a security issue. However, he regretted that the Council had not addressed AIDS expressly in several recent resolutions establishing and extending United Nations missions, especially those in regions experiencing major HIV epidemics. Nonetheless, in his view, the Council's resolve had been integral to winning the support of national Governments in responding in a more concerted fashion to the threat of AIDS in the peacekeeping context and had opened the door for UNAIDS to work with defence and civil defence forces. The Executive Director indicated that he planned to present to the Council in 2004 a detailed progress report on UNAIDS implementation activities in relation to resolution 1308 (2000). Declaring that AIDS was not only a great moral challenge, but also a barrier to development and a fundamental threat to security, he expressed his appreciation to the Security Council for its part in meeting that challenge, and stated that he looked forward to the continued leadership of the Council.⁷³

Council members recalled that resolution 1308 (2000) was a milestone in the struggle against the scourge of HIV/AIDS, which had the potential to unravel societies, destroy economies, evaporate progress made in development and threaten international peace and security. They shared the view that HIV/AIDS continued to threaten to kill more people and undermine more societies than any other conflict addressed by the Council.

Recalling that in conflict and post-conflict areas, peacekeepers were at high risk for HIV/AIDS, speakers were encouraged by the progress made in implementing resolution 1308 (2000). In particular,

⁷² S/PV.4859, pp. 2-5.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

they commended the practical work undertaken by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and UNAIDS and the improved coordination between them in combating the epidemic.

Council members also welcomed the steps taken by the Department in increasing the awareness of peacekeepers, establishing the post of HIV/AIDS advisers, creating focal points in missions and revising the code of conduct. The representative of Germany noted that the three related areas of HIV/AIDS, women and peace and security, and children and armed conflict were key components in setting up future peacekeeping missions. The creation of the United Nations Mission in Liberia was therefore very encouraging.⁷⁴

Speakers expressed support for the creation of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Many representatives detailed the steps taken by their Governments in addressing the danger posed by the disease in their national armed forces.⁷⁵

Council members stressed that the eradication of the disease required further strong cooperative action on the part of the entire international community, as well as an urgent need to provide adequate resources for the implementation of resolution 1308 (2000), bearing in mind the 2005 targets set in the Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS. The representative of Germany believed that progress should be followed closely in both the Council and the General Assembly.⁷⁶ The representative of the United Kingdom noted that the Council had to be clear that it was fulfilling its potential in working collectively with the

Assembly and the Economic and Social Council to ensure that the response of the United Nations system was coherent and effective.⁷⁷ Similarly, the representative of France observed that the Security Council, together with the Economic and Social Council, should consider means to respond more effectively to the challenges linked to HIV/AIDS.⁷⁸

A few representatives underlined the need for a joint evaluation report by UNAIDS and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations on implementation of resolution 1308 (2000), to be available by 2004.⁷⁹ The representative of the United Kingdom held also that the Council should draw on experience of UNAIDS, the Department and others to offer a clear evidence base for the links between peace, security and HIV/AIDS, and with suggestions for action; and the Council should ask the Secretary-General to bring both strands together in a definitive assessment for consideration by the Council in 2005.⁸⁰

The representative of Mexico urged Member States to assist developing countries that supply troop contingents for peacekeeping operations as they did not have the resources necessary for voluntary and confidential counselling and testing.⁸¹ The representative of Germany held that testing facilities should be part of all peacekeeping operations.⁸² The representative of Chile drew attention to the need for a coordinated approach regarding HIV/AIDS prevention when United Nations peacekeepers were replaced by regional organizations.⁸³

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 15.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 11 (United States); p. 12 (Chile); p. 14 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 17 (Bulgaria); p. 18 (France); p. 20 (Guinea); p. 23 (Pakistan); and p. 25 (Angola).

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 15.

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 9.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 18.

⁷⁹ Ibid., pp. 9-10 (United Kingdom); p. 12 (Chile); and p. 23 (Cameroon).

⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 9-10.

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 21.

⁸² Ibid., p. 15.

⁸³ Ibid., p. 12.

E. Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa

Decision of 7 September 2000 (4194th meeting): resolution 1318 (2000)

At its 4194th meeting,⁸⁴ held at the level of Heads of State and Government, on 7 September 2000, the Council was briefed by the Secretary-General. Statements were made by all Council members.⁸⁵

In his introductory remarks, the President of the Council (Mali) stressed that Member States, in renewing their commitment to the ideals and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations as well as their commitment to achieving real progress towards international peace and security, must accord the United Nations the necessary means to achieve peace.⁸⁶

The Secretary-General, citing what he considered to be a crisis of credibility facing the Council, noted the need for prompt, united and effective action in halting conflict and restoring peace, especially in Africa, where millions were suffering from the ravages of war. He stressed the importance of summoning the will to act preventively, before crises spiralled out of control. Whether in the case of sanctions, peacekeeping operations or armed intervention as a last resort, he stressed that the will to act had to be accompanied by the ability to act effectively and decisively. Affirming his commitment to implementing the changes proposed in the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations of 21 August 2000 (the Brahimi report),⁸⁷

he urged Council members and the larger United Nations membership to do likewise.⁸⁸

Echoing the Secretary-General, Council members generally noted that in recent years, conflicts, including in Africa, were increasingly internal in nature and their settlement required addressing the root cause of conflict. Council members also highlighted the importance of conflict prevention, stressing the need for addressing such core issues as the illegal exploitation of natural resources, trafficking in narcotics and small arms, terrorism and fundamentalism. In that context, the representatives of France and the Netherlands advocated a greater role for the Secretary-General in the field of conflict prevention.⁸⁹

Several speakers addressed the issue of State sovereignty and the principle of non-intervention.⁹⁰ While noting that the principle of non-intervention had to be respected, the representative of Argentina stated that a complementary value should be added, namely the principle of non-indifference, which meant that perpetrators of crimes that offended the common conscience of humankind could not be left unpunished.⁹¹ Similarly, the representative of Jamaica observed that breaches of international humanitarian and human rights laws must not go unchallenged and therefore held that rightful concerns over sovereignty could not justify turning a blind eye to the forces of evil.⁹² The representative of China held that wilful use of force and interference in the internal affairs of other countries in the name of humanitarianism not only ran counter to the purposes and principles of the Charter, but would also have severe negative consequences. He stressed that the success of peacekeeping operations

⁸⁴ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. I, part I, sect. B, case 2, with regard to procedural developments relating to meetings; and chap. XII, part III, sect. A, with regard to general considerations of the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter.

⁸⁵ Argentina, China, France, Mali, Namibia, the Russian Federation, Tunisia, Ukraine and the United States were represented by their respective Presidents; Bangladesh, Canada, Jamaica, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom were represented by their respective Prime Ministers; and Malaysia was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

⁸⁶ S/PV.4194, pp. 2-3.

⁸⁷ S/2000/809, prepared by the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations established by the Secretary-General, and chaired by former minister for foreign affairs of

Algeria, Lakhdar Brahimi. It contained an assessment of the ability of the United Nations to conduct peace operations effectively and offered specific recommendations for ways in which the Organization could enhance that capacity.

⁸⁸ S/PV.4194, pp. 3-4.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (France); and p. 17 (Netherlands).

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Argentina); pp. 7-8 (China); and p. 16 (Jamaica).

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

depended on the observance of the purposes and principles of the Charter, particularly the principles of respect for State sovereignty, non-interference in the internal affairs of recipient countries, seeking prior consent of the parties concerned, neutrality and the non-use of force except for self-defence.⁹³

Many members welcomed the recommendations contained in the Brahimi report and recognized that further consideration of such proposals was needed with a view to implementing them. Furthermore, Council members supported the recommendations concerning the need for peace operations to have sufficient resources, quality troops and proper equipment, objectives in line with operating mandates, and a strengthened partnership between the Council, the Secretariat and regional organizations and initiatives.

Drawing attention to the destabilizing effect of infectious diseases, the representative of the United States stressed the need to define security more broadly. He added that the Council would increasingly have to deal with such issues as HIV/AIDS and climate change and expressed hope that the Council would have a twenty-first century vision of security.⁹⁴ A number of representatives held that international security in the twenty-first century had to be understood in terms of human security.⁹⁵ The representative of Canada noted that, while remaining essential, the security of States was not sufficient to ensure the safety and well-being of people. He further recalled his delegation's past efforts to broaden the Council's definition of security to encompass new human security challenges and insisted on the need for the Council to give greater weight to humanitarian principles and human rights when making decisions.⁹⁶

The representative of Namibia urged the Council to accord equal importance to all regions of the world in undertaking swift response to breaches of international peace and security. He demanded that Africa not be treated as an afterthought.⁹⁷ Similarly, the representative of Malaysia stressed the importance

of an even-handed, rather than a selective, approach by the Council to conflict situations.⁹⁸

Calling for better use of sanctions, several speakers noted that when such measures were resorted to, they should be proportionate to the objective and targeted to achieve maximum results with minimal effect on civilian populations.⁹⁹

The President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁰⁰ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1318 (2000),¹⁰¹ by which the Council decided to adopt a declaration, annexed to the resolution, on ensuring an effective role for the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa.

Decision of 13 November 2000 (4220th meeting): resolution 1327 (2000)

At its 4220th meeting,¹⁰² on 13 November 2000, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 10 November 2000 from the Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on the Brahimi Report¹⁰³ addressed to the President of the Council,¹⁰⁴ transmitting the report of the Working Group; the

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 18.

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 9 (France); p. 10 (Namibia); p. 13 (Ukraine); p. 18 (Malaysia); and p. 19 (Mali).

¹⁰⁰ S/2000/845.

¹⁰¹ At the same meeting, the Council adopted a presidential statement in connection with the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (S/PRST/2000/28). For more information, see section 10 of the present chapter (The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo).

¹⁰² For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. VI, part VI, case 18, with regard to relations with the Military Staff Committee; chap. X, part IV, with regard to the constitutional discussion bearing on the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter; chapter XI, part V, section B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 43 of the Charter; and chap. XI, part V, sect. F, with regard to the discussion relating to Articles 46 to 47.

¹⁰³ The Security Council Working Group on the Brahimi Report (S/2000/809) was established on 3 October 2000 pursuant to a decision by the Council to undertake a comprehensive review of the recommendations contained in the report on improving the role of the United Nations in peace operations. For more information, see chap. V, part I, sect. C, with regard to informal and ad hoc working groups.

¹⁰⁴ S/2000/1084.

⁹³ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 5.

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 6 (Argentina); p. 14 (Bangladesh); and p. 15 (Canada).

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 15.

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 10.

results of its discussions were set out in the form of a draft resolution and an annex containing a number of decisions and recommendations for the Council.

At the meeting, statements were made by all Council members. At the outset, the President (Netherlands) drew attention to the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the Brahimi report,¹⁰⁵ and to the text of a draft resolution,¹⁰⁶ which contained an annex identical to that above-mentioned report of the Working Group. The draft resolution was adopted unanimously as resolution 1327 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Agreed to adopt the decisions and recommendations contained in the annex to the resolution; and decided to review periodically the implementation of the provisions contained in the annex.

Decided to remain actively seized of the matter.

Following the adoption of the resolution, Council members expressed their support for the work undertaken by the Working Group and observed that the Council had taken an important step forward by adopting a resolution which implemented a number of the recommendations included therein. Speakers particularly supported the recommendations whereby the Council resolved to give peacekeeping operations clearer, more credible and achievable mandates as well as appropriate resources to fulfil those mandates, in the light of the changing nature of peacekeeping operations and conflicts. Speakers also drew attention to, *inter alia*, the need to improve the rapid deployment capacity of the United Nations, ensure the safety of peacekeepers and improve the training of peacekeeping forces. A number of Council members also recommended that, in line with the recommendations included in the Brahimi report, more effective conflict prevention strategies be adopted, and underlined the importance of addressing the root causes of conflicts and of elaborating better peacebuilding strategies.

¹⁰⁵ S/2000/1081, including recommendations in the areas of enhancing the effectiveness of key peace and security instruments; creating new mechanisms for improving system-wide integration; enhancing rapid and effective deployment capacities; securing funding for Headquarters support to peacekeeping operations; restructuring the Department of Peacekeeping Operations; strengthening other parts of the United Nations system; and improving information technology and knowledge management.

¹⁰⁶ S/2000/1085.

The representative of Argentina observed that lack of participation by States with greater capability, in resources and means, could have a deterrent effect on other troop-contributing countries, which made all initiatives geared towards obtaining a stronger commitment from the most capable States attractive to countries of moderate resources.¹⁰⁷ Similarly, the representative of Tunisia noted that the provision of sufficient numbers of troops and equipment for peacekeeping operations was an issue of collective responsibility incumbent upon all Member States, in particular those having greater means and capacities.¹⁰⁸

The representative of Bangladesh drew attention to the seriousness of the question of a commitment gap and supported the Panel's recommendations to keep Council resolutions in draft form until a firm commitment of troops was available. He also spoke in favour of permanent Council members each contributing 5 per cent of the troops needed for each peacekeeping operation.¹⁰⁹ In response, the representative of the United Kingdom rejected the implication that all permanent members failed to meet their responsibilities in respect of peacekeeping and recalled some of his country's contributions to peacekeeping operations.¹¹⁰

Council members unanimously underlined the importance of an improved system of consultations between troop-contributing countries, the Secretary-General and the Council. The representative of Bangladesh held that those consultations, whatever the provisions of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, should be neither traditional troop-contributor meetings nor private meetings in the Council Chamber. Rather, they should be in a format that allowed a free exchange of views between Council members and troop-contributing countries, and they should include the necessary substantive briefings.¹¹¹

In that context, several members endorsed the Council's request for regular military briefings from the Secretariat.¹¹² The representative of Canada believed that the Council, when considering the creation of a peacekeeping force, should receive timely

¹⁰⁷ S/PV.4220, p. 10.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 3 (Jamaica); p. 7 (Bangladesh); p. 9 (Canada); and p. 11 (United Kingdom).

military advice from those directly involved in the military dimension of a peacekeeping mission.¹¹³ The representative of Bangladesh voiced his delegation's strong support for humanitarian briefings by the Secretariat.¹¹⁴ The representative of Jamaica, echoed by the representative of Mali, advocated the strengthening of consultations and cooperation with regional organizations.¹¹⁵

While welcoming the initiative to more frequently deploy fact-finding missions to areas of tension as a means of preventing crises, the representative of Mali cautioned that conflict-prevention measures should not be taken in violation of the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of States.¹¹⁶

On the need to mainstream the gender perspective into United Nations peacekeeping operations, the representative of Jamaica, while recalling that the gender perspective had been absent from the Brahimi report, welcomed references to the issue in the implementation report of the Secretary-General¹¹⁷ and the resolution.¹¹⁸ The representative of Namibia fully endorsed the mainstreaming of a gender perspective into peacekeeping operations and was satisfied with the creation of a gender unit within the Department of Peacekeeping Operations.¹¹⁹

Decision of 22 March 2001 (4302nd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4288th meeting,¹²⁰ on 7 March 2001, the Council included in its agenda letter dated 28 February 2001 from the representative of Ukraine addressed to

the Secretary-General,¹²¹ transmitting a working paper prepared by the President of the Security Council to serve as the basis for the discussion. In his opening remarks, the President (Ukraine), recalling that the meeting constituted a follow-up to the high-level meeting held by the Council on 7 September 2000 on the same item, stated that the debate would focus on evaluating the progress achieved in the implementation of the declaration contained in resolution 1318 (2000) and on exploring further ways to enhance the role of the Council in the maintenance of international peace and security.¹²²

At the meeting, the Council was briefed by the Secretary-General and statements were made by a majority of Council members,¹²³ and by the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Croatia, Egypt, Japan, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union¹²⁴).

The Secretary-General, recalling his statement during the high-level meeting on 7 September 2000 that the Council was facing a crisis of credibility, expressed the hope that the current meeting would assess whether that was still true and what progress had been made in overcoming the crisis. Stressing that the impact of the Council's resolutions depended on a great deal of effort by Member States as well as by the Secretariat, he stated that continuous dialogue was needed with Member States to translate the aspirations of each resolution into real change on the ground. Referring to resolutions 1318 (2000) and 1327 (2000), and recognizing that by adopting such resolutions the Council had undertaken important new commitments, the Secretary-General hoped that the most strenuous effort would be made by Member States to translate into action the important provisions included therein.¹²⁵

Focusing their statements on the implementation of resolutions 1318 (2000) and 1327 (2000), the majority of speakers reiterated the need to strengthen

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (Jamaica); and p. 16 (Mali).

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹¹⁷ S/2000/1081.

¹¹⁸ S/PV.4220, p. 3.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

¹²⁰ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. VI, part VI, case 18, with regard to relations with the Military Staff Committee; chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 41 of the Charter, chap. XI, part V, sect. F, with regard to the discussions relating to Articles 46 to 47; chap. XI, part VIII, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 50; and chap. XII, part III, sect. A, with regard to general considerations of the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter.

¹²¹ S/2001/185.

¹²² S/PV.4288, p. 2.

¹²³ The representative of Ukraine did not make a statement in his national capacity.

¹²⁴ Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

¹²⁵ S/PV.4288, pp. 2-3.

the efficiency and effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping operations, while highlighting the importance of conflict prevention and the need to address the root causes of conflicts; welcomed the establishment of the Working Group of the whole on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations;¹²⁶ and stressed the importance of enhancing the Council's cooperation with regional and subregional organizations as well as with troop-contributing countries.

With respect to consultations with troop-contributing countries, the representative of Canada emphasized that, to develop a meaningful three-way relationship between the Security Council, the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries, a mechanism should be found for troop contributors to participate fully in the decision-making process for Council-mandated operations.¹²⁷ Similarly, the representative of Egypt called for the formalization and institutionalization of the method of consultation between troop-contributing countries and the Council at all stages of the formulation of the mandates of peacekeeping operations, and during all steps taken by the Council to revise, review, extend or terminate those mandates.¹²⁸ Several representatives noted that while in recent years the Council had paid more attention to the conflicts in Africa, its involvement came too late or was inadequate.¹²⁹ The representative of Singapore concluded that the Council's responses to conflict situations had remained inconsistent.¹³⁰ In response, the representative of France pointed out that the United Nations could not entrust the same objectives to all of its missions, as each operation had to be judged by what could and should be accomplished.¹³¹ The representatives of the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation acknowledged that the Council could not give equal priority to all conflicts, but instead had to concentrate on those crises that were most susceptible to treatment.¹³² The representative of Norway held that the authority of the Council depended to a great extent

on its ability to demonstrate that it gave equal priority to the maintenance of international peace and security in every region of the world.¹³³

On the issue of peacebuilding, the representative of Sweden, speaking on behalf of the European Union, held that it was essential to give the Secretariat an information and analysis capacity that would permit it to understand both the profound and immediate causes of conflict.¹³⁴ The representative of Japan underlined the importance of ensuring a smooth transition from conflict prevention to peacebuilding.¹³⁵ Noting that peacebuilding was well beyond the responsibilities of the Council alone, the representative of Brazil stated that peacebuilding required strong political will and commitment on the part of both the recipient country and the donor community and that the involvement of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council was necessary.¹³⁶ In that sense, a number of speakers generally stressed the need for cooperation between the Council and other organs of the United Nations, including the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.¹³⁷ The representative of Mauritius believed that a special unit should be set up in the Secretariat to facilitate coordination between the Security Council and various United Nations bodies in the area of post-conflict peacebuilding.¹³⁸

At its 4302nd meeting, on 22 March 2001, the Council resumed consideration of the letter dated 28 February 2001 from the representative of Ukraine addressed to the Secretary-General.¹³⁹

The President (Ukraine) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁴⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Noted the progress achieved in translating the commitments made at its summit meeting into practical results and expressed its determination to intensify efforts to that end;

Underlined the importance of the declaration on ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa, as a

¹²⁶ For more information, see chap. V, part I, sect. C, with regard to informal and ad hoc working groups.

¹²⁷ S/PV.4288, p. 4.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Algeria); p. 12 (Egypt); p. 18 (Pakistan); and p. 22 (Namibia).

¹³⁰ S/PV.4288 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 11 (United Kingdom); and p. 14 (Russian Federation).

¹³³ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹³⁴ S/PV.4288, p. 6.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21 (Peru); and p. 24 (Belarus); S/PV.4288 (Resumption 1), pp. 11-12 (United Kingdom); and p. 14 (Russian Federation).

¹³⁸ S/PV.4288 (Resumption 1), p. 23.

¹³⁹ S/2001/185.

¹⁴⁰ S/PRST/2001/10.

contribution towards the development of a well-targeted strategy and shared vision in the maintenance of international peace and security and of the deeper and broader involvement of Member States and the wider international community in that regard;

Underlined the need for closer cooperation and interaction within the United Nations system in addressing the challenges to

peace and security, including the root causes of conflicts, and intended to continue taking concrete steps in advancing that goal;

Decided to conduct a further review, with the active participation of non-members, of the implementation of the commitments made at its meeting at the level of Heads of State and Government.

38. Children and armed conflict

Decision of 11 August (4185th meeting): resolution 1314 (2000)

On 19 July 2000, the Secretary-General submitted the first report on children and armed conflict,¹ which contained an overview of the fate of children in conflict areas, traced the progress made in addressing the situation of children and indicated the challenges that lay ahead. Drawing on concrete activities from the field, the Secretary-General made a number of recommendations related to the normative foundation of the protection of children; the protection of children in the midst of conflict; integrating the protection of children into peacemaking and peacekeeping; post-conflict peacebuilding for children; regional initiatives on behalf of children affected by armed conflict; and the role of non-governmental organizations and civil society in shaping the agenda regarding children affected by armed conflict. With regard to the Security Council, the Secretary-General recommended, inter alia, that the Council urge armed groups to commit themselves to the child protection standards embodied in the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its Optional Protocol and in international humanitarian law, and to accept and cooperate in the monitoring of adherence to those standards; demand that parties involved in armed conflict not commit egregious crimes against children, or face the possibility of targeted sanctions if they failed to comply; call on all parties to conflict and other concerned actors to give systematic consideration to the special needs and particular vulnerabilities of girls; develop a coordinated and integrated approach to minimize the unintended consequences of sanctions on civilian populations, especially children, primarily through the establishment of effective humanitarian exemptions; reaffirm the responsibility of targeted States and armed groups to ensure the humanitarian

protection of all those under their control, particularly children; and encourage collaboration between the United Nations and regional organizations for the protection of children affected by armed conflict.

At its 4176th meeting,² on 26 July 2000, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report.³ The Council was briefed by the Deputy Secretary-General, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict and the Executive Director of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Statements were made by most Council members⁴ and by the representatives of Austria (in his capacity as Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe), Barbados, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the Sudan, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uganda, as well as by the head of the delegation of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

Introducing the report, the Deputy Secretary-General noted that since the adoption of resolution 1261 (1999), which had placed the issue of children and armed conflict on the peace and security agenda,

² For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 39 of the Charter; and chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 41.

³ S/2000/712.

⁴ The representative of Mali did not make a statement. The representative of France spoke on behalf of the European Union; Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹ S/2000/712, submitted pursuant to paragraph 20 of resolution 1261 (1999).

progress had been achieved on the issue of protection of children in war-torn areas. Achievements included the adoption of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which focused on the involvement of children in armed conflict, and the deployment of child protection advisers in Sierra Leone and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Despite those positive developments, children continued to be killed, maimed, sexually abused, recruited into armed forces or deprived of life-saving humanitarian assistance. She concluded by expressing the hope that the Council would show the necessary political leadership in the fight against those who exploited children.⁵

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict detailed some of the progress that had been achieved on the agenda, which included an increase in public awareness; raising the minimum age for compulsory recruitment and deployment from 15 to 18; the systematic inclusion of child protection concerns into peace operation mandates by the Council; the insertion of sections on the protection and well-being of children in reports to the Council on specific conflict situations; the establishment and deployment of child protection advisers; the placing of children's concerns on peace agendas; the elaboration of training programmes for peacekeepers in the domain of the rights and protection of children and women; the increasing and widespread engagement of non-governmental organizations in advocacy work; increasing focus and resource allocation for children in post-conflict situations; and some innovative national initiatives on behalf of war-affected children, such as the National Commission for War-Affected Children in Sierra Leone and the enactment of a new law in Rwanda which opened the way for girls to inherit land and other property. He stressed that the challenge ahead was how to ensure that parties in conflict adhered to the commitments made concerning the protection of children. In that regard, the Council and other key actors could make a big difference by using their collective weight and influence to lean on parties in conflict. He stressed that the international community should make any assistance to parties in armed conflict contingent on their observing standards for the protection of children, and should encourage the corporate sector to develop voluntary codes of conduct regarding illicit trade with

⁵ S/PV.4176, p. 3.

parties in conflict where children and women are the primary victims. In the context of peace processes, he believed that crimes against children should be excluded from any amnesty provisions and legislation. He further hoped that the Council would continue to explore measures to ease the impact of sanctions on children. The Special Representative also praised the actions taken by regional groups and hoped that the Council would encourage regional organizations to systematically incorporate the rights and protection of children into their policies, activities and programmes. In his opinion, the international community needed to fill three gaps within the existing mode of response: the special needs of girls, the vulnerability of the adolescent and the importance of providing more consistent education to children both caught in the midst of, and in the aftermath of, conflict.⁶

The Executive Director of UNICEF asked Council members to do everything in their power to ensure that the words contained in the Secretary-General's report and in Council resolutions became deeds that made a difference to the lives of children. On the basis of the experiences of UNICEF in conflict areas, she highlighted several critical issues, such as the need for education programmes to be restarted as soon as possible, even when conflict still raged, and for hospitals, clinics, schools and other sites where children were more likely to be found to be protected from attacks and violence. Furthermore, she held that children should have their own demobilization programmes; that the parties to a conflict must be actively engaged in upholding the international standards protecting children; that the vulnerability of girls, especially to sexual abuse and other forms of violence and abuse, must be addressed; that the lack of security for humanitarian personnel reduced access to children in need; and that landmine-awareness programmes could significantly reduce death and injury rates. She expressed the hope that the Council's response to the report would be strong and unambiguous, with determined and intensive follow-up. That meant that in authorizing any peacekeeping missions, imposing sanctions, facilitating a ceasefire or finding ways to prevent conflict, the Council would ensure that children's rights were addressed in a practical and effective way. When warring parties or others violated the provisions of any resolution, including resolution 1261 (1999), she urged Council

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.

members to speak out collectively and individually, to make it clear that violators were overstepping the bounds of decent and acceptable behaviour.⁷

In their statements, speakers welcomed the adoption of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child by the General Assembly and insisted that the development of new legal standards had to be supported by effective efforts in the field to ensure their implementation. In that connection, they recommended the establishment of monitoring and reporting mechanisms to ensure the compliance of armed groups and non-State actors with their commitments regarding the protection of children. Referring to the necessity of ending impunity both for crimes committed against children and for the use of children as soldiers, most speakers welcomed the conclusion of the Rome Statute for the establishment of the International Criminal Court.

Observing that the best way to protect children was to prevent conflict, speakers also stressed the need to address the economic, social and political causes of conflict and establish systems which protected children before conflict broke out, and to improve access to education, which could play an important role in protecting children from forced recruitment. To achieve those goals, they called for improved coordination among the agencies of the United Nations and for enhanced cooperation with regional organizations, non-governmental organizations and civil society. Equally important, in their view, was the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of child soldiers, which should be an integral part of the humanitarian relief and peacebuilding strategy. In the post-conflict phase, the emphasis should be on the reintegration of former child soldiers to avoid their return to armed groups. Speakers also expressed support for the recommendations in the report of the Secretary-General addressing gender violence and stressed the need for rehabilitation and reintegration programmes to take into account the special needs of girl soldiers.

Noting that the proliferation of small arms and light weapons had not only exacerbated conflicts around the world, but had also led to the increased use of children as combatants, speakers called for concrete measures to stem their illegal flow. Furthermore, they deplored the use of landmines, which

disproportionately affected children and women, and espoused support for landmine-awareness programmes.

Referring to the unintended consequences of sanctions regimes on children, speakers called for the adoption of mechanisms to monitor and assess their impact on children.

Speakers, in general, agreed with the Secretary-General's recommendations. The representative of India held that the recommendations contained in the report did not delve into the larger implications, or lacked the necessary clarity. Furthermore, he held that several recommendations asked the Council to take actions well beyond its mandate, as they should be addressed by the Economic and Social Council or Member States. He concluded that where armed conflicts could be stopped or curbed if strong peacekeeping operations were quickly set up, the Council must do so.⁸ The representative of Iraq cautioned that the Council's discussion of the issue of children and armed conflict should in no way prejudice the competence of the General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council.⁹

The representative of Colombia protested against the use of the Arria formula for the Council's meetings with non-governmental organizations, as it did not allow States that were not members of the Council to participate in the discussions.¹⁰ Several speakers welcomed the Council's meetings with non-governmental organizations, which could serve as an early warning of impending crisis.¹¹

At its 4185th meeting, on 11 August 2000, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1261 (1999) on children and armed conflict.¹²

The President (Malaysia) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹³ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1314 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

⁸ S/PV.4176 (Resumption 1), pp. 19-20.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹¹ S/PV.4176, p. 11 (United Kingdom); p. 17 (Bangladesh); p. 19 (Namibia); and p. 20 (China).

¹² S/2000/712.

¹³ S/2000/787.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

Urged all parties to armed conflict to respect fully international law applicable to the rights and protection of children in armed conflict, in particular the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and the obligations applicable to them under the Additional Protocols thereto of 1977, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989 and the Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict of 25 May 2000, and to bear in mind the relevant provisions of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court;

Urged Member States in a position to do so to sign and ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict;

Requested parties to armed conflict to include, where appropriate, provisions for the protection of children, including the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of child combatants, in peace negotiations and in peace agreements, and for the involvement of children, where possible, in those processes;

Underlined the importance of giving consideration to the special needs and particular vulnerabilities of girls affected by armed conflict, including, *inter alia*, those heading households, orphaned, sexually exploited and used as combatants, and urged that their human rights, protection and welfare be incorporated in the development of policies and programmes, including those for prevention, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration;

Urged Member States and relevant parts of the United Nations system to strengthen the capacities of national institutions and local civil society for ensuring the sustainability of local initiatives for the protection of children;

Called upon Member States, relevant parts of the United Nations system, and civil society to encourage the involvement of young persons in programmes for peace consolidation and peacebuilding.

**Decision of 20 November 2001
(4423rd meeting): resolution 1379 (2001)**

On 7 September 2001, the Secretary-General submitted a report on children and armed conflict, describing the progress made in the implementation of existing Council resolutions and identifying areas where further action was needed.¹⁴ In that respect, the Secretary-General presented a series of action points with regard to consolidation of the normative framework; monitoring of obligations and commitments and eliciting compliance; placing child protection on the United Nations peace and security agenda; the impact on children of illicit exploitation of natural resources in zones of conflict; child soldiers and abducted children; HIV/AIDS; the involvement

and protection of children in the truth- and justice-seeking process; peacebuilding for children during and after conflict; and regional responses to child protection concerns. More specifically, the Secretary-General called upon the Council to continue to ensure compliance by all parties to armed conflict with their child protection obligations. He recommended that the mandates of peace operations explicitly include provisions for the monitoring of the rights of children as well as child protection elements, and provide for child protection advisers and child-focused rights officers, where appropriate. He further observed that the Council might wish to continue to consider targeted measures against parties to armed conflict whose actions were contributing to the illegal exploitation of natural resources and decide to continue its development of strategic maps of resource flows in zones of conflict characterized by egregious harm to children and civilians. In that context, he called upon the Council to consider the inclusion, where feasible, of specific provisions in the mandates of peacekeeping operations to monitor such activity. He suggested that future Council missions might decide to include an assessment of the HIV/AIDS situation, with particular focus on the impact of that situation on children.

At its 4422nd meeting,¹⁵ on 20 November 2001, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report.¹⁴ The Council was briefed by the Secretary-General, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict and the Executive Director of UNICEF. Statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Belgium (on behalf of the European Union¹⁶), Canada, Egypt, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, the Republic of Korea, Slovenia and South Africa. Additionally, the Council heard testimony from Alhaji Babah Sawaneh, a 14-year-old former child soldier from Sierra Leone.¹⁷

¹⁴ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 39 of the Charter; and chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 41.

¹⁶ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁷ S/PV.4422, pp. 7-8.

¹⁴ S/2001/852, submitted pursuant to paragraph 21 of resolution 1314 (2000).

In his opening remarks, the Secretary-General drew attention to the draft resolution before the Council,¹⁸ which contained measures for protecting children in armed conflict. He stressed the importance of field monitoring through the presence of child protection advisers at the field level and the conveyance of accurate and timely information to the Council regarding the implementation of its resolutions. He further expressed readiness to bring to the Council's attention the identities of parties that were in violation of the draft resolution.¹⁹

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict noted that despite an impressive body of practice that had developed over the past four years, which had been registered at the levels of advocacy to policies and programmes, the overall situation of children exposed to war remained grave and unacceptable. He highlighted the need to monitor and report more systematically and effectively the conduct of parties to conflict in relation to their treatment of children; take practical measures on the ground to apply the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict; strengthen and give wider application to the appointment of child protection advisers to peacekeeping operations; integrate child protection into peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding processes; and pay more attention to the protection and rehabilitation of girls.²⁰

Calling attention to the Optional Protocol and the Rome Statute, the Executive Director of UNICEF stated that understanding and awareness of the situation of children in armed conflict had come a long way. However, access to children caught up in conflict remained a major problem. She commended the inclusion in the draft resolution of the issue of HIV/AIDS and the pledge to put children at the centre of recovery and rehabilitation efforts.²¹

Saying he was speaking on behalf of all child soldiers, Alhaji Babah Sawaneh provided a description of his life as a child soldier in Sierra Leone. He spoke of his release, his fear of re-recruitment, the reaction of the local community to his being a former child soldier,

and his experience under the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme. He appealed to the Council to help all the children of his country who, like himself, had experienced life as a child soldier.²²

Speakers noted that continued progress in the Council's efforts would require full cooperation with the United Nations system in general, particularly with UNICEF and the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict and also with non-governmental organizations operating in the field and civil society. Speakers also advocated better and more effective cooperation and coordination with regional and subregional organizations.

Speakers also stressed the need for international legal standards to be upheld in the area of child protection and children's rights, and urged Member States to ratify all relevant legal instruments, including the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and International Labour Organization Convention No. 182 concerning the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour. They welcomed the fact that the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child was due to enter into force by February 2002, establishing a minimum of 18 years of age for the recruitment of soldiers.

Reaffirming their commitment to keeping children and armed conflict high on the Council's agenda, some representatives emphasized that the issue remained within the Council's primary mandate to maintain international peace and security.²³ The representative of the United Kingdom held that the failure to recognize the issue of children and armed conflict and tackle its effects would have a damaging effect on the international peace and security efforts of the Council.²⁴ The representative of South Africa observed that while the consideration of the issue of children and armed conflict raised its political profile, the Council needed to take a lead in establishing the parameters of acceptable conduct with regard to children in armed conflict.²⁵

In their interventions, speakers, *inter alia*, endorsed the recommendations contained in the

¹⁸ S/2001/1093.

¹⁹ S/PV.4422, pp. 2-3.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (United Kingdom); and p. 14 (Mali).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²⁵ S/PV.4422 (Resumption 1), p. 22.

Secretary-General's report; stressed the need to effectively monitor compliance with commitments and obligations by parties to conflict and mobilize resources for supporting activities to help child victims; held that there should be no impunity for those found guilty of inflicting pain on children or recruiting children as soldiers; highlighted the well-documented link between the flow of small arms and children's involvement in armed conflict; noted the link between armed conflict, sexual exploitation and abuse of children and the spread of HIV/AIDS; underlined the importance of education for children in the post-conflict phase; and highlighted the situation of refugees and internally displaced children in and around Afghanistan. In addition, a number of speakers drew attention to the plight of children in Palestine.²⁶

At its 4423rd meeting, on 20 November 2001, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on children and armed conflict.²⁷

At the same meeting, the President (Jamaica) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;²⁸ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1379 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Expressed its readiness explicitly to include provisions for the protection of children when considering the mandates of peacekeeping operations, and reaffirmed, in that regard, its readiness to continue to include child protection advisers in peacekeeping operations;

Supported the ongoing work of the Secretary-General, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, UNICEF, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, other agencies of the United Nations system and other international organizations dealing with children affected by armed conflict;

Expressed its intention to consider taking appropriate steps to address the linkages between armed conflict and terrorism, the illicit trade in precious minerals, the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons, and other criminal activities;

Undertook to consider the economic and social impact of sanctions on children, with a view to providing appropriate humanitarian exemptions that take account of their specific needs and their vulnerability, and to minimize such impact;

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Tunisia); p. 16 (Egypt); p. 25 (Iraq); and pp. 28-29 (Malaysia).

²⁷ S/2001/852.

²⁸ S/2001/1093.

Requested the Secretary-General to submit a report to the Council by 31 October 2002 on the implementation of the resolution and of resolutions 1261 (1999) and 1314 (2000).

**Decision of 7 May 2002 (4528th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4528th meeting, on 7 May 2002, the Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, the Executive Director of UNICEF and the former independent expert of the Secretary-General on the impact of armed conflict on children.²⁹ The Council also heard personal testimonies from three child delegates to the Children's Forum of the special session of the General Assembly on children.³⁰

Noting that the meeting was being held in support of the special session of the General Assembly on children, the President of the Council (Singapore) traced the decisions taken by the Council since 1998, comprehensively laying out the Council's extensive support and guidance for international efforts to protect and assist children in armed conflict.³¹

Stressing that the greatest burdens of war were borne by children, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict commended the Council for its commitment to incorporate the protection of children into the peace and security agenda of the United Nations. He, *inter alia*, called on the Council to do more to ensure that child protection would become part of peace accords and the mandates of peacekeeping operations.³²

The former independent expert of the Secretary-General on the impact of armed conflict on children echoed the Special Representative's praise of the Council and pointed to successes achieved on the ground, including the demobilization of child soldiers in the Sudan. She stressed, however, that the prevention of armed conflict, which was the primary mandate of the Council, remained the best means of protecting children. She further called upon the Council to implement means of monitoring its child

²⁹ Cameroon was represented by its Minister of State in charge of External Relations; Norway was represented by its Minister for International Development. Also present were the Minister of Children and Family Affairs of Norway and the Minister for Social Affairs of Guinea.

³⁰ S/PV.4528, pp. 7-9.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

protection mandates and to take new measures when implementation thereof was deemed too slow.³³

The Executive Director of UNICEF welcomed the Council's engagement with non-governmental organizations, stressing that only through such a partnership could UNICEF advocate policy, programmes and strategies to strengthen the protection of children in armed conflict. She indicated that UNICEF would continue to invest in education, particularly in the education of girls, as a means of ensuring the long-term well-being and sustainable protection of the rights of war-affected children.³⁴

The three child delegates to the Children's Forum of the special session of the General Assembly on children, from Liberia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and East Timor respectively, each described how conflict in their homelands had affected them and other children, and appealed for an end to conflict and for the protection of children.³⁵

The President then made a statement on behalf of the Council,³⁶ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Expressed its concern at the grave impact of armed conflict on children and reiterated its strong condemnation of the continued targeting and use of children in armed conflicts, and called on all parties to conflict to desist from such practices immediately;

Reaffirmed its call for the inclusion of provisions for the protection of children, with particular attention to the special needs of girls in, *inter alia*, peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations;

Looked forward to a successful final document concerning the protection of children affected by armed conflict on the occasion of the special session of the General Assembly on children;

Urged Member States to consider ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict;

Underscored the importance of unhindered humanitarian access for the benefit of children.

**Decision of 30 January 2003 (4695th meeting):
resolution 1460 (2003)**

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.

³⁶ S/PRST/2002/12.

At its 4684th meeting,³⁷ on 14 January 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on children and armed conflict dated 26 November 2002.³⁸ In his report, the Secretary-General reviewed activities and progress made with respect to the protection of children affected by situations of armed conflict and in post-conflict situations, as well as in the implementation of resolutions 1261 (1999), 1314 (2000) and 1379 (2001). The Secretary-General provided an overview of the issue of child protection on the peace and security agenda of the United Nations, welcoming the inclusion of child protection provisions in the mandates of peacekeeping operations and the deployment of child protection advisers or units in the United Nations missions in Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sierra Leone. As requested in paragraph 16 of resolution 1379 (2001), the Secretary-General, for the first time, presented a list of parties to armed conflict that recruited or used children as soldiers in violation of relevant international obligations, in situations of which the Council was seized, in an annex to his report. He stressed the need for action to promote and disseminate the standards and norms put in place to protect children and to raise awareness about them on the ground. Similarly, he underscored the need to put in place strengthened monitoring and reporting mechanisms to identify the violators and to take measures against them. Dissemination, advocacy, monitoring and reporting were seen as the key components of an era of application.

At the meeting, the Council was briefed by the Secretary-General, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict and the Executive Director of UNICEF. Statements were made by all Council members, the representatives of Austria (in his capacity as Chair of the Human Security Network), Bahrain, Burundi, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece (on behalf of the European Union³⁹), Indonesia, Israel, Japan,

³⁷ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. X, part IV, with regard to the recourse to investigation by the Security Council in the light of Article 34 of the Charter; and chap. X, part IV, with regard to referrals by the Secretary-General in the light of Article 99.

³⁸ S/2002/1299, submitted pursuant to paragraph 15 of resolution 1379 (2001).

³⁹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary,

Liechtenstein, Malawi, Monaco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, the Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Switzerland and Ukraine, and the Permanent Observer of Palestine.

Expressing satisfaction with the steady progress that had been made in embedding the protection, rights and well-being of children affected by armed conflict into the United Nations peace and security agenda, and with the progressive development of a body of international norms and standards on the subject, the Secretary-General stressed that it was time to ensure that those norms and standards were put into practice on the ground. He reported that the list contained 23 parties in five conflict situations on the Council's agenda and highlighted other conflicts not on the Council's agenda where children were recruited or used. By naming parties that continued to recruit or use child soldiers, the international community was serving notice that it was finally willing to back expressions of concern with action. He urged the Council to maintain its resolve on the issue.⁴⁰

Joining the Secretary-General's call for translating words into action, the Special Representative for Children and Armed Conflict called on the Council to lead the way by example and action. The list annexed to the report provided an important opportunity for the Council to respond. In that context, he recommended the following measures for the Council's consideration: a call on the parties on the list to immediately end recruiting and using child soldiers and to provide full information on measures they had taken to that effect; consideration of imposing targeted measures against parties where substantial progress was not found to have been made; and a comprehensive list in the next report of the Secretary-General to include all parties involved in armed conflict which continued to recruit and use child soldiers. Child soldiering was only one aspect of the impact of war on children, he added, emphasizing that all child victims of war deserved the attention and protection of the international community.⁴¹

The Executive Director of UNICEF was convinced that the naming and shaming of parties who

Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

⁴⁰ S/PV.4684, pp. 3-4.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6.

recruited and used children in armed conflict would help to establish a culture of accountability, which could, in turn, prevent such abuses from occurring in the future. She thus encouraged the Council to consider the Secretary-General's list in all its deliberations, and to update it regularly, expanding its scope to include parties to armed conflict in situations not on the Council's agenda at the time. For its part, UNICEF would use the list to intensify its advocacy efforts, both globally and locally. In closing, she noted that the recent allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse of refugee and internally displaced children and women in West Africa by peacekeepers served as a wake-up call for the entire international community, and called on the Council to follow up on the statement by the President of 20 December 2002⁴² on the protection of civilians, which encouraged States, in particular troop-contributing countries, to adopt six core principles to prevent sexual abuse and exploitation.⁴³

In their interventions, speakers reaffirmed that using children as a tool of war was intolerable, and that the international community and the Council had to commit to a new era of action, as called for by the Secretary-General. While welcoming the progress achieved since the adoption of resolution 1379 (2001), and expressing support for the work of the Office of the Special Representative for Children and Armed Conflict, as well as the role played by United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations, speakers noted that much remained to be done. Pointing to the interconnectedness of the items relating to children and armed conflict and those relating to the protection of civilians in armed conflict and women, peace and security, the representatives of the United Kingdom and Japan called for an integrated approach to address them, with the representative of Japan suggesting that the Council consider them as a single item.⁴⁴

Referring to the normative framework for child protection in armed conflict, speakers welcomed the entry into force of the two landmark international instruments, namely, the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, which classified conscription, enlistment or use in

⁴² S/PRST/2002/41.

⁴³ S/PV.4684, pp. 6-8.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 18 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4684 (Resumption 1), p. 40 (Japan).

hostilities of children below the age of 15 as a war crime in both international and internal armed conflicts. Speakers concurred that those two legal instruments strengthened the international framework for the protection of children in situations of armed conflict. Nevertheless, they stressed that the challenge was to ensure that those standards were implemented on the ground. The representative of the Russian Federation held the view that the International Criminal Court would merge harmoniously with the existing United Nations system and the role of the Council in making sure that there could be no evasion of punishment for crimes against children.⁴⁵

Speakers stated that the list of parties to armed conflict that recruited or used child soldiers, annexed to the report of the Secretary-General, represented an important step forward in the efforts to induce compliance by parties to conflict with international child protection obligations. A number of speakers called for the list to be updated regularly and suggested that the criteria for inclusion on the list be broadened to include all situations where children were recruited or used as soldiers or where their protection was severely threatened.⁴⁶ In that connection, the representative of the United States expressed regret that some of the worst violators of children in armed conflict were not included on the list, pointing to Myanmar, Uganda and Colombia.⁴⁷ Expressing similar views, the representative of the United Kingdom also noted that Myanmar had not been included on the list despite consistent reports indicating wide, systematic and forced recruitment and training of children for use in combat.⁴⁸ In contrast, the representative of Myanmar stressed that there had been no credible evidence of the use and recruitment of children in his country's armed forces, while it was a practice of armed insurgent groups in Myanmar to recruit and abuse child soldiers. He stated that such information should be verified before it was presented to the Council.⁴⁹ While his country was included on the list, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo reaffirmed that his country had ended the enlistment of children in the Congolese armed forces, unlike the armed groups

operating in certain occupied provinces.⁵⁰ The representative of Burundi, while recognizing the existence of child soldiers on the Government side who were recruited on a voluntary basis, pointed out that a project for the demobilization of child soldiers had been established in cooperation with UNICEF. With respect to the non-State armed groups in Burundi, however, he remarked that the situation for children remained distressing.⁵¹

Speakers joined the Secretary-General's appeal for the creation of monitoring and reporting mechanisms aimed at identifying violators and taking measures against them. The representative of Pakistan proposed that the mandate of existing peacekeeping operations and observer missions be broadened to encompass such monitoring and reporting activities.⁵² The representative of Canada, echoed by the representative of Austria, suggested that the Council dispatch missions to visit those conflict situations mentioned specifically in the report of the Secretary-General. He held that the Council should ask for a six-month interim report, evaluate progress made in those situations, and commit itself to follow up in one year on the parties named in the report.⁵³ The representative of Mexico noted that at the 13 January 2003 Arria formula meeting, the establishment of an informal Security Council group had been proposed, which would assess compliance with international norms by the parties to conflict.⁵⁴

Speakers commended the Secretary-General's call for child protection to be an explicit feature of the mandates of peacekeeping operations and for those operations to include child protection units, and welcomed the implementation of those recommendations to date in Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sierra Leone. The representative of the United Kingdom was pleased that an inter-agency working group would do further work on developing guidelines on the integration of child protection issues in the context of United Nations peace efforts, and expected the working group to play an active part in

⁴⁵ S/PV.4684, p. 14.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 21 (United States); and pp. 25-26 (Guinea); S/PV.4684 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Switzerland); p. 18 (Austria); p. 24 (Costa Rica); and p. 29 (Slovenia).

⁴⁷ S/PV.4684, p. 21.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁴⁹ S/PV.4684 (Resumption 1), p. 30.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

⁵² S/PV.4684, p. 23.

⁵³ S/PV.4684 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Canada); and p. 18 (Austria).

⁵⁴ S/PV.4684, p. 13.

the regular briefings provided to the Council and in the Council's subsequent discussions of those countries.⁵⁵

Speakers also underlined the importance of ensuring that children were able to participate in the process of post-conflict reconstruction, and the need to focus on child soldiers in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes, while calling for the allocation of sufficient resources to that end.

Speakers also reiterated their condemnation of reports of sexual exploitation and abuse of refugee and internally displaced women and children in West Africa and elsewhere, involving aid workers and peacekeepers among others. The representative of the Russian Federation called for comprehensive training for United Nations personnel, as well as monitoring and measures to prevent impunity.⁵⁶ Several representatives welcomed the Plan of Action, submitted by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee's Task Force on Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in Humanitarian Crises, which called for the incorporation of the Committee's codes of conduct of six core principles.⁵⁷

Many speakers emphasized the need to mitigate the impact on children of illicit commercial exploitation of natural resources in conflict zones, speed up the clearance of anti-personnel mines and regulate the proliferation of small arms and light weapons.

At its 4695th meeting, on 30 January 2003, at which no statements were made, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on children and armed conflict.⁵⁸

The President (France) drew attention to a draft

⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 17 and 19.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 14.

⁵⁷ S/PV.4684, p. 13 (Mexico); and pp. 17-19 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4684 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Canada); and p. 33 (Malawi).

⁵⁸ S/2002/1299.

resolution;⁵⁹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1460 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Supported the call of the Secretary-General for "an era of application" of international norms and standards for the protection of children affected by armed conflict;

Expressed its intention to enter into dialogue, as appropriate, or to support the Secretary-General in entering into dialogue with parties to armed conflict in violation of the international obligations applicable to them on the recruitment or use of children in armed conflict, in order to develop clear and time-bound action plans to end that practice;

Noted with concern the list annexed to the Secretary-General's report, and called on the parties identified in that list to provide information on steps they had taken to halt their recruitment or use of children in armed conflict in violation of the international obligations applicable to them to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, bearing in mind the provisions of paragraph 9 of its resolution 1379 (2001);

Reiterated its determination to continue to include specific provisions for the protection of children in the mandates of United Nations peacekeeping operations, including provisions recommending child protection advisers on a case-by-case basis and training for United Nations and associated personnel on child protection and child rights;

Noted with concern all the cases of sexual exploitation and abuse of women and children, especially girls, in humanitarian crisis, including those cases involving humanitarian workers and peacekeepers, and requested contributing countries to incorporate the six core principles of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee on Emergencies into pertinent codes of conduct for peacekeeping personnel and to develop appropriate disciplinary and accountability mechanisms;

Requested the Secretary-General to ensure that in all his reports to the Security Council on country-specific situations, the protection of children in armed conflict was included as a specific aspect of the report.

⁵⁹ S/2003/112.

39. Items relating to terrorism

A. Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts

Decision of 12 September 2001 (4370th meeting): resolution 1368 (2001)

At the 4370th meeting of the Security Council, on 12 September 2001, the President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution.¹ At the meeting, statements were made by all members of the Council and the Secretary-General.

At the outset of the meeting, the Council observed a minute of silence in memory of all the victims of the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001.

Speaking before the vote, the Secretary-General stated that the Council was meeting under exceptionally grave circumstances in which the host country and the host city had been subjected to a terrorist attack that horrified all. He reiterated that terrorism was an international scourge and the United Nations had condemned it many times. He stated that a terrorist attack on one country was an attack on humanity as a whole and he called for all nations to work together to identify the perpetrators and bring them to justice.

All members of the Council expressed their deepest condolences and sympathy to the Government and people of the United States and to the victims of the terrorist attack on 11 September 2001. Several speakers suggested that international terrorism should be addressed through efforts of the whole international community and through international cooperation.² Some representatives also supported the idea of holding a special summit of the Council to discuss ways and means of combating terrorism.³

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that his country was determined to eradicate terrorism globally, in cooperation with and in support of the United States. He stated that the international spirit of the response was exemplified by the European Union

in a meeting of ministers the same morning, which had stated that the horrendous attacks were an attack not only on the United States, but against humanity itself and the values and freedoms they all shared. He stated that mass terrorism was the new evil in the world today, perpetrated by fanatics, who were utterly indifferent to the sanctity of human life. He noted that terrorism was a global issue that needed a global response.⁴

The representative of Mauritius condemned the attacks as inhuman and barbaric terrorist acts and underlined that all who believed in the cardinal values of democracy stood shoulder-to-shoulder with the American people in the struggle to preserve peace and the rule of law. He stated that terrorism represented a major threat to international peace and security. His delegation also stood ready to cooperate with the United States and the international community to find the perpetrators of the terrorist acts of 11 September 2001 and bring them to justice.⁵

The representative of Singapore emphasized that terrorism anywhere should not be condoned for any reason whatsoever and held that the Council and the international community had to come together to ensure that the events of 11 September were not repeated.⁶ The representative of Tunisia stated that no civilization condoned and no cause whatsoever could justify the attacks, and that it was time for all societies of the international community to cooperate in preventing and combating terrorism and organized crime.⁷

The representative of Ireland stated that the perpetrators of the attacks on 11 September had sought to destroy the values that formed the fundamental principles of the United Nations, including the right of every human being to live in freedom and dignity, and

¹ S/2001/861.

² S/PV.4370, p. 3 (Mauritius); p. 3 (Ukraine); p. 4 (Singapore); p. 4 (Tunisia); p. 6 (Jamaica); and p. 6 (Bangladesh).

³ Ibid., p. 3 (Mauritius); p. 4 (Ukraine); and p. 6 (Jamaica).

⁴ Ibid., pp. 2-3.

⁵ Ibid., p. 3.

⁶ Ibid., p. 4.

⁷ Ibid., p. 4.

he called for the international community to work together to bring the perpetrators to justice.⁸

The representative of China stated that international terrorism seriously endangered human society as well as the political and economical order of countries and was a serious potential danger to international peace and security. He held that the attacks represented an open challenge to the international community as a whole. China was in favour of enhanced cooperation among Member States through the practical implementation of the relevant international conventions against terrorists. He underlined that the Council, as the organ with the primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security, should play a leading role in that respect.⁹

The representative of the Russian Federation stated that the attack had been a brazen challenge to all of humankind. It highlighted the timeliness of the task of joining the efforts of the international community in combating terror. In that respect, he recalled resolution 1269 (1999), which had been unanimously adopted by the Council on the initiative of the Russian Federation. The draft resolution on the table demonstrated unconditionally the resolve of Council members to leave not one terrorist act unpunished and to increase efforts to prevent and end terrorism.¹⁰

The representative of Norway stated that the attacks had been directed against freedom and democracy itself and had been an effort to undermine the value that constituted the foundations of the civilized world. He held that the Council had been established to defend those values and that a unified Council must show that it was ready to support efforts to do just that.¹¹

The representative of Colombia informed the Council that the Organization of American States had adopted a vigorous condemnation of terrorist attacks and expressed the need to strengthen hemispheric cooperation to combat terrorism. He expressed his delegation's willingness to participate with all members of the Council in the adoption of immediate

measures in keeping with the responsibilities of the Council under the Charter of the United Nations.¹²

The representative of France also stated that the events constituted an attack upon all of humanity and against the values and principles that the Charter embodied and constituted a challenge to the international community as a whole. He emphasized that it was time for unity and resolve. He stated that France stood with the United States in deciding upon any appropriate action to combat those who resorted to terrorism, those who aided them and those who protected them. He called for a global strategy and held that the Council should work on the issue as the principal organ entrusted with international peace and security.¹³

The representative of the United States, while thanking all Members for their support and resolve, underlined that the attack was an assault not just on the United States, but on all who supported peace and democracy and the values for which the United Nations stood. He stated that his country looked for all those who stood for peace, justice and security in the world to stand together with the United States to win the war against terrorism. He emphasized that there would be no distinction between the terrorists who committed those acts and those who harboured them. The United States would bring those responsible to account.¹⁴

The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1368 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Unequivocally condemned in the strongest terms the horrifying terrorist attacks which took place on 11 September 2001 in New York, Washington, D.C., and Pennsylvania and regarded such acts, like any act of international terrorism, as a threat to international peace and security;

Expressed its deepest sympathy and condolences to the victims and their families and to the people and Government of the United States;

Called upon all States to work together urgently to bring to justice the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of those terrorist attacks, and stressed that those responsible for aiding, supporting or harbouring the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of those acts would be held accountable;

Called upon the international community to redouble their efforts to prevent and suppress terrorist acts, including by

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

increased cooperation and full implementation of the relevant international anti-terrorist conventions and Security Council resolutions;

Expressed its readiness to take all necessary steps to respond to the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 and to combat all forms of terrorism, in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations.

**Decision of 28 September 2001
(4385th meeting): resolution 1373 (2001)**

At the 4385th meeting, on 28 September 2001, the President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a number of letters, by which the representatives of Belgium (on behalf of the European Union),¹⁵ Pakistan,¹⁶ Qatar (on behalf of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC)),¹⁷ Mali,¹⁸ Azerbaijan, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine and Uzbekistan (the GUUAM States)¹⁹ and China²⁰ expressed condemnation of the attacks on 11 September 2001, offered their support to the Government of the United States and called for the international community to work together to combat international terrorism.

In his letter, the representative of Qatar transmitted a statement by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, who stressed that Islam was a true religion, which denounces and rejects terrorism, repudiates violence and bloodshed and calls for the protection of human beings and non-aggression against innocent persons.

By a letter dated 25 September 2001, addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, the representative of Belgium transmitted the conclusions and plan of action of the European Council meeting of 21 September 2001, in which the European Council stated that it would cooperate with the United States in bringing to justice and punishing the perpetrators, sponsors and accomplices of the barbaric acts, and that on the basis of resolution 1368 (2001), a riposte by the United States was legitimate. It stated that the member States of the European Union were prepared to undertake

such actions, which must be targeted and might also be directed against States abetting, supporting or harbouring terrorists.

By his letter, the representative of China transmitted the position paper of the Government of China, recommending that the Council establish an anti-terrorism mechanism to explore, formulate and conduct concrete programmes for the fight against terrorism, and that the Secretariat strengthen its capacity for information collection and analysis in the field of anti-terrorism.

By his letter, the representative of Georgia transmitted a letter from the President of Georgia, who suggested that the United Nations convene a summit of heads of States Members of the United Nations to address the fight against terrorism, genocide, ethnic cleansing, mass murder and the sources that fed them, such as aggressive nationalism, aggressive separatism, xenophobia, fanaticism and bigotry.²¹

By a letter dated 14 September 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Afghanistan transmitted a letter from the President of Afghanistan,²² in which the President stated that the attacks on the United States established how terrorism constituted a threat to international peace and security. He noted that the officials of Afghanistan had made every attempt over the years during the General Assembly and special sessions to warn of the threat of terrorist activities emanating from the Taliban-occupied parts of Afghanistan. He stressed that the people of Afghanistan were not only victims of terrorism but were in fact hostage to it. He called upon the international community to put effective and bold pressure on the Government of Pakistan to cease immediately their aggression in Afghanistan and withdraw their armed personnel from Afghanistan, and invoked Article 35 of the Charter to propose the convening of a special meeting of the Council to address the presence of foreign military and armed personnel in Afghanistan. He also asked the international community to establish a multi-ethnic, broad-based and fully representative government, which would secure the right of the Afghan people to self-determination.

¹⁵ S/2001/894 and S/2001/909, letters dated 12 and 25 September 2001, respectively.

¹⁶ S/2001/877, letter dated 13 September 2001.

¹⁷ S/2001/869, letter dated 14 September 2001.

¹⁸ S/2001/895, letter dated 18 September 2001.

¹⁹ S/2001/906, letter dated 25 September 2001.

²⁰ S/2001/914, letter dated 27 September 2001.

²¹ S/2001/893.

²² S/2001/870.

By a letter dated 18 September 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Iraq transmitted two letters from the President of Iraq,²³ who maintained that it was irresponsible of the Government of the United States to accuse Islamic countries of committing the 11 September 2001 attacks without having the minimum evidence or allowing enough of an opportunity to verify things. He maintained that the security of the United States and the security of the world would be achieved if the United States and its constituents became rational and if the United States disengaged itself from the evil alliance with Zionism, which had been scheming to plunder the world and plunge it into blood and darkness by exploiting the United States and some Western countries. He accused the United States of committing attacks against other countries, which were the main cause of instability in the world.

By a letter dated 25 September 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General,²⁴ the representative of the United Arab Emirates transmitted a statement from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs stating that the Government had severed all diplomatic relations with the Government of Afghanistan, as the latter had refused to comply with the request of the Council to hand over Osama bin Laden.

The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;²⁵ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1373 (2001), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, *inter alia*:

Decided that all States should:

- (a) Prevent and suppress the financing of terrorist acts;
- (b) Criminalize the wilful provision or collection, by any means, directly or indirectly, of funds by their nationals or in their territories with the intention that the funds should be used, or in the knowledge that they are to be used, to carry out terrorist acts;
- (c) Freeze without delay funds and other financial assets or economic resources of persons who commit, or attempt to commit, terrorist acts or participate in or facilitate the commission of terrorist acts;
- (d) Prohibit their nationals or any persons and entities within their territories from making any funds, financial assets

²³ S/2001/888.

²⁴ S/2001/903.

²⁵ S/2001/921.

or economic resources or financial or other related services available, directly or indirectly, for the benefit of persons who commit or attempt to commit or facilitate or participate in the commission of terrorist acts, of entities owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by such persons and of persons and entities acting on behalf of or at the direction of such persons;

Declared that acts, methods, and practices of terrorism are contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations and that knowingly financing, planning and inciting terrorist acts are also contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations;

Decided to establish, in accordance with rule 28 of its provisional rules of procedure, a Committee of the Security Council, consisting of all the members of the Council, to monitor implementation of this resolution;

Directed the Committee to delineate its tasks, to submit a work programme within 30 days of the adoption of the resolution, and to consider the support it required, in consultation with the Secretary-General.

Decision of 12 November 2001 (4413th meeting): resolution 1377 (2001)

At the 4413th meeting,²⁶ on 12 November 2001, the President (Jamaica) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution.²⁷ At the meeting, statements were made by all members of the Council and the Secretary-General.²⁸

In his statement before the vote, the Secretary-General applauded the Council for acting so swiftly in adopting resolution 1373 (2001) to enshrine in law the first steps to carry the fight against terrorism forward with new vigour and determination. He recalled that this was a broad resolution aimed at targeting terrorists and those which had harboured, aided, or supported them. It required Member States to cooperate in a wide range of areas, namely suppressing the financing of terrorism, providing early warning, cooperating in criminal investigations and exchanging information on possible terrorist acts. He reported that the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism had produced a work programme that focused on the first 90 days of the work of the Committee and had

²⁶ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part IX, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 51 of the Charter.

²⁷ S/2001/1060.

²⁸ The meeting was held at the ministerial level: all delegations were represented by their respective State Minister for Foreign Affairs, Minister for Foreign Affairs or Secretary of State.

established mechanisms for States to report progress. He encouraged all States to ensure the full implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). In addition, he reported that he had established a working group, bringing together senior officials from the United Nations system, as well as outside experts, to identify the longer-term implications and broad policy dimensions of the issue of terrorism for the United Nations and formulate recommendations on steps that the United Nations system might take. He pointed out that the United Nations was uniquely placed to facilitate cooperation between Governments in the fight against terrorism, as it could convey the necessary legitimacy to ensure that States would take the necessary and difficult diplomatic, legal and political steps needed to defeat terrorism. He stated that the first step would be to ensure that the 12 existing legal instruments on international terrorism would be ratified and implemented without delay by all States. In addition, it would be important to obtain agreement on a comprehensive convention on international terrorism. He also called for a strengthening of the global norms against the use or proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the banning of the sale of small arms to non-State groups, the elimination of landmines, improvement of the physical protection of sensitive industrial facilities, specifically nuclear and chemical plants, and increased vigilance against cyberterrorist threats. He held that there was a need for moral clarity and expressed the view that there could be no acceptance of those who sought to justify the deliberate taking of innocent civilian life, regardless of cause or grievance. Nevertheless, he warned against treating terrorism as a single phenomenon, emphasizing that it was, like war, an immensely complicated phenomenon with multiple objectives and causes, a multitude of weapons and agents and virtually limitless manifestations, with the only common denominator being the calculated use of deadly violence against civilians for political purposes.²⁹

In their statements before the vote, most representatives emphasized that full cooperation at the international level was needed to address international terrorism. The speakers supported the measures taken by the Council so far and called for the full implementation of the recently adopted resolutions. In that regard, many speakers held that the creation of the

Counter-Terrorism Committee would prove helpful in ensuring the implementation of those resolutions. Most representatives expressed their country's commitment to the fight against terrorism and reported progress in the ratification and implementation of the existing legal instruments against terrorism. Many speakers held that, as a matter of priority, the international community should cooperate to track the financial resources of terrorist networks and should strengthen the exchange of information that could lead to the dismantling of terrorist networks. A number of speakers reported on the approach taken by several regional organizations and called for enhanced coordination of the national, regional, subregional and international levels to strengthen the global response to international terrorism.

In addition, several representatives called for a renewed commitment to address such global problems as poverty, regional conflicts and a lack of sustainable development, which could constitute the wider conditions on which terrorism could thrive.³⁰

The representative of Jamaica also noted that not all States had an equal capacity to fully implement the measures provided in resolution 1373 (2001), and called for countries with the capacity to provide financial and technical assistance to assist those countries that were in need of assistance.³¹

The representative of China, while emphasizing that terrorism was a brazen challenge to all of human civilization, also held that the strike against terrorism should be clearly targeted and try to avoid injuring innocent people, and should be in compliance with the purposes and principles of the Charter. He also opposed linking terrorism to any specific religion or ethnicity, and believed that there should be no double standards with regard to counter-terrorism and that the international community should take a common stand against all forms of terrorist acts and carry out a resolute fight against them. He pointed out that China had also been threatened by terrorism and that the "East Turkestan" terrorist forces had received training, financial aid and support from international terrorist groups.³²

²⁹ S/PV.4413, pp. 2-3.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 4 (Jamaica); p. 4 (China); pp. 7-8 (Ireland); p. 9 (Mauritius); pp. 10-11 (Russian Federation); p. 13 (Tunisia); p. 14 (Ukraine); and p. 17 (Mali).

³¹ Ibid., p. 4.

³² Ibid., pp. 4-5.

The representative of Colombia drew the attention of the Council to the role played by the world market in illicit drugs as a factor in the financing of violence and terror.³³

The representatives of France and Norway reaffirmed that the armed response of the United States against Osama bin Laden, the Al-Qaida network and the Taliban was undertaken pursuant to resolution 1368 (2001) and in exercise of the United States right of self-defence, and declared that they supported that action.³⁴

The representative of Mauritius pointed out that the attacks of 11 September 2001 had seriously affected the economies of poor countries, which did not have the resilience of the major economies.³⁵

The representative of the Russian Federation welcomed the fact that the Council, as the body entrusted with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, was demonstrating its central coordinating role in uniting the efforts of the world community to combat international terrorism, which he regarded as the most acute threat to global stability. He held that the adoption, by the Council, of resolutions of unprecedented scope, especially resolution 1373 (2001), laid a solid political and legal basis for the neutralization of the terrorist threat. He believed that the creation of the Counter-Terrorism Committee would facilitate the implementation of those resolutions and reiterated that they were binding on all States. He also emphasized that there should be no double standards with regard to terrorism, but held that it would be a mistake to identify terrorism with any religion, nationality or culture. In that regard, he called for the establishment of dialogue and mutual understanding between different civilizations on the basis of the common values of protecting the life and dignity of human beings. In addition, he called for the Council to appeal to the General Assembly to adopt at its fifty-sixth session the draft international convention on the suppression of acts of nuclear terrorism.³⁶

The representative of the United Kingdom declared that terrorism, the deliberate targeting of innocent people for political ends, was criminal, and there was no political, religious or ideological cause

that could justify the use of such indiscriminate violence. He also welcomed military advances in the north of Afghanistan as a first step to the overall liberation of Afghanistan, to the establishment there of a broad-based, representative and multi-ethnic Government, and to the goal of a world free from the twin scourges of terrorism and war.³⁷

The representative of the United States declared that action was needed and action was needed now. In reference to the question on the definition of terrorism, he responded that those who sought to define terrorism needed to look no further; no one could defend such heartless acts against innocent people. It was not about a clash of civilizations or religions. It was an attack on civilization and religion themselves. That was what terrorism meant. He stated that the United States was taking the fight against terrorism directly to the terrorists as well as their supporters and that the United States had declared war on all terrorist organizations with a global reach. He held that since those organizations were global, the United States needed the support of the international community, and especially the help of police forces, intelligence services and banking systems around the world to isolate and eradicate the common enemies. He welcomed the swift action by the Council and stated that resolution 1373 (2001) was a mandate to change fundamentally how the international community responded to terrorism, and reiterated that its obligations were urgent and binding. He acknowledged that, for many States, its implementation would necessitate changes in their financial and legal systems and offered technical assistance ranging from aviation security to financial tracking measures and law enforcement.³⁸

The President drew the attention of the Council to the draft resolution;²⁷ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1377 (2001), by which the Council decided to adopt a declaration, annexed to the resolution, on the global effort to combat terrorism.

**Decision of 15 April 2002 (4513th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4453rd meeting, on 18 January 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the

³³ Ibid., p. 6.

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 6-7 (France); and p. 10 (Norway).

³⁵ Ibid., p. 9.

³⁶ Ibid., pp. 10-11.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 15-16.

³⁸ Ibid., pp. 16-17.

Counter-Terrorism Committee.³⁹ Statements were also made by the Secretary-General, most members of the Council, the representatives of Bangladesh, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)), Canada, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Rio Group), India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Jamaica (on behalf of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM)), Japan, Mongolia, Morocco (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Nauru (on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum Group), Nepal, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal,⁴⁰ Qatar, Spain (on behalf of the European Union⁴¹), Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, and the Permanent Observer of Palestine.

Speaking first, the Secretary-General welcomed the energy and spirit of cooperation prevailing among Member States in response to the terrorist attacks of 11 September, and held that the work of the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the cooperation it had received from Member States were unprecedented and exemplary. He stressed that through the work of the Committee, Member States were, for once, really using the Organization in the way that its founders had intended — as an instrument through which to forge a global defence against a global threat. He expressed the hope that Member States could apply that same spirit to other global threats, ranging from weapons of mass destruction to HIV/AIDS or climate change. In addition, he pointed to the interrelationship between terrorism and other threats, including organized crime and illicit trafficking in weapons drugs and diamonds, and underlined the need for the various United Nations bodies dealing with those threats to coordinate their work closely. Further, he noted that there was no trade-off between effective action against terrorism and the protection of human rights, which, on the contrary, along with democracy and social justice, was one of the best prophylactics against terrorism. He held, therefore, that human rights and other key principles should not be sacrificed in the fight against terrorism and that there was a need to make sure that the

measures adopted by the Council did not unduly curtail human rights or would give others a pretext to do so. Finally, he pointed to the lack of capacity of many States to adopt effective counter-terrorist measures and the ensuing need for technical and financial assistance.⁴²

The Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, in his briefing, noted that the Council had reacted strongly and quickly to the threat which international terrorism in its latest form posed to international peace and security by, inter alia, the adoption of resolution 1373 (2001), which imposed binding obligations on all States to take immediate action to suppress and prevent terrorism. Those measures, monitored by the Committee, intended to improve the capacity of every State to fight terrorism and ensure that there was no weak part of the chain. Resolution 1377 (2001), he noted, had given the Committee the task of identifying assistance programmes and best practices, which it had started to do by inviting States and international and regional organizations to contribute to a directory of available assistance. In addition, the Chairman had requested the Secretary-General to consider establishing a United Nations trust fund to ensure that such essential work was adequately funded. The Chairman welcomed the fact that 123 States had to that date submitted reports to the Committee on the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001), but pointed out that some States remained. He reported that the Committee hoped to have reviewed two thirds of the reports received to that date by the end of March 2002. In its review, the Committee intended to write to each State, in confidence, offering comments, requesting more information or outlining areas in which legislation or further executive measures might be needed. He held that it was not the role of the Committee to act as a tribunal for judging States. Nor would the Committee trespass on to areas of competence of other parts of the United Nations system. The Committee would not define terrorism in a legal sense, nor would it issue lists of terrorist organizations. Where a matter of political controversy arose, that matter would be referred back to the Council. While the mandate of the Committee was to monitor the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001), rather than monitor performance against other international conventions, including human rights, the Chairman held that the

³⁹ The representative of the United Kingdom, who delivered the briefing in his capacity as the Chairman of the Committee, did not make a statement in his national capacity.

⁴⁰ In the capacity of Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

⁴¹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

⁴² S/PV.4453, pp. 2-3.

Committee would remain aware of the interaction with human rights concerns. Other organizations were free to study the reports and take up their content in other forums, he added.⁴³

In their statements, all speakers condemned terrorism with several speakers highlighting that terrorist attacks victimized the innocent civilian population.⁴⁴ Most speakers recognized the important role of the Committee as a follow-up mechanism for the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) and commended its Chairman for the work achieved to date and for the transparent approach taken by the Committee vis-à-vis the wider membership. They underlined support for the 12 international conventions against terrorism and highlighted the importance of having those conventions ratified by as many States as possible. A number of speakers reported on the measures taken by regional organizations and groups.⁴⁵ Most speakers noted that some States would need technical assistance to enable them to fulfil their obligations under resolution 1373 (2001). Several other speakers reiterated their countries' readiness to provide a range of technical assistance programmes in areas related to counter-terrorism.⁴⁶ Several speakers agreed with the Secretary-General that there could be no trade-off between the fight against terrorism and the protection of human rights.⁴⁷ In addition, the representative of Peru maintained that the Council and the General Assembly should affirm that terrorist groups themselves were violators of human rights.⁴⁸

Several speakers referred to the need to define terrorism. In that regard, several representatives expressed their support for the negotiations on the draft comprehensive convention on international terrorism in the General Assembly.⁴⁹

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, while strongly condemning the brutal crime of 11 September 2001 and its impact on innocent civilians, also held that there was a need to define terrorism and to distinguish it from the just struggle of people to free themselves from foreign occupation. Referring to, inter alia, the Palestinian question, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, supported by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, held that foreign occupation was the most brutal form of terrorism and that therefore, resistance to foreign occupation, in his opinion, constituted legitimate struggle. He regretted that the Council had not denounced Israeli State terrorism.⁵⁰ The representatives of Morocco (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Qatar also recognized a right to self-defence for the Palestinian people.⁵¹ The representative of Palestine rejected suicide bombings carried out in Israel targeting Israeli civilians as terrorist acts. With regard to acts of violence in the occupied Palestinian territory, he stated that while they were incompatible with the current ceasefire, he regarded them as legitimate resistance to foreign occupation and did not accept any attempt to label them as terrorist acts. Moreover, he also accused Israel of committing State terrorism.⁵² The representative of Pakistan also held that foreign occupation constituted a form of State terrorism and linked the concept to the situation in Kashmir.⁵³ The representative of India stressed that the existence of, and support for the activities of, terrorist groups such as Jaish-e-Mohammed and Lashkar-e-Tayyiba was in direct and complete contravention of resolution 1373 (2001).⁵⁴ The representative of Israel

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 3-5.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 8 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 10 (Costa Rica on behalf of the Rio Group).

⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 10-11 (Costa Rica on behalf of the Rio Group); pp. 12-13 (Spain on behalf of the European Union); p. 14 (Canada on behalf of the Group of Eight); p. 17 (Bulgaria); p. 18 (China); and pp. 22-23 (Morocco on behalf of the Group of Arab States); S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), pp. 12-13 (Brunei Darussalam on behalf of ASEAN); p. 13 (Portugal on behalf of OSCE); p. 15 (Nauru on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum); p. 17 (Nepal); and pp. 28-29 (Mauritius).

⁴⁶ S/PV.4453, p. 6 (United States); p. 7 (France); p. 12 (Spain on behalf of the European Union); p. 15 (Canada); and p. 28 (Norway); S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Japan).

⁴⁷ S/PV.4453, p. 10 (Costa Rica on behalf of the Rio Group); p. 15 (Ireland); and p. 21 (Peru); S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Bangladesh) and p. 27 (Mexico).

⁴⁸ S/PV.4453, p. 22.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 6 (United States); p. 13 (Spain on behalf of the European Union); p. 16 (Ireland); and p. 23 (Morocco on behalf of the Group of Arab States); S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Mongolia); p. 19 (Qatar); p. 26 (Cameroon); and p. 27 (Mexico).

⁵⁰ S/PV.4453, pp. 7-8 (Syrian Arab Republic); S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), pp. 21-22 (Islamic Republic of Iran).

⁵¹ S/PV.4453, p. 23 (Morocco on behalf of the Group of Arab States); S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), p. 19 (Qatar).

⁵² S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), p. 23.

⁵³ S/PV.4453, p. 31.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 21.

regretted the baseless allegations made by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic and held that States that provided support, assistance or safe harbour to terrorist organizations had to be targeted no less than the terrorists themselves.⁵⁵ The Chairman of the Committee noted that neither resolution 1373 (2001) nor the 12 international conventions relating to terrorism referred to a concept of “State terrorism”. He stated that the Committee had to proceed within the given consensus. He further held that States should be judged against the international instruments dealing with war crimes, crimes against humanity and international human rights and humanitarian law.⁵⁶

Several speakers held that efforts to address other global challenges facing the United Nations, including in the area of development, would strengthen the fight against terrorism.⁵⁷ Several speakers held that nothing could justify the deliberate taking of innocent civilian life, regardless of cause or grievance.⁵⁸ The representative of Morocco (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) held that it was necessary to address the fundamental causes of terrorism, which would not in any way constitute an attempt to justify or rationalize terrorism.⁵⁹ The representative of Pakistan also held that the roots of terrorism, which in his view lay in inequality, the denial of fundamental rights and in a sense of injustice, needed to be addressed.⁶⁰ In contrast, the representative of Canada held that the root cause of terrorism was terrorists.⁶¹

The representative of Costa Rica (on behalf of the Rio Group) maintained that extreme poverty and the violation of human rights fed extremism and terrorism, and that a multilateral strategy against terrorism needed to tackle the problems of extreme poverty, hunger, destitution, illness and the lack of housing and education. He also held that respect for human rights and democracy constituted the best line of defence

against terrorism and that the struggle against terrorism should not become an excuse to disregard fundamental rights. He expressed his belief that the fight against terrorism should not lend itself to fuelling ethnic hatred or promoting discord among the different religions and civilizations.⁶² The representative of Morocco (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) held that the international community should act to prevent all slander and defamation campaigns against the Arab and Muslim communities.⁶³

The representative of Spain (on behalf of the European Union) emphasized that the European Union could not remain indifferent to States who did not comply with the obligations established by resolution 1373 (2001), and that the importance that the European Union attached to combating terrorism would be reflected in its relations with those States.⁶⁴

Several speakers voiced support for the establishment of a United Nations trust fund to support Member States in their implementation of resolution 1373 (2001).⁶⁵

The representative of Peru also highlighted the potential of a biological terrorist threat and asked the Committee to consider that threat, and promote international cooperation on nuclear and radiological safety.⁶⁶ The representative of Colombia put special emphasis on the need to combat the financing of terrorism.⁶⁷ Several speakers highlighted the linkages between terrorism and drug-trafficking, organized crime, money-laundering and the illicit trafficking of arms.⁶⁸

At its 4512th meeting,⁶⁹ on 15 April 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, following which statements were made by most members of the

⁵⁵ S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), pp. 20-21.

⁵⁶ S/PV.4453, pp. 24-25.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Costa Rica on behalf of the Rio Group); p. 18 (China); and p. 28 (Norway); S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Mongolia); p. 11 (Jamaica on behalf of CARICOM); and pp. 18-19 (Qatar).

⁵⁸ S/PV.4453, p. 6 (United States); p. 10 (Costa Rica on behalf of the Rio Group); p. 20 (India); and p. 28 (Norway); S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), p. 11 (Jamaica on behalf of CARICOM); p. 16 (Nepal); and p. 20 (Israel).

⁵⁹ S/PV.4453, p. 23.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 16 (Ireland); and p. 18 (China); S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Guinea).

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Costa Rica on behalf of the Rio Group); p. 17 (Bulgaria); and p. 29 (Colombia); S/PV.4453 (Resumption 1), p. 11 (Jamaica on behalf of CARICOM); and p. 17 (Nepal).

⁶⁹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part IX, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 51 of the Charter.

Council⁷⁰ and the representatives of Australia, Cambodia (on behalf of ASEAN), Canada, Chile, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Rio Group), Israel, Japan, Malawi, Malaysia, Pakistan, Peru, Spain (on behalf of the European Union),⁷¹ Turkey and Ukraine.

In his briefing, the Chairman of the Committee reviewed the structure and activities of the Committee six months after its establishment pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001). He informed the Council that the Committee had so far received 143 reports from Member States, had reviewed and responded to 62 States and was following up with the 50 States that had not yet submitted reports. He stressed that the Committee would continue the excellent dialogue with all Member States and continue to perform on the basis of transparency and even-handedness until the Committee was confident that each State had taken action on all the issues covered by resolution 1373 (2001). In introducing the work programme for the following 90-day period,⁷² the Chairman stated that the Committee would continue to check the facts given in the country reports concerning the legislation in place, the administrative action taken and the way in which those tools were used to prevent the territory of each State being abused by terrorists. He held that, as the preliminary review of the reports received was completed, the Committee would, in a second review of the second round of reports, be more direct in identifying potential gaps and in asking States what action they intended to take to address issues of concern. It would also expect the experts to recommend where assistance would be needed and inform States where to find the required assistance. He emphasized that there was agreement that the Committee and the Council would, if necessary, consider what action was needed to address failures to meet the requirements of resolution 1373 (2001). While expressing understanding for the lack of capacity in some countries to prepare a full report, he requested those States that had not yet done so to begin their written exchange with the Committee before 31 May 2002. In addition, he reported that the Committee intended to deepen its contacts with

regional organizations and continue to make contact with other international organizations, including the Financial Action Task Force, the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Maritime Organization, to encourage them to take action on issues within their area of expertise.⁷³

In their statements, most speakers stated that they were impressed with the work achieved so far by the Committee and endorsed its programme of work. Most speakers underlined the importance of providing assistance to States to implement their obligations under resolution 1373 (2001) and called on the Committee for facilitation. In that regard, most speakers welcomed the imminent appointment of an additional expert dealing with technical assistance. Several speakers underlined the need for equitable geographical representation in the group of experts.⁷⁴

In a similar vein, while stressing the obligation of the remaining States to submit reports to the Committee as soon as possible, most speakers recognized that many States lacked the financial, technical and administrative resources to do so. Several speakers suggested that the Committee should assist those States in their responses.⁷⁵

In addition, most speakers emphasized the need for cooperation with regional organizations. As in previous meetings, a number of speakers reported on the measures taken by regional organizations and groups.⁷⁶

Many speakers reiterated that the fight against terrorism should never come at the expense of human rights.⁷⁷ Several speakers also held that terrorism itself

⁷⁰ The representative of the United Kingdom, who delivered the briefing in his capacity as the Chairman of the Committee, did not make a statement in his national capacity.

⁷¹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

⁷² S/2002/318.

⁷³ S/PV.4512, pp. 2-4.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (Guinea); p. 9 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 17 (Russian Federation on behalf of the Commonwealth of Independent States).

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Bulgaria); and p. 9 (Syrian Arab Republic).

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17 (Russian Federation on behalf of the Commonwealth of Independent States); pp. 18-19 (Spain on behalf of the European Union); and pp. 22-23 (Canada on behalf of the Group of Eight); S/PV.4512 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3 (Costa Rica on behalf of the Rio Group); p. 6 (Cambodia on behalf of ASEAN); p. 9 (Malawi on behalf of SADC); and pp. 10-11 (Malaysia, on behalf of OIC).

⁷⁷ S/PV.4512, p. 9 (Norway); p. 13 (Mexico); p. 15 (Mauritius); p. 16 (Ireland); pp. 18-19 (Spain on behalf of the European Union); and p. 20 (Chile); S/PV.4512 (Resumption 1), pp. 7-8 (Peru).

represented a violation of fundamental human rights.⁷⁸ In addition, the representative of Malawi (on behalf of the Southern African Development Community) held that terrorism represented the antithesis of socio-economic development.⁷⁹

The representative of Singapore noted that support for the Committee would become stronger if it became clear in which way it impacted the struggle against terrorism, and noted four concrete areas where the impact of the Committee went beyond reports and discussions, including by forcing Member States to review their national legislation and assessing its adequacy in the struggle against terrorism; increasing the momentum towards the ratification of international conventions related to counter-terrorism; deepening the mechanisms for information and intelligence exchange; and pushing for an increase in assistance to Member States in the fight against terrorism.⁸⁰ The representative of Australia observed that the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 had revealed that existing counter-terrorism instruments, while enjoying wide adherence, had not provided sufficient accountability or verification of their implementation and that other weaknesses in the international counter-terrorism regime had included insufficient information exchange and the lack of assistance for capacity-building.⁸¹

The representative of Norway emphasized the importance of cutting terrorist financing and noted, in that regard, that information obtained suggested that terrorist groups were already finding it difficult to receive funding through international channels.⁸²

In addition, the representative of Mexico insisted that all efforts in the fight against terrorism conform to the provisions of the Charter and of international law. He emphasized that the use of force was not without limits, had to be governed by a valid interpretation of the legitimate right of self-defence and should in all circumstances conform to the principle of proportionality.⁸³

⁷⁸ S/PV.4512 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Costa Rica on behalf of the Rio Group); p. 4 (Turkey); and p. 9 (Malawi on behalf of SADC).

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁸⁰ S/PV.4512, p. 4.

⁸¹ S/PV.4512 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

⁸² S/PV.4512, p. 9.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

The representative of Mauritius, reflecting on his experiences with respect to his Vice-Chairmanship of the Committee, shared some of the concerns that Member States had expressed when presented with the response of the Committee to their reports, including concerns as to whether some questions in the response might not be beyond the scope and purview of the mandate of resolution 1373 (2001), whether answers by Member States to the questions of the Committee would help in understanding if a country had complied with resolution 1373 (2001) and what the next course of action would be after the reports of all Member States had been thoroughly studied by the Committee.⁸⁴ The representative of Ireland stressed that as the Committee progressed into more detailed assessments regarding the implementation by States of resolution 1373 (2001), it should be careful not to micromanage or prescribe beyond the requirements of resolution 1373 (2001).⁸⁵ The representative of the Russian Federation held that the Council had a clear general understanding that the Committee should and would not function as a repressive organ or in any way go beyond the limits of its mandate.⁸⁶ The Chairman of the Committee, responding to those questions, maintained that the text of resolution 1373 (2001) was extremely broad and that the Committee had agreed to implement nothing less and nothing more than the mandate. Addressing the question of non-compliance with resolution 1373 (2001), the Chairman stated that this had not happened so far, and that the Committee would address the question if and when it would arise.⁸⁷

The representative of Spain (on behalf of the European Union) welcomed the initiative of the Secretary-General to create a working group to review and improve actions undertaken by the various departments of the Secretariat in the fight against terrorism. While indicating that the European Union was carrying out an assessment of its relations with third countries in the light of their attitude towards terrorism, he also emphasized that the actions of the European Union were aimed at individuals or groups of terrorists, never at peoples, religions or cultures.⁸⁸

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁸⁷ S/PV.4512 (Resumption 1), p. 13.

⁸⁸ S/PV.4512, p. 19.

The representative of Costa Rica (on behalf of the Rio Group) held that extremism was fueled by political oppression, extreme poverty, hunger, destitution, disease and the violation of fundamental human rights. He also expressed his conviction that the fight against terrorism required the building of societies reigned by a true culture of peace, tolerance and solidarity.⁸⁹

The representative of Chile condemned both the appalling violence unleashed against the population of Palestine and the atrocity of the acts of terrorism committed against civilians in Israel and held that the international community, in addition to combating terrorism, should address situations, such as the one in the Middle East, which in his view, fostered a climate contributing to a spiral of violence and terror. He also expressed the conviction that the oppression of peoples, ignorance accompanied by extreme ideologies and conditions of extreme poverty were increasingly creating a climate of marginalization and dehumanization that encouraged recourse to violence and legitimized the actions of terrorists through the degradation it perpetrated. He underlined the limitations of strategies that reduced combating terrorism to a simple question of military strength and held that the international strategy should be based on a multifaceted and resolute approach. In that regard, he proposed that the Committee participate in the elaboration of new, twenty-first century concepts of security.⁹⁰

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic reiterated his country's position on the need to include "State terrorism" in the definition of terrorism and called the acts of destruction and killing being perpetrated against the Palestinian people the most severe form of terrorism.⁹¹ The representative of Pakistan, also reiterating his position on State terrorism, held that to confront terrorism, it was necessary to address the source and the roots of the problem and that it was time for correcting historical wrongs and for redressing endemic injustices, and in the same vein to find a just, lasting and honourable settlement of the Kashmir and Palestine issues.⁹²

The representative of Malaysia quoted a declaration of the Organization of the Islamic

Conference, in which OIC stressed that terrorism had no association with any religion, civilization or nationality and underlined that preventive action taken to combat terrorism should not result in ethnic or religious profiling or in the targeting of a particular community. While referring to the concept of State terrorism, he stressed the legitimacy of resistance to foreign occupation in the struggle for national liberation and self-determination and called for an internationally agreed definition of terrorism that differentiated such struggles from acts of terrorism. The statement also emphasized the importance of addressing the root causes of international terrorism, which included foreign occupation, injustice and exclusion. While it reaffirmed the commitment of OIC to international action in combating terrorism in conformity with the principles of the Charter, including the principles of non-intervention in internal affairs and respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, it rejected any unilateral action taken against any Islamic country on the pretext of combating international terrorism. The Organization of the Islamic Conference also reiterated the call to convene an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations to formulate a joint, organized response of the international community to terrorism in all its forms and manifestations.⁹³

The representative of Turkey, regretting that Turkey could not align itself with the statement of the European Union, stressed that the problem of terrorism should not be addressed partially and selectively with regard to terrorist groups and organizations, and expressed the belief that the terrorist list of the European Union was incomplete and deficient in its current form.⁹⁴

The representative of Peru proposed that the Committee could develop or promote extensive cooperation programmes with requesting countries, including a programme for legal assistance, a programme of "smart borders" and a programme to strengthen awareness of human rights in the fight against terrorism.⁹⁵

The representative of Israel, while underlining the role of States in providing support, assistance and safe harbour to terrorists, also called for ending

⁸⁹ S/PV.4512 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

⁹⁰ S/PV.4512, p. 20.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁹² S/PV.4512 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

encouragement, incitement and moral and religious sanctioning of terrorist acts.⁹⁶

At the 4513th meeting, on 15 April 2002, the President (Russian Federation) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁹⁷ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed and confirmed the continuation of the current Chairmanship and Bureau arrangements for a further six months; invited the Counter-Terrorism Committee to continue its work as set out in the work programme for the Committee for the third 90-day period;⁹⁸

Considered it essential that those Member States which had not yet submitted a report pursuant to paragraph 6 of resolution 1373 (2001) did so as soon as possible;

Invited the Counter-Terrorism Committee to report on its activities at regular intervals and expressed its intention to review the structure and activities of the Committee no later than 4 October 2002.

**Decision of 8 October 2002 (4619th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4561st meeting, on 27 June 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, following which statements were made by most members of the Council⁹⁹ and the representatives of Brunei Darussalam (on behalf of ASEAN), Costa Rica (on behalf of the Rio Group) and Spain (on behalf of the European Union¹⁰⁰). In his briefing, the Chairman drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 17 June 2002 that he had written to the Council, explaining the way in which the Committee planned to follow up with the States that had not submitted a report to the Committee as at that date.¹⁰¹ Encouraging States to make contact with the Committee, he reiterated the readiness of the Committee and the experts to discuss any difficulties States might have in submitting reports. Presenting the work programme for

the next 90-day period, the Chairman stated that the Committee would focus on reviewing the second reports submitted by many States on the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). He stressed that the Committee, in its second response to States, intended to set out more clearly the gaps identified by the experts together with recommendations to improve the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). He expected many States to submit a third report to the Committee setting out their response to those recommendations and including timetables for action. He also stressed that experts would indicate, where appropriate, how a State might benefit from technical or other assistance. He reiterated that the Committee did not intend to declare any Member State fully compliant with resolution 1373 (2001), as the Committee believed that there was always further work to improve counter-terrorism measures against a constantly evolving background. With regard to the Committee's outreach to regional organizations, the Chairman had called on those organizations to develop permanent mechanisms for dealing with terrorism, to use those forums to discuss counter-terrorism measures on a regional level and to develop their own assistance programmes. Turning to the achievements of the Committee, the Chairman held that widespread attention had been directed to resolution 1373 (2001) and that a broad range of regional and subregional organizations were now aware that there was a global structure for countering terrorism. He also pointed to ratifications of the 12 international conventions and protocols relating to terrorism, which had gone up by more than 15 per cent since July 2001, as an indicator of success.¹⁰²

In their statements, most speakers commended the work of the Committee and committed themselves to cooperation against terrorism. Several speakers welcomed the scheduling of a full debate on the matter in three months time. Many speakers welcomed cooperation with regional and subregional organizations. The representative of the Russian Federation believed that cooperation between the Committee and the Commonwealth of Independent States anti-terrorism centre and the regional anti-terrorist structure of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization could be fruitful.¹⁰³

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁹⁷ S/PRST/2002/10.

⁹⁸ S/2002/318.

⁹⁹ The representative of the United Kingdom, who delivered the briefing in his capacity as the Chairman of the Committee, did not make a statement in his national capacity.

¹⁰⁰ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁰¹ S/2002/673.

¹⁰² S/PV.4561, pp. 2-4.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

Many speakers reiterated the importance of providing assistance to States to implement their obligations under resolution 1373 (2001). The representative of Spain (on behalf of the European Union) expected that the Committee and countries or regions in need of assistance would provide specific requests to donors.¹⁰⁴ The representative of Norway stated that, in addition to other measures, his country considered a strong commitment to development cooperation to be a relevant contribution to combating terrorism by improving socially unjustifiable conditions.¹⁰⁵

The representative of Singapore, although fully agreeing with the approach of the Committee not to declare any State completely in compliance with resolution 1373 (2001), questioned if it would not be possible to create some informal criteria against which Member States could assess whether they had fulfilled the requirements of that resolution.¹⁰⁶ In that regard, he was supported by the representative of Colombia.¹⁰⁷ In response, the Chairman of the Committee offered to provide to the Committee a synthesis of ongoing experience drawn from the reports of Member States, which would begin to amount to benchmarks for the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001).¹⁰⁸

The representative of the United States held that the review of the second round of reports would, to a large extent, determine the level of impact that the Committee would have in the fight against terrorism and whether it would be anything more than an ongoing world audit of the capacity of Member States to combat terrorism. He stressed that the Committee should be prepared to be professionally critical and tough-minded but also constructive. He emphasized the need to focus attention on those States which lacked the capacity or the will to implement resolution 1373 (2001). He therefore welcomed that the Committee had informally agreed to identify, in the response to the second round of reports, gaps in each State's implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). He also emphasized that resolution 1373 (2001) and the Committee established to monitor it had no time limits

and would continue until the Council would be satisfied with the implementation of the resolution.¹⁰⁹

The representative of Ireland held that the Committee should continue to be vigilant in the extreme not to go beyond the letter or the spirit of the mandate of resolution 1373 (2001). He noted that the role of the United Nations in the international counter-terrorism efforts was to provide legitimacy, to build a global consensus and to act as the defender and promoter of multilateralism and internationalism against those who were enemies of the international good. The Council should therefore avoid any actions that could undermine the sense of international legitimacy in the struggle against international terrorism. He also held that as the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) advanced, it might be necessary to renew the mandate of the Committee in the light of the experiences gathered to that date.¹¹⁰

The representative of Spain (speaking on behalf of the European Union) emphasized that resolution 1373 (2001) was not complied with through mere presentation of reports and that the reports should reflect the reality of legal and practical measures adopted at the national or regional level.¹¹¹ The representative of China noted that the Security Council should focus on how the counter-terrorism efforts of the United Nations could be integrated into the international fight against terrorism.¹¹² In addition, several speakers underlined the connection between terrorism and organized crime.¹¹³

With regard to the relationship between counter-terrorism efforts and human rights, the representative of Ireland quoted the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, who warned that order and security had become overriding priorities, and that in the past, emphasis on national order and security had often involved the curtailment of democracy and human rights.¹¹⁴ The representative of Spain (on behalf of the European Union) held that individual human rights had to be taken into account in the design and implementation of sanctions in the fight against terrorism and emphasized that States, in

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (Guinea); p. 9 (Cameroon); and p. 14 (Mauritius).

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

fighting terrorism, must not condone acts of indiscriminate violence against civilians or use counter-terrorism as a pretext for political repression.¹¹⁵

The representative of Costa Rica (on behalf of the Rio Group) stressed that it was not a sustainable solution that the growing practical and financial requirements of the Committee were being met with resources earmarked for other programmes and mandates and held that it was essential that resources for the Committee be allocated within the regular budget of the organization.¹¹⁶

At its 4618th meeting,¹¹⁷ on 4 October 2002, the Council heard a statement by the Secretary-General and a briefing by the Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, following which statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Australia, Burkina Faso, Cambodia (on behalf of ASEAN), Costa Rica (on behalf of the Rio Group), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union),¹¹⁸ Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji (on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum), Georgia, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Nepal, the Philippines, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine (on behalf of GUUAM), Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia, the Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the Permanent Observer of the African Union.

In his statement, the Secretary-General reiterated that terrorism was a global threat with global effects which affected every aspect of the United Nations agenda, ranging from development to peace, to human rights and the rule of law. He held that terrorism was an assault on the fundamental principles of law, order, human rights and the peaceful settlement of disputes. He emphasized that the United Nations had an indispensable role in providing the legal and organizational framework for the international

campaign against terrorism. He noted that he had set up the Policy Working Group on the United Nations and Terrorism, which had submitted a report dated 28 June 2002 with recommendations for a strategic definition of priorities to orient the work of the United Nations.¹¹⁹ He stated that following the strategy proposed in the report, the United Nations would set itself three goals: (a) dissuading would-be perpetrators of terror by setting effective norms and implementing relevant legal instruments, by mounting an active public information campaign and by rallying an international consensus against terrorism; (b) denying would-be perpetrators the opportunity to commit terrorist acts by supporting the efforts of the Committee to monitor compliance with resolution 1373 (2001), through greater efforts to achieve disarmament, especially through strengthening global norms against the use or proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and through technical assistance and support to States seeking to curb the flow of arms, funds and technology to terrorist cells; and (c) sustaining cooperation in the struggle against terrorism, especially by encouraging subregional, regional and global organizations to join forces in a common campaign.¹²⁰

The Chairman, in his briefing, vowed to continue the work of the Committee on the basis of the principles of cooperation and transparency. He stated that the Committee was not a tribunal and did not judge States but expected every State to work at its fastest pace to implement the far-reaching obligations of resolution 1373 (2001), which for most States would mean to have legislation in place covering all aspects of resolution 1373 (2001) and an effective executive machinery for preventing and suppressing terrorist financing. The Chairman held that the global environment for terrorists had changed, whereby almost all States had reviewed their legislation and institutions to fight terrorism. Ratifications of the 12 international conventions and protocols related to terrorism had increased and the number of States working together to improve regional capacities against terrorism and cooperation between States, particularly in the form of assistance, had increased. The Chairman also reported that to date the Committee had received 265 reports from States and regional organizations on the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001), including 86 follow-up reports; however, 16

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹¹⁷ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part IV, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 51 of the Charter.

¹¹⁸ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹¹⁹ S/2002/875, annex.

¹²⁰ S/PV.4618, pp. 3-4.

Member States had not yet filed a report, 7 of which had not made any type of written contact with the Committee.¹²¹

In their statements following the briefing, most speakers lauded the work and the achievements of the Committee in raising awareness of resolution 1373 (2001) and global counter-terrorism measures; in reviewing country reports, identifying areas for improvement in national legislation and implementation; and in facilitating counter-terrorism assistance. Many speakers appealed to the Member States that had not submitted their first report to contact the Committee without delay. Most speakers laid out the measures taken by their countries to adhere to resolution 1373 (2001) and effectively counter the threat of terrorism. They also reiterated the importance of regional and subregional approaches, with the representative of Bulgaria suggesting that regional and subregional organizations were often the most suited for the fight against terrorism.¹²²

Many speakers underlined that there should be no contradiction between counter-terrorism measures and the protection of human rights. Several speakers held that terrorism itself was a threat to human rights.¹²³ The representative of Norway, supported by the representative of Ireland, emphasized that the effective implementation of anti-terrorist measures at the national level should not be perceived as an excuse to deny fundamental rights and freedoms.¹²⁴ The representative of Peru added that the humanitarian institution of political asylum should not be debased; that authorities should be careful not to extend refugee status to possible authors of terrorist acts.¹²⁵ The representative of the United States held that terrorists and their supporters were enemies of the rule of law. He held that effective counter-terrorism was also an effort to vindicate and defend the rule of law, as recognized by the obligation in resolution 1373 (2001) to strengthen domestic legal institutions and capacities to combat terrorism. He also stated that the effective protection of human rights was always the defence of the rule of law. Hence, there was no incompatibility

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-7.

¹²² *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 14 (Mexico); and p. 17 (Norway); S/PV.4618 (Resumption 2), p. 2 (Peru); and p. 8 (Ukraine on behalf of GUUAM).

¹²⁴ S/PV.4618, p. 17 (Norway); and p. 18 (Ireland).

¹²⁵ S/PV.4618 (Resumption 2), p. 2.

between the effort to combat terrorism and developing the rule of law and, therefore, the protection of basic human rights.¹²⁶

A number of speakers held that combating terrorism also required taking account of the political, diplomatic, economic, social and humanitarian dimension of the problem. In that regard, several speakers suggested that economic and social development and the fight against poverty would be an essential part of the fight against terrorism.¹²⁷ Other speakers suggested that it was necessary to find just and peaceful solutions to conflicts, with the representative of Lebanon suggesting that a comprehensive solution to the Middle East conflict could ease tensions in that region and eradicate most sources of violence and terrorism.¹²⁸ The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran held that terrorist acts had roots in political issues, which neither justified the acts of its perpetrators nor necessarily demonized the cause they might embrace.¹²⁹ Several other speakers also referred to those factors as the roots or root causes of terrorism.¹³⁰ In response, the Chairman of the Committee held that poor development and poverty were a growth medium for support for terrorism and that the effective eradication of terrorism would both contribute to and be enhanced by effective sustainable development policies.¹³¹

Several speakers called for finalizing the draft comprehensive convention on international terrorism.¹³²

A number of speakers, while sharply condemning terrorism, also held that there should be a clear

¹²⁶ S/PV.4618, p. 20.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 14 (Mexico); S/PV.4618 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Tunisia); p. 12 (Pakistan); and p. 17 (Costa Rica on behalf of the Rio Group); S/PV.4618 (Resumption 2), p. 7 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); p. 13 (Zambia); p. 15 (African Union); and p. 17 (Nepal).

¹²⁸ S/PV.4618, p. 14 (Mexico); and pp. 26-27 (Islamic Republic of Iran); S/PV.4618 (Resumption 1), p. 12 (Pakistan); S/PV.4618 (Resumption 2), p. 16 (Lebanon).

¹²⁹ S/PV.4618, p. 27.

¹³⁰ S/PV.4618 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Tunisia); and p. 12 (Pakistan); S/PV.4618 (Resumption 2), p. 13 (Zambia); and p. 15 (African Union).

¹³¹ S/PV.4618 (Resumption 2), p. 18.

¹³² S/PV.4618 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Japan); and p. 3 (Yemen); S/PV.4618 (Resumption 2), p. 6 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); p. 11 (Turkey); pp. 15-16 (Lebanon); and p. 17 (Nepal).

distinction between terrorism and the legitimate right to self-determination and the legitimate struggle against foreign occupation. In making that argument, many speakers pointed to their own struggles for independence as an example and to the fact that self-determination was a right confirmed by international law and the Charter.¹³³ In that regard, some speakers pointed to the need to define terrorism, with the Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference reiterating the call of its Member States to convene an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations to define terrorism and to differentiate between it and the right of peoples to resist occupation, and to take all necessary measures to completely eliminate international terrorism in all its forms and manifestations.¹³⁴ The representative of Yemen also held that a definition of terrorism should cover all acts of terrorism, whether undertaken by individuals, groups or States.¹³⁵ The representative of Zambia held that as a country which upheld the right of peoples to self-determination and independence, he knew very well the difference between a freedom fighter and a terrorist. He held that liberation movements were legal bodies with clear objectives and programmes of actions that are available to all those interested. On the contrary, terrorists had no missions, their activities were illegal and often they claimed to represent mysterious forces that existed only in the minds of the perpetrators.¹³⁶ The representative of Israel held that the distinctions between so-called good terrorism and bad terrorism, between the justifiable targeting of civilians and the unjustifiable targeting of civilians were not only wrong and contrary to the most basic principles of international law, but also profoundly dangerous. He held that the principle that no cause or grievance ever justified the deliberate and indiscriminate targeting of civilians had to be defended and that terrorism must be defined on the basis of what a perpetrator did, and not what he did it for.¹³⁷

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic expressed his bewilderment that despite the condemnation by the Arab States of the terrorist attacks on the United States and their expression of solidarity with the families of the victims, despite the efforts of the Committee and despite the fact that the events of 11 September 2001 had been officially linked to Al-Qaida and the Taliban regime, the blame had recently been shifted to Arab States, some of which were being threatened though none played a role in the attacks.¹³⁸

The representative of Colombia suggested that the Committee should move on from a general framework of cooperation to the consideration of specific cases, developing actions and decisions specifically targeting States, individuals or organizations that were directly or indirectly involved in terrorist activities. To do this, he acknowledged that the committee would require a re-evaluated and possibly modified mandate. He also held that there should be more effective cooperation between the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Afghanistan, which monitored the implementation of sanctions against Al-Qaida and the Taliban.¹³⁹

The representative of Singapore noted that terrorist groups had gone through a privatization process by receiving private funding and training and that they had become highly networked organizational structures. She held that it was critical for Member States to deepen the exchange of information between intelligence and law enforcement officers at the regional and international levels, thereby also forming closely coordinated networks. In his opinion, it took a network to beat a network.¹⁴⁰

The representative of the United States held that the adoption of resolution 1373 (2001) and the ensuing work of the Committee represented a chapter in the history of the Council and the United Nations in which everyone could take pride. He admitted to initial scepticism at the intent to create a body to monitor the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001), but stated that this scepticism had long since vanished, as without the creation of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, the international community would be far behind in the

¹³³ S/PV.4618 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Yemen); p. 8 (Tunisia); p. 17 (Egypt); and p. 21 (Organization of the Islamic Conference); S/PV.4618 (Resumption 2), p. 14 (African Union); and pp. 15-16 (Lebanon).

¹³⁴ S/PV.4618 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Tunisia); and p. 21 (Organization of the Islamic Conference); S/PV.4618 (Resumption 2), p. 14 (African Union).

¹³⁵ S/PV.4618 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

¹³⁶ S/PV.4618 (Resumption 2), p. 13.

¹³⁷ S/PV.4618 (Resumption 2), p. 4.

¹³⁸ S/PV.4618, p. 9.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

fight against terrorism and in the effort to improve the world's capacity to conduct counter-terrorism operations.¹⁴¹

The representative of the Russian Federation held that, with regard to the recommendations made by the Committee, to eliminate identified weaknesses it was important to note that the general view in the Council was that the Committee was not a punitive body and that it would adhere strictly to its agreed mandate.¹⁴²

The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, while underlining the priority of the fight against terrorism and the measures taken by the Government to cooperate with the international community in this regard, also pointed to the danger that the fight against terrorism would be employed as a means to bring pressure to bear on States that might pursue a different political outlook.¹⁴³

The representative of the Republic of Korea suggested that the findings of the Committee regarding the strengths, setbacks and patterns of national counter-terrorism measures could be of benefit to the relevant deliberations in the General Assembly.¹⁴⁴

The representative of Pakistan held that thanks to a successful international campaign in Afghanistan and elsewhere, Al-Qaida had been virtually destroyed and the Government that had harboured and protected Al-Qaida had been ejected from power, but warned that the war against terrorism in Afghanistan was not fully won and that failure to take timely action to consolidate security could prove to be very costly in the future. He also stated that agencies of the Government of Pakistan were engaged in successful operations to hunt down Al-Qaida and other terrorists that might have infiltrated the country. He warned, however, that the ability of Pakistan to support the international struggle against terrorism could be significantly eroded by the military threat against Pakistan from its eastern neighbour, which in his view had misused the rationale of the anti-terrorism campaign by denigrating the noble freedom struggle of the people of Jammu and Kashmir as cross-border terrorism and had deployed one million troops on the border with Pakistan and along the Line of Control in Kashmir. He also warned of the danger of unwittingly provoking a clash of religions and cultures. He held that the attempt to equate Islam and Muslims with terrorism was

exacerbating discrimination against Muslim minorities in various parts of the world, and pointing to events in Gujarat earlier in the year, he warned of organized pogroms against minorities and suppressed peoples. In that regard, he recalled the proposal by the President of Pakistan that the General Assembly adopt a declaration on religious and cultural understanding, harmony and cooperation.¹⁴⁵

The representative of Georgia, while emphasizing the goodwill of his Government, accused the Russian Federation of subjecting his country to daily terror, intimidation and the threat of aggression. He held that Georgia had launched and completed an anti-terrorist and anti-criminal operation in the Pankisi Gorge, where it had rooted out Chechnyan fighters, terrorist suspects and mercenaries, in line with its obligations under resolution 1373 (2001). However, he held that a notorious international terrorist, wanted for assassination attempts against the President of Georgia, had been taking refuge in the Russian Federation for seven years. He also referred to the conflict in Abkhazia, Georgia, and contended that the Abkhazia and Tskhinvali — the former South Ossetia — regions of Georgia had become a breeding ground for terrorism, drug trafficking and illicit arms smuggling.¹⁴⁶

The representative of Yugoslavia stated that his country had been faced with extremism in the province of Kosovo and Metohija and welcomed the efforts by the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo to address those problems.¹⁴⁷

The representative of Egypt, while forcefully condemning terrorism, held that the war against terrorism should be waged by a broad-based international coalition, rather than by a few nations.¹⁴⁸

The representative of India, while lauding the work of the Committee, held that enforceability of violations of counter-terrorist conventions and resolutions remained an issue, as there was more than one instance of blatant non-compliance. He therefore questioned what the Committee and the Council would do to account for the complaint of a Member State that was a victim of cross-border terrorist acts.¹⁴⁹ The Chairman of the Committee, in response, recognized

¹⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 19-20.

¹⁴² Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁴³ Ibid., pp. 26-27.

¹⁴⁴ S/PV.4618 (Resumption 1), p. 7.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 11.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 13-14.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 15.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 18.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 20.

the importance of enforcement and enforceability, but held that the Committee had to start with capacity-building and creating political momentum to create objectivity in its work. He hoped that once objectivity had been established and the Committee felt able to move on in unanimity to some of the questions of enforcement, it could consider how to approach failures to meet the necessary standard. He also added that enforcement was a matter for the Council as a whole, and not for the Committee.¹⁵⁰

The Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference emphasized that the phenomenon of terrorism was not restricted to one people, ethnic group or religion.¹⁵¹

The representative of Peru hoped that the Council would find a way to agree on a list of terrorist organizations. He also pointed to the activities of small groups of Shining Path militants in the United States and Europe.¹⁵²

The representative of Burkina Faso held that the fall of the Taliban regime and the destruction of their sanctuary in Afghanistan had not yet served to eradicate the Al-Qaida organization and that its financial networks had been replaced. He also held that everything must be done to prevent the use of weapons of mass destruction by terrorists.¹⁵³ The representative of Nepal also pointed to the danger of an attack with radiological, chemical or biological weapons or against nuclear installations.¹⁵⁴

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo held that his country and its people had been victims of the most insidious and abject form of international terrorism — State terrorism perpetrated by neighbouring countries.¹⁵⁵

At the 4619th meeting, on 8 October 2002, the President (Cameroon) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁵⁶ by which the Council, inter alia:

Confirmed the continuation of the current arrangements for the Bureau of the Committee for a further six months; invited the Counter-Terrorism Committee to pursue its agenda as set out in the work programme for the Committee for the fifth

90-day period,¹⁵⁷ focusing on ensuring that all States had legislation in place covering all aspects of resolution 1373 (2001), a process in hand for ratifying as soon as possible the 12 international conventions and protocols relating to terrorism, and effective executive machinery for preventing and suppressing terrorism financing; exploring ways in which States could be assisted to implement resolution 1373 (2001), in particular in the areas of primary focus; and building a dialogue with international, regional and subregional organizations active in the areas covered by the resolution.

Decision of 14 October 2002 (4624th meeting): resolution 1438 (2002)

At the 4624th meeting, on 14 October 2002, the President (Cameroon) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁵⁸ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1438 (2002), by which the Council, inter alia:

Condemned in the strongest terms the bomb attacks in Bali, Indonesia, on 12 October 2002, as well as other recent terrorist acts in various countries, and regarded such acts as a threat to the international peace and security;

Urged all States to work together and to cooperate with and provide support and assistance to Indonesian authorities in their efforts to find and bring to justice the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of those terrorist attacks;

Expressed its reinforced determination to combat all forms of terrorism in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter.

Decision of 24 October 2002 (4632nd meeting): resolution 1440 (2002)

At the 4632nd meeting, on 24 October 2002, the President (Cameroon) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁵⁹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1440 (2002), by which the Council, inter alia:

Condemned in the strongest terms the act of taking hostages in Moscow, Russian Federation, on 23 October 2002, as well as other recent terrorist acts in various countries, and regarded such acts as a threat to international peace and security;

Demanded immediate and unconditional release of all hostages in that terrorist act;

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 22.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁵² S/PV.4618 (Resumption 2), p. 2.

¹⁵³ Ibid., pp. 5-6.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁵⁶ S/PRST/2002/26.

¹⁵⁷ S/2002/1075.

¹⁵⁸ S/2002/1145.

¹⁵⁹ S/2002/1189.

Urged all States to cooperate with the Russian authorities in their efforts to find and bring to justice the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of those terrorist attacks;

Expressed its reinforced determination to combat all forms of terrorism, in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter.

Decision of 13 December 2002 (4667th meeting): resolution 1450 (2002)

At the 4667th meeting, on 13 December 2002, the President (Colombia) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution, submitted by the United States.¹⁶⁰ A statement was made by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. Speaking before the vote, he stated that he would vote against the draft resolution because it departed from the pattern of resolutions 1438 (2002) and 1440 (2002). Rather, he stated, the scope of the draft resolution was expanded to include elements that implied direct intervention in the internal affairs of the country where the events took place. He also expressed concern about political references that reflected negatively on the situation in the Middle East region, including the situation in the occupied Arab territories, which he deemed unacceptable. He also held that the attempt to link Israel to efforts to combat terrorism exploited the international campaign against terrorism. He further emphasized that the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic condemned the terrorist attack in Kikambala, Kenya, and reiterated its condemnation of terrorism in all its forms, but that it would vote against the draft resolution because it could not accept the repeated mention of Israel in a manner that was not within the wording of the resolutions on Bali and Moscow".¹⁶¹

The draft resolution was then put to the vote; it received 14 votes in favour and 1 against (Syrian Arab Republic), and was adopted as resolution 1450 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Condemned in the strongest terms the terrorist bomb attack at the Paradise Hotel, in Kikambala, Kenya, and the attempted missile attack on Arkia Israeli Airlines flight 582 departing Mombasa, Kenya, on 28 November 2002, as well as other recent terrorist acts in various countries, and regarded such acts, like any act of international terrorism, as a threat to international peace and security;

Urged all States, in accordance with their obligations under resolution 1373 (2001), to cooperate in efforts to find and

¹⁶⁰ S/2002/1351.

¹⁶¹ S/PV.4667, p. 2 (Syrian Arab Republic).

bring to justice the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of those terrorist attacks.

Decision of 17 December 2002 (4672nd meeting): statement by the President

At the 4672nd meeting, on 17 December 2002, the President (Colombia) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁶² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Requested the Counter-Terrorism Committee, with a view to improving the flow of information on experiences, standards and best practice, and to coordinating ongoing activity, to invite all relevant international, regional and subregional organizations:

(a) To contribute to a report information on their activities in the area of counter-terrorism;

(b) To send a representative to attend a special meeting of the Counter-Terrorism Committee with international, regional and subregional organizations on 7 March 2003;

Invited the Counter-Terrorism Committee to report on developments at regular intervals.

Decision of 20 December 2002 (4678th meeting): resolution 1452 (2002)

At the 4678th meeting, on 20 December 2002, the President (Colombia) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁶³ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1452 (2002), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter,¹⁶⁴ *inter alia*:

Decided that the provisions of paragraph 4 (b) of resolution 1267 (1999), and paragraphs 1 and 2 (a) of resolution 1390 (2002), did not apply to funds and other financial assets or economic resources that had been determined by the relevant State(s) to be:

(a) Necessary for basic expenses, including payments for foodstuffs, rent or mortgage, medicines and medical treatment, taxes, insurance premiums and public utility charges, or exclusively for payment of reasonable professional fees and reimbursement of incurred expenses associated with the provision of legal services, or fees or service charges for routine holding or maintenance of frozen funds or other financial assets or economic resources, after notification by the relevant State(s) to the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) of the intention to authorize, where appropriate, access to such

¹⁶² S/PRST/2002/38.

¹⁶³ S/2002/1384.

¹⁶⁴ For more information on the sanctions regime relating to Al-Qaida and the Taliban, see sect. 26 of the present chapter (The situation in Afghanistan).

funds, assets or resources and in the absence of a negative decision by the Committee within 48 hours of such notification;

(b) Necessary for extraordinary expenses, provided that such determination had been notified by the relevant State(s) to the Committee and had been approved by the Committee.

Decision of 17 January 2003 (4686th meeting): resolution 1455 (2003)

At the 4686th meeting, on 17 January 2003, the President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁶⁵ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1455 (2003), by which the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*:

Decided to improve the implementation of the measures imposed by paragraph 4 (b) of resolution 1267 (1999), paragraph 8 (c) of resolution 1333 (2000) and paragraphs 1 and 2 of resolution 1390 (2002);

Decided that the above-mentioned measures above would be further improved in 12 months, or sooner if necessary;

Requested the Committee to communicate to Member States the list referred to in paragraph 2 of resolution 1390 (2002) at least every three months, and stressed to all Member States the importance of submitting to the Committee the names of and identifying information, to the extent possible, about members of Al-Qaida and the Taliban and other individuals, groups, undertakings and entities associated with them so that the Committee could consider adding new names and details to its list, unless to do so would compromise investigations or enforcement actions;

Requested the Secretary-General to reappoint five experts, drawing on the expertise of the members of the Monitoring Group established pursuant to paragraph 4 (a) of resolution 1363 (2001), to monitor for a further period of 12 months the implementation of the above-mentioned measures and to follow up relevant leads relating to any incomplete implementation of those measures.

Decision of 13 February 2003 (4706th meeting): resolution 1465 (2003)

At its 4706th meeting, on 13 February 2003, the Council invited the representative of Colombia to participate in the meeting. The President (Germany) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁶⁶ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1465 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

¹⁶⁵ S/2003/48.

¹⁶⁶ S/2003/177.

Condemned in the strongest terms the bomb attack in Bogota, Colombia, on 7 February 2003 in which many lives were lost and people injured, and regarded such an act, like any act of terrorism, as a threat to peace and security;

Expressed its deepest sympathy and condolences to the people and the Government of Colombia and to the victims of the bomb attack and their families;

Urged all States to work together urgently and to cooperate with and provide support and assistance, as appropriate, to the Colombian authorities in their efforts to find and bring to justice the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of that terrorist attack;

Expressed its reinforced determination to combat all forms of terrorism, in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter.

Decision of 4 April 2003 (4734th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4710th meeting, on 20 February 2003, the President (Germany) drew the attention of the Council to the report of the Secretary-General submitted pursuant to resolution 1456 (2003).¹⁶⁷ In his report the Secretary-General, as requested, presented a summary of the proposals made by members of the Council at its 4688th meeting, held on 20 January 2003, and forwarded commentaries and responses to those proposals by four members of the Council.

At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, followed by statements by the representatives of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji (on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum), Greece (on behalf of the European Union¹⁶⁸), the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Myanmar (on behalf of ASEAN), Peru (on behalf of the Rio Group), South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Ukraine and Yemen.

In his briefing, the Chairman of the Committee stated that its work programme for the period concentrated on three areas: first, working with Member States to raise their capacity to defeat terrorism; second, promoting assistance programmes to accelerate the capacity-building process; and third,

¹⁶⁷ S/2003/191; see also S/2003/191/Add.1.

¹⁶⁸ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

creating a global network of international and regional organizations to maximize the efficiency of each of them in dealing with terrorism and to share experience and best practice.¹⁶⁹

The majority of speakers commended the work done so far by the Committee. Many representatives emphasized the need for a cooperative approach to combat terrorism bilaterally, as well as at the subregional, regional and international levels, and took the opportunity to outline their Governments' participation in and contribution to cooperative counter-terrorism initiatives. Some speakers expressed the view that the declaration adopted following the ministerial-level meeting on 20 January¹⁷⁰ was a valuable addition to resolution 1373 (2001) in helping to determine the Council's future approaches to fighting terrorism. In addition, they looked forward to the special meeting of the Committee and regional organizations.

A number of speakers underlined the need to further strengthen the international legal framework to combat terrorism more generally, and called on all States to ratify the 12 existing international conventions against terrorism. Several speakers also stressed the connections between terrorism, drug trafficking and other kinds of crime and the need to combat all of them in an integrated manner. Many speakers stressed the need for agreement on a universal definition of terrorism. A number of representatives highlighted the danger associated with the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, particularly the risk of terrorists obtaining access to them.¹⁷¹ Several representatives also underlined the importance of analysing and redressing the root causes of terrorism.¹⁷²

Several representatives spoke in favour of a distinction between terrorism and legitimate resistance as well as the legitimate rights of peoples, particularly the people of Palestine, to self-determination.¹⁷³ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic opined that

the greatest danger to the international campaign against terrorism was the Israeli terrorist approach to combating terrorism. He concluded by stating that occupation was terrorism.¹⁷⁴ The representative of Bahrain also pointed out that the most important component of international terrorism was State terrorism, as in the Balkans, Kosovo and Bosnia and Herzegovina, and which continues in the occupied Arab territories.¹⁷⁵

The representative of Israel called for the Committee to be more transparent in its work as well as to name and shame those States that continued to support terrorism. He expressed the belief that to battle terrorism on all fronts meant making no distinctions between so-called bad terrorism and good terrorism. He stated that his country could never allow the apologists for terrorism to invoke the mantra of root causes to justify murder while laying the moral foundation for future attacks. He therefore called on the Security Council to implement a policy of zero tolerance for terrorism. He also pointed out the appalling contradiction between the membership of the Syrian Arab Republic on the Council and its continued, extensive and unapologetic support for no fewer than 10 separate terrorist organizations.¹⁷⁶

The representative of Cuba declared that unilateral acts or pre-emptive war by a State or a group of States however powerful they may be, on the pretext of combating terrorism were totally unacceptable. Moreover, he added that it was impossible to eliminate terrorism if some terrorist acts were condemned while others were concealed, tolerated or justified.¹⁷⁷

The representative of Turkey expressed the belief that the international community could not come up with degrees of leniency towards terrorism and that it was not possible to talk sensibly about better terrorisms.¹⁷⁸

The representative of South Africa cautioned the Council and the Committee about the public perceptions with regard to terrorism, as many countries, particularly in the North, issued vague statements or advisories warning their citizens of the potential threat of terrorist attacks abroad, which had a

¹⁶⁹ S/PV.4710, pp. 2-3.

¹⁷⁰ Resolution 1456 (2003), annex.

¹⁷¹ S/PV.4710, p. 3 (Japan); p. 6 (Australia); pp. 21-22 (Ukraine); p. 28 (Greece on behalf of the European Union); and p. 34 (Canada).

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14 (Bahrain); pp. 3-4 (Japan); pp. 30-32 (South Africa); and pp. 25-26 (Yemen).

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14 (Bahrain); pp. 31-32 (Islamic Republic of Iran); and pp. 25-26 (Yemen).

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-11.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

negative impact on a country's standing, as well as on its security situation.¹⁷⁹

At its 4734th meeting, on 4 April 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee,¹⁸⁰ following which statements were made by all Council members and Afghanistan, Australia, Belarus, Brazil, Cambodia (on behalf of ASEAN), Colombia, Fiji (on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum), Greece (on behalf of the European Union¹⁸¹), India, Israel, Japan, Norway, Peru (on behalf of the Rio Group), the Philippines and the Republic of Korea.

Speaking first, the Chairman of the Committee drew the attention of the Council to the work programme for its seventh 90-day period.¹⁸² He highlighted the excellent cooperation established with the vast majority of Member States and the beginnings of a global network to tackle terrorism. He noted that, for those furthest ahead, the Committee was moving from examining legislation to establishing that executive machinery existed to prevent terrorist activities and bring terrorists to justice. For that reason, he believed that the Committee would need to deepen its understanding of what was required of States; there was no one standard pattern of counter-terrorism machinery for all countries. He also pointed out that a better flow of information on best practice, made available by an expanded Committee website, was necessary, as was its use by Member States and regional organizations.¹⁸³

The majority of representatives commended the work of the Committee during the previous 18 months and welcomed the new work programme. A few representatives underlined the need to strengthen the provision of assistance on counter-terrorism to developing countries and to monitor the implementation

of resolution 1373 (2001) by States. Many representatives recalled that in combating terrorism, the international community had to respect national and international law, human rights and the Charter. Several representatives also called attention to the interlinked problems of transnational crime and drugs.

A number of speakers cautioned about the risk of terrorists gaining access to weapons of mass destruction.¹⁸⁴ Some representatives regretted that there had been no significant progress by the Ad Hoc Committee established by General Assembly resolution 51/210 of 17 December 1996 in the elaboration of a draft comprehensive convention against terrorism and of a draft international convention on the suppression of nuclear terrorism.¹⁸⁵

The representative of the United States believed that the Committee needed to expand its tool kit to conduct a credible review of implementation resolution 1373 (2001) and to enhance its effectiveness. He added that some form of site visits might be necessary to ascertain the truth on the ground in certain instances. He also emphasized that unwilling States needed to be encouraged and pressured, as necessary, to do more to fight terrorism.¹⁸⁶

The representative of Pakistan maintained that it was essential to devise some safeguard mechanisms to prevent terrorist incidents and unsubstantiated allegations from becoming a *casus belli* for the use or threat of force, contrary to the Charter.¹⁸⁷

The representative of Spain, noting his role as the new Chairman of the Committee, affirmed that from then on the Committee would focus on the implementation and effectiveness of national legislation.¹⁸⁸

At the same meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁸⁹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

¹⁸⁰ The representative of the United Kingdom made statements in his capacity as the Chairman of the Committee and in his national capacity.

¹⁸¹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁸² S/2003/387; by this work programme, the Committee would strengthen international, regional and subregional cooperation, as well as improve coordination and information exchange.

¹⁸³ S/PV.4734, pp. 2-5.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (Germany); p. 7 (United States); p. 10 (Pakistan); p. 20 (Bulgaria); and p. 22 (Mexico); S/PV.4734 (Resumption 1), p. 11 (Greece); and p. 13 (Japan).

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Chile); p. 17 (Cameroon); and p. 20 (Bulgaria).

¹⁸⁶ S/PV.4734, pp. 7-9.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-12.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

¹⁸⁹ S/PRST/2003/3.

Confirmed the appointment of Mr. Arias (Spain) as the new Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, and the continuation in office of Mr. Gaspar Martins (Angola), Mr. Aguilar Zinser (Mexico) and Mr. Lavrov (Russian Federation) as Vice-Chairmen of the Committee;

Invited the Committee to pursue its agenda as set out in the work programme for the seventh 90-day period;

Noted that three States had not yet submitted a report to the Committee and that 51 Member States were late in submitting a further report, in contravention of the requirements set out in resolution 1373 (2001); called on them urgently to do so, in order to maintain the universality of response which resolution 1373 (2001) required;

Invited the Committee to continue reporting on its activities at regular intervals and expressed its intention to review the structure and activities of the Committee no later than 4 October 2003.

**Decision of 20 August 2003 (4811th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4752nd meeting, on 6 May 2003, the Council heard a statement by the Prime Minister of Spain, following which the representatives of Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, China, France, Germany, Guinea, Mexico, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Kingdom and the United States made statements.¹⁹⁰

The Prime Minister of Spain urged the international community not to fall into complacency. He advocated, *inter alia*, strengthening the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the mechanisms aimed at curbing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; cooperating with the disarmament agencies, especially those responsible for weapons of mass destruction; considering the possibility of empowering the Committee to draw up a general list of terrorist organizations; incorporating counter-terrorism assistance into international, bilateral and multilateral cooperation programmes; preventing terrorist groups from using the United Nations system as a platform for conveying their violent message to the world; giving a clear voice to the victims of terrorism; and addressing the social factors that terrorist organizations used as excuses.¹⁹¹

Most speakers supported Spain's leadership of the Committee and the efforts of the Committee to foster a

¹⁹⁰ The Secretary-General also attended the meeting, but did not make a statement.

¹⁹¹ S/PV.4752, pp. 2-4.

global counter-terrorism network. Some representatives emphasized that strengthening the Committee's assistance to States in need should be a priority. Several representatives also stressed the need to legitimize the fight against terrorism under international law, human rights and the Charter, and increase attention to other security threats that were linked to terrorist organizations, such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and drug trafficking.

The representative of the United Kingdom believed that it was time for the Committee to take action with respect to States that were falling behind on the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) and organize visits to Member States. He cautioned against the drawing up of a list of global terrorist organizations because of the lack of a definition of terrorism.¹⁹²

The representative of the Russian Federation expressed his disappointment at the stagnation in the work on the draft comprehensive convention against terrorism and the draft convention against nuclear terrorism.¹⁹³

The representative of Pakistan maintained that the Council needed to ensure that counter-terrorism measures did not mutate into measures used to cloak or justify violations of human rights, and that the right to self-determination could not be delegitimized through association with terrorism.¹⁹⁴

At its 4792nd meeting on 23 July 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, followed by statements by all members of the Council and the representatives of Colombia, Indonesia (on behalf of ASEAN), Israel, Italy (on behalf of the European Union¹⁹⁵), Japan, Nepal, Peru (on behalf of the Rio Group), the Republic of Korea, Uganda and Ukraine.

The President then drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 15 July 2003 from the

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

¹⁹⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

Chairman of the Committee, which outlined its eighth 90-day work programme.¹⁹⁶

The Chairman of the Committee announced that technical assistance and strengthening cooperation with international organizations would be priorities for the next three months. He remarked that the Committee needed to be able to ensure that the needs of the countries that requested assistance were truly met.¹⁹⁷

Most of the representatives welcomed the new work programme of the Committee as well as the Chairman's suggestions about expanding technical assistance programmes and increasing regional and subregional cooperation. The majority of speakers agreed that the Committee had succeeded in providing assistance to Member States to enhance their capacities to combat terrorism and align their legislation with the requirements of resolution 1373 (2001). A number of representatives also highlighted the need to increase and evaluate the effectiveness of the measures adopted by the States, which was part of the next phase of the Committee's work. Several speakers called for the establishment, under the auspices of the United Nations, of an international fund to combat terrorism. A few speakers pointed out the link between terrorism and the illicit trade of small arms and light weapons.

The representatives of Cameroon, Chile, Guinea and Mexico highlighted the establishment of cooperation between the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999).¹⁹⁸

The representative of Colombia suggested that an initiative that deserved attention was the possibility for the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the Council to draw up a general list of international terrorist organizations worldwide, similar to the one kept by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) for Al-Qaida and the Taliban. He did not believe that a formal definition of terrorism was a prerequisite to devising such a list; indeed, such a definition had not been achieved in more than 30 years.¹⁹⁹ The representative of Mexico, however, warned against having the Counter-Terrorism Committee become distracted by the drawing up of

lists until a satisfactory solution was found to the matter of a generally accepted definition of terrorism.²⁰⁰

The representative of the Russian Federation maintained that the international community had at its disposal scarcely any standard anti-terrorist models that would be equally effective in all countries. Looking for solutions in specific situations would require individual approaches. Therefore, the focus should be placed on stepping up the Counter-Terrorism Committee's cooperation with profiling, regional and sectoral organizations.²⁰¹

At its 4798th meeting, on 29 July 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), following which statements were made by all Council members, by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Colombia, India, Israel, Italy (on behalf of the European Union²⁰²), Japan, Liechtenstein and Ukraine, and by the Chairman of the Monitoring Group established pursuant to resolution 1363 (2001).

The President (Spain) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 7 July 2003 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) addressed to the President, which included the report of the Monitoring Group.²⁰³ In the report, the Monitoring Group observed that members of the original command team of Osama bin Laden had been arrested, denting its operational capability and providing critical intelligence concerning the network. Nevertheless, recent bombings had demonstrated that Al-Qaida and associated groups still posed a significant threat to international peace and security.

In his briefing, the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) stated that the effectiveness of the measures adopted to confront the threat to international peace and security posed by Al-Qaida and the Taliban needed to be examined in detail in order to improve and strengthen them. He highlighted, inter alia, the improvements in

¹⁹⁶ S/2003/710.

¹⁹⁷ S/PV.4792, pp. 2-4.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 6 (Guinea); p. 9 (Chile); p. 15 (Mexico); and p. 16 (Cameroon).

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 27.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 15.

²⁰¹ Ibid., p. 4.

²⁰² Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁰³ S/2003/669 and Corr.1.

the format and content of the consolidated list of persons and entities belonging to or associated with the Taliban and Al-Qaida; the review and expansion of the guidelines to assist States in submitting additional list-related information; the preparation and dissemination of guidelines for the preparation of implementation reports; the contacts between the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) and the Counter-Terrorism Committee; the overall disappointing response in the timely submission of the reports; and the current work of the Monitoring Group, including its programme of visits to Member States. He highlighted the need for the international community to exercise greater control over the accounting methods and transparency of charities.²⁰⁴

Speaking after the Chairman, many representatives supported the efforts and work of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) and of the Monitoring Group. Most of them called on the Committee to deepen cooperation between Member States, the Monitoring Group experts and the Counter-Terrorism Committee to avoid duplication, as well as with other subregional, regional and international organizations. Several representatives expressed concern about States on whose territory the Al-Qaida network was presumed to be operating that had not submitted their reports, and urged them to do so without further delay. Several representatives underscored the difficulties in implementing the travel ban measures. Some representatives emphasized the need to prevent Al-Qaida from using financial networks and from gaining access to weapons of mass destruction. A number of speakers cautioned about the growing link between drug trafficking and terrorist activities.

A number of representatives pointed out that the regulation of such informal money transfer systems as *hawala* also warranted closer Council attention.²⁰⁵

The representative of China proposed that the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), *inter alia*, strengthen its capacity for analysis and research; implement and improve sanctions against Al-Qaida and the Taliban; and improve and enhance the practicality of the consolidated list.²⁰⁶

²⁰⁴ S/PV.4798, pp. 2-6.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 13 (Guinea); p. 18 (United States); p. 23 (Japan); and p. 28 (Colombia).

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

The representative of Bulgaria asked the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) for information in his next report on the main difficulties encountered by States in the implementation of the measures imposed by resolution 1455 (2003).²⁰⁷

The representatives of Guinea, Germany and Ukraine pointed out the need for accurate identification data for the consolidated list as well as the de-listing issue to avoid impacts on innocent individuals.²⁰⁸ Regarding the sanctions list, the representative of Liechtenstein observed that, at a time when the Council was increasingly making decisions that had a direct impact on the rights of individuals, it was important to provide for avenues that allowed individuals to address concerns stemming from such decisions.²⁰⁹ The representative of India stressed that Member States needed to be proactive in proposing all names available to them for inclusion on the list.²¹⁰

The representative of the United States urged the 39 States that had not yet introduced domestic legislation enabling terrorist-linked assets to be frozen to enact appropriate laws.²¹¹

The representative of Italy (on behalf of the European Union) pointed out that the European Union had strengthened its cooperation with the Committee and that a unique regulatory framework directly applicable in all European Union member States had ensured proper and timely implementation of Security Council resolutions in this field.²¹²

The representative of Colombia suggested a broadening of the guidelines for the preparation and submission of national reports to include information about suspicious transactions from traffic in illicit drugs.²¹³

At the 4811th meeting, on 20 August 2003, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,²¹⁴ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 13 (Guinea); p. 14 (Germany); and p. 30 (Ukraine).

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

²¹² *Ibid.*, p. 21.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

²¹⁴ S/PRST/2003/13.

Unequivocally condemned the terrorist attack that took place on 19 August 2003 against the United Nations Headquarters in Baghdad;

Condemned also in the strongest terms the perpetrators of that attack and underlined the need to bring them to justice;

Reaffirmed the imperative to respect, in all circumstances, the safety and security of United Nations personnel and the need for adequate security measures to be taken in that regard;

Reaffirmed its determination to assist the Iraqi people to build peace and justice in their country and to determine their own political future by themselves; welcomed in that regard the determination of the United Nations to continue its operation in Iraq to fulfil its mandate in the service of the Iraqi people, and would not be intimidated by such attacks.

Decision of 16 October 2003 (4845th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4845th meeting, on 16 October 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, followed by statements by all Council members and the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, India, Indonesia (on behalf of ASEAN), Israel, Italy (on behalf of the European Union²¹⁵), the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Peru (on behalf of the Rio Group), South Africa, Switzerland, Uganda and Yemen.

In his briefing, the Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee presented its ninth work programme. He observed that the rate of review had slowed down because the Committee was gradually entering a more complex phase requiring more careful evaluation, as States moved from stage A, related to the verification of adequate anti-terrorist legislation, to stage B, focusing on the implementation of those measures. He noted the agreement between the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) to establish periodic meetings to ensure better coordination between the two bodies. He pointed out that the Counter-Terrorism Committee had decided that the Chairman would submit to the Council a list of all States that were late in submitting reports. Finally, he indicated his intention to submit a report identifying problems being encountered by States in implementing

²¹⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

resolution 1373 (2001), as well as difficulties with the structure and functioning of the Committee itself.²¹⁶

Most representatives welcomed the new work programme, including the plans to submit a report on the difficulties encountered. Many representatives expressed concern about the delay of 48 States in submitting their reports. A number of speakers called for a more practical orientation of the Counter-Terrorism Committee and stressed the need to balance reporting requirements with actual action on the ground. Some representatives perceived a weakness in the structure of the Committee and encouraged its members to propose reforms in order to fully implement its mandate. A few speakers called on the United Nations to redouble its efforts in the fields of economic development and poverty eradication in order to fight against terrorism.

The representative of Cameroon suggested that as a purely legal matter there was an urgent need for an overall international regulatory instrument to combat terrorism. He regretted that political differences were delaying consensus in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly on the drafting of an overall convention and a convention for the suppression of acts of nuclear terrorism.²¹⁷

The representative of Germany suggested the creation of a high-level authority — such as a United Nations counter-terrorism coordinator — to better focus and streamline enhanced United Nations activities to counter terrorism in all its aspects and on a global basis.²¹⁸

The representative of France believed that the Committee needed to focus further on ensuring that the efforts undertaken by States in the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) were commensurate with the terrorist threats against them. He also highlighted that the work of the Committee needed to be more actively linked to the political level through the Security Council.²¹⁹

The representative of Pakistan held the view that it was important that the Committee consolidate its

²¹⁶ S/PV.4845, pp. 2-4.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²¹⁹ S/PV.4845 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3.

activities within its existing mandate, avoiding the assumption of a policing role.²²⁰

The representative of Mexico, noting the importance of the Committee maximizing its efforts to ensure that counter-terrorism was carried out in full compliance with international humanitarian law and human rights, suggested that the Council take account of the need to include a human rights expert on the Committee.²²¹

The representative of India suggested that the Committee would need to go beyond the stage of inexhaustible reporting to a more serious examination of the actual actions taken by States in their international counter-terrorism effort and hold countries accountable for their actions. Finally, he stressed that the undue emphasis on cooperation with other international and regional organizations in the work of the Committee would require careful consideration, as several partner organizations of the Committee that had been placed on an equal pedestal with Member States did not bear the same responsibility or accountability and might lack the mandate or competence to deal with the area of work of the Committee.²²²

The representative of South Africa cautioned about regulating or monitoring cultural practices, such as informal donations to charitable causes, to uphold civil liberties.²²³

Following the discussion, the President (United States) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²²⁴ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Confirmed the continuation of the current arrangements for the Bureau of the Counter-Terrorism Committee for a further six months; invited the Committee to pursue its agenda as set out in the work programme for the Committee's ninth 90-day period;²²⁵

Noted that 48 Member States were late in submitting their reports, as called for in resolution 1373 (2001); called on them urgently to do so, in order to maintain the universality of response which resolution 1373 (2001) required;

Invited the Committee to continue reporting on its activities at regular intervals and expressed its intention to review the structure and activities of the Committee no later than 4 April 2004.

Decision of 20 November 2003 (4867th meeting): resolution 1516 (2003)

At the 4867th meeting, on 20 November 2003, the representative of Turkey made a statement. He condemned the recent attacks in Istanbul. Observing that while the international community had been more successful in reaching a broader understanding not to distinguish between the motivations, forms and so-called causes of terrorism, it had not been as successful in showing the same sensitivity in not making a distinction between the victims of terrorism, adding that all victims of terrorism deserved to be treated in the same manner.²²⁶

The President (Angola) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;²²⁷ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1516 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Condemned in the strongest terms the bomb attacks in Istanbul, Turkey, on 15 and 20 November 2003 in which many lives were lost and people injured, as well as other terrorist acts in various countries, and regarded such acts, like any act of terrorism, as a threat to peace and security;

Expressed its deepest sympathy and condolences to the people and Governments of Turkey and the United Kingdom and to the victims of the terrorist attacks and their families;

Urged all States, in accordance with their obligations under resolution 1373 (2001), to cooperate in efforts to find and bring to justice the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of those terrorist attacks.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²²² *Ibid.*, p. 22.

²²³ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

²²⁴ S/PRST/2003/17.

²²⁵ S/2003/995.

²²⁶ S/PV.4867, p. 2.

²²⁷ S/2003/1106.

B. High-level meeting of the Security Council on the anniversary of 11 September 2001: acts of international terrorism

Initial proceedings

Decision of 11 September 2002 (4607th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4607th meeting, on 11 September 2002, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled “High-level meeting of the Security Council on the anniversary of 11 September 2001: acts of international terrorism”.

Statements were made by the Secretary-General and the representative of the United States.²²⁸ In his opening remarks, the President (Bulgaria) stated that the meeting was to pay solemn tribute to the memory of the victims of the terrorist attacks that had struck the United States on 11 September 2001.²²⁹

The Secretary-General emphasized the role of the Council as the most central body in the fight against terrorism, being the forum for building the broadest possible international coalition. Recalling the adoption by the Council of strong resolutions after the attacks, the Secretary-General noted the cooperation of Member States in a wide range of counter-terrorism areas. He stressed that, one year after the attacks, the importance of global legitimacy in the fight against terrorism had only grown, and called on the Council to strive even harder to win the widest possible support in

the struggle ahead.²³⁰

The Secretary of State of the United States affirmed that following the attacks, it was clear that terrorism was a threat to international peace and security and that concerted and long-term action was necessary to eradicate that menace. He referred to the combined efforts of members of the United Nations to combat terrorism to date, including the instalment of an interim governing authority in Afghanistan. He held that the international community must be prepared for a long effort measured in years, not months, to eliminate terrorism as a global menace.²³¹

At the same meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,²³² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Honoured those innocents killed and injured in the attacks of 11 September 2001;

Affirmed that those attacks had been an assault on global civilization and the common efforts to make the world a better and safer place;

Called upon all States and regional and subregional organizations to carry forward and build on their cooperation with the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999).

²²⁸ Bulgaria was represented by its President; all other Council members except Mexico were represented at the ministerial level.

²²⁹ S/PV.4607, p. 2.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

²³² S/PRST/2002/25.

C. High-level meeting of the Security Council: combating terrorism

Initial proceedings

Decision of 20 January 2003 (4688th meeting): resolution 1456 (2003)

At its 4688th meeting, on 20 January 2003, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled “High-level meeting of the Security Council: combating terrorism”.

During the meeting, statements were made by all members of the Council,²³³ the Secretary-General and the Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee.

The Secretary-General stressed that the threat of terrorism, if it were to be addressed successfully,

²³³ Except for Chile and the Syrian Arab Republic, the Council members were represented at the ministerial level.

required a global response as well as long-term action. He urged the United Nations to set effective international norms in order to play an increasing role in dissuading potential perpetrators of terror. He assigned the key role for this to the Counter-Terrorism Committee which had the responsibility to ensure the implementation of international anti-terrorism conventions and standards and therefore was at the centre of global efforts to fight terrorism. He also warned about collateral damage of the war on terrorism, by sacrificing crucial liberties or the rule of law on the domestic level, and by using the fight against terrorism as an excuse for military action on the international level. He further held that to the extent the Organization succeeded in fighting poverty, injustice, suffering and war in line with the goals of the Charter, it was also likely to help to end the conditions serving as a justification for those who committed acts of terror.²³⁴

The Chairman of the Committee stated that although the vast majority of States had begun to implement resolution 1373 (2001) by starting to consider or adopting new laws, more and faster action was needed. He named the States that had not yet submitted their reports to the Committee for a number of reasons, setting a deadline for submission after which any non-reporting State would be held to be non-compliant with the resolution. He also emphasized the complexity of resolution 1373 (2001) for implementation and therefore stressed that the Committee was offering a variety of guidance and advice to States that might require help. In that context, he also pointed out the benefits to individual States of working within the collective efforts of their regions and asked for support from international and regional organizations. He drew the attention to potential links between terrorism and other forms of international organized crime which had already been taken up in resolution 1373 (2001) and stated that the structures the Committee was helping to put in place for counter-terrorism might also be useful for the fight against international crime of all kinds.²³⁵

In their statements, most speakers commended the work of the Committee and saw a continued need for its coordinating and assisting role in the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). They

²³⁴ S/PV.4688, pp. 2-30.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.

reaffirmed the need for a comprehensive approach and strengthened cooperation in the fight against terrorism, and in that regard acknowledged the leading role played by the United Nations.

Some speakers pleaded for cooperation at various levels, in particular at the regional and international levels, and welcomed the special meeting of the Committee with regional and international organizations to be held in March 2003 in order to strengthen cooperation and improve coordination at various levels in the fight against terrorism.²³⁶ According to the representative of Chile, the draft resolution before the Council²³⁷ marked a turning point in the Committee's work since it emphasized the establishment of horizontal relationships between countries and international and regional organizations and put cooperation among States at the centre of the efforts to combat terrorism.²³⁸

Many speakers recognized the need to strengthen the international anti-terrorist legal framework and hoped that the work on the draft conventions on international terrorism and on the suppression of acts of nuclear terrorism would be finalized.²³⁹ Some speakers reminded the Council that while combating terrorism, it had to respect the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law.²⁴⁰

Several speakers also addressed the importance of tackling the root causes underlying terrorism²⁴¹ and regarded conflict prevention and conflict settlement as an essential effort to eliminate terrorism.²⁴² Others drew attention to the fact that terrorism was often related to other illegal activities, in particular arms

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Bulgaria); p. 14 (Mexico); p. 19 (United States); p. 21 (Guinea); and p. 25 (Chile).

²³⁷ S/2003/60.

²³⁸ S/PV.4688, pp. 24-25.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Germany); p. 8 (Cameroon); p. 10 (Bulgaria); p. 11 (Angola); pp. 15-16 (Russian Federation); p. 18 (United States); p. 21 (Guinea); p. 25 (Chile); and p. 26 (France).

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6 (Germany); p. 14 (Mexico); p. 15 (Russian Federation); p. 20 (China); and p. 22 (Syrian Arab Republic).

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Germany); p. 6 (Cameroon); p. 9 (United Kingdom); p. 11 (Angola); p. 16 (Russian Federation); p. 20 (China); p. 22 (Guinea); p. 23 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 26 (France).

²⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Germany); p. 9 (United Kingdom); p. 14 (Mexico); p. 16 (Russian Federation); p. 20 (China); p. 22 (Guinea); and p. 26 (France).

trafficking, money-laundering and the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction.²⁴³ The representative of Spain proposed consideration of an adjustment of the Committee's mandate in that regard.²⁴⁴ Some other speakers in particular expressed concern at the risk of terrorists acquiring weapons of mass destruction and emphasized the need to address the issue.²⁴⁵ To prevent terrorist groups from using radioactive sources to make dirty bombs, the representative of France announced concrete proposals with a view to formulating an international convention strengthening controls over the use and transfer of such radioactive sources.²⁴⁶

The link between terrorism and States possessing weapons of mass destruction was addressed in particular in relation to the situation in Iraq: while the representatives of the Russian Federation, the United States and the United Kingdom unanimously hoped that the crisis would be resolved peacefully, the representative of the United Kingdom warned of a potential use of force in the event that Iraq did not actively comply with its Security Council obligations and cooperate fully with inspectors.²⁴⁷ Similarly, the representative of the United States stressed that if Iraq did not come into full compliance, States must not shrink from the responsibilities set before themselves

unanimously in resolution 1441 (2002).²⁴⁸ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic took up the link between terrorism and weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East region and called for international conferences to define terrorism and to make the Middle East a zone free of such weapons.²⁴⁹

As to the role of the Committee, referring to resolution 1373 (2001), which required States also to take measures against accomplices of terrorists, the representative of the Russian Federation proposed that the Committee pursue the matter, given the importance of not only assisting Member States in improving their anti-terrorist laws but also in examining the application of those laws in accordance with current requirements.²⁵⁰ The representative of Spain stressed that the Committee should not be limited to a review of reports submitted by States and must propose concrete legal and political measures with regard to preventing the financing of terrorism, proposing instruments for information exchange and recommending effective border control.²⁵¹

The President (France) drew the attention of the Council to the draft resolution,²⁵² it was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1456 (2003), by which the Council decided to adopt a declaration annexed to the resolution, on the issue of combating terrorism.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Bulgaria); p. 15 (Russian Federation); p. 18 (United States); p. 21 (Guinea); and p. 26 (France).

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Germany); p. 8 (United Kingdom); p. 15 (Russian Federation); p. 17 (Spain); and p. 18 (United States).

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9 (United Kingdom); p. 15 (Russian Federation); and p. 18 (United States).

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

²⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

²⁵² S/2003/60.

40. Promoting peace and security: humanitarian assistance to refugees in Africa

Initial proceedings

Decision of 13 January 2000 (4089th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4089th meeting, on 13 January 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Promoting peace and security: humanitarian assistance to refugees in Africa". The Council heard a briefing by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, following which an interactive discussion took place and statements were made by all Council members.

The High Commissioner stated that the past few years had witnessed significant changes in the pattern of refugee crises, notably the increase in internally displaced persons. While the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) had assisted internally displaced persons upon the request of the Secretary-General or when their situation was closely linked to a refugee or returnee issue, and other humanitarian agencies had intervened in some situations, she noted with concern that there was no

established mechanism for the assistance, and particularly the protection, of the internally displaced. The High Commissioner held that it was the countries which had most generously hosted refugees that had paid the highest price, as the security, socio-economic and natural environments of those countries were severely affected by large, forced population movements. She noted that war-induced mass population movements had contributed to the spreading of conflicts and cautioned that if wars that forced people to flee were not stopped, there could be no solutions to refugee crises. In that context, she urged the Council to seek more decisive measures to address such critical problems as the indiscriminate struggle for resources, the uncontrolled flow of arms, the lack of conflict resolution mechanisms and weak support to post-conflict situations.

Assessing the respective refugee crises in Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Angola, the Horn of Africa and West Africa, the High Commissioner observed that humanitarian action alone would not be able to solve any of the problems leading to forced human displacement and stressed that it could not substitute for Governments and the Council in areas for which they had a clear responsibility, such as peacekeeping and peacebuilding. She emphasized that the Council had an essential role to play in preventing, containing and resolving conflicts — and, hence, refugee problems — in Africa. To that end, she urged the Council to put aside differences, take clear, strong and united positions and translate discussion into concrete action to support more decisively, rapidly and substantively the follow-up to peace agreements, and promote the mobilization of resources for reconstruction and peacebuilding. The High Commissioner, while demanding quick solutions to the refugee crises, emphasized that States must continue to uphold the rights of refugees and provide asylum to people who had fled war and persecution. Meanwhile, donor Governments must share the burden of asylum by ensuring an adequate level of basic assistance in camps and settlements, and for returnees going back home. In that connection, she considered it unacceptable that the assistance provided to refugees in Africa, including food and other basic survival items, was far less than in other parts of the world. She hoped that the international community would address seriously that grave imbalance in material assistance. Finally, she informed the Council that UNHCR was planning to launch a special refugee education trust,

which would allow refugees, especially in Africa, to pursue post-primary education during their exile.¹

Council members expressed concern at the dire situation of many refugees in Africa and underlined the importance of taking action without delay to address the plight of refugees and internally displaced persons. In that context, most speakers highlighted the need urgently to address the root causes of population displacement, particularly by putting an end to the conflicts and political tensions on the African continent. They also emphasized the need to ensure adequate protection for all refugees and internally displaced persons, particularly women and children, and to guarantee the safety of the humanitarian workers and their access to the population in need.

Echoing comments by the High Commissioner, many members emphasised that all refugees around the world must be treated in the same manner and that the imbalances in material assistance provided to African refugees ought to be corrected.² Drawing particular attention to the situation of internally displaced persons, the representatives of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands noted the complexity of assisting people in areas where State authorities or rebel forces were part of the cause of their predicament.³ For his part, the representative of the United States, who had worked on the refugee issue since 1978, expressed concern that two thirds of the world's refugees were designated as internally displaced persons and did not fall under the purview of UNHCR. While recognizing that the distinction between refugees and internally displaced persons raised complex legal issues of international sovereignty, he stressed that both were equal victims in terms of what had happened to them. He thus urged the leadership of UNHCR and the Secretary-General to expand the definition of refugees, erode the distinction between refugees and internally displaced persons, and treat internally displaced persons in such a way that they did not fall between the bureaucratic cracks. He suggested that responsibility for internally displaced persons should be fixed in a single bureaucratic entity.⁴

¹ S/PV.4089, pp. 2-7.

² *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Namibia); p. 13 (Jamaica); p. 19 (Argentina); p. 20 (Mali); p. 21 (Bangladesh); and p. 22 (China).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 18 (United Kingdom); and p. 23 (Netherlands).

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.

Several members underlined the need to assist host countries, pointing to the negative impact of refugees on their economies and societies.⁵ In that regard, the representative of Ukraine voiced deep concern at the cases where refugees and internally displaced persons themselves became a source of instability and renewed strife. He proposed that following conflict situations, the Council consider sending special missions to major refugee camps and areas to assess the situation on the ground, or establishing, with the consent of the host country, preventive deployment missions, if circumstances so required.⁶ Similarly, the representative of Jamaica regretted the fact that sometimes refugees became potential pools for rebel recruitment, thereby posing a threat to the peace and security of the host communities.⁷ The High Commissioner, however, held that it was very difficult to maintain the civilian character of refugee camps since most of the refugees were victims of internal conflict who had fled their countries either temporarily or in an effort to fight back.⁸

Some members underlined the need to respect the sovereignty of States when addressing the refugee problem.⁹ In that context, the representative of Malaysia reiterated that humanitarian assistance must be apolitical in nature and predicated on the principles

of strict neutrality and non-selectivity. He urged donors to resist the temptation to use humanitarian aid as a means of exerting political pressure on the parties in a conflict.¹⁰ Nevertheless, the representative of Canada held that sovereignty did not exempt the concerned countries of their responsibility to provide full access to others in order that the basic needs of refugees and internally displaced persons could be met.¹¹

At the same meeting, the President (United States) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Stressed the need to address the root causes of armed conflict in a comprehensive manner in order to prevent those circumstances that lead to internal displacement and the outflow of refugees; emphasized that national authorities had the primary duty and responsibility to provide protection and humanitarian assistance to internally displaced persons within their jurisdiction;

Urged all parties concerned to comply strictly with their obligations under international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law, and emphasized the need for better implementation of relevant norms with regard to internally displaced persons;

Reaffirmed the responsibility of States hosting refugees to ensure the security and the civilian and humanitarian character of refugee camps and settlements, in accordance with existing international standards and international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law; underlined the unacceptability of using refugees and other persons in refugee camps and settlements to achieve military purposes in the country of asylum or the country of origin.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Namibia); p. 12 (Jamaica); p. 14 (Canada); and p. 20 (Mali).

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 16 (Tunisia); and p. 22 (China).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹² S/PRST/2000/1.

41. Protection of civilians in armed conflict

Decision of 19 April 2000 (4130th meeting): resolution 1296 (2000)

On 8 September 1999, the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council the first report on the protection of civilians in armed conflict.¹ The Secretary-General presented the realities faced by civilians in armed conflict and the challenges those situations posed to the international community. Stressing that protection of civilians was fundamental

to the central mandate of the United Nations, the Secretary-General stated that the Council should play a leading role in compelling parties to conflict to respect the rights guaranteed to civilians by international law and convention. To strengthen the capacity of the Council and the United Nations to protect civilians, he recommended, *inter alia*, that the Council take steps to strengthen the Organization's capacity to plan and deploy rapidly by enhancing the participation in the United Nations Standby Arrangements System and increasing the numbers of civilian police and specialized civil administration and humanitarian personnel. Furthermore, the Council should establish a

¹ S/1999/957, submitted pursuant to the presidential statement of 12 February 1999 (S/PRST/1999/6).

permanent technical review mechanism of United Nations and regional sanctions which could be used to ascertain the probable impact of sanctions on civilians. In case an outbreak of violence against civilians was imminent, the Council should impose arms embargoes; consider the deployment of a preventive peacekeeping operation or of another preventive monitoring presence; make greater use of targeted sanctions to deter and contain those who committed egregious violations of international humanitarian and human rights law; and deploy international military observers to monitor the situation in camps for internally displaced persons and refugees when the presence of arms, combatants and armed elements was suspected. To alleviate the suffering of civilians, the Council should underline in its resolutions, at the onset of a conflict, the imperative for civilian populations to have unimpeded access to humanitarian assistance; ensure that, whenever required, peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations were authorized and equipped to control or close down hate media assets; and consider the imposition of appropriate enforcement action in the face of massive and ongoing abuses. He concluded by underscoring that the Council needed to act rapidly to ensure that the legal protection conferred upon civilians in armed conflict was accompanied by physical security.

At its 4130th meeting,² on 19 April 2000, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report. The Council was briefed by the Secretary-General and the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). Statements were made by all Council members³ and the representatives of Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan,⁴ Bahrain, Colombia, Egypt, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal

² For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. VI, part I, sect. F, case 3, with regard to relations with subsidiary organs established by the General Assembly; chap. X, part IV, with regard to the constitutional discussion bearing on the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter; chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 39 of the Charter; and chap. XII, part I, sect. E, case 8, with regard to Article 2, paragraph 7.

³ Canada was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

⁴ The representative of Azerbaijan spoke on behalf of Georgia, Uzbekistan, Ukraine, Azerbaijan and the Republic of Moldova (GUUAM).

(on behalf of the European Union)⁵, the Republic of Korea and Singapore, and by the Permanent Observer of Switzerland.⁶

The Secretary-General urged the Council to give greater consideration to the creation of a rapid deployment force to be readily used in cases of humanitarian need. Highlighting the positive impact of preventive measures taken in the Central African Republic and Prevlaka, he stressed that preventive missions, including the dispatch of monitors and fact-finding missions, could make the difference between the peaceful settlement of disputes and violent conflict. In cases where the mass exodus of a civilian population could not be prevented, the security of refugee camps should be enhanced. He underscored the importance of improving the protection of civilians by setting up temporary security zones and safe corridors, noting that a credible force must be deployed in such security zones if the consent of the parties was not forthcoming.⁷

The President of the International Committee of the Red Cross reiterated the distinction made in the Secretary-General's report between physical protection and legal protection. Arguing that coercive measures should be envisaged only in extreme cases to protect civilians, he stressed that the legitimacy of the cause being defended could, in no circumstance, exempt a military operation from the obligations laid down in international humanitarian law. Confusion between military action, designed to address the causes of conflict, and humanitarian action, intended to address its effects, was dangerous and a cause for concern since being associated with coercive action would jeopardize the work of humanitarian organizations by undermining their credibility and acceptance by the parties to a conflict. In his view, firm resolve on the part of the Council to take bold political decisions and create the conditions necessary for humanitarian organizations to preserve their indispensable independence would guarantee the effective

⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

⁶ The representative of the Sudan was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

⁷ S/PV.4130 and Corr.1, pp. 2-4.

implementation of the shared objectives to protect civilians.⁸

Speakers expressed their support for the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General⁹ and noted that the provisions contained in the draft resolution under consideration¹⁰ represented a concerted effort of the Council to take the issue forward. They agreed on the importance of promoting respect for international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law and stressed the need for early warning, preventive action or preventive deployment. They highlighted the importance of a comprehensive, integrated approach on the part of the international community, for greater efforts to address the root causes of conflict and emphasized the responsibility of State authorities in ensuring access to civilian populations at risk. They called for, inter alia, controlling the inflow of arms into conflict areas and keeping refugee camps safe from armed elements. Furthermore, speakers expressed support for the recommendations in the report related to the special protection needs of women and children.

The representative of the Netherlands underlined the importance of combining United Nations actions in the field of politics, human rights, humanitarian assistance, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, and development. He encouraged the Secretary-General to make full use of the prerogatives conferred on him by the Charter of the United Nations and participate fully in the preparation of United Nations mandates.¹¹ The representative of the United Kingdom held that the proactive role of the Secretary-General needed to be strengthened to improve coordination and the flow of information within the United Nations system.¹²

Several representatives emphasized that the adoption of sanctions by the Council in cases of armed conflict should not contribute to a worsening of the situation for civilians.¹³ To avoid the unintended humanitarian impact of sanctions regimes, the representative of Jamaica expressed support for the use

of humanitarian exemptions and “smart” sanctions.¹⁴ Similarly, several speakers favoured targeted sanctions.¹⁵

The representative of the United States insisted that every specific situation of armed conflict must be dealt with individually, in its own context, bearing in mind the global standards set by international humanitarian law.¹⁶ Similarly, the representative of China held that the Council should review and address the issue of the protection of civilians in armed conflict on a case-by-case basis, dealing with each situation on its own merits.¹⁷ In that context, several speakers touched upon the issue of respect for political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity in protecting civilians in armed conflict.¹⁸

The President (Canada) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1296 (2000), by which the Council, inter alia:

Emphasized the need, when considering ways to provide for the protection of civilians in armed conflict, to proceed on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the particular circumstances, and affirmed its intention to take into account relevant recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General of 8 September 1999 when carrying out its work;

Expressed its intention to collaborate with representatives of the relevant regional and subregional organizations, where appropriate, in order further to improve opportunities for the resolution of armed conflicts and the protection of civilians in such conflict;

Emphasized the importance for humanitarian organizations to uphold the principles of neutrality, impartiality and humanity in their humanitarian activities;

Requested the Secretary-General to disseminate appropriate guidance to United Nations personnel involved in peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities and to ensure that such personnel had the appropriate training, and

⁸ Ibid., pp. 4-7.

⁹ S/1999/957.

¹⁰ S/2000/335.

¹¹ S/PV.4130 and Corr.1, p. 8.

¹² Ibid., p. 16.

¹³ Ibid., p. 11 (France); p. 21 (Jamaica); and p. 26 (Canada); S/PV.4130 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 6 (Republic of Korea).

¹⁴ S/PV.4130 and Corr.1, p. 21.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 25 (Mali); S/PV.4130 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 4 (Portugal on behalf of the European Union); and p. 6 (Republic of Korea).

¹⁶ S/PV.4130 and Corr.1, p. 9.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 14 (China); p. 17 (Tunisia); and p. 22 (Ukraine); S/PV.4130 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 12 (Egypt); p. 15 (Bahrain); and p. 22 (Indonesia). For more information, see chap. XII, part I, sect. E, case 8, with regard to Article 2, paragraph 7.

¹⁹ S/2000/335.

urged relevant Member States to disseminate appropriate instructions and to ensure that appropriate training was included in their programmes for personnel involved in similar activities;

Requested the informal working group of the Security Council on the general issue of sanctions to consider the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General of 8 September 1999 relating to its mandate;

Requested the Secretary-General to submit by 30 March 2001 his next report on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, and further requested the Secretary-General to include in that report any additional recommendations on ways the Council and other organs of the United Nations, acting within their sphere of responsibility, could further improve the protection of civilians in situations of armed conflict.

**Decision of 15 March 2002 (4493rd meeting):
statement by the President**

On 30 March 2001, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council the second report on the protection of civilians in armed conflict.²⁰ He noted that only a few of the recommendations in his first report had been implemented. Pointing out that the political and legal instruments available for the protection of civilians had been developed in a world where State actors were overwhelmingly dominant, he stressed the need to update them to reflect the internal nature of conflicts. Additionally, new mechanisms and strategies were required to deal with the changed circumstances. The Secretary-General recommended, *inter alia*, that the Council actively engage the parties to each conflict in a dialogue aimed at sustaining safe access for humanitarian operations and demonstrate its willingness to act where such access was denied; consider the establishment of arrangements addressing impunity and for truth and reconciliation, as appropriate, during the crafting of peacekeeping mandates; conduct more frequent fact-finding missions to conflict areas with a view to identifying the specific requirements for humanitarian assistance; make provision for the regular integration in mission mandates of media monitoring mechanisms for hate media; and emphasize in its resolutions the direct responsibility of armed groups under international humanitarian law. Moreover, he encouraged the Council to further develop the concept of regional approaches to regional and subregional crises, in particular when formulating mandates of peacekeeping operations. The Council should also develop a regular

²⁰ S/2001/331, submitted pursuant to resolution 1296 (2000).

exchange with the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations on issues pertaining to the protection of civilians in armed conflict.

The Secretary-General emphasized that reports and recommendations were no substitute for effective action and that the primary responsibility for the protection of civilians fell on Governments and armed groups involved in conflict situations. Where they did not honour those responsibilities, it was up to the Council to take action.

At its 4312th meeting,²¹ on 23 April 2001, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report. The Council was briefed by the Deputy Secretary-General, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator. Statements were made by all Council members, the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Canada, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union and associated and aligned countries), the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen, and the Permanent Observers of Palestine, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and Switzerland.

In his introductory remarks, the President (United Kingdom) stressed the need for the discussion to centre on the implementation aspect of the Secretary-General's recommendations. At the same time, he emphasized that the Council had to respect the division of responsibilities in the United Nations system, in particular between the Council and other organs of the United Nations. The topic of coordination would therefore be relevant.²²

Introducing the second report of the Secretary-General, the Deputy Secretary-General noted that the

²¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. I, part V, cases 11 and 15, with regard to the conduct of business (rules 27-36); chap. X, part IV, with regard to the constitutional discussion bearing on the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter; and chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 39 of the Charter, and part III, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 41.

²² S/PV.4312, p. 3.

report focused on several priorities for the international community: (a) the criminal prosecution of violations of international criminal law; (b) the question of access to vulnerable populations; and (c) the separation of civilians and armed elements in refugee camps or other settlements where displaced persons gathered. She pointed out that many of the main recommendations of the Secretary-General's first report²³ had gone unimplemented and hoped that the current meeting would facilitate the transition from words to deeds and from intention to implementation.²⁴

On the subject of human rights fact-finding during situations of armed conflict, the High Commissioner observed that establishing the facts could play a crucial part in the protection of civilians, and pointed to past fact-finding missions in Afghanistan, East Timor, Sierra Leone and Kosovo. Regarding human rights mechanisms, she welcomed the fact that the Council was increasingly looking to and drawing on the expertise of the special mechanisms of the Commission on Human Rights. She also saw great merit in proposals for a focal point for civilians in peacekeeping missions and for increased emphasis on protection in peacekeeping mandates.²⁵

The Under-Secretary-General welcomed, in particular, the idea of establishing a cross-cutting team in the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to ensure that issues related to the protection of civilians were adequately addressed in the mandates of peacekeeping operations. He elaborated on several proposals contained in the second report of the Secretary-General for which the Office had a leading role, such as the work of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee on developing a manual of best practices and guidance for access negotiations and strategies, and the strengthening of collaboration with non-governmental organizations on the issue of staff security in the field.²⁶

Speakers endorsed the Secretary-General's call for a culture of protection and stressed the need to implement the recommendations made in the two reports. They reaffirmed the need for all States to comply strictly with their obligations under

international humanitarian and human rights law, emphasizing that national Governments had the primary responsibility for ensuring the protection of civilians. They also reaffirmed the importance of preventing conflicts from occurring in the first place.

Several speakers stressed the need for those who had committed gross violations of international criminal law, including non-State actors, to be brought to justice through recourse to the International Criminal Court, the existing Tribunals or truth and reconciliation mechanisms.²⁷ In that regard, many speakers emphasized the need for all States to sign and ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.²⁸ The representative of India expressed the view that the Council should weigh whether ad hoc international tribunals gave value for the money they already had.²⁹

Turning to non-State actors, speakers held that the Council must consistently urge armed groups to commit themselves to the standards contained in international humanitarian and human rights law. Pointing out the need for the United Nations and other humanitarian actors to negotiate with non-State actors in order to provide assistance to affected populations, several speakers welcomed the proposal for the Inter-Agency Standing Committee to develop a manual of guidelines for access negotiations and strategies, as mentioned in the report of the Secretary-General.³⁰ Noting that the Geneva Conventions did not contain a right of unimpeded access, the representative of India questioned the legal basis of the Secretary-General's recommendation. In his view, such a right violated international humanitarian law and the Council had no power to grant it. He argued that the denial of access needed not and usually would not constitute a threat to

²³ S/1999/957.

²⁴ S/PV.4312, pp. 3-4.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-7.

²⁶ S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, pp. 2-3.

²⁷ S/PV.4312, p. 8 (Bangladesh); pp. 21-22 (Russian Federation); p. 24 (Ireland); p. 29 (Norway); p. 31 (Mauritius); and p. 32 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 37 (Nepal).

²⁸ S/PV.4312, p. 24 (Ireland); p. 29 (Norway); p. 31 (Mauritius); and p. 32 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 4 (Canada); p. 6 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union); p. 34 (Israel); and p. 37 (Nepal).

²⁹ S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 16.

³⁰ S/PV.4312, p. 9 (Bangladesh); p. 11 (Ukraine); p. 13 (Singapore); and p. 23 (Ireland); S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 11 (Switzerland).

international peace and security, the only trigger for Council action.³¹

Several representatives stressed the need to develop clear criteria and procedures for the identification and separation of armed elements from civilians as well as the need to send international military observers to monitor the situation in refugee camps.³² The representative of India expressed scepticism with regard to the effectiveness of such criteria, while the representatives of Australia and Indonesia raised concern as to the difficulty of drafting such criteria.³³

Commenting on the effects of hate media on the protection of civilians, several speakers highlighted the need to integrate media monitoring mechanisms into mission mandates.³⁴ With regard to the importance of disseminating accurate information on international humanitarian and human rights law and on the role of the United Nations, the representatives of Bangladesh and Jamaica held that a mass media component should be built into the mandate of missions and welcomed closer collaboration between the Department of Public Information and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations towards that end.³⁵

Speakers underlined the need for effective cooperation and coordination among the plethora of actors involved in the protection of civilians in armed conflict and supported the Secretary-General's observation in his first report that the Council could play a leading role in devising an overall approach to crisis resolution and encouraging cooperation between all components of the United Nations system, regional forces, donors and non-State actors. Many speakers advocated stronger cooperation between the Council and regional organizations.³⁶ The representative of India,

however, noted that in the past the Council had often either sheltered behind regionalism to avoid having to take action or subcontracted its powers and abdicated its responsibilities to some regional organizations.³⁷

Several speakers contended that the best means to ensure civilian protection started with conflict prevention.³⁸ The representative of Bangladesh held that strengthening the Organization's early-warning capacities would go a long way towards ensuring a better understanding of protection needs.³⁹ The representative of Singapore held that the Council should give serious consideration to working out clear criteria for intervention by force as a means of protection, as demonstrated by its role in Kosovo and East Timor.⁴⁰ The representative of Jamaica proposed that the Council should explore ways of integrating civilian protection issues into the Council's approach to prevention.⁴¹ The representative of Canada pointed out that three recent peacekeeping missions, in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, East Timor and Sierra Leone, included provisions for civilian protection.⁴² The representative of Jordan argued that where peacekeeping mandates included the protection of civilians, members of the Council should be first in line to offer their troops for service and not leave the Secretary-General to scramble for troops.⁴³

Several speakers linked the issue of civilian protection with the impact of sanctions, and some expressed support for a permanent technical review mechanism on the impact of sanctions on civilians, and highlighted the importance of a pre-assessment of the humanitarian impact of sanctions.⁴⁴ The representative

³¹ S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 17.

³² S/PV.4312, p. 10 (Ukraine); pp. 11-12 (Tunisia); p. 13 (Singapore); p. 19 (United States); and p. 23 (Ireland); S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 9 (Republic of Korea).

³³ S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 17 (India); p. 26 (Australia); and p. 33 (Indonesia).

³⁴ S/PV.4312, p. 9 (Bangladesh); p. 16 (Jamaica); p. 19 (United States); p. 24 (Ireland); and p. 33 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 6 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union).

³⁵ S/PV.4312, p. 9 (Bangladesh); and p. 16 (Jamaica).

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15 (Jamaica); p. 22 (Russian Federation); p. 25 (Colombia); p. 26 (Mali); p. 31 (Mauritius); and p. 33 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and

Corr.1, p. 8 (Argentina); p. 9 (Republic of Korea); p. 21 (Malaysia); p. 23 (New Zealand); p. 26 (Australia); p. 29 (Organization of the Islamic Conference); p. 34 (Indonesia); and p. 38 (Nepal).

³⁷ S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 17.

³⁸ S/PV.4312, p. 8 (Bangladesh); p. 15 (Jamaica); p. 17 (China); p. 22 (Russian Federation); p. 27 (Mali); and p. 31 (Mauritius); S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 13 (South Africa); p. 16 (United Arab Emirates); p. 22 (Pakistan); p. 33 (Mexico); and p. 36 (Nepal).

³⁹ S/PV.4312, p. 8.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁴² S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 4.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁴⁴ S/PV.4312, p. 9 (Bangladesh); p. 15 (Jamaica); p. 18 (China); and p. 25 (Colombia); S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 9 (Republic of Korea); and p. 12 (Switzerland).

of Pakistan contended that there were no smart sanctions, or targeted sanctions, only unjust sanctions.⁴⁵

In respect of future action, several speakers favoured, *inter alia*, setting up a Security Council working group to study the implementation of the recommendations and decisions relating to the protection of civilians, with a view to providing the Council with information for decision-making.⁴⁶ The representative of Norway advocated the elaboration of a road map establishing a targeted plan of action guiding the different actors in implementing the recommendations.⁴⁷ The representative of Jamaica called for drawing up a checklist for drafting resolutions and elaborating peacekeeping and peacebuilding mandates.⁴⁸ In concurring with the idea, the representative of Ireland opined that all peacekeeping operations should include a human rights component.⁴⁹ The representative of Singapore, echoed by the representative of Canada, proposed an objective and impartial annual audit of the Council's work *vis-à-vis* the protection of civilians.⁵⁰ Several speakers recommended mainstreaming the protection of civilians into the work of the Secretariat and the Council, including through the reports of the Secretary-General, the Secretariat's briefings to the Council and Council missions to conflict areas.⁵¹

By a letter dated 21 June 2001 from the President of the Council to the Secretary-General,⁵² the Council members requested that the recommendations on the protection of civilians contained in the Secretary-General's two reports⁵³ be reorganized with the aim of clarifying responsibilities, enhancing cooperation and facilitating implementation. To ensure closer cooperation between the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and the Department of

Peacekeeping Operations, the Council encouraged the Secretary-General to establish a cross-cutting team for the two offices. To facilitate consideration by the Council of issues pertaining to the protection of civilians in its deliberations on the establishment, change or closing of peacekeeping mandates, Council members requested that an aide-memoire listing the relevant issues be drafted in close cooperation with the Council. In addition, Council members requested a briefing by the Secretariat on the status of those initiatives by November 2001.

At its 4424th meeting,⁵⁴ on 21 November 2001, held against the background of the above-mentioned letter,⁵² the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator on the implementation plan for the protection of civilians in armed conflict. During the interactive debate, questions were posed by the representatives of Bangladesh, Colombia, France, Ireland, Mali, Mauritius, Norway, Singapore, Tunisia, Ukraine and the United Kingdom.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General elaborated on the three main initiatives taken by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in response to suggestions made by the President of the Council in his letter of 21 June 2001. Regarding the suggestion to create a road map for the implementation of the Secretary-General's recommendations, the Under-Secretary-General indicated that an implementation chart would be included in a comprehensive report of the Secretary-General to the Council to be submitted in November 2002. To assist in the preparation of the road map, the Office had organized three workshops, with the participation of interested Member States, the Secretariat, agencies, the International Committee of the Red Cross, non-governmental organizations and other actors. At the workshops, participants had discussed such issues as States' obligations under international humanitarian and human rights law; operationalizing the guiding principles concerning internally displaced persons; and including elements related to the protection of civilians in the mandates of peacekeeping operations. Regarding the aide-memoire, he announced that a checklist of key issues to be considered by the Council in the design and planning of peacekeeping mandates was being

⁴⁵ S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 23.

⁴⁶ S/PV.4312, p. 12 (Tunisia); p. 14 (Jamaica); and p. 24 (Ireland); S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 20 (Malaysia).

⁴⁷ S/PV.4312, pp. 29-30.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 13 (Singapore); S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 5 (Canada).

⁵¹ S/PV.4312, p. 19 (United States); and p. 33 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 4 (Canada).

⁵² S/2001/614.

⁵³ S/1999/957 and S/2001/331.

⁵⁴ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. I, part V, case 11, with regard to special cases concerning the application of rules 27-36.

developed. On the issue of strengthening the cooperation between the Office and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, he pointed to the establishment of a cross-cutting team to facilitate consideration of issues related to the protection of civilians in the design, planning and implementation of peacekeeping operations.⁵⁵

In response to questions raised by Council members, the Under-Secretary-General indicated that an inter-agency process had been initiated for the preparation of a manual for United Nations field staff, with guidance for practical steps on when, how and on what basis to engage or disengage armed groups. The manual would be shared in an appropriate forum with members of the Council. He further noted that some issues, such as women and peace and security, protection of civilians in armed conflict, children and armed conflict and conflict prevention, which were dealt with separately by the Council, were in fact complementary, and pointed out the need to identify the common threads.⁵⁶

At the 4492nd meeting,⁵⁷ on 15 March 2002, at which the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, statements were made by all Council members.

Underlining the need to keep the protection of civilians high on the Council's agenda, the Under-Secretary-General noted, *inter alia*, the increased dialogue and partnerships among United Nations agencies and offices, through coordinated efforts, in the areas of humanitarian access, child protection and other protection issues. Concerning the allegations of sexual exploitation of children in refugee camps in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone, he reiterated the Secretary-General's policy of zero tolerance for any such acts perpetrated by anyone employed by or affiliated with the United Nations and referred to the investigation launched by the Office of Internal Oversight Services.

⁵⁵ S/PV.4424, 2-4.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9 and pp. 12-13.

⁵⁷ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 39 of the Charter; and chap. XII, part II, sect. A, case 15, with regard to Article 24.

The Under-Secretary-General further informed the Council of progress that had been made in the development of the aide-memoire, which represented an unprecedented example of interactive cooperation between the Council and the Secretariat. He hoped that the document would serve as a checklist facilitating the Council's consideration of the establishment, change or phasing out of any peacekeeping operations. He pointed out that, in addition to identifying 13 core objectives for protecting civilians in armed conflict, it also provided, in part, a useful framework for considering interrelated and complementary thematic issues such as women and peace and security; children in armed conflict; and conflict prevention.⁵⁸

Council members focused, *inter alia*, on the aide-memoire before them and expressed gratitude to Norway and Canada for their support to the issue on the agenda. They recalled that in the past the majority of the victims of conflict were soldiers, whereas today, over 90 per cent of the victims were civilians. Cognizant of the primary role of the Council in the maintenance of peace and security, they underlined the need for a better response by the Council to the protection of civilians in armed conflicts through fostering a culture of protection, and for the Council to look at ways to prevent conflicts.

Several members cited examples of recent and current conflicts, which to varying degrees had demonstrated complete disregard for the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, as well as other international legal standards.⁵⁹

With respect to the aide-memoire, speakers stressed that it was not a blueprint but rather a toolbox that would enable the Council to become more effective in addressing concerns related to the protection of civilians. They noted that, like any other tool, it would be useful only to the extent that it was utilized to solve particular tasks. In that respect, several representatives underlined the importance of applying the aide-memoire on a case-by-case basis.⁶⁰ The representative of Singapore suggested that a review should be conducted of all peacekeeping

⁵⁸ S/PV.4492, pp. 2-5.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (France); p. 13 (Mauritius); pp. 15-16 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 18 (Russian Federation).

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Colombia); p. 14 (Bulgaria); and p. 17 (Mexico).

operations using the aide-memoire as a checklist for evaluation.⁶¹ Several representatives stressed the need periodically to update and review the aide-memoire in the light of the Council's experience with peacekeeping mandates.⁶²

Speakers held that the serious allegations of sexual exploitation of children in refugee camps in West Africa by United Nations personnel had indicated the possible value of the aide-memoire in highlighting relevant protection concerns and in ensuring a more systematic approach to the planning process for peacekeeping operations. Several representatives stressed the need to develop codes of conduct, so as to give substance to the Secretary-General's call for zero tolerance in cases of abuse of civilians by United Nations personnel.⁶³ In that regard, the Under-Secretary-General announced that he had requested the task force within the Inter-Agency Standing Committee to elaborate a code of conduct for all humanitarian professionals within the United Nations or outside, including non-governmental organizations. He stated that the Department of Peacekeeping Operations was already working on the issue with regard to peacekeeping operations.⁶⁴

Referring to the road map for the recommendations arising from the Secretary-General's report of 30 March 2001,⁶⁵ the representatives of the United Kingdom and Ireland drew attention to the need to ensure consistency and synergy between the aide-memoire and the road map.⁶⁶ The representative of Singapore, echoed by the representative of Bulgaria, suggested that the forthcoming Secretary-General's report on the road map should highlight specific tools for the implementation of the recommendations.⁶⁷

The representatives of the United Kingdom and Guinea particularly welcomed the establishment of the cross-cutting team composed of representatives of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations.⁶⁸ The

representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States proposed that the two bodies could hold joint briefings in the context of deliberations concerning peacekeeping mandates.⁶⁹

At the 4493rd meeting, on 15 March 2002, the President (Norway) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁷⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its concern at the hardships borne by civilians during armed conflict, and recognized the consequent impact that had on durable peace, reconciliation and development, bearing in mind its primary responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, and underlining the importance of taking measures aimed at conflict prevention and resolution;

Adopted the aide-memoire contained in the annex to the statement as a means to facilitate the consideration by the Council of issues pertaining to protection of civilians; further emphasized the need, when considering ways to provide for the protection of civilians in armed conflict, to proceed on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the particular circumstances.

Decision of 20 December 2002 (4679th meeting): statement by the President

On 26 November 2002, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council the third report on the protection of civilians in armed conflict,⁷¹ in which he drew attention to three global issues challenging the capacity of Member States to protect civilians. The first issue related to an increased focus on gender-based violence in humanitarian crisis and conflict situations. Acknowledging that the issue went beyond the United Nations system, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee set up the Task Force on Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in Humanitarian Crises, charged with assessing weaknesses or gaps in existing procedures and standards of behaviour and proposing specific measures for their remedy. He indicated that the United Nations was implementing a number of preventive and remedial measures aimed at enhancing the protection and care of vulnerable persons in situations of humanitarian crisis and conflict, and was working to ensure that the design of peacekeeping and relief operations incorporated protection measures for groups vulnerable to abuse and exploitation. In that

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Colombia); p. 10 (Ireland); p. 12 (United States); and p. 17 (Mexico).

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 9 (Colombia); and p. 17 (Mexico).

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

⁶⁵ S/2001/331.

⁶⁶ S/PV.4492, p. 8 (United Kingdom); and p. 10 (Ireland).

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Singapore); and p. 14 (Bulgaria).

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (United Kingdom); and p. 14 (Guinea).

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (United Kingdom); and p. 12 (United States).

⁷⁰ S/PRST/2002/6.

⁷¹ S/2002/1300, submitted in accordance with the request of the Council, contained in the letter from the President dated 21 June 2001 (S/2001/614).

respect, he recommended that the Council consider the inclusion of a standard paragraph in relevant resolutions that required the reporting of follow-up actions and prosecutions undertaken in response to allegations of sexual abuse and exploitation.

The second issue with an increasing impact on the protection of civilians related to the commercial exploitation of conflict. Noting that the illegal exploitation of natural resources was a growing problem that served to fuel conflict and harmed the security of the civilian population, the Secretary-General recommended that the Council adopt coercive measures directed at companies and individuals involved in plundering of resources in conflict situations.

Finally, the rise of terrorism and the involvement of terrorist organizations in armed conflicts added a new and difficult set of challenges to the work on the protection of civilians. While past statements to the Council had already discussed terrorism and the role of the United Nations in the fight against terrorism, the Secretary-General believed that the Organization would need to formulate clear guidelines for its future work on the protection of civilians in armed conflicts where terrorist organizations were active.

In the report, the Secretary-General presented a number of practical initiatives that would serve to heighten awareness of the need for the protection of civilians in the daily work of the United Nations, such as the regional workshops organized by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs designed to allow Member States to identify threats to regional peace and security and ways to address them collectively; continued use of the aide-memoire⁷² to develop frameworks and more structured approaches to the protection of civilians by United Nations country teams in areas of conflict; and further reviews of key mandates and resolutions where the protection of civilians remained an important concern.

At its 4660th meeting,⁷³ on 10 December 2002, the Council included in its agenda the above-

⁷² See S/PRST/2002/6, annex.

⁷³ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. X, part IV, with regard to the constitutional discussion bearing on the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter; and chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 39 of the Charter.

mentioned report of the Secretary-General. The Council was briefed by the Secretary-General, the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, and the Director-General of the International Committee of the Red Cross. Statements were made by all Council members, the representatives of Argentina, Austria (on behalf of the Human Security Network), Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union⁷⁴), Egypt, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland and Timor-Leste and the Permanent Observer of Palestine.⁷⁵

The Secretary-General noted that the protection of civilians in armed conflict was among the most urgent items on the agenda of the Council, since millions of civilians were targeted, subjected to human rights abuses and denied assistance. Observing that the protection of civilians was critical to achieving a sustainable peace, he stressed the need for practical action and a clear transition from policy to implementation, including by developing a more systematic approach and a structure of best practices that would translate immediately into practical action.⁷⁶

Outlining the progress achieved over the past three years, the Under-Secretary-General noted, *inter alia*, that the United Nations had raised awareness of the steps and measures needed to protect civilians more effectively. He reiterated the three significant new challenges identified in the report of the Secretary-General.⁷⁷ He welcomed the fact that the aide-memoire, adopted by the Council on 15 March 2002,⁷⁸ had led to practical applications, including the Council's recent review of the United Nations peacekeeping mandates in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sierra Leone. He looked forward to additional and regular reviews of other peace operations in areas of serious concern for the

⁷⁴ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

⁷⁵ The representative of Ukraine was invited to participate but did not make a statement; Norway was represented by the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs.

⁷⁶ S/PV.4660, p. 3.

⁷⁷ S/2002/1300.

⁷⁸ See S/PRST/2002/6, annex.

protection of civilians. He also focused on the road map contained in the annex to the Secretary-General's report, pointing out that the ultimate objective was to produce a plan of action for implementation, with specific responsibilities assigned and time frames, where appropriate. He was encouraged by the establishment of a support group of Member States, led by Norway, which would create a broader support base for the protection of civilians in armed conflict and promote and encourage the use of the aide-memoire by relevant actors and serve as a forum for information exchange. He referred to the decision of the Executive Committee on Humanitarian Affairs to create an implementation group for the protection of civilians, which would spearhead the production of the plan of action and liaise with the protection of civilians support group, donors and the Council. He expressed his intention to report back on progress achieved in 6 months, while the Secretary-General would report comprehensively to the Council every 18 months.⁷⁹

The Director-General of the International Committee of the Red Cross stated that the persistent suffering of civilians in conflict situations could not be explained by a lack of norms. On the contrary, humanitarian law had evolved over time and remained an essential frame of reference to guarantee effective protection and assistance to civilian populations that had been trapped in conflicts. However, the major challenge was applying the law, which was primarily the responsibility of States. In that respect, ICRC could only encourage States to promote a culture of respect. He stressed the need to punish violations of international humanitarian law and adopt preventive measures, such as cultivating respect for the law before crises emerged.⁸⁰

Speakers welcomed the Secretary-General's report and the road map. While stressing that the primary responsibility for the protection of civilians rested with Governments, speakers recalled that safeguarding civilians in armed conflict was at the heart of the Charter. They stressed the need for further concrete, systematic action to protect civilians in armed conflict, adding that effective protection was also critical for making peace processes succeed.

Furthermore, speakers, *inter alia*, called for the separation of civilians and armed elements and for the

United Nations and other international bodies to strengthen protection of and assistance to refugees and internally displaced persons; recalled the usefulness of the aide-memoire as a tool to promote the implementation of protection issues; praised the road map as another tool to facilitate further implementation of protection measures among the different actors involved; welcomed the introduction of new issues such as terrorism and sexual exploitation in the Secretary-General's report; and supported the design of further reviews of existing Council mandates and resolutions based on the aide-memoire, through further strengthening of joint cooperation between United Nations departments and entities, in order to integrate the protection of civilians into planning frameworks for peace missions and peace processes.

Calling for further action, speakers commended the progress already achieved by the United Nations, including the recent initiative by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to hold six regional workshops on the protection of civilians in armed conflict. More specifically, they called for the proactive implementation of the aide-memoire and for closer cooperation and coordination within the Secretariat and between the programmes, funds and agencies of the United Nations system. Pointing out the interlinkages of the issues of women and peace and security; children and armed conflict; and the protection of civilians in armed conflict, several representatives expressed the view that the Council should address them in a coherent and integrated manner so as to avoid inconsistencies and duplications.⁸¹

Several speakers also called for the promotion of a culture of protection that benefited civilian populations,⁸² while other speakers stressed the need to prevent conflicts from arising.⁸³ The representative of Bulgaria noted that the culture of prevention had not been fully mainstreamed and expressed the belief that the Council ought not to intervene only when violent

⁷⁹ S/PV.4660, pp. 3-6.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 26 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4660 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Japan); and p. 22 (Indonesia).

⁸² S/PV.4660 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Switzerland); p. 15 (Cambodia); and pp. 16-17 (Austria).

⁸³ S/PV.4660, p. 11 (Bulgaria); p. 14 (Ireland); p. 17 (Guinea); p. 19 (Cameroon); p. 22 (Singapore); p. 25 (China); p. 26 (United Kingdom); and p. 28 (Russian Federation); S/PV.4660 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Colombia); and p. 12 (Chile).

incidents took place on a large scale, but should act proactively before those conflicts spread.⁸⁴ Emphasizing that the idea of humanitarian intervention was a complex issue, the representative of Singapore questioned how, when and by whom a right of intervention should be exercised.⁸⁵ Recalling Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter, the representative of Egypt maintained that the protection of civilians in armed conflict must not lead to the disregard of the concept of State sovereignty or of the responsibilities and powers States had in their territory.⁸⁶ In determining whether the protection of human rights took precedence over State sovereignty, the representative of Burkina Faso, arguing that the answer depended on the circumstances and gravity of the situation, held that the endorsement by the Council was a prerequisite for intervention.⁸⁷

The representative of Canada drew attention to the inconsistency in the Council's responses aimed at protecting civilians, which called for effective steps not only to prevent assaults on civilians, but also, where prevention failed, to react.⁸⁸

Many speakers underlined the need to address the question of access to vulnerable populations by international aid workers as an indispensable requirement in the protection of civilians. A number of speakers endorsed the need for coordinated efforts by the United Nations to include conditions for humanitarian access in all framework agreements signed between States and non-State actors.⁸⁹ The representative of Ireland agreed that the Council and other actors could play a critical role in securing access by putting significant pressure on warring parties. In that respect, he believed that the aide-memoire was a valuable instrument for structuring and shaping negotiations on access and related issues.⁹⁰ Several speakers drew attention to the imperative to ensure the security and protection of aid workers.⁹¹

Speakers also stressed the need to promote the rule of law and justice, in particular by protecting

human rights and implementing humanitarian law through the implementation of, inter alia, the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and other international legal standards. To that end, speakers welcomed the existing international tribunals and the International Criminal Court, as well as other initiatives to bring to justice perpetrators of grave violations of international humanitarian and human rights law. The representative of the United Kingdom stressed the need to develop an accountability structure that rewarded a proactive approach to protection issues.⁹²

Several representatives highlighted the gravity of gender-based violence in humanitarian and conflict situations and called for strengthened efforts to ensure gender mainstreaming in peacekeeping operations.⁹³ The representative of Canada urged the Council to insert language in relevant texts requiring follow-up on allegations of sexual abuse and exploitation.⁹⁴

At its 4679th meeting, on 20 December 2002, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the protection of civilians.⁹⁵ The President (Colombia) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁹⁶ by which the Council, inter alia:

Strongly condemned all attacks and acts of violence directed against civilians or other protected persons under international law;

Called upon all parties to armed conflict to comply fully with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and with the rules and principles of international law, in particular international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law, and to implement fully the relevant decisions of the Council;

Underscored the importance of the aide-memoire adopted by the Council on 15 March 2002, as a practical tool that provided a basis for improved analysis and diagnosis of key protection issues during deliberations on peacekeeping mandates;

Was mindful of the particular vulnerability of refugees and internally displaced persons and reaffirmed the primary responsibility of States to ensure their protection;

⁸⁴ S/PV.4660, p. 11.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁸⁶ S/PV.4660 (Resumption 1), p. 18.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁸⁹ S/PV.4660, p. 9 (Norway); p. 24 (Mauritius); and p. 26 (United Kingdom).

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19 (Cameroon); and p. 26 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4660 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Switzerland).

⁹² S/PV.4660, p. 26.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 13 (Mexico); p. 15 (Ireland); and p. 16 (Guinea); S/PV.4660 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Denmark on behalf of the European Union); p. 7 (Republic of Korea); and p. 11 (Canada).

⁹⁴ S/PV.4660 (Resumption 1), p. 11.

⁹⁵ S/2002/1300.

⁹⁶ S/PRST/2002/41.

Recognized the importance of a comprehensive, coherent and action-oriented approach to the protection of civilians in armed conflict.

Decision of 15 December 2003 (4882nd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4777th meeting, on 20 June 2003, the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator. Statements were made by a majority of Council members.⁹⁷

Presenting the progress made since the third report of the Secretary-General on the protection of civilians in armed conflict,⁹⁸ the Under-Secretary-General declared that, to make the road map a more practical and time-bound document, an implementation group on the protection of civilians, under the auspices of the Executive Committee on Humanitarian Affairs, and a Member States support group had been established and had begun to identify key areas of responsibility. Using the aide-memoire to highlight various protection concerns in the world, he cited the lack of or restricted humanitarian access; the widespread use of rape and other atrocities against women and girls as a weapon of war; the need to separate civilians and combatants; the breakdown in security, law and order; the fundamental importance of disarmament, demobilization, rehabilitation and reintegration with respect to the protection of civilians; the need to safeguard the security of humanitarian personnel; the Organization's priority to protect civilians from sexual exploitation and abuse by humanitarian workers and peacekeepers; and the status of internally displaced persons.

Reflecting on the progress made in the past few years in the area of protection, the Under-Secretary-General expressed satisfaction over the work done to promote greater sensitivity and responsibility of Member States towards the pleas of civilians caught in conflict. He stated that the framework for the protection of civilians, initiated by the Council on 12 February 1999,⁹⁹ was now well established within the United Nations system. The aide-memoire was becoming a regular point of reference for the Council in drafting mandates of peace operations. Furthermore,

the aide-memoire had contributed to a more effective and coherent humanitarian response vis-à-vis protection issues. He recommended that an update of the aide-memoire be presented to the Council at the next briefing in December 2003, together with the updated road map.¹⁰⁰

Council members agreed that the protection of civilians was an issue of utmost importance, mindful that the overwhelming majority of victims in armed conflicts were civilians — mostly vulnerable women, children and the elderly. They welcomed the efforts undertaken by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to keep the protection of civilians at the top of the Organization's agenda and stressed the responsibility of the Council to take action to prevent violence against civilians in armed conflict. Council members welcomed the Under-Secretary-General's proposal to update the aide-memoire and present a revised road map in December 2003.

Council members also pointed to the gap between continued appeals to warring parties to comply with the Charter and international humanitarian law, and the fact that, in practice, such appeals were largely ignored. Massive challenges on the ground, therefore, remained. The representative of the United Kingdom expressed the view that further mainstreaming of activities in the field of protection of civilians was necessary.¹⁰¹

Sharing the view that the dissemination of information on the rights of civilians and the obligations of parties in armed conflict was crucial, speakers welcomed the organization of regional workshops. The representative of Pakistan proposed to transform the individual, ad hoc workshops into a well-defined global programme of action in terms of capacity-building and awareness-raising, with concrete follow-up to enable countries to have their own national programmes of capacity-building.¹⁰²

Council members stressed that the fight against impunity was a key priority in the protection agenda. A number of speakers held that bringing perpetrators to justice was an important element of reconciliation, facilitating the reintegration of post-conflict societies.¹⁰³ The representative of Mexico argued that

⁹⁷ The representatives of Angola and Bulgaria did not make statements.

⁹⁸ S/2002/1300.

⁹⁹ S/PRST/1999/6.

¹⁰⁰ S/PV.4777, pp. 3-8.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Mexico); p. 12 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 15 (Chile); and p. 17 (Spain).

unrestricted access of humanitarian organizations to zones of conflicts was vital and had to be enshrined in Council resolutions, whenever appropriate.¹⁰⁴

At its 4877th meeting,¹⁰⁵ on 9 December 2003, the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator. Statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Azerbaijan, Canada, Colombia, Egypt, Italy (on behalf of the European Union¹⁰⁶), Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Switzerland and Ukraine.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General presented the main challenges to the protection of civilians; the developments since the last Council briefing; and a 10-point platform for future collective action. Noting that the recent deliberate attacks against humanitarian personnel had dramatically reduced access to civilians in armed conflict, he highlighted the primary importance of addressing the issues of access and protection; the challenges to ensuring the security of humanitarian workers; the special protection needs of children; disarmament, demobilization, rehabilitation and reintegration; sexual violence; justice and reconciliation; the special protection of and assistance for internally displaced persons; and the sexual abuse of civilians by United Nations personnel.

The Under-Secretary-General presented for the Council's consideration two documents: an updated aide-memoire, reflecting evolving protection priorities which would assist the Council in ensuring that the protection needs and rights of civilians were included in its resolutions; and the road map, which Council members had called for as a tool to clarify responsibilities, enhance cooperation, facilitate implementation and further strengthen coordination within the United Nations system. He also presented 10 action points that built on areas of the road map that had enjoyed the consensus of the Council, dealing with

the issues of humanitarian access; security of humanitarian personnel; special protection of children; and that of women; impunity; forgotten emergencies; responses to the security needs of refugees and internally displaced persons; disarmament, demobilization, rehabilitation and reintegration; the impact of small arms and light weapons on the protection of civilians; and the promotion of the responsibility of armed groups and non-State actors to protect civilians and respect international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law.¹⁰⁷

Speakers stressed the importance of building a culture of protection and the need to improve humanitarian access to civilians in need, as well as ensure the safety and protection of humanitarian personnel. They drew attention to the suffering of women and children in conflict situations, and to the situation of internally displaced persons. Furthermore, they underlined the need to ensure the implementation of the measures designed to protect civilians. They highlighted the importance of an effective United Nations system-wide response, as well as improved cooperation within the system and with regional organizations.

Speakers also welcomed the updated aide-memoire and road map and expressed the view that the two documents should guide the Council in devising peacekeeping mandates. A number of speakers maintained that protection issues should be included in peacekeeping mandates, such as the facilitation by the United Nations of unhindered access by humanitarian organizations to needy populations.¹⁰⁸ The representatives of Norway and Canada argued that peacekeeping operations must be provided with unambiguous mandates and adequate resources to protect civilians, when such responsibilities were given.¹⁰⁹

The representative of Egypt remarked that, in most cases, Council intervention to protect civilians came too late or else was not commensurate with the security and emergency humanitarian needs of the population.¹¹⁰ The representative of Azerbaijan

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹⁰⁵ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 41 of the Charter.

¹⁰⁶ Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁰⁷ S/PV.4877, pp. 2-7.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Spain); p. 11 (United Kingdom); and p. 25 (Germany).

¹⁰⁹ S/PV.4877 (Resumption 1), pp. 10-11 (Norway); and p. 13 (Canada).

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

expressed disappointment at the lack of will on the part of the Council to ensure the implementation of its resolutions on the settlement of armed conflicts, or deal on a case-by-case basis with the reality of those hostilities and their impact on civilian populations.¹¹¹

A number of speakers underlined the need to prevent conflicts from occurring.¹¹² The representative of the Russian Federation stressed that the Council should take full account of the particular nature of specific conflict situations and, on that basis, take measures to protect civilians. He added that while the humanitarian component was crucial as an element of a comprehensive strategy for crisis prevention and during the stage of post-conflict settlement, the efficacy of humanitarian work depended to a large extent on how it was incorporated into the international efforts to find a political settlement to conflict.¹¹³ Similarly, the representative of Azerbaijan pointed out that the settlement of an armed conflict was the best option for ensuring that those who had been targeted with systematic violence would not be physically abused again.¹¹⁴ The representative of Egypt held that it was necessary to understand that the concept of providing protection to civilians in armed conflict should not stop with the end of military operations, but should extend into post-conflict peacebuilding.¹¹⁵ The representative of Sierra Leone stated that emphasis should be placed not merely on the obligation and responsibility to protect, but also on the capacity to provide protection.¹¹⁶

The representative of Japan stressed that interventions to protect civilians should not be viewed as a challenge to national sovereignty, especially when national authorities had failed, or had a limited capacity, to protect civilians.¹¹⁷ The representative of Egypt insisted on the need to balance the right of civilians to protection with the right of each State to sovereignty. In his view, the international community's treatment of and respect for one of those rights should

not be at the expense of the other. The issue of protection of civilians should be guided by the Charter and international law.¹¹⁸

Many speakers pointed out that justice and reconciliation efforts should form an integral part of the protection agenda and called for putting an end to the culture of impunity. The representative of Angola supported the inclusion in all country-related draft resolutions of a call upon States and non-State actors to adhere to international human rights, humanitarian and refugee law and to reinforce the principle of no impunity for genocide, war crimes or crimes against humanity.¹¹⁹ Some representatives highlighted the role of the International Criminal Court in achieving that goal.¹²⁰ Speaking on behalf of the European Union, the representative of Italy opined that violators of international humanitarian and human rights law must be brought to justice at the national level or, where not possible, to international justice, while the primary responsibility to carry that out lay with each State.¹²¹

At the 4882nd meeting, on 15 December 2003, the President (Bulgaria) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹²² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed the need to keep the protection of civilians in armed conflict as an important item on the Council's agenda;

Also reaffirmed its concern at the suffering inflicted upon and hardships borne by civilians during armed conflict; strongly condemned all attacks and acts of violence directed against civilians or other persons protected under international law; reaffirmed the need for parties to armed conflict to take all possible measures to ensure the safety, security and freedom of movement of United Nations and associated personnel as well as personnel of international humanitarian organizations in accordance with applicable international law; reiterated its call to all parties to armed conflict to comply fully with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and with the rules and principles of international law; recalled the obligations of States to respect and to ensure respect for international humanitarian law, including the four Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and emphasized the responsibility of States to end impunity and to prosecute those responsible for genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and serious violations of humanitarian law.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹¹² S/PV.4877, p. 9 (Russian Federation); p. 16 (China); p. 16 (Angola); p. 22 (Cameroon); and p. 24 (Pakistan); S/PV.4877 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Sierra Leone); and p. 14 (Canada).

¹¹³ S/PV.4877, pp. 8-9.

¹¹⁴ S/PV.4877 (Resumption 1), p. 12.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹¹⁹ S/PV.4877, pp. 17-18.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Spain); p. 19 (Mexico); and p. 29 (Ukraine); S/PV.4877 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Switzerland); p. 10 (Republic of Korea); and p. 14 (Canada).

¹²¹ S/PV.4877, p. 27.

¹²² S/PRST/2003/27.

42. Items relating to small arms

A. Small arms

Decision of 31 August 2001 (4362nd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4355th meeting, on 2 August 2001, the Security Council included in its agenda a letter dated 25 July 2001 from the representative of Colombia addressed to the President,¹ transmitting a document entitled "Issues for the open debate on the question of small arms". The document informed Member States that wished to participate in an open debate by the Council, scheduled to take place on 2 August 2001, that issues to be considered during the debate included, but were not limited to, the content of the relevant reports of the Secretary-General; follow-up mechanisms; special briefings on the question of small arms; strengthening of regional and subregional mechanisms; arms embargoes; and advisory missions.

During the meeting, statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Belgium (on behalf of the European Union²), Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Egypt, Ghana, India, Japan, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the Sudan (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Thailand and Venezuela. The Council also heard a briefing by the Secretary-General.

In his briefing, the Secretary-General noted progress made at the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects held the previous month, particularly the adoption of a comprehensive programme of action.³ The Secretary-General highlighted the commitment of States to developing, strengthening and implementing norms and measures aimed at preventing, fighting and eradicating illicit manufacture of and trade in small arms and light weapons. He affirmed that States had

agreed to place special emphasis on post-conflict situations, particularly the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants; agreed to act responsibly in the areas of export, import, transit and transfer of weapons; recognized the need to mark and keep accurate records to allow timely tracing and identification; pledged to improve the implementation of arms embargoes; and agreed to destroy illicit or surplus weapons as necessary. He informed the Council that the Programme of Action called for greater transparency and for public awareness programmes, and encouraged Governments to continue working on the issues on which they could not reach consensus at the Conference, such as the question of negotiating legally binding instruments. The Secretary-General also drew attention to the need to address the supply side of the problem, as well as elaborating on the complexity of the devastating impact of small arms violence in the areas of development, democracy, human rights and human security, to which children were especially vulnerable. Finally, the Secretary-General assured the Council that the Conference was not meant to infringe on national sovereignty, limit the rights of States to defend themselves or take away guns from legal owners.⁴

Most speakers welcomed the outcome of the Conference and expressed gratitude to the President for a timely debate at the Council. Speakers also acknowledged that small arms and light weapons posed a grave threat to humanity and called for a comprehensive approach that covered various areas affected by small arms proliferation, such as cooperation with international and regional bodies, civil society and other organizations of the United Nations system. They also emphasized the need to address the root causes of proliferation in small arms, including poverty, lack of development, ethnic strife and the culture of violence; take into account specific facts of each conflict situation; include in the mandates of peacekeeping operations provisions relating to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration; find measures to monitor the implementation of arms embargoes, including the provision of more information to sanctions committees; and ensure that

¹ S/2001/732.

² Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³ See *Report of the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, New York, 9-20 July 2001 (A/CONF.192/15)*, para. 24.

⁴ S/PV.4355, pp. 3-4.

States adopted national legislation to comply with, and punished violations of, such embargoes.

The representative of Mauritius called for further measures to implement resolution 1209 (1998), which stressed the importance of restricting arms transfers which could prolong armed conflicts in Africa, and resolution 1196 (1998), which called upon States to adopt legislation making the violation of arms embargoes a criminal offense.⁵

Several speakers reiterated the Secretary-General's remark that measures against illicit small arms and light weapons should not encroach on the legitimate right of States to defend themselves and legally acquire weapons, under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.⁶ The representative of China asserted that the sovereignty of States, as well as their right to the legal production, possession and transfer of small arms should not be compromised.⁷

While most speakers welcomed the Programme of Action as the first international agreement that established a realistic and comprehensive framework and encouraged all Member States to fully implement it, a number of speakers remarked on its shortcomings. The representative of Ireland voiced his preference for stronger commitments, while the representative of Peru mentioned the incomprehensible deficiencies apparent in its adoption.⁸ The representative of Mali, who made a joint statement with the representative of Norway, indicated that his Government would have preferred a more ambitious plan of action, and that both an international agreement on explicit export criteria that could be effectively implemented and international instruments on marking and tracing small arms and on brokering operations were necessary. He also expressed regret, echoed by a number of other representatives, that the Conference had failed to achieve agreement on the regulation of individual possession of small arms and light weapons.⁹ The representative of Mauritius, echoed by other representatives, expressed

disappointment in the lack of agreement on the need to establish restrictions on the transfer of small arms to non-State actors.¹⁰ The representative of India asserted that the international community must agree, as it had been unable to do so at the Conference, that the trade in arms must flow only through channels authorized by both exporting and importing Governments to stop any diversion to terrorists or non-State actors.¹¹ The representative of Costa Rica expressed concern that the Programme of Action failed to explicitly prohibit the transfer of arms to rebel groups; condemn the dispatch of arms to Governments that committed systematic violations of human rights; reflect the need for a legally binding code of conduct on the transfer of arms; or include any explicit reference to human rights.¹²

Although most speakers called for the Council's continued involvement in the resolution of illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, some speakers advocated a limited role for the Council. The representatives of the United States and Pakistan remarked that the focus of the Conference was on the obligation of the Member States as reflected in the Programme of Action, and warned that the Council should not seek a more elaborate role beyond its competence.¹³ The representative of South Africa, echoed by the representative of the Sudan, stated that the issue of small arms should continue to be dealt with in the General Assembly and that the Council should confine its involvement to specific areas related to its agenda.¹⁴

However, the representative of Jamaica and the representative of the United Kingdom expressed the hope that the debate would result in practical proposals and recommendations for the mainstreaming of the small arms issue in the work of the Council, moving it from a tangential to a more central position in the Council's deliberations.¹⁵ The representatives of the Republic of Korea and Costa Rica stated that the Council should strengthen its role in combating the

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 13 (Russian Federation); and p. 16 (Tunisia); S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 15 (Venezuela); and p. 17 (Sudan on behalf of the Group of Arab States).

⁷ S/PV.4355, p. 15.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 22 (Ireland); and p. 27 (Peru).

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 19 (Mali, also on behalf of Norway); S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 5 (Chile); p. 24 (Canada); and p. 28 (Costa Rica).

¹⁰ S/PV.4355, p. 18 (Mauritius); S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 5 (Chile); pp. 11-12 (South Africa); and p. 24 (Canada).

¹¹ S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, pp. 19-20.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 28.

¹³ S/PV.4355, p. 5 (United States); S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, pp. 23-24 (Pakistan).

¹⁴ S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 11 (South Africa); and p. 17 (Sudan).

¹⁵ S/PV.4355, p. 6 (Jamaica); and p. 12 (United Kingdom).

illicit trade in small arms and preventing their excessive accumulation.¹⁶ The representative of Sierra Leone asserted that because issuing presidential statements and resolutions had little meaningful effect, the Council should develop the capacity to have greater leverage over the parties directly responsible for the propagation of conflicts and adopt sterner, more resolute measures to attain its obligations under the Charter. He added that the Council should markedly and continuously exert its authority over the form and content of the provisions of the Programme of Action.¹⁷

Several speakers expressed their belief that the Council had its own distinctive role to play, particularly in strengthening the effectiveness of its arms embargoes and supporting disarmament, demobilization and reintegration measures.¹⁸ The representative of Ukraine pointed out that the Council could offer added value in putting an end to economies of war and encouraging voluntary moratoriums on arms exports to regions in conflict.¹⁹ The representative of Chile stated that the Council should have the relevant information about the illicit use of arms and military weapons in order to strengthen preventive measures, and that it must play a dynamic role in educating Member States about the negative effects of sustained flows of weapons to areas of conflict.²⁰ Some representatives suggested that closer consultation and coordination with the General Assembly and other United Nations organs could enhance the effectiveness of the work of the Council.²¹ The representative of Peru added that the overlap in the functions and responsibilities of the Council and the General Assembly afforded a splendid opportunity for coordination between the two organs.²²

At its 4362nd meeting, on 31 August 2001, the Council again included in its agenda the above-mentioned letter.²³

At the same meeting, the President (Colombia) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁴ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Noted with grave concern that the destabilizing accumulation and uncontrolled spread of small arms increased the intensity and duration of armed conflicts; expressed grave concern at the harmful impact of small arms on civilians in situations of armed conflict;

Welcomed recent global and regional initiatives; also welcomed the Programme of Action and called on all Member States to take the required measures to implement promptly the recommendations contained therein;

Underlined the importance of practical disarmament measures in averting armed conflicts;

Emphasized the importance of the effective collection and control of small arms and of their storage and destruction in the context of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes;

Reiterated its call for the effective implementation of arms embargoes imposed by the Council in relevant resolutions;

Requested the Secretary-General to submit a report by September 2002 containing specific recommendations on ways and means in which the Council might contribute to dealing with the question of illicit trade in small arms.

**Decision of 31 October 2002 (4639th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4623rd meeting, on 11 October 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on small arms of 20 September 2002.²⁵ The report, which reflected initiatives taken by the Council, identified areas where further action by the Council was required, and stressed that preventing, combating and eliminating the uncontrolled spread of small arms and light weapons constituted one of the key tasks of the Council in discharging its primary responsibility of maintaining peace and security. The report contained 12 recommendations of the Secretary-General, calling upon Member States to develop an international instrument to enable States to identify and trace illicit small arms and light weapons; use, and provide technical and financial support to the INTERPOL Weapons and Explosives Tracking System; assist the Secretariat in establishing the small arms advisory service; enforce all Council resolutions on sanctions and bring their own national legislation into

¹⁶ S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 14 (Republic of Korea); and p. 27 (Costa Rica).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.

¹⁸ S/PV.4355, p. 21 (Ukraine); S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 9 (Philippines); p. 15 (Venezuela); and p. 29 (Belarus).

¹⁹ S/PV.4355, p. 21.

²⁰ S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 6.

²¹ S/PV.4355, p. 7 (Jamaica); and p. 23 (Singapore).

²² *Ibid.*, p. 27.

²³ S/2001/732.

²⁴ S/PRST/2001/21.

²⁵ S/2002/1053, submitted pursuant to the presidential statement of 31 August 2001 (S/PRST/2001/21).

compliance with the Council's measures on sanctions, as well as make available to the appropriate United Nations bodies all pertinent information on any alleged violations of arms embargoes and take appropriate measures to investigate such allegations. The recommendations of the Secretary-General further indicated that the Council should enhance its interaction with the General Assembly on issues relating to small arms; continue its efforts to identify the links between the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons and the illicit exploitation of natural and other resources, as well as the trade in illegal drugs; recognize the importance of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and include such measures in the text of negotiated agreements and mandate of peacekeeping operations; strengthen the financing of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration through the expansion of measures covered under the budget for peacekeeping operations; establish the necessary legislative or other measures to ensure effective control over the export and transit of small arms and light weapons; pursue more vigorously and expeditiously the use of arms embargoes under Article 41 of the Charter and promote their effective implementation; consider coercive measures against Member States that deliberately violated arms embargoes and establish monitoring mechanisms; and enhance transparency in armaments.

During the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, and statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, the Congo (on behalf of the Economic Community of Central African States),²⁶ Costa Rica, Croatia, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union²⁷), Egypt, India, Indonesia, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Malawi, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, South Africa, Switzerland, Ukraine and Zambia.

²⁶ Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Rwanda and Sao Tome and Principe aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁷ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

The Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, in his briefing, stated that Member States had engaged in the implementation of the Programme of Action with great enthusiasm, and that several initiatives on a national and regional level had yielded encouraging results. He called for the Council's political support for the Secretariat initiative to build a small arms advisory service within the Department of Disarmament Affairs to enhance the effectiveness of the Coordinating Action on Small Arms mechanism and the ability of the United Nations to assist Member States in the implementation of the Programme of Action.²⁸

Most speakers welcomed the report of the Secretary-General and endorsed his recommendations. Speakers called for, inter alia, national legislative measures that complied with sanctions imposed by the Council, including end-user certificates; firmer implementation of arms embargoes and monitoring mechanisms to identify violators; enhanced coordination with the General Assembly, regional organizations, non-governmental organizations and civil society; a comprehensive approach to address the multifaceted consequences of proliferation in small arms and the limits to the effectiveness of arms embargoes; and attention to the root causes of armed conflicts, including economic and social dimensions. Most speakers maintained that although the Council should continue to pay special attention to the illicit traffic of small arms and light weapons including via arms embargoes and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, the primary responsibility lay with Member States. The representative of Egypt stressed that the Council had an important role to play in the field of small arms and light weapons, in the light of its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter.²⁹ However, the representative of the Russian Federation emphasized that the Council should focus its attention primarily on those instances in which illicit arms trade was directly linked to conflict situations on the Council's agenda.³⁰

Many speakers acknowledged the challenges and difficulties faced by disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes and urged the Council to include such measures in the mandates of the

²⁸ S/PV.4623, pp. 2-3.

²⁹ S/PV.4623 (Resumption 1), p. 5.

³⁰ S/PV.4623, p. 17.

peacekeeping operations. However, China noted that because the causes and manifestations of the world's armed conflicts varied, the Council should bear that in mind when deciding whether to incorporate disarmament, demobilization and reintegration into peacekeeping mandates.³¹

The representative of Malawi emphasized the importance of developing closer, mutually reinforcing linkages between the Programme of Action and the Secretary-General's broad-ranging recommendations.³²

While a number of speakers drew attention to the danger of small arms and light weapons reaching terrorist groups and non-State actors, several speakers reiterated the right of every State to self-defence according to Article 51 of the Charter.³³ The representative of Israel reminded the Council that while States had the right to acquire and produce small arms, the international community had the right and the obligation to insist that the use of such weapons be restricted to self-defence and national security, and to demand that States ensure that such weapons did not fall into unauthorized hands.³⁴ The representative of Japan drew attention to resolution 1373 (2001), which called for the elimination of the supply of weapons, including small arms, to terrorists as an essential element in the global fight against terrorism.³⁵

Several speakers commended progress made in regional-level cooperation.³⁶ The representative of Denmark, speaking on behalf of the European Union, welcomed the emergence of new partnerships among States, civil society and non-governmental organizations in follow-up to the Conference, while the representative of Canada noted progress in developing legislation, promoting technology for marking and tracing, dealing with harmful brokering and collecting and destroying weapons.³⁷

The representative of South Africa, in contrast, echoed by the representative of Namibia, expressed concern that the international community still faced the

proliferation and excessive accumulation of small arms and light weapons despite the adoption of the Programme of Action.³⁸ The representative of Mauritius stated that the circulation of illicit small arms and light weapons had increased, and asked the Council to look beyond the classical approach of simply coming out with another statement which will remain a dead letter. He pointed out the lack of coordination not only between the General Assembly and the Council but also at the regional, subregional and international levels. He noted the need to follow up to ensure the implementation of decisions and recommendations that were left to the will and discretion of individual countries and to find an effective way to deal with brokers and middlemen involved in the trade of small arms and light weapons.³⁹ The representative of Egypt stated that practical difficulties of accurately monitoring arms exports, and an absence in the Council of the will to enforce certain embargoes and verify their implementation, limited the success of new measures such as the establishment of independent panels of experts and monitoring mechanisms for implementing arms embargoes.⁴⁰ The representative of the Republic of Korea also hoped that the Council would pursue the use of monitoring mechanisms, in accordance with Article 41, with a view to ensuring successful enforcement.⁴¹

Several speakers expressed concern about the absence of an international treaty or other legal instrument to control the illicit use of small arms and light weapons and called for further pursuit of legally binding commitments on marking, tracing, and brokering.⁴²

At its 4639th meeting, on 31 October 2002, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 20 September 2002.⁴³

At the same meeting, the President (Cameroon) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁴⁴ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

³² S/PV. 4623 (Resumption 1), p. 36.

³³ S/PV.4623, p. 14 (Syrian Arab Republic); S/PV.4623 (Resumption 1), p. 37 (Pakistan).

³⁴ S/PV.4623 (Resumption 1), p. 15.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Australia); p. 14 (Israel); and p. 37 (Pakistan).

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 19 (Denmark); and p. 26 (Canada).

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 22 (South Africa); and p. 29 (Namibia).

³⁹ S/PV.4623, pp. 5-6.

⁴⁰ S/PV.4623 (Resumption 1), pp. 4-5.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 17 (Nigeria); p. 19 (Denmark); p. 25 (Argentina); and p. 28 (Jamaica).

⁴³ S/2002/1053.

⁴⁴ S/PRST/2002/30.

Encouraged all Member States to continue to take all measures to implement fully the recommendations contained in the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects;

Reaffirmed the inherent right of individual and collective self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter;

Encouraged arms-exporting countries to exercise the highest degree of responsibility in small arms and light weapons transactions;

Stressed the need for cooperation and sharing of information among Member States;

Recognized the important role of arms embargoes;

Recognized that the primary responsibility for the implementation of sanctions measures rested with the States;

Reiterated its call for the effective implementation of arms embargoes imposed by the Council pursuant to its relevant resolutions.

B. Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa

Initial proceedings

Decision of 18 March 2003 (4720th meeting): resolution 1467 (2003)

At its 4720th meeting,⁴⁵ on 18 March 2003, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled “Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa” and held a workshop to discuss the matter in an interactive manner. The Council heard a statement by the Secretary-General and briefings by the Interim Commissioner for Peace, Security and Political Affairs of the African Union, the representative of the Chairman of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS and the Regional Director of the Programme for Coordination and Assistance for Security and Development. Subsequently, all the members of the Council and the representatives of Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, the Gambia, Liberia, Mali, the Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo made statements.⁴⁶

The Secretary-General noted that the uncontrolled proliferation of small arms and light weapons and the use of mercenaries in West Africa sustained conflict, exacerbated violence, fuelled crime and terrorism, promoted cultures of violence, violated international humanitarian law and impeded political, economic and social development. Unless adequately addressed, their spread would continue to pose a severe threat to the hopes of attaining durable peace and security in the region. Fortunately, the international community and the countries concerned had the necessary tools to combat the problems, including such legal instruments and international agreements as the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, the International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries and the ECOWAS moratorium on the importation, exportation and manufacture of small arms and light weapons in West Africa.⁴⁷

The Interim Commissioner for Peace, Security and Political Affairs of the African Union, outlining the efforts of the African States to combat the proliferation of small arms and mercenary activities, underlined that States must display sufficient political will to implement their collective decisions on small arms and endow themselves with the necessary means to implement the decisions, such as a truly independent follow-up and monitoring mechanism and appropriate

⁴⁵ For more information on the Council’s discussion concerning small arms and light weapons, see sect. 42.A of the present chapter.

⁴⁶ Angola, Guinea, Liberia, Senegal and Togo were represented by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs. Cameroon was represented by the Minister of State for External Relations, the Gambia by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Benin by the Minister of State for Defence, Burkina Faso by the Minister for Regional Cooperation, and Mali by the Minister of Labour and Vocational Training.

⁴⁷ S/PV.4720, pp. 2-4.

sanctions regimes against non-compliant parties. He stressed the need to tackle the underlying causes of tensions and conflicts, noting that the challenge of good governance was at the core of the quest for peace and security in Africa.⁴⁸

The representative of the Chairman of ECOWAS highlighted that the international community should be duly cognizant of the implications of the activities of individual weapons retailers. While it was worth considering revising the ECOWAS moratorium and making it a permanent instrument, sanctions ought to be applied where there were violations of the moratorium and of the relevant international legal instruments. He also drew attention to the upsurge in the activities of mercenaries and private armies that were being recruited from one conflict situation to another in West Africa.⁴⁹

The Executive Secretary of ECOWAS noted that ECOWAS remained engaged with the international community over the twin devils of small arms and mercenary activities. With regard to small arms, he appealed to the Council and the international community at large to support effective implementation of the ECOWAS moratorium and to facilitate the establishment of a well-resourced small arms unit in the ECOWAS secretariat. In regard to mercenary activities, while calling for global action to eliminate the practice, he was deeply concerned that a unique type of mercenary was emerging in West Africa, where the rebel factions had taken on the semblance of mercenaries and had shown no loyalty to any particular authority and were always available for hire.⁵⁰

The Regional Director of the Programme for Coordination and Assistance for Security and Development opined that the most important aspect of the fight against the proliferation of small arms was not only political commitment and will but also the mobilization of resources. He highlighted that the Programme, which was established to support the ECOWAS moratorium, had taken various steps to curb the flow of small arms and mercenary activities in West Africa, including by establishing a network of national commissions, strengthening border controls and training security forces, but that it lacked the necessary means to do more. Meanwhile, he stressed the

importance of addressing both the demand and supply sides of the proliferation of small arms by reducing demand through the moratorium and through stricter monitoring regimes while urging suppliers to avoid the export of weapons to conflict-torn regions.⁵¹

With regard to the proliferation of small arms and light weapons, most speakers emphasized that the current international framework, particularly the ECOWAS moratorium and the Programme of Action, must be fully implemented and further strengthened. To that end, they held that a number of steps could be taken which included the effective functioning of national commissions and the development of national laws, including those addressing the brokering of illegal arms;⁵² enhanced controls for arms exports;⁵³ end-user certificates;⁵⁴ and an international instrument for tracing illicit small arms.⁵⁵ The representative of Togo specifically called on certain members of the former Warsaw Pact to commit to a true ban on the illicit export of weapons to African countries in general and ECOWAS States in particular.⁵⁶ Speakers in general held that arms embargoes needed to be implemented more effectively. In that context, some supported the establishment of an independent monitoring mechanism on sanctions⁵⁷ and others expressed the view that those responsible for illegal small arms trade should be subject to sanctions.⁵⁸

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-12.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 17 (Cameroon); and p. 25 (United States); S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Togo); p. 6 (Russian Federation); p. 13 (France); p. 17 (Mali); p. 20 (Niger); p. 21 (China); and p. 28 (Guinea).

⁵³ S/PV.4720, p. 15 (Angola); p. 20 (United Kingdom); p. 25 (United States); and p. 27 (Germany); S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), p. 13 (France); and p. 25 (Nigeria).

⁵⁴ S/PV.4720, p. 21 (United Kingdom); and p. 27 (Germany); S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Mexico); p. 13 (France); p. 23 (Pakistan); p. 25 (Nigeria); and p. 28 (Guinea).

⁵⁵ S/PV.4720, p. 16 (Angola); p. 21 (United Kingdom); and p. 24 (Senegal); S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), pp. 12-13 (France); p. 22 (Sierra Leone); and p. 24 (Nigeria).

⁵⁶ S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), p. 5.

⁵⁷ S/PV.4720, p. 17 (Cameroon); and p. 21 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), pp. 18-19 (Bulgaria).

⁵⁸ S/PV.4720, p. 14 (Gambia); S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), pp. 5-6 (Russian Federation); p. 15 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 17 (Mali); p. 21 (China); and p. 23 (Pakistan).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

In addition, a number of speakers held that disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes should be effectively implemented so that small arms were collected or destroyed and ex-combatants would not be recruited as mercenaries to fight in new conflicts.⁵⁹ Attributing the various conflicts in West Africa to the unfinished job of disarming and reintegrating combatants following the end of the first civil war in Liberia, the representative of France stressed that the only long-term solution to the proliferation of small arms and mercenary activities entailed a real disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme.⁶⁰

With regard to mercenary activities, a number of speakers stressed the importance of observing the spirit and the letter of the International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries and the Convention for the Elimination of Mercenarism in Africa adopted by the Organization of African Unity.⁶¹ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic drew attention to the private military security companies that used well-organized small armies of mercenaries in armed conflicts in Africa to calm the situation and stated that it was wrong to think that such companies could help in managing the affairs of the countries in which they operated.⁶² Similarly, the representative of Burkina Faso was concerned that

some Governments were using mercenaries to deal with internal rebellions and crisis situations.⁶³ The representative of Benin called for a United Nations convention for dismantling the official mercenary companies and agencies specializing in the provision of military services.⁶⁴ The representative of Liberia alleged in that regard that mercenaries from a Liberian rebel group were fighting for the Government of Côte d'Ivoire to gain access to and open a second front along the Liberian-Ivorian border.⁶⁵ In protest, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire stressed that instead of fighting alongside the Ivorian national army, the Liberian mercenaries were indeed part of the aggressors against his country.⁶⁶

Finally, several speakers underlined the need to address the root causes of armed conflicts that incited demand for weapons, including poverty and bad governance,⁶⁷ while others drew special attention to the urgent issue of child soldiers in West Africa.⁶⁸

At the meeting, the President (Guinea) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁶⁹ it was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1467 (2003), by which the Council decided to adopt a declaration, annexed to the resolution, on the item entitled "Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa".

⁵⁹ S/PV.4720, p. 14 (Gambia); p. 16 (Angola); p. 18 (Liberia); p. 20 (Spain); p. 24 (Senegal); and p. 25 (United States); S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Togo); p. 6 (Russian Federation); p. 7 (Mexico); p. 20 (Niger); p. 21 (China); p. 22 (Sierra Leone); p. 23 (Pakistan); and p. 24 (Nigeria).

⁶⁰ S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), p. 12.

⁶¹ S/PV.4720, p. 17 (Cameroon); and pp. 23-24 (Senegal); S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Togo); p. 5 (Russian Federation); and p. 10 (Burkina Faso).

⁶² S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), p. 16.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁶⁵ S/PV.4720, p. 18.

⁶⁶ S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), pp. 26-27.

⁶⁷ S/PV.4720, p. 26 (Germany); S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Benin); p. 19 (Niger); p. 21 (China); and p. 28 (Guinea).

⁶⁸ S/PV.4720, p. 13 (Gambia); p. 20 (Spain); and p. 27 (Germany); S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), p. 14 (Chile).

⁶⁹ S/2003/328.

43. Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts

Decision of 20 July 2000 (4174th meeting): statement by the President

At the 4174th meeting of the Security Council, on 20 July 2000,¹ statements were made by all members of the Council² and the Secretary-General, the representatives of Austria (in his capacity as Chair in Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe), Brazil, Colombia, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Norway, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Senegal, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania and the Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference to the United Nations.³

Opening the discussion, the Secretary-General noted that there was a consensus that prevention strategies should address the root causes of conflicts and not simply their violent symptoms. Describing conflict prevention as multidimensional, he stated that, to be effective, prevention needed to address the structural faults that predisposed a society to conflict, and that the best form of long-term conflict prevention was represented by healthy and balanced economic development. Recalling that peace and development constituted two great responsibilities of the United Nations, the Secretary-General stated that the latter had a special role to play. Recalling the various initiatives that he had undertaken since taking office, the Secretary-General pointed out that any type of work in post-conflict peacebuilding constituted prevention,

since it was designed to prevent the resurgence of conflict. Noting recent indications that the Council itself was also taking prevention more seriously, he suggested that the Council undertake a number of steps, including making greater use of fact-finding missions; encouraging States to bring potential conflicts to the attention of the Council; setting up an informal working group or a subsidiary body to study early warning and prevention; holding periodic meetings at the ministerial level to discuss thematic or actual prevention issues, as provided for in Article 28 of the Charter of the United Nations; working more closely with the other principal organs of the United Nations, particularly the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council in accordance with Article 65 of the Charter, and the International Court of Justice in accordance with Article 96 of the Charter; and examining ways of interacting more closely with non-State actors with expertise and experience in conflict prevention. The Secretary-General urged the Council to agree on the most practical ideas and act upon them. He observed that prevention was costly, but stressed that intervention, relief and rebuilding broken societies and lives cost far more. He hoped that Member States would acknowledge that the international community could also play a constructive role in internal situations, and that this could strengthen sovereignty rather than weaken it, and called upon Member States to give the existing institutions working on conflict prevention the backing they urgently needed. Finally, the Secretary-General called for prevention to be made the cornerstone of collective security in the twenty-first century, a direction that would be achieved not by grand gestures or short-term thinking, but by changing deeply ingrained attitudes.⁴

In the ensuing discussion, the majority of speakers, inter alia, acknowledged that the prevention of armed conflict was less costly than dealing with conflicts once they had erupted, from the human, political, economic and financial perspectives; agreed with the Secretary-General on the importance of shifting from a culture of reaction to a culture of prevention; indicated that it was important to focus on the resolution of the root causes, including through

¹ For more information on the discussion at the meeting, see chap. X, part III, sect. C, with regard to the role of the Secretary-General in the pacific settlement of disputes; chap. X, part IV, with regard to the relevance of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter to conflict prevention; and chap. XII, part III, sect. A, with regard to the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter.

² Namibia and Jamaica were represented by their Ministers for Foreign Affairs. The representative of France made a statement on behalf of the European Union: Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

³ The President of the Council (Jamaica) also acknowledged the presence of the President of the General Assembly, who did not make a statement at the meeting.

⁴ S/PV.4174, pp. 2-4.

social and economic development, if conflicts were to be prevented in the first place or prevented from re-emerging; and emphasized the importance of post-conflict peacebuilding efforts aimed at preventing the recurrence of conflicts. A number of speakers underscored the need to improve the tools and means to prevent conflict, including, for instance, by strengthening the early-warning capacities of the Secretariat and encouraging the Council to conduct early missions to conflict areas;⁵ recalled the critical role that the Secretary-General could play in making conflict prevention a more effective strategy;⁶ and explicitly invoking Article 99 of the Charter, emphasized the importance of the role of the Secretary-General in using that prerogative.⁷

A number of representatives stressed that conflict prevention should be pursued with due regard to the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of States.⁸ The representative of the Netherlands observed that while the Charter was geared towards inter-State conflict, the overwhelming majority of conflicts were of an internal nature. He therefore opined that the Council needed a more flexible interpretation of Article 2(7) of the Charter to be able to take the necessary action in the face of conflicts.⁹

Several speakers recognized the important role that regional organizations and arrangements played in the prevention of armed conflicts and expressed support for stronger cooperation with regional organizations.¹⁰ While commenting on the increasingly important role played by regional organizations in the maintenance of

peace and security and conflict prevention, in line with their mandate under Chapter VIII of the Charter, the representatives of China and Namibia recalled that intervention by regional organizations needed to be undertaken with the authorization of the Council, as provided for by Article 53 of the Charter.¹¹

The President then made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its belief that early warning, preventive diplomacy, preventive deployment, preventive disarmament, and post-conflict peacebuilding were interdependent and complementary components of a comprehensive conflict-prevention strategy; emphasized its continuing commitment to addressing the prevention of armed conflicts in all regions of the world;

Reaffirmed the importance of its consideration of all situations that might deteriorate into armed conflicts, and of considering follow-up action, as appropriate; expressed continued willingness to consider the use of Council missions, with the consent of host countries, in order to determine whether any dispute, or any situation that might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, and to make recommendations for action by the Council, as appropriate;

Invited the Secretary-General to submit to the Council, by May 2001, a report containing an analysis, and recommendations on initiatives within the United Nations.

Decision of 30 August 2001 (4360th meeting): resolution 1366 (2001)

At its 4334th meeting, on 21 June 2001,¹³ the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 7 June 2001 on the prevention of armed conflict.¹⁴ In the report, the Secretary-General recalled that conflict prevention was one of the primary obligations of Member States set forth in the Charter. Adding that United Nations efforts in conflict prevention must be in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter, he emphasized that conflict prevention was an activity best undertaken

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Russian Federation); p. 16 (Malaysia); and pp. 27-28 (France); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), pp. 4-5 (Pakistan); and p. 10 (Senegal).

⁶ S/PV.4174, p. 4 (United States); p. 6 (United Kingdom); p. 11 (the Netherlands); p. 14 (Tunisia); pp. 15-16 (Malaysia); and p. 27 (France); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), pp. 7-8 (Brazil); and p. 11 (Indonesia).

⁷ S/PV.4174, p. 13 (China); p. 14 (Tunisia); p. 16 (Malaysia); p. 22 (Ukraine); and p. 27 (France); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Pakistan); and p. 10 (Senegal).

⁸ S/PV.4174, p. 10 (Russian Federation); p. 13 (China); p. 15 (Tunisia); and p. 16 (Malaysia); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Pakistan).

⁹ S/PV.4174, p. 11.

¹⁰ S/PV.4174, p. 5 (United States); pp. 6-7 (United Kingdom); p. 11 (Russian Federation); p. 14 (Tunisia); p. 21 (Canada); p. 23 (Ukraine); and p. 27 (France); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 16 (Kenya).

¹¹ S/PV.4174, p. 13 (China); and p. 18 (Namibia).

¹² S/PRST/2000/25.

¹³ For more information on the discussion at the meeting, see chap. X, part III, sect. C, with regard to the role of the Secretary-General in the peaceful settlement of disputes; chap. X, part IV, with regard to the relevance of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter to conflict prevention; and chap. XII, part II, case 13, with regard to the provisions of Articles 24 and 25 of the Charter.

¹⁴ S/2001/574 and Corr.1.

under Chapter VI of the Charter, while certain measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, such as sanctions, could have an important deterrent effect. However, the Secretary-General stressed that the primary responsibility for conflict prevention rested with national Governments, with the United Nations and the international community supporting national efforts for conflict prevention and assisting in building national capacity in that field. According to the Secretary-General, preventive action should be initiated at the earliest possible stage of a conflict cycle. As an effective preventive strategy it required a comprehensive approach encompassing both short- and long-term political, diplomatic, humanitarian, human rights, developmental, institutional and other measures taken by the international community, in cooperation with national and regional actors. In particular, he pointed out that one of the principal aims of preventive action should be to address the deep-rooted and structural causes that often underlay the immediate political symptoms of conflicts, and that conflict prevention and sustainable and equitable development were mutually reinforcing activities. Finally, the Secretary-General emphasized the clear need for introducing a coordinated and consistent conflict prevention element into the United Nations system's multifaceted development programmes and activities, recognizing at the same time that effective preventive action by the United Nations required sustained political will on the part of Member States.

At the meeting, statements were made by all members of the Council, the representatives of Argentina, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, South Africa and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union¹⁵), the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations and the Deputy Secretary-General.

In her introductory statement, the Deputy Secretary-General reiterated the need to intensify efforts in order to move from a culture of reaction to a culture of prevention, recalling the principles proposed by the Secretary-General in his report to guide future approaches to conflict prevention. Noting that effective conflict prevention required both national and

international political will, she stressed the high cost of conflict and conflict intervention, maintaining that conflict prevention was the most desirable and cost-effective approach for maintaining peace. Regarding possible ways for the Secretary-General to enhance his traditional preventive role, she recalled four possible options: first, increasing the use of United Nations interdisciplinary fact-finding and confidence-building missions to volatile regions; second, developing regional prevention strategies with regional partners and appropriate United Nations organs and agencies; third, establishing an informal network of eminent persons for conflict prevention; and fourth, improving the capacity and resource base for preventive action in the Secretariat.¹⁶

During the discussion, speakers generally acknowledged that Chapter VI of the Charter provided important instruments for conflict prevention and expressed support for the recommendation of the Secretary-General encouraging Member States and the Council to make more active use of preventive deployments before the onset of conflict, as appropriate; endorsed the Secretary-General's pledge to move the United Nations from a culture of reaction to a culture of prevention; underlined the need for a multidimensional approach to conflict prevention, including the repatriation of refugees, restrictions on the proliferation of small arms and both short- and long-term development assistance to affected States; emphasized the need to address the root causes of conflicts; endorsed the Secretary-General's premise that the primary responsibility for conflict prevention rested with national Governments; stressed the need for a variety of actors, such as the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Secretary-General, the Economic and Social Council and other United Nations organs as well as regional organizations to take the lead in coordinating preventive responses to incipient conflicts, and underlined the importance of the role of regional organizations, non-governmental organizations, civil society and the private sector in the area of conflict prevention; expressed support for enhancing the role of the Secretary-General in conflict prevention, under Article 99 of the Charter; and supported the proposal of the Secretary-General to dispatch fact-finding missions to potential conflict areas, with the aim of working out comprehensive prevention strategies.

¹⁵ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁶ S/PV.4334, pp. 2-4.

At the 4360th meeting, on 30 August 2001, the President (Colombia) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁷ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1366 (2001), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Called upon all Member States to ensure timely and faithful implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, adopted on 20 July 2001, and to take all necessary measures at national, regional and global levels to prevent and combat the illicit flow of small arms and light weapons in areas of conflict;

¹⁷ S/2001/828.

Decided to consider inclusion as appropriate, of a disarmament, demobilization and reintegration component in the mandates of United Nations peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations, with particular attention to the rehabilitation of child soldiers;

Endorsed the call of the Secretary-General for support to the follow-up processes launched by the Third and Fourth High-level United Nations regional organizations meetings in the field of conflict prevention and peacebuilding, and to provide increased resources for the development of regional capacities in those fields;

Called for the enhancement of the capacity for conflict prevention of regional organizations, in particular in Africa, by extending international assistance to, *inter alia*, the Organization of African Unity and its successor organization, through its Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution, as well as to the Economic Community of West African States and its Mechanism for Prevention, Management and Resolution of Conflicts, Peacekeeping and Security.

44. Protection of United Nations personnel, associated personnel and humanitarian personnel in conflict zones

Initial proceedings

Decision of 9 February 2000 (4100th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4100th meeting, on 9 February 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Protection of United Nations personnel, associated personnel and humanitarian personnel in conflict zones". The Council heard briefings by the Deputy Secretary-General, the Executive Director of the World Food Programme, and the Permanent Observer of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) to the United Nations. All Council members and the representatives of Australia, Belarus, Brazil, Egypt, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Slovenia, South Africa and Uruguay made statements during the meeting.

The Deputy Secretary-General outlined a number of concrete steps to better safeguard the security of United Nations personnel, namely, to strengthen the capacity of the Office of the United Nations Security Coordinator; to ensure that missions were adequately staffed and equipped; and to promote security training. She also emphasized the need for better coordination

between United Nations actors and other humanitarian organizations in the same location. To achieve those objectives, she highlighted the need for proper and reliable funding and called for responses to the inter-agency consolidated appeals launched for 2000, as well as for contributions to the Trust Fund for Security of personnel of the United Nations. Calling on Member States to do more, she suggested that, first, those who had not done so should sign and ratify the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel of 9 December 1994; second, they should consider extending the scope of the Convention to cover categories of personnel who fell outside its protective regime; third, they should take steps to speed up ratification of the Statute of the International Criminal Court; and fourth, they should assist in investigating and bringing to justice perpetrators of acts of violence against United Nations and associated personnel.¹

The Executive Director of the World Food Programme drew attention to the growing numbers of

¹ S/PV.4100, pp. 2-5.

civilian staff of United Nations agencies who had been the victims of violence since 1992. The situation was exacerbated, she noted, by the increasing use of hunger as a weapon of war, resulting in attacks on humanitarian workers delivering food aid. She called for security training for all United Nations staff required to work in insecure environments, enhancement of the United Nations Security Coordinator's role and the establishment of a clearing house for security information. Stressing the importance of maintaining the humanitarian principles of impartiality in all crises, she urged, on behalf of all United Nations agencies, that the Council consider the safety of humanitarian aid workers when taking decisions.²

The Permanent Observer of the International Committee of the Red Cross emphasized that the protection of humanitarian personnel was linked to a number of legal and operational tools. In addition to the vast body of international law relevant to such protection and the implementation and respect for this law, she highlighted that the modalities of humanitarian action could have a decisive effect on the security of humanitarian personnel. In particular, humanitarian action must be conducted neutrally, impartially and independently, with a view to fostering relations of trust with parties to the conflict as a key factor for the security of humanitarian personnel, an approach that had led ICRC to be extremely prudent in taking measures of armed protection for its personnel. She reiterated that ICRC remained firmly convinced that humanitarian action must be clearly distinguished from the use of force.³

Citing statistics on fallen victims and attacks against United Nations and associated personnel, almost all speakers condemned those acts of violence. They echoed the four suggestions made by the Deputy Secretary-General to Member States and, in particular with regard to her third and fourth suggestions, they affirmed that an end must be put to the culture of impunity and underlined the need to strengthen international legal mechanisms. They also expressed keen interest in receiving the follow-up report of the Secretary-General envisaged for May containing analysis and proposals to address the scope of legal protection under the Convention.

² Ibid., pp. 5-7.

³ S/PV.4100 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3.

Some speakers drew attention to important contributions to the body of international legal protection of the United Nations and relief personnel. Two primary developments highlighted in that respect were the entry into force of the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel, and the inclusion of attacks on United Nations and associated personnel as a category of war crimes under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.⁴

The representative of France stressed that the Council was increasingly attentive to the elements of mission mandates and rules of engagement that made it possible effectively to protect the security and freedom of movement of United Nations and associated personnel.⁵

While many speakers noted that the responsibility for the safety and security of United Nations and associated personnel lay with the host Government, the representative of China, echoed by the representative of Namibia, stressed that those personnel should abide by international law and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the laws of the host country.⁶ In a similar vein, the representative of Egypt emphasized that such personnel should also respect local traditions and culture when carrying out their duties.⁷

The President (Argentina) then made a statement⁸ on behalf of the Council, by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Concerned at continued attacks against United Nations and associated personnel, and humanitarian personnel, which are in violation of international law, including international humanitarian law;

Expressed the view that improving the security of United Nations and associated personnel, and humanitarian personnel, may require, *inter alia*, the development and strengthening of all aspects of the current safety and security regime in place, as well as the

⁴ S/PV.4100 p. 9 (Canada); pp. 12-13 (Russian Federation); p. 14 (Jamaica); p. 16 (Mali); p. 17 (Malaysia); p. 19 (Namibia); p. 20 (Tunisia); p. 21 (Ukraine); p. 23 (Argentina); p. 24 (Belarus); p. 26 (Japan); p. 29 (Republic of Korea); p. 30 (Egypt); and p. 31 (Portugal on behalf of the European Union); S/PV.4100 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Australia); p. 8 (Slovenia); p. 9 (New Zealand); and p. 10 (Norway).

⁵ S/PV.4100, p. 10.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 7-8 (China) and pp. 18-19 (Namibia).

⁷ Ibid., p. 30.

⁸ S/PRST/2000/4.

adoption of effective action to address the impunity of those who commit crimes against such personnel;

Underlined the importance of including in each status-of-forces agreement and status-of-missions agreement specific and practical measures based on the provisions of the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel.

Decision of 26 August 2003 (4814th meeting): resolution 1502 (2003)

At the 4814th meeting, on 26 August 2003, the President (Syrian Arab Republic) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution.⁹ The Secretary-General and the representatives of the United States and Mexico made statements during the meeting.¹⁰

While expressing strong support for the draft resolution, the Secretary-General recalled the vicious attack against United Nations Headquarters in Baghdad one week earlier that had brought the issue in question to the forefront of United Nations priorities. He urged Member States in whose territories attacks against United Nations personnel had been committed to take practical and effective steps to investigate and prosecute those responsible, and urged Member States that had not yet done so to accede to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel. He stated that the adoption of the resolution would send an unambiguous message to all those who mistakenly believed that, in today's turbulent world, they could advance their cause by targeting the servants of humanity.¹¹

The draft resolution was then put to the vote, and

⁹ S/2003/581.

¹⁰ S/PV.4814, pp. 2-4.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 2.

was unanimously adopted as resolution 1502 (2003), by which the Council, inter alia:

Expressed its strong condemnation of all forms of violence, including, inter alia, murder, rape and sexual assault, intimidation, armed robbery, abduction, hostage-taking, kidnapping, harassment and illegal arrest and detention, to which those participating in humanitarian operations are increasingly exposed, as well as attacks on humanitarian convoys and acts of destruction and looting of their property.

Following the vote, the representative of the United States made a statement highlighting the importance of humanitarian personnel and United Nations and associated personnel and the need to protect them. He noted that the resolution focused on the prevention of attacks against such personnel and on the accountability of those who committed such acts. The resolution, he further remarked, did not create any new international obligations, but rather reaffirmed the existing obligations of the parties to a conflict to comply fully with the relevant rules.¹²

The representative of Mexico stated that the resolution was intended to send a clear and unequivocal message that the Council and the United Nations as a whole were committed to carrying out concrete actions leading to the creation of a better framework of protection for humanitarian workers. He expressed regret that the text did not mention the International Criminal Court and the Rome Statute, noting, however, that given the purpose of the resolution and the vital importance of its unanimous adoption, the sponsors felt justified in reaching the difficult decisions made during the negotiation process.¹³

¹² Ibid., p. 3.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 3-4.

45. General issues relating to sanctions

Deliberations of 17 April 2000 to 25 February 2003 (4128th, 4394th and 4713th meetings)

At its 4128th meeting, on 17 April 2000,¹ the Security Council included in its agenda the item

¹ For more information on the discussion of this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to the use of measures not involving the use of armed forces in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter; and chap. XI, part VIII, sect. B, with regard to the special economic problems of the nature described in Article 50 of the Charter.

entitled "General issues relating to sanctions". At the meeting, statements were made by all members of the Council,² the representatives of Australia, Bulgaria, Cuba, Germany, Iraq, Italy, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, New Zealand, Pakistan, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union³), Sweden, the former

² Canada was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

³ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey, the Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations and the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs.

The President (Canada) drew the attention of the Council to a note by the President dated 17 April 2000, by which the members of the Council decided to establish on a temporary basis an informal working group of the Council to develop general recommendations on how to improve the effectiveness of United Nations sanctions.⁴

In his opening remarks, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs noted that while in recent years sanctions imposed by the Council had become a primary tool of peace enforcement, difficulties in their implementation, as well as the unintended consequences on civilian populations and on neighbouring or third States, had raised doubts about their effectiveness and made it imperative to consider improvements in their design. Properly targeted sanctions, he stressed, could play a major role in inducing compliance with resolutions of the Council and serve as a preventive measure while mitigating unintended consequences. Recalling that in order to make its contribution to the concept of "smart" sanctions the Secretariat had undertaken a review of lessons learned from recent sanctions regimes, he emphasized the need to protect vulnerable segments of the population of a State, while better targeting the sanctions to enhance their effectiveness. He added that sanctions regimes should be equipped with a credible monitoring mechanism, possibly in cooperation with regional or subregional organizations, and that the Secretariat should be provided with the resources and specialized expertise to administer the sanctions regimes effectively; in addition, the Council and its sanctions committees should be in a position to have available to them, when required, a comprehensive impact assessment of any given sanctions regime. With regard to the need to minimize the negative effects of sanctions, the Under-Secretary-General said that the Council should consider including provisions for humanitarian exemptions in its relevant resolutions, and the establishment of an appropriate mechanism providing the Council with periodic evaluations of the effectiveness of sanctions and their humanitarian, socio-economic and political impact. He also invited

⁴ S/2000/319.

the Council to consider including in its resolutions provisions to address the impact of sanctions on non-targeted States and mitigate the concerns deriving from Article 50 of the Charter of the United Nations. He added that greater clarity and uniformity of language and technical terminology in Council resolutions would be helpful, combined with the inclusion in resolutions of specific criteria for the lifting or suspension of sanctions. Although national authorities bore the responsibility for enforcing sanctions measures imposed by the Council, he noted that Member States often required advice and assistance in carrying out such a responsibility. He concluded by stating that sanctions could be effective only if the United Nations and its Member States were prepared to shoulder additional responsibilities and develop the necessary capacity to assure their monitoring and enforcement.⁵

During the debate, speakers generally acknowledged that the time had come to carry out an analytical review of the existing policy and practices in the field of sanctions, in order to address issues related to their design, management and effectiveness; welcomed the establishment of a working group of the Council for developing recommendations on how to improve the effectiveness of sanctions; recognized that sanctions remained a necessary and important instrument in the hands of the Council; expressed concern over the potential negative humanitarian impact of sanctions on the civilian population of a targeted country as well as the adverse economic effects on third States, and welcomed the trend towards the adoption of more targeted sanctions; and emphasized the need to improve the management and effectiveness of sanctions.

In connection with the general purpose of sanctions, many speakers emphasized that sanctions should be employed as an option for ensuring compliance only after all other peaceful options had been exhausted, while others noted that sanctions should not be an end in themselves but a means to an end. Concerning the concept of targeted sanctions, the vast majority of speakers shared the view that sanctions should be better targeted against those responsible for the sanctioned behaviour to ensure more effective compliance with Council decisions and prevent the harming of civilians. In addition, several delegations stated that the impact of sanctions on third

⁵ S/PV.4128, pp. 2-5.

States should be carefully considered, in line with the provisions of Article 50 of the Charter.⁶

In regard to the criteria for imposing and terminating sanctions, a number of speakers observed that sanctions should be imposed only when the Council had clearly established a threat to or a breach of the peace.⁷ The representative of the United States noted the need for sanctions regimes to be carefully tailored to fit the particular situation in which they were to be applied, as well as targeted and enforceable in order to be effective in forcing behavioural change. He observed that once sanctions were imposed, the burden of proof for their suspension or termination resided in the demonstrated behaviour of the sanctioned entity and remarked that sanctions should not be terminated due to a lack of resolve, a lack of will or a lack of patience.⁸ Several representatives insisted that sanctions should have a clearly defined purpose and should have objective criteria for their suspension or termination.⁹ Further, some delegations underlined the importance of a fixed duration whenever sanctions were imposed,¹⁰ while others advocated the use of more unified and precise terminology in resolutions relating to sanctions to enhance harmonized national implementation.¹¹

With regard to the implementation of sanctions, the majority of speakers called for more effective implementation and monitoring of sanctions regimes and agreed on the need to enhance capacities to implement and monitor sanctions at the national, regional, and international levels. Some delegations expressed the view that the provision of adequate resources for administration and implementation was a vital prerequisite for effective sanctions regimes, and

in particular called for an enhancement of the capacity of the Secretariat in providing support to the sanctions committees.¹² Other delegations stressed that Member States should be assisted in the implementation and enforcement of sanctions, including in the areas of national legislation, monitoring and enforcement.¹³

At the 4394th meeting,¹⁴ on 25 October 2001, statements were made by the majority of Council members,¹⁵ the representatives of Germany and Sweden,¹⁶ the Permanent Observer of Switzerland and the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs.

At the outset, the Council heard briefings by the Permanent Observer of Switzerland and the representatives of Germany and Sweden, respectively.

The Permanent Observer of Switzerland, welcoming the concept of targeted sanctions, and particularly that of targeted financial sanctions, referred to the key results of the Interlaken process, which had focused on the question of the feasibility of such sanctions. Emphasizing that one of the essential preconditions to making targeted financial sanctions more effective was the ability to define the target clearly, including the effective identification of the actual economic beneficiary of assets, he noted that financial sanctions were likely to be most effective when considered as part of a broader coordinated political and diplomatic strategy.¹⁷

The representative of Germany focused his remarks on the results of the Bonn-Berlin process, designed to introduce targeted sanctions with respect to arms embargoes and travel bans. Observing that targeted sanctions required regular reviews to determine their effectiveness and consequences, he stated that even the most precise resolutions imposing

⁶ Ibid., p. 11 (Namibia); p. 14 (Malaysia); p. 19 (Tunisia); p. 23 (Russian Federation); p. 25 (Canada); p. 29 (Pakistan); pp. 35-36 (Bulgaria); p. 42 (Iraq); p. 44 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); and p. 45 (Turkey).

⁷ Ibid., pp. 7-9 (France); pp. 13-15 (Malaysia); pp. 23-24 (Russian Federation); pp. 30-31 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); and pp. 38-39 (Cuba).

⁸ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

⁹ Ibid., p. 9 (France); p. 11 (Namibia); p. 12 (China); p. 16 (Argentina); p. 19 (Tunisia); p. 22 (Jamaica); p. 23 (Russian Federation); p. 30 (Pakistan); and p. 39 (Cuba).

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 9 (France); p. 14 (Malaysia); p. 20 (Mali); and p. 23 (Russian Federation).

¹¹ Ibid., p. 16 (Argentina); p. 27 (Portugal); and p. 40 (Permanent Observer of Switzerland).

¹² Ibid., p. 8 (France); p. 11 (Namibia); p. 15 (Malaysia); p. 17 (Argentina); p. 17 (Netherlands); p. 19 (Ukraine); p. 20 (Tunisia); p. 22 (Jamaica); p. 25 (Canada); and p. 27 (Portugal).

¹³ Ibid., p. 5 (Bangladesh); p. 18 (Netherlands); p. 19 (Tunisia); p. 22 (Jamaica); and p. 34 (Australia).

¹⁴ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to measures not involving the use of armed force in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter.

¹⁵ The representatives of Bangladesh and Ireland did not make statements at the meeting.

¹⁶ Sweden was represented by its State Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

¹⁷ S/PV.4394, pp. 2-4.

sanctions might fail should some Member States lack the political will to implement them.¹⁸

Recognizing that the Interlaken and Bonn-Berlin processes had shown that more could be done to develop the concept and practice of targeted sanctions, the representative of Sweden announced that his Government intended to continue that work through the Stockholm Process in the Implementation of Targeted Sanctions, which would focus, *inter alia*, on how to achieve more coherent and effective incorporation of Security Council resolutions into national legislation and how to assist Member States in implementing sanctions, including through technical and financial support.¹⁹

Highlighting the importance of the Interlaken and Bonn-Berlin processes, the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs welcomed the decision of the Government of Sweden to lead the process forward. Noting that, if sanctions were to be a useful tool at the disposal of the Council, a constructive dialogue on their implementation and monitoring was essential, he stated that pragmatic solutions should be found to the difficulties of monitoring sanctions regimes. Although the task of effective implementation and monitoring of sanctions fell primarily on Member States, he noted that the latter often lacked the necessary capacity and required assistance in that regard. He therefore proposed that assistance be provided to Member States by an augmented United Nations Secretariat as well as by the competent regional organizations. He also expressed the view that the establishment of a permanent sanctions monitoring mechanism might allow more systematic follow-up on violations of sanctions regimes and enable better cooperation in their implementation. Underscoring that targeted sanctions could also have important deterrent and preventive roles, he urged the Council to consider the use of sanctions in that context in the future. In conclusion, he expressed the view that enhanced substantive support to the sanctions committees, which would include more technical expertise and enhanced analytical capacity, required the commitment of adequate resources.²⁰

In the ensuing discussion, expressing their continuing support for the concept of targeted and

closely monitored sanctions, speakers supported the results of the Interlaken and Bonn-Berlin processes, which would provide a valuable tool for the Council in formulating future sanctions regimes, aimed at avoiding the negative consequences for the general population and third countries; and welcomed the decision of the Government of Sweden to carry forward the results of the Interlaken and Bonn-Berlin processes through the Stockholm Process. With regard to ways to improve the monitoring and implementation of sanctions, the representative of France advocated the establishment of a permanent mechanism for monitoring sanctions, available to both the Council and the sanctions committees, which would allow for a greater synergy of approach between the different subjects and crises, particularly in Africa where several situations were interconnected.²¹ On the same issue, other representatives welcomed further work on the proposal to establish a permanent unit charged with monitoring the effectiveness of sanctions regimes.²² Finally, a number of speakers encouraged the Council to adopt, without further delay, the draft report produced by the Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions, maintaining that the recommendations contained in that report, together with those comprising the outcome of the Interlaken and Bonn-Berlin processes, provided the necessary tools for ensuring better implementation of the Council's current and future sanctions measures.²³

At the 4713th meeting, on 25 February 2003,²⁴ statements were made by all Council members, the representative of Sweden²⁵ and the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs.

Presenting to the Council the results of the Stockholm Process, the representative of Sweden noted that the main goal had been to increase the efficiency

²¹ S/PV.4394, pp. 8-9.

²² S/PV.4394, p. 10 (Ukraine); S/PV.4395 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 4 (United Kingdom); p. 5 (Norway); p. 6 (Mauritius); and p. 7 (Colombia).

²³ S/PV.4394, p. 8 (France); and p. 10 (Ukraine); S/PV.4395 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 3 (Jamaica); p. 7 (Colombia); p. 8 (Mali); p. 10 (Tunisia); and p. 11 (China).

²⁴ For more information the discussion of this meeting, see chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to use of measures not involving the use of armed force in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter.

²⁵ Sweden was represented by its State Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

of targeted sanctions by reforming and improving their implementation, both within the United Nations system and among Member States, while also minimizing unintentional negative consequences. In particular, he added that one specific priority had been to identify measures to enhance planning, monitoring, reporting and coordination among sanctions committees and monitoring bodies. Noting that the report had made numerous suggestions in that regard, he recalled a few recommendations which included, *inter alia*, the establishment of a sanctions coordinator to further improve and support greater cooperation among sanctions entities, and the development of legal frameworks for implementation of sanctions.²⁶

The Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs noted that the Stockholm Process had drawn attention to some pitfalls related to the implementation of sanctions. He encouraged the Council to take into account the findings of the Stockholm Process when conducting sanctions reviews or when considering future application of the targeted sanctions instrument. He also expressed the hope that work would continue, particularly in the areas that remained to be addressed, such as improving coordination among all relevant actors; enhancing coordination among different expert groups; optimizing the design and use of sanctions lists; and studying ways by which to probe the deterrent value of targeted Council sanctions and their integration into an overall strategy for preventive diplomacy.²⁷

In the ensuing discussion, members of the Council generally acknowledged and welcomed the contribution made by the Stockholm Process in the development of more refined approaches to the use of sanctions, building on the findings of the Interlaken and Bonn-Berlin processes. Reiterating that comprehensive sanctions had at times led to unintended negative consequences for the civilian population of the targeted country and third countries, Council members concurred that targeted sanctions were a good means of minimizing such occurrences. Members of the Council also agreed that care should be exercised in the decision to apply sanctions and in their actual design, with the majority of them noting that new sanctions regimes should have a built-in monitoring process to regularly assess the political and

humanitarian impact of sanctions. The representative of Bulgaria supported the introduction of a preliminary comprehensive assessment, which would help to focus targeted sanctions on responsible decision makers while minimizing unintended side effects, and the representatives of China, the Russian Federation, France and Pakistan urged the Council to undertake a humanitarian impact assessment of measures.²⁸ With regard to the termination of sanctions, some speakers called attention to the need for an exit strategy to be built into the design of sanctions regimes, endorsing the notion of time-bound sanctions.²⁹ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic underlined the need for sanctions to be lifted immediately, once compliance was verified, while the representative of Pakistan held that provisions should be made to ease sanctions in response to partial compliance.³⁰ Expressing another view, the representative of the United States contended that sanctions measures should be tied directly to the change in policy and behaviour of targeted actors, rather than artificially linking the duration of sanctions to an arbitrary time limit.³¹

With regard to the monitoring of sanctions regimes, the majority of members of the Council agreed that monitoring mechanisms and expert groups were among the most important tools available to the Council to implement sanctions. The representatives of China and the Russian Federation drew particular attention to the monitoring mechanism applied to the sanctions regime against the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA), arguing that it might serve as a model for other circumstances.³² The representative of Germany held that the very existence of monitoring mechanisms, such as in the case of measures against UNITA, had served as a deterrent for those involved in sanctions breaking, and at the same time, an early-warning instrument against disproportionate collateral damage.³³ The representatives of France and the United Kingdom expressed satisfaction that the conclusions of the Stockholm Process accorded with the proposal for a

²⁶ S/PV.4713, pp. 2-3.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (Bulgaria); p. 7 (China); p. 8 (France); p. 14 (Russian Federation); and p. 16 (Pakistan).

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (China); p. 8 (France); p. 13 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 15 (Pakistan).

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 13 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 15 (Pakistan).

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 7 (China); and p. 14 (Russian Federation).

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

semi-permanent monitoring mechanism for the implementation of targeted sanctions.³⁴ Along similar lines, other members called for the establishment of an autonomous uniform mechanism for the monitoring of sanctions within the Secretariat. For instance, the representative of the United States recommended that the Secretariat establish an informal system that would document and categorize the relevant findings and recommendations of the various expert groups in order to generate commonalities, as well as reduce overlap and increase efficiency.³⁵ The representatives of France and Chile maintained that the idea of setting up a United Nations special coordinator for sanctions merited close attention.³⁶

Several speakers drew attention to the importance of coordination in the implementation of sanctions. The representative of Bulgaria, echoed by the representatives of Guinea and Mexico, advocated regular coordination between the sanctions committees, including through the holding of joint meetings, aimed at ensuring consistency and continuity among them and

³⁴ Ibid., p. 8 (France); and p. 12 (United Kingdom).

³⁵ Ibid., p. 10.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 8 (France); and p. 12 (Chile).

avoiding duplication.³⁷ The representative of China called for greater communication and coordination among sanctions committees, monitoring mechanisms and expert bodies, while the representative of Guinea encouraged regular consultation and cooperation between the Secretariat and the sanctions committees on the one hand, and interested international, regional and subregional organization, on the other.³⁸ The representative of Mexico also stressed the importance of improving coordination between sanctions committees and other actors, including humanitarian agencies, international and local non-governmental organizations.³⁹

Finally, a number of speakers called for an enhancement of the capacity of the Secretariat in supporting the implementation of sanctions,⁴⁰ while others called for the provision of adequate financial resources to Member States lacking in resources.⁴¹

³⁷ Ibid., p. 6 (Bulgaria); p. 9 (Guinea); and p. 18 (Mexico).

³⁸ Ibid., p. 7 (China); and p. 9 (Guinea).

³⁹ Ibid., p. 18.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 8 (France); and p. 19 (Mexico).

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 9 (Guinea); pp. 13-14 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 19 (Mexico).

46. Women and peace and security

Initial proceedings

Decision of 31 October 2000 (4213th meeting): resolution 1325 (2000)

At its 4208th meeting, on 24 October 2000, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled “Women and peace and security”. At the meeting, the Council heard briefings by the Secretary-General, the Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, and the Executive Director of the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), following which statements were made by all members of the Council¹ and the representatives of Australia, Belarus, Botswana, Croatia, Cyprus, the Democratic

Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand (on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum), Norway, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Singapore, South Africa, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

The Secretary-General observed that the United Nations was making special efforts to recruit more women for its peacekeeping and peacemaking missions, and to make all its operations more aware of gender issues. He recognized that women were still grossly underrepresented at the decision-making level, from conflict prevention to conflict resolution to post-conflict reconciliation. He asked the Council to help ensure that women and girls in conflict situations were protected, that perpetrators of violence against women in conflict were brought to justice and that women

¹ The representative of France made a statement on behalf of the European Union: Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

were able to take their rightful and equal place at the decision-making table on questions of peace and security.²

The Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women suggested that women needed to be part of all stages of the peace negotiations, in planning for the future, in rebuilding and in crafting preventive strategies to avoid conflict. Reporting on the results of a three-year study on mainstreaming a gender perspective in multidimensional peace operations, she explained that, having at least 30 per cent women in a mission, empowered local women and fostered confidence and trust among the local population, among other benefits. Noting that women at the local level were also a rich resource, she recognized that capacity-building for leadership and governance led by the United Nations Development Programme and UNIFEM had greatly facilitated women's ability to play constructive roles. She called for, *inter alia*, the integration of gender considerations into the mandate of missions and the guidelines for special representatives; the establishment of gender units on mission sites and in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations; and greater efforts to ensure the appointment of women as special representatives. Finally, she emphasized that without the equal and fair participation of women in decision-making positions in the United Nations and also in Member States as well as in the Council, the international community would never achieve the vision outlined in the Charter of the United Nations.³

The Executive Director of the United Nations Development Fund for Women informed Council members about the efforts of UNIFEM to leverage political, financial and technical support for women to participate in peacebuilding. She maintained that during the transition to peace, a unique opportunity existed to put in place a gender-responsive framework for a country's development. She expressed concern about, *inter alia*, the inadequate protection of and humanitarian assistance for women; and the failure of political settlements to protect women's rights. She pointed out the need to examine every aspect of the consequences of conflict for women to guide future action. Therefore, she recommended that the Council, *inter alia*, ensure that human rights observation and

verification and peacekeeping operations focus on gender-based violations and women's human rights; call for the training of all peacekeeping personnel in their responsibilities to women and children; elaborate a code of conduct for peacekeeping personnel and establish clear reporting requirements on sexual violence in a peacekeeping environment; ensure that field operations take special measures to protect women and girls from rape and other forms of sexual violence; and ensure that peacebuilding elements of an operation were gender-sensitive.⁴

In their statements, representatives expressed appreciation for the leading role played by UNIFEM and the other United Nations bodies and agencies to protect and secure peace and security for women and girls, and supported the Namibia Plan of Action on Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective in Multidimensional Peace Support Operations. Delegations welcomed the International Criminal Court definition of such crimes as rape, sexual torture, forced impregnation and sexual slavery as war crimes. A few representatives also expressed the view that gender issues were not sufficiently covered in the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (Brahimi report).⁵

Many representatives expressed concern about the exploitation and targeting of women and girls as a strategic weapon of war; nevertheless, they warned against seeing women and girls only as victims of conflicts and not as participants. Most speakers stressed the need to ensure women's representation at all levels of the decision-making process, including preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Therefore, they called upon Member States to present for consideration qualified women for appointment at high levels.

In addition, many delegations advocated, *inter alia*, ending impunity for sexual and gender-based violence in situations of conflict; respect for international humanitarian and human rights law; mainstreaming of a gender perspective in all multidimensional operations; appropriate training and sensitization of personnel on gender issues; including a gender unit in all peacekeeping missions; greater representation of women as Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, Special Envoys and

² S/PV.4208, pp. 2-3.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-6.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9.

⁵ S/2000/809.

ambassadors to the United Nations; a roster of qualified women; and recognition of women as peace educators.

The representative of the United States highlighted that as the international community moved forward, it needed to take care that its efforts to further empower women in no way disadvantaged men. The international community needed to strive for equality, not special treatment and develop concrete initiatives in support of the promises already made.⁶ The representative of Bangladesh insisted on avoiding tokenism and suggested that the international community needed to aim not only for visibility in the representation of women, but for representation that was wider and more effective.⁷ The representative of Indonesia recalled that an important step taken at the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995 was to stress that women's involvement in decision-making was not only a question of quotas for women, but a process that also entailed increased gender sensitivity in general.⁸ In the same vein, the representative of Nepal remarked that a gender-based quota as a quick fix made sense, but in the long run it was the quality that sustained the gains of women, not the quota.⁹

At the 4213th meeting, on 31 October 2000, the President (Namibia) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹⁰ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1325 (2000), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Urged Member States to ensure increased representation of women at all decision-making levels in national, regional and international institutions for the prevention, management, and resolution of conflict;

Encouraged the Secretary-General to implement his strategic plan of action for the improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat;¹¹

Urged the Secretary-General to appoint more women as special representatives and envoys to pursue good offices on his behalf;

Also urged the Secretary-General to seek to expand the role of women in United Nations field-based operations;

Requested the Secretary-General to provide to Member States training guidelines on the protection, rights and the particular needs of women;

Urged Member States to increase their voluntary financial, technical and logistical support for gender-sensitive training efforts;

Called upon all parties to armed conflict to respect fully international law applicable to the rights and protection of women and girls, especially as civilians;

Also called upon all parties to armed conflict to take special measures to protect women and girls from gender-based violence, particularly rape and other forms of sexual abuse;

Invited the Secretary-General to carry out a study on the impact of armed conflict on women and girls, the role of women in peacebuilding and the gender dimensions of peace processes and conflict resolution.

**Decision of 31 October 2001 (4402nd meeting):
statement by the President**

At the 4402nd meeting, on 31 October 2001, the President (Ireland) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹² by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its strong support for increasing the role of women in decision-making with regard to conflict prevention and resolution and renewed its call on States to include women in the negotiations and implementation of peace accords, constitutions and strategies for resettlement and rebuilding, and to take measures to support local women's groups and indigenous processes for conflict resolution;

Underscored the importance of promoting an active and visible policy of mainstreaming a gender perspective in all policies and programmes while addressing armed conflicts, in particular peacekeeping operations;

Renewed its support for gender-sensitive training guidelines and material on the protection, rights and the particular needs of women, as well as on the importance of involving women in all peacekeeping and peacebuilding measures; called upon all troop-contributing countries to include those elements in their national training programmes for peacekeepers;

Welcomed the specific proposals made by the Secretary-General aimed at strengthening the Best Practices Unit of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations through the appointment of gender advisers at sufficiently senior levels;

Urged the Secretary-General to appoint women as Special Representatives and Special Envoys to pursue good offices on his behalf, in accordance with his strategic plan of action.

⁶ S/PV.4208, p. 14.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁸ S/PV.4208 (Resumption 1), p. 24.

⁹ S/PV.4208 (Resumption 2), p. 11.

¹⁰ S/2000/1044.

¹¹ See A/49/587 and Corr.1.

¹² S/PRST/2001/31.

Decision of 31 October 2002 (4641st meeting): statement by the President

At its 4589th meeting, on 25 July 2002, the Council heard briefings by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, the Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, and the Executive Director of UNIFEM, following which statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Australia, Canada, Chile, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union¹³), Grenada, Jamaica, Japan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Nigeria and the Republic of Korea.

The Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations observed that gender mainstreaming in peacekeeping was about recognizing that all segments of society were affected by conflict, sometimes in different ways, and that all segments of society also had a role to play in helping to end the violence and lay the foundation for sustainable peace. He recognized that the international community had wrongly assumed that conflict and peace were gender-blind, which they were not. He detailed the progress made by the Department in implementing resolution 1325 (2000), particularly in the areas of addressing gender-based violence; responding to trafficking in women and children; incorporating gender perspectives into the process of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of refugees and displaced persons; facilitating the participation of women in constitutional and electoral reform and civil administration; and combating the spread of HIV/AIDS. Finally, he reiterated that the Council maintained a zero-tolerance policy on the engagement of peacekeepers in acts of sexual exploitation, harassment, and trafficking of women and girls.¹⁴

The Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women pointed out that the main conclusion of the Secretary-General's study on women, peace and security mandated by resolution 1325 (2000), which was still under preparation, was that sustainable peace and lasting security could not be achieved without women's

empowerment and full involvement. She also highlighted that the challenges shown by the study were the lack of political will to recognize women as equal partners and insufficient understanding of how to translate gender equality into policies or adapt best practices. She also mentioned some of the study's recommendations, inter alia, the need for the full support of the Council for the incorporation of a gender perspective in peace and humanitarian operations; the establishment of gender advisers in all missions; the inclusion in the missions' budgets of the necessary financial resources for gender-related programmes; and the maintenance of a database of civil society organizations.¹⁵

The Executive Director of UNIFEM informed Council members that she had appointed two independent experts to carry out a global, field-based assessment of the impact of armed conflict on women and of women's role in peacebuilding. In advance of the release of the report, she shared with the Council the principal findings and recommendations, inter alia, the inclusion of women in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes; the establishment of quotas for women in peace processes; and stronger investigative and disciplinary mechanisms to support the Secretary-General's call for zero tolerance for violations by United Nations personnel.¹⁶

Most of the delegations acknowledged resolution 1325 (2000) as a determining factor for strengthening the place of women in actions by the Council, and encouraged the Council to ensure its full implementation. They commended, inter alia, the Department's progress in implementing resolution 1325 (2000); the work of UNIFEM; and the positive developments in international humanitarian law, including the International Criminal Court definition of rape and other forms of sexual violence as war crimes and crimes against humanity.

Several representatives spoke in favour of the United Nations zero-tolerance policy towards sexual exploitation by United Nations personnel and called for a code of conduct and the implementation of a disciplinary mechanism for sexual violence. Some delegations supported, inter alia, the need to ensure the integration of gender perspective throughout the United Nations; more involvement of women at all

¹³ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁴ S/PV.4589, and Corr.1, pp. 3-5.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 5-6.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 6-8 and 13.

stages and all levels in peace operations, including more women appointed as Special Representative and Special Envoy of the Secretary-General; the establishment of a senior gender adviser in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations; closer collaboration with non-governmental organizations and the elimination of the root causes of conflicts. A number of speakers underlined that during conflict women were often both victims and perpetrators of violence, and that approaches needed to take that into account.

At its 4635th meeting, on 28 October 2002, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on women and peace and security.¹⁷ In the report, the Secretary-General observed that despite positive efforts undertaken, gender perspectives were still not systematically incorporated into all activities related to peace and security. He recognized that much remained to be done to ensure that the existing frameworks and the recommendations in Council resolution 1325 (2000) were fully implemented. He recalled that sustainable peace would not be achieved without the full and equal participation of women and men. Finally, he recommended, *inter alia*, recognizing the extent of the violations of the human rights of women and girls during armed conflict; ensuring that amnesty provisions excluded impunity from all war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide, including gender-based crimes; ensuring consultation with women's groups and networks; integrating gender perspectives into Council missions and the mandates of all peacekeeping missions; disaggregating data collected in research, assessments and appraisals by sex and age; ensuring necessary financial and human resources for gender mainstreaming; and developing clear strategies and action plans on the incorporation of gender perspectives in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes.

At the same meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the Secretary-General, following which statements were made by the President of the Economic and Social Council, all members of the Council, and the representatives of Australia, Austria (on behalf of the Human Security Network¹⁸), Bangladesh, Canada,

¹⁷ S/2002/1154.

¹⁸ Members of the Network include Austria, Canada, Chile, Greece, Ireland, Jordan, Mali, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Switzerland and Thailand; South Africa

Chile, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union¹⁹), Egypt, Fiji (on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum group), India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Liechtenstein, Morocco, Namibia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, South Africa and Venezuela.²⁰

The Secretary-General stressed that if women suffered the impact of conflict disproportionately, they were also the key to the solution of conflict. He underlined the importance of, *inter alia*, greater representation of women in formal peace negotiations; more women's appointments at the highest levels of decision-making; a stronger response to the sexual exploitation of women and girls; and extensive capacity-building so that more women could play their full part in the many activities that support peace.²¹

In their statements, representatives endorsed the Secretary-General's recommendations and conclusions and asked for, *inter alia*, full implementation and regular and frequent follow-up of the provisions contained in resolution 1325 (2000); regular contacts between United Nations organs and women's organizations; a plan that prioritized the recommendations in the report for future action; adequate resources in support of gender issues; and a gender-based approach in the administration of international justice as well as a fair representation of female judges in the International Criminal Court. Many representatives commended the efforts of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations in implementing resolution 1325 (2000) and noted the successful experience of including a gender adviser in several peacekeeping missions, as well as the Secretary-General's intention of setting concrete targets to appoint women as his special representatives and special envoys, with a view to gender parity by 2015.

The representative of the United Kingdom pointed out that one element that was in the report was the need to place United Nations work on women, peace and security within the broader humanitarian framework. He also argued that the United Nations

participates as an observer.

¹⁹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

²⁰ The Officer-in-Charge of the Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women was invited to participate in the discussion but did not make a statement.

²¹ S/PV.4635, pp. 2-4.

system should operate in cross-cutting ways that integrated that work into programmes on the ground.²² The representative of Denmark, speaking on behalf of the European Union, pointed out the lack of reference in the report to the Secretary-General's bulletin on the observance by United Nations forces of international humanitarian law,²³ which included some valid gender paragraphs, and expressed the view that all United Nations-mandated military operations should operate in accordance with the bulletin.²⁴

The representative of Venezuela regretted that the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women, despite its being the only United Nations organ that had a specific mandate to address gender issues and the training of women, had not been consulted in the elaboration of the report of the Secretary-General.²⁵

The representative of India affirmed that while there had been calls for gender balance in the composition of peacekeeping forces, his delegation had some doubts about the overall desirability of such a move.²⁶

At its 4641st meeting, on 31 October 2002, the Council again included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on women and peace and security.²⁷

At the same meeting, the President (Cameroon) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁸ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Remained concerned about the slow progress in the appointment of women as special representatives and envoys of the Secretary-General and urged him to increase the number of women serving as high-level representatives to achieve the overall goal of gender balance; also urged Member States to continue to provide candidates for inclusion in a database;

Reaffirmed the importance of gender mainstreaming in peacekeeping operations and post-conflict reconstruction;

Requested the Secretary-General to establish a database of gender specialists;

Encouraged, *inter alia*, Member States, the entities of the United Nations system and civil society to develop clear strategies and action plans on the integration of gender perspectives in

humanitarian operations, rehabilitation and reconstruction programmes;

Deplored the continuing occurrence of sexual exploitation, including trafficking, of women and girls;

Condemned all violations of the human rights of women and girls in situations of armed conflict.

Deliberations of 29 October 2003 (4852nd meeting)

At its 4852nd meeting, on 29 October 2003, the Council heard briefings by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations and the Senior Gender Adviser of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), following which statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Australia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Fiji (on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum), Iceland, India, Indonesia, Italy (on behalf of the European Union²⁹), Japan, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, Timor-Leste, Ukraine and the United Republic of Tanzania.³⁰

The Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations informed Council members of the efforts of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations in five main areas that were highlighted in resolution 1325 (2000): increasing the number of women in peacekeeping operations; integrating a gender perspective into peacekeeping operations; training in gender awareness and HIV/AIDS issues; strengthening discipline for peacekeeping personnel; and combating trafficking in human beings. He thanked Member States for having approved the post of Gender Adviser, based at Headquarters, which had been filled temporarily. He pointed out that the Department had provided all missions with an updated set of disciplinary directives, which covered the issue of sexual abuse and exploitation as well as other types of

²⁹ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³⁰ The representative of Egypt was invited to participate in the discussion, but did not make a statement. At the meeting, Fiji and Germany were represented by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs, and the Netherlands by its Minister for Development and Cooperation.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

²³ ST/SGB/1999/13.

²⁴ S/PV.4635, p. 24.

²⁵ S/PV.4635 (Resumption 1), p. 20.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

²⁷ S/2002/1154.

²⁸ S/PRST/2002/32.

serious misconduct. Finally, noting the grave allegations of sexual abuse by humanitarian workers and peacekeepers and the efforts made by the Department in improving its procedures, he recalled that personnel contributed for service in a peacekeeping operation were required to abide by the highest standards of integrity while in service for the United Nations.³¹

The Senior Gender Adviser of MONUC briefed Council members in detail about the Gender Unit of MONUC. She highlighted the ways in which the Gender Unit had facilitated the implementation of the Mission's mandate through such activities as training and research, communication and dissemination of gender-sensitive information, outreach to the Congolese population, capacity-building for women leaders and advocacy, monitoring and evaluation of women's participation in the peace and transition processes. Finally, she presented several priority action points, including the appropriate staffing of gender units, and the need for troop- and police-contributing countries to ensure a substantial proportion of women among personnel recruited for peacekeeping operations.³²

Most speakers observed progress towards implementing resolution 1325 (2000), including the new post of Gender Adviser within the Department of

³¹ S/PV.4852, pp. 3-6.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9.

Peacekeeping Operations, but agreed that much remained to be done. Therefore, they advocated, *inter alia*, the integration of gender perspectives into the analysis, decisions and new mandates of the Council, and the inclusion of information on the situation of women in the reports of the Secretary-General; the development of effective monitoring mechanisms to enable more systematic control of implementation; and the proposal, by Member States, of more women as candidates for posts and the appointment of more women as Special Representatives and Special Envoys of the Secretary-General. Many speakers recognized the important role of non-governmental organizations in women's participation and empowerment in conflicts, including the dissemination of resolution 1325 (2000). Several speakers welcomed the bulletin on special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and abuse developed by the United Nations system.

The representative of Mexico opined that a new resolution would serve to update and supplement resolution 1325 (2000) and keep the attention of the Council and the attention of the membership of the United Nations at large focused on the issue.³³

The representative of South Africa recommended that the international community consider establishing centres of excellence to train women for leadership positions in peacekeeping operations.³⁴

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

³⁴ S/PV.4852 (Resumption 1), p. 5.

47. Items relating to peacekeeping

A. No exit without strategy

Initial proceedings

Deliberations of 15 November 2000 (4223rd meeting)

In a letter dated 6 November 2000 addressed to the Secretary-General,¹ the representative of the Netherlands referred to the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (the Brahimi report)² and related discussions, which showed the importance

that Member States placed on improving peace operations. He noted that the Security Council was often faced with the decision on whether to extend, modify or terminate a peace operation. However, there had been cases in which the Council had decided to end a mission or reduce its military component only to have the situations remain unstable or deteriorate, which would seem to contradict the Council's mandate as contained in the Charter of the United Nations that it should work towards a self-sustaining peace, or at least

¹ S/2000/1072.

² S/2000/809.

a durable absence of violence. By his letter, he also transmitted a paper, in preparation for an open debate of the Council on peacekeeping operations to be organized by the Netherlands, which elaborated on the issues of mission closure and transition, and included three short case studies, on Mozambique, Liberia and Haiti.

At its 4223rd meeting, held on 15 November 2000, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled “No exit without strategy”, as well as the above-mentioned letter. At the same meeting, the Council heard statements by all members of the Council, and the representatives of Australia, Austria, Belarus, Croatia, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa and Thailand.

In his introduction, the President (Netherlands) stated that he expected to hear suggestions for improvements in a variety of fields such as analysis and planning, political will, commitment and leadership, and resources and funding. However, he acknowledged that a realistic discussion needed to take into account that there could never be a guarantee that a peace operation would reach conditions that allowed for an orderly transition to post-conflict peacebuilding. He stressed that it was therefore important to look at how the United Nations could limit the damage caused by early termination of a peace operation.

In their statements, representatives touched on a wide variety of issues, including the definition of “exit strategy”, which should not mean a hasty departure from a strategically stated goal; the need to base any exit strategy on objectives to be attained, rather than pre-established timetables; the need to adequately consult troop-contributing countries and ensure adequate resources; the need to pay more attention to underlying causes when the Council was seized with a conflict; the need for clear and appropriate mandates; the importance of demobilization, disarmament and reintegration efforts; and the importance of a transitional mechanism to the peacebuilding phase followed by a long-term commitment.

During the course of the debate, speakers referred to a number of peacekeeping missions, including the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic; the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and

Western Sirmium; the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia; the United Nations Operation in Mozambique; the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda; and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor.

Many representatives stressed the importance of coordination with other organs of the United Nations, and with the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. The representatives of Bangladesh and Canada also stressed the role of responsible non-governmental organizations.³ In addition, the representative of Bangladesh proposed the establishment of an institutional mechanism of cooperation and coordination among all relevant actors.⁴

Most of the representatives agreed that the Council needed to improve its performance in terminating peacekeeping operations. However, the representative of the United Kingdom pointed out that none of the Council members had answered the question of how to improve the Council’s performance. He stressed three essential things to improve the Council’s performance: the necessity of a specific, strategic analysis capability to be present in the Secretariat; the need for consultation among the wider membership, particularly with troop contributors or potential troop contributors, to assure a broader understanding of the mandate; and, in regard to implementation, the necessity of better planning, higher speed, better coordination and all the things that were outlined in the Brahimi report.⁵

The representative of Namibia, Egypt and Pakistan questioned whether the Council was too selective in the termination of peacekeeping operations and pointed out that the Council needed to look at each situation objectively, not in terms of individual Council members’ national interests.⁶ However, the representative of the United Kingdom replied that the question of whether the Council was too selective had to be looked at politically; that in talking about exit strategies, the Council was talking about strategy.⁷

³ S/PV.4223, p. 9 (Bangladesh); and p. 10 (Canada).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 18 (Namibia); S/PV.4223 (Resumption 1), p. 13 (Egypt); and p. 21 (Pakistan).

⁷ S/PV.4223. p. 23.

The representatives of France, Canada, Germany and the United Kingdom stressed that the Council needed to build into its thinking, particularly in connection with mandates, an awareness of the possible need for change, with the representatives of France and the United Kingdom highlighting the fact that clear objectives for a peacekeeping operation were not always possible.⁸ Similarly, the representative of Denmark suggested that a mandate should not inappropriately limit the Secretary-General's ability to shape and adjust the operation or mission to take account of evolving circumstances.⁹

The representative of Egypt stated that the Council should not resort to exerting political pressure on any side by hinting at terminating an operation, reducing an operation or resorting to any method of political pressure that would serve the political interests of one or more States in the Council without paying attention to the interests of the host State or region in which the operation was conducted, not to mention the interests of the members of the society

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 6-7 (France); p. 11 (Canada); and pp. 23-24 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4223 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Germany).

⁹ S/PV.4223 (Resumption 1), p. 18.

hosting the operation.¹⁰

The representative of India emphasized that successful peacekeeping could be carried out only by countries that were neutral and had no interests of their own to pursue. He continued that there was also renewed confusion over what peacekeeping was. While the Council's humanitarian impulse was natural, conducting humanitarian relief through peacekeeping undermined both. Moreover, the delegate recalled that there was a gap between emergency relief and long-term development and reconstruction programmes, and, during that gap, societies could unravel again and conflicts resume.¹¹

The representative of Argentina noted that even in conventional armed conflicts, the conflict might remain latent, and the mission might be given a stabilization function that could lead to a syndrome in which the parties became dependent on the peacekeeping operation, thereby making it more difficult for the Council to take the decision to put an end to it.¹²

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 23-25.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 12.

B. Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries

Decision of 31 January 2001 (4270th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4257th meeting,¹³ on 16 January 2001, the Security Council included in its agenda a letter dated 8 January 2001 from the representative of Singapore addressed to the Secretary-General, announcing the organization of an open debate on strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries, and

¹³ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. I, part V, case 9, with regard to special cases concerning the application of rules 27-36; chap. VI, part IV, sect. A, case 20, with regard to practice in relation to the election of members of the International Court of Justice; and chap. XI, part V: sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 43 of the Charter; sect. D, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 44; and sect. F, with regard to the discussion relating to Articles 46-47.

enclosing background papers and suggesting some specific questions for discussion.¹⁴

At the meeting, the Council was briefed by the Deputy Secretary-General. Statements were made by all Council members¹⁵ and the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Egypt, Fiji, India, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, South Africa, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union¹⁶) and Zambia.

In his introductory statement, the President (Singapore) stressed that the success of peacekeeping operations depended on a healthy triangular

¹⁴ S/2001/21.

¹⁵ Singapore was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

¹⁶ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

relationship between the Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries. He suggested a number of issues to be addressed, such as identifying the key problems in the relations between the three partners, mechanisms to strengthen the link between the Council and the troop-contributing countries, and ways to improve cooperation between the three partners in addressing peacekeeping problems.¹⁷

The Deputy Secretary-General stated that closer cooperation between the three partners could help to address commitment gaps in the contribution of troops, failures or shortcomings in operations and problems concerning safety and security. Recognizing the importance of communication between the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries, she highlighted measures taken by the Secretariat and pledged to explore how that relationship could be strengthened. She pointed out that the need for partnership and close communication was stressed in the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations.¹⁸ She also cited various suggestions made by the Panel, such as improved planning and better articulation of the mandates of peacekeeping missions, the establishment of an on-call list of military and civilian police specialists and the strengthening of standby arrangements. In conclusion, the Deputy Secretary-General emphasized that the strength and promise of peacekeeping lay in its collaborative nature.¹⁹

Speakers focused on the need to improve the existing consultation mechanism for troop-contributing countries by making it more timely and interactive and providing for a real exchange of views. The representative of Pakistan, echoed by the representative of Nepal, stated that the guidelines laid down in previous Council decisions on consultations with troop-contributing countries²⁰ had been largely ignored and that the consultations had become ritualistic, convening more out of form than purpose.²¹ Similarly, the representative of India observed that, notwithstanding the presidential statements of 1994 and 1996, the meetings with troop-contributing countries had become pro forma and ritualistic and not

an occasion for fruitful deliberations and enabling forming of shared perspectives, as they should be.²²

A number of representatives argued for broadening participation in consultations to include not only troop-contributing countries but also the countries making contributions of civilians, logistics and equipment, as well as major financial contributors.²³ The representative of Argentina held that other concerned parties, such as the operation's host country and the countries affected in the region, should be included in the discussions.²⁴ With respect to the timing of consultations, many speakers stressed that the Council should meet with troop-contributing countries prior to establishing a mission's mandate, and also when the Council considered substantive changes to an operation's mandate.²⁵

Many speakers noted the existence of a commitment gap with regard to troop contributions, developing countries contributing the majority of the troops deployed in United Nations peacekeeping operations. Some speakers representing troop-contributing countries lamented that the risk burden was uneven, as developing countries were providing the majority of the troops but troop-contributing countries had little voice in decision-making by the Council, and called on Council members and developed States to share the risks of deploying troops in the field.²⁶ The representative of Mali drew attention to the need to build up trust, which was essential if Member States were to provide the necessary resources and shoulder the risks involved in deploying peacekeepers. That confidence, he stressed, must be based on true partnerships between those who made the decisions and those who implemented them.²⁷ The representative of the United States emphasized that it would not be wise to blur the responsibilities of the participants in the partnership formed by troop-

¹⁷ S/PV.4257, pp. 2-3.

¹⁸ S/2000/809.

¹⁹ S/PV.4257, pp. 3-4.

²⁰ See S/PRST/1994/62, S/PRST/1996/13 and resolution 1327 (2000).

²¹ S/PV.4257, p. 5 (Pakistan); S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1), p. 28 (Nepal).

²² S/PV.4257, p. 9.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15 (Japan); S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Jamaica); and p. 24 (Senegal).

²⁴ S/PV.4257, pp. 19-20.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-11 (India); pp. 13-14 (Republic of Korea); p. 16 (Australia); p. 20 (Argentina); p. 24 (Egypt); and p. 31 (Nigeria); S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1), p. 13 (Ireland); p. 19 (Colombia); p. 20 (Mauritius); p. 25 (Poland); and p. 27 (Bulgaria).

²⁶ S/PV.4257, p. 7 (Jordan); and pp. 24-25 (Egypt); S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Bangladesh); and p. 28 (Nepal).

²⁷ S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1), p. 21.

contributing countries, the Council and the Secretariat, nor hinder Council decision-making.²⁸

In responding to the statements made by troop-contributing countries, the representative of China noted that while positive steps had been taken towards improving consultations and cooperation with those countries, there was much room for improvement.²⁹

Several representatives called for an institutionalized mechanism to allow for genuine participation by troop-contributing countries.³⁰ Many speakers pointed out that the best way to achieve a more formalized process of consultations was through the establishment of ad hoc subsidiary organs of the Council, as provided in Article 29 of the Charter.³¹ The representative of Pakistan held that such bodies could be mission-specific and based around a core group of troop-contributing countries for each mission.³² Similarly, the representative of Canada suggested that the Council and troop contributors establish a joint committee for each peace operation.³³ The representative of New Zealand advocated creating a formal committee composed of all Council members and every Member State contributing troops to the peacekeeping operation on the committee's agenda.³⁴ Stressing the need for a new approach, not simply new procedures, the representative of the United Kingdom reiterated his suggestion to form a working group of the Council to examine overall peacekeeping trends and working methods and play a role in establishing a more direct and proactive relationship between the Council and troop-contributing countries.³⁵ Several speakers endorsed the creation of such a working group.³⁶ The representative of the United States noted

that a real partnership between the Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat required a change of mentality, not necessarily new mechanisms, and suggested using existing mechanisms to have more interactive exchanges.³⁷ Similarly, the representative of France emphasized that what mattered was not so much the formal machinery as the use to which it was put.³⁸

Summing up the discussion, the representative of Singapore noted the widespread agreement among speakers that new mechanisms needed to be established, although there were differing views on what form such mechanisms should take. He expressed the hope that the concrete recommendations that had emerged from the discussion could be incorporated into a Council resolution or presidential statement.³⁹

At its 4270th meeting, on 31 January 2001, the Council again included in its agenda the letter dated 8 January 2001 from the representative of Singapore addressed to the Secretary-General.⁴⁰

The President (Singapore) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁴¹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Stressed the importance of full implementation of the provisions of resolution 1327 (2000) and in the statements by its President of 3 May 1994 and 28 March 1996;⁴²

Stressed the importance of full participation by all those involved and encouraged troop-contributing countries to take the initiative to call for meaningful exchanges of information;

Encouraged the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to improve coordination and cooperation on peacekeeping issues within the United Nations system and the Secretariat;

Encouraged the Secretary-General to raise globally public awareness of the positive contribution of peacekeeping operations;

Acknowledged that the Secretariat must be able to rely on sufficient human and financial resources to respond to the demands placed upon it;

Reiterated that the problem of the commitment gap with regard to personnel and equipment for peacekeeping operations required that all Member States assume the shared responsibility to support United Nations peacekeeping;

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

³⁰ S/PV.4257, p. 13 (India); p. 14 (Republic of Korea); p. 24 (Egypt); p. 25 (Zambia); p. 28 (Malaysia); and p. 32 (Nigeria); S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Tunisia); p. 11 (Ukraine); p. 16 (Norway); and p. 22 (Romania).

³¹ S/PV.4257, p. 5 (Pakistan); p. 14 (Republic of Korea); p. 22 (Sweden on behalf of the European Union); p. 27 (New Zealand); p. 28 (Malaysia); and p. 31 (Nigeria); S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1), pp. 9-10 (Bangladesh); p. 16 (Norway); p. 20 (Mauritius); and p. 30 (Nepal).

³² S/PV.4257, p. 5.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

³⁵ S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1), p. 4.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Ukraine); p. 15 (China); and p. 24 (Senegal).

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 30-32.

⁴⁰ S/2001/21.

⁴¹ S/PRST/2001/3.

⁴² S/PRST/1994/22 and S/PRST/1996/13, respectively.

Acknowledged that the delay in reimbursement placed severe budgetary constraints upon troop-contributing countries; urged all Member States to pay their assessed contributions in full and on time;

Decided to establish a Working Group of the Whole on United Nations peacekeeping operations, which would address both generic peacekeeping issues relevant to the responsibilities of the Council, and technical aspects of individual peacekeeping operations.

Decision of 13 June 2001 (4326th meeting): resolution 1353 (2001)

At its 4326th meeting,⁴³ on 13 June 2001, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 31 May 2001 from the Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations addressed to the President of the Council,⁴⁴ transmitting the first report of the Working Group, which examined the relationship between the Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat.

At the meeting, at which no statements were made, the President (Bangladesh) drew the attention of the Council to a letter from the representatives of Argentina, Canada, Ghana, India, Jordan, the

Netherlands and New Zealand addressed to the President, providing thoughts on implementing the concept of a mission-specific cooperative management committee as a way of improving cooperation between the Council and troop-contributing countries.⁴⁵

The President also drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁴⁶ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1353 (2001), by which the Council, inter alia:

Agreed to adopt the decisions and recommendations contained in the annexes to the resolution;

Requested its Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations to continue its work on strengthening the capacity of the United Nations to establish and support efficient and effective peacekeeping operations;

Undertook to follow closely the implementation of the agreed measures for cooperation with troop-contributing countries, and requested its Working Group to assess within six months of the adoption of the resolution the efficiency and effectiveness of the agreed measures, to consider their further improvement taking into account the proposals of the troop-contributing countries and to report to the Council on those matters.

⁴³ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. VI, part VI, case 20, with regard to relations with the Military Staff Committee.

⁴⁴ S/2001/546, submitted pursuant to the presidential statement of 31 January 2001 (S/PRST/2011/3).

⁴⁵ S/2001/535.

⁴⁶ S/2001/573.

C. Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations

Initial proceedings

Decision of 14 January 2002 (4447th meeting): note by the President of the Council

By a letter dated 31 December 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations transmitted the third report of the Working Group and, annexed to the report, a draft note by the President of the Council on an agreement to convene joint meetings of the Working Group and troop-contributing countries as an additional mechanism for strengthening cooperation with those countries on specific peacekeeping operations.⁴⁷

At its 4447th meeting, held in private on 14 January 2002, the Council considered the above-mentioned report. At the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by Mr. Curtis Ward, the former Chairman of the Working Group. Members of the Council also made comments and asked questions in connection with the briefing. The members of the Council approved a note by the President of the Council.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ S/2001/1335.

⁴⁸ S/2002/56.

D. United Nations peacekeeping

Initial proceedings

Decision of 12 July 2002 (4572nd meeting): resolution 1422 (2002)

At its 4572nd meeting, on 12 July 2002,⁴⁹ the Council included in its agenda the item entitled “United Nations peacekeeping”. The President (United Kingdom) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;⁵⁰ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1422 (2002), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Requested that the International Criminal Court, if a case arose involving current or former officials or personnel from a contributing State not a party to the Rome Statute over acts or omissions relating to a United Nations established or authorized operation, should for a 12-month period starting 1 July 2002 not commence or proceed with investigation or prosecution of any such case, unless the Council decided otherwise;

Expressed the intention to renew the request under the same conditions each 1 July for further 12-month periods for as long as might be necessary;

Decided that Member States should take no action inconsistent with the above-mentioned request and with their international obligations.

Decision of 12 June 2003 (4772nd meeting): resolution 1487 (2003)

By a letter dated 6 June 2003 addressed to the President of the Council,⁵¹ the representatives of Canada, Jordan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand and Switzerland requested the Council to convene a public meeting and invite interested States to speak in the Council’s discussions on the proposed renewal of the provisions of resolution 1422 (2003). They noted that the proposed renewal of that resolution had implications of direct import to Member States, including those that were parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, relating to international peacekeeping, fundamental questions of international law and the role of the Council in promoting law and accountability.

At its 4772nd meeting,⁵² held on 12 June 2003, the Council included the above-mentioned letter in its agenda. In addition, the President (Russian Federation) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 10 June 2003 from the representative of Greece addressed to the President of the Council,⁵³ and to a draft resolution.⁵⁴ During the meeting, statements were made by most of members of the Council,⁵⁵ and the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Canada, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Greece (on behalf of the European Union⁵⁶), the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Malawi, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru,⁵⁷ South Africa, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago and Uruguay.⁵⁸

The Secretary-General noted that the Council was meeting to renew its request that the International Criminal Court not commence or proceed if a case arose involving current or former officials or personnel from a contributing State not a party to the Rome Statute over acts or omissions relating to a United Nations established or authorized operation. Noting that the Council was relying on article 16 of the Rome

⁵² For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XII, part II, sect. A, case 17, with regard to Article 24 of the Charter; and chap. XI, part I, sect. B, with regard to the discussion relating to Article 39.

⁵³ S/2003/639, stating that Greece, in its capacity as President of the European Union, strongly supported the request made by the Governments of Canada, Jordan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand and Switzerland to convene a meeting.

⁵⁴ S/2003/630.

⁵⁵ The representatives of Chile and Mexico did not make statements.

⁵⁶ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

⁵⁷ The representative of Peru spoke on behalf of the States members of the Rio Group (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Uruguay, Venezuela and Peru).

⁵⁸ The representative of Cuba was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

⁴⁹ See also chap. XII, part IV, case 21, with regard to consideration of the miscellaneous provisions of the Charter.

⁵⁰ S/2002/747.

⁵¹ S/2003/620.

Statute,⁵⁹ he emphasized that the article was not intended to cover such a sweeping request, but only a more specific request relating to a particular situation. In addition, he did not believe the request was necessary for the following reasons: first, in the history of the United Nations, no peacekeeper or any other mission personnel had been anywhere near committing the kinds of crimes that fell under the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court; second, people serving in United Nations peacekeeping missions remained under the jurisdiction of their home States; and third, under article 17 of the Rome Statute, no case was admissible in the Court if it had already been or was being investigated or prosecuted by a State that had jurisdiction over it. The Secretary-General underlined his belief that, in the case of a person serving in a United Nations authorized mission being accused of the kind of crime under the jurisdiction of the Court, the home State would be most anxious to investigate that accusation, which would make the case inadmissible to the Court. While he could accept that the Council felt that it was necessary to renew the request for a further 12 months, as the Court was still in its infancy and no case had yet been brought before it, he expressed the hope that this would not become an annual routine. He expressed the fear that the world would interpret it as meaning that the Council wished to claim absolute and permanent immunity for people serving in its operations. If that were to happen, it would undermine not only the authority of the Court but also the authority of the Council and the legitimacy of United Nations peacekeeping.⁶⁰

Many speakers expressed the belief that resolution 1422 (2002) and the draft resolution were unnecessary, that they diminished the importance of accountability and justice for victims and that they undermined fundamental principles of international law. Several speakers stressed that Council action was not needed to address the risk of frivolous prosecutions because safeguards to address that risk were already included within the Statute of the International

Criminal Court. They also expressed doubt about the compatibility of the resolutions with the Council's mandate and were troubled that action would be taken in the absence of any apparent threat to international peace and security, which was the fundamental precondition for action under Chapter VII of the Charter. They also stressed that it was a misapplication of article 16 of the Rome Statute, which was never intended as a tool to grant a priori immunity to a whole category of persons.⁶¹

The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran also expressed concern that, given the existing safeguards in the Statute of the International Criminal Court, as well as the very responsible statement that had been made by various officers of the Court, the insistence on extending the provision of the resolution indefinitely would amount to seeking impunity for more serious crimes, including genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. He also recalled that resolution 1422 (2002) was adopted only after the extension of the mandate of the United Nations mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina, along with those of other missions, had been threatened with a veto.⁶²

The representative of Uruguay stated that resolution 1422 (2002) introduced a curious kind of discrimination among perpetrators of the most hateful crimes: on the one hand there were criminals who might be judged or sentenced for their crimes, and on the other hand those who might act under the protection of immunity.⁶³

Several speakers noted that the maintenance of international peace and security and the repression of serious crimes could not be viewed as conflicting objectives and that the rules of the International Criminal Court also reflected the determination to establish a framework that made the Court's role compatible with the needs of the collective security.⁶⁴

⁵⁹ Article 16 of the Rome Statute reads as follows: "No investigation or prosecution may be commenced or proceeded with under this Statute for a period of 12 months after the Security Council, in a resolution adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, has requested the Court to that effect; that request may be renewed by the Council under the same conditions."

⁶⁰ S/PV.4272, pp. 2-3.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5 (Canada); pp. 5-6 (New Zealand); pp. 6-7 (Jordan); p. 7 (Switzerland); pp. 7-8 (Liechtenstein); pp. 8-9 (Greece); p. 10 (Islamic Republic of Iran); pp. 10-11 (Peru); pp. 11-12 (Malawi); p. 13 (Brazil); pp. 14-15 (Trinidad and Tobago); pp. 15-16 (Argentina); pp. 16-17 (South Africa); pp. 17-18 (Nigeria); p. 20 (Netherlands); pp. 24-25 (Germany); and pp. 25-26 (Syrian Arab Republic).

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Switzerland); p. 13 (Brazil); p. 14 (Peru); p. 16 (Argentina); p. 19 (Democratic Republic of the

The representative of Pakistan regretted that the Rome Statute did not provide for reservations by countries, which might have ensured wider adherence to the Statute. He noted that the Government of Pakistan had concerns with respect to several provisions of the Statute of the International Criminal Court, including the mechanism for initiation of proceedings, provisional arrest, provisions dealing with armed conflicts not of an international character and the question of immunity of Heads of State or Government. As the largest contributor to United Nations peacekeeping, he underlined that peacekeepers should not be exposed to any arbitrary or unilateral action by any national or international body. As that was the primary concern that had inspired the present draft resolution, no matter how unlikely the circumstances, he expressed his support for the draft resolution. He believed that annual renewal might be avoided in the future through separate arrangements.⁶⁵

The draft resolution was put to the vote; it received 12 votes in favour, none against, with 3 abstentions (France, Germany, Syrian Arab Republic), and was adopted as resolution 1487 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Requested that the International Criminal Court, if a case arose involving current or former officials or personnel from a contributing State not a party to the Rome Statute over acts or omissions relating to a United Nations established or authorized operation, should for a 12-month period starting 1 July 2003 not commence or proceed with investigation or prosecution of any such case, unless the Council decided otherwise;

Decided that Member States should take no action inconsistent with that request and with their international obligations; and decided to remain seized of the matter.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of France expressed hope that the new one-year extension would allow States that still had a bias against the International Criminal Court to overcome that bias.⁶⁶

The representatives of Bulgaria, China, Guinea and the Russian Federation expressed strong support for the International Criminal Court, but also

Congo); and p. 22 (Cameroon).

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁶⁶ S/PV.4772, p. 24.

acknowledged the legitimate concerns of the various countries involved in peacekeeping operations. They stressed that Council members must act in the spirit of compromise and understanding and actively work to find a solution that was acceptable to all.⁶⁷

The representatives of Angola, Bulgaria, Spain and the United Kingdom were of the view that resolutions 1422 (2002) and 1487 (2003) were consistent with article 16 of the Statute of the International Criminal Court; that the renewal of the provision in paragraph 1 of resolution 1422 (2002) did not affect the integrity of the Statute and did not undermine the Court; and that the resolution did not create a precedent for interference by the Council in the sovereign right and capacity of Member States to prosecute repugnant crimes against humanity that were included in the Rome Statute.⁶⁸

The representative of the United States underlined that the primary concern was for American personnel that might find themselves subject to the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court. He emphasized that the resolution was consistent with a fundamental principle of international law: the need for a State to consent if it is to be bound. He stated that that principle was respected by exempting from Court jurisdiction personnel and forces of States that were not parties to the Rome Statute. He stressed that the resolution did not in any way affect parties to the Court, or the Rome Statute itself, nor did it elevate an entire category of people above the law, as the Court was not the law. He suggested that even one instance of the Court attempting to exercise jurisdiction over those involved in a United Nations operation would have a seriously damaging impact upon future United Nations operations. He argued that the Court was vulnerable at every stage of any proceeding to politicization; that the Rome Statute provided no adequate check; and that having every confidence in the Court's correct behaviour was not a safeguard.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 26 (Bulgaria); p. 27 (Guinea); p. 27 (China); and p. 28 (Russian Federation).

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 23 (United Kingdom); p. 25 (Spain); p. 26 (Bulgaria); and p. 27 (Angola).

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

E. The importance of mine action for peacekeeping operations

Initial proceedings

Deliberations of 13 November 2003 (4858th meeting)

At its 4858th meeting, on 13 November 2003, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "The importance of mine action for peacekeeping operations". The Council heard briefings by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, and the Director of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining. All Council members made statements after the briefings.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General elaborated on the remarkable progress that had been made with regard to mine action since the Council last took up the issue in 1996. In that regard, he drew attention to the work of the United Nations Mine Action Service within the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Children's Fund, which were the lead United Nations actors undertaking and coordinating mine action initiatives. Noting that United Nations mine action was helping to build peace and security in almost 20 situations of concern to the Council, the Under-Secretary-General highlighted, *inter alia*, United Nations efforts in supporting national mine action authorities, promoting mine risk education and facilitating mine survey and clearance operations. He observed that mine action had become a dynamic component of multidimensional peacekeeping operations, often involving early planning with mine action specialists and the inclusion of mine action coordination centres.

He also noted that the briefing that day provided an opportunity for the Council to call upon a range of actors to undertake specific actions to enhance mine action in the peacekeeping context. He suggested that the Council might wish to consider the following issues in their discussion: the possibility of a new legal instrument to address unexploded ordnance and other explosive remnants of war as well as the rights of mine survivors; encouraging the parties to conflicts to incorporate mine action, where appropriate, into their discussions; the role of peacekeeping operations in information gathering on the scope and importance of the landmine and unexploded ordnance problem; calling upon troop-contributing countries to train their

peacekeeping troops to demine; the use of demobilized soldiers to conduct mine action; and the need for adequate and sustained financial assistance for mine action from Member States.⁷⁰

The Director of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining highlighted the areas of the work of the Centre that were particularly important to peacekeeping. To facilitate the standardized collection and exchange of information on the threat of mines, working together with the United Nations Mine Action Service, the Geneva Centre had developed the Information Management System for Mine Action, and was at that time providing both predeployment and post-deployment support for the System, which had been installed in 36 countries or programmes. He stated that the International Mine Action Standards had improved the quality of mine action, enhanced interoperability and mutual understanding among the various mine action actors, and improved prospects for smoother transitions by peacekeeping operations to the post-conflict phase. With respect to the appropriate role of the military in mine action, which had been the subject of debate in both civilian and military circles for some time, the Director presented findings from a study conducted by the Geneva Centre, at the request of the United Nations Mine Action Service. The study had found that military expertise in breaching minefields was not easily transposed to humanitarian demining, where nothing less than 100 per cent clearance was acceptable. While the military were able to provide warnings to civilians about the dangers of mines and unexploded ordnance, they were not well prepared to undertake ongoing community-based awareness education programmes. In general, military peacekeeping troops had not carried out large-scale survey, marking or mine clearance operations.⁷¹

All members of the Council expressed deep concern regarding the devastating humanitarian consequences arising from the use of landmines on affected populations, and stressed that mine action was a priority for the maintenance of international peace and security. In that regard they welcomed the efforts

⁷⁰ S/PV.4858, pp. 2-4.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6.

by the United Nations to take stock of the problem and the mainstreaming of mine action into the Organization's culture. They welcomed in particular the work of the United Nations Mine Action Service of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Information Management System for Mine Action in ensuring the coordination of mine action throughout the United Nations system and the provision of support to multidimensional peace operations, as well as the role of other United Nations agencies, and non-governmental organizations. Members agreed that further progress was needed in mine action. They shared the view that there was a need to strengthen internal coordination among United Nations bodies, and between those bodies and other actors, including non-governmental organizations. They concurred that mine action was a new concept that went beyond the mere military and disarmament aspects, and consisted of a broad-based approach that included humanitarian aspects.

Members agreed that it was imperative that the Council include mine action in the mandates of its peacekeeping operations, and that it consider mine action requirements at the very beginning of the planning of those operations. The representative of Guinea held that mine action training should be included in the training of peacekeeping troops, and that a gender perspective should be included in mine-clearance programmes. Several members welcomed the existing mainstreaming of mine action into the mandates of peacekeeping operations, citing specific examples, which included the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea, and the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁷² The representative of Bulgaria expressed the view that mine action in Kosovo could be used as a model for other operations.⁷³ The representative of the United Kingdom noted that mine action in the context of peacekeeping operations improved the safety of peacekeepers, the environment for the safe return of refugees, employment possibilities and income opportunities, along with many other benefits, such as a psychological gain for the population.⁷⁴

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9 (Syrian Arab Republic); pp. 11-13 (Cameroon); pp. 12-13 (United Kingdom); and pp. 18-19 (China).

⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

With respect to demining and its relevance to the respective mandates of the General Assembly and the Council, the representative of Germany emphasized that the Council's role was to ensure that such activities were considered and, as the case might require, included in peacekeeping mandates. The Assembly, on the other hand, dealt with mine action in all its aspects, thus responding to the report of the Secretary-General⁷⁵ on that matter.⁷⁶ Similarly, the representative of the Russian Federation highlighted that the Council's discussion of the question should focus on the specific tasks that arose when carrying out the mandates of peacekeeping operations. At the same time, he warned against the duplication of work by the various agencies and organs of the United Nations system. Since the Assembly considered the matter of assistance for mine-clearance activities on a regular basis, he believed that it would be a good idea for the subject of providing assistance to mine-affected countries to be discussed in that body.⁷⁷

The representative of Guinea, echoed by the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and France, emphasized the political role of the General Assembly in mine action.⁷⁸ The representative of Guinea highlighted that the Security Council, in contrast, had an operational role through its peacekeeping operations.⁷⁹ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic maintained that a focus on mine action in peacekeeping operations in no way entailed a transfer of responsibilities from the Assembly to the Council.⁸⁰

The representative of Pakistan stated that unless there was universal acceptance and implementation of the principle of the responsibility of States that placed landmines or left unexploded ordnance in conflict situations, action to clear up landmines would continue to be slow and inadequate at the global level. In the context of the situations of which the Council was seized, mine prevention and mine clearance had to be included in its considerations.⁸¹

⁷⁵ A/58/260 and Add.1.

⁷⁶ S/PV.4858, pp. 15-16.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Guinea); p. 8 (Syrian Arab Republic); and pp. 8-9 (France).

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

Speakers emphasized that the adoption in 1997 of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction indicated significant progress and reaffirmed the international community's commitment to the elimination of all mines. The representative of France maintained that the Convention could be used as a mobilization tool for mine action at all levels, including financing.⁸² The representatives of France and Mexico urged those States that had not yet signed or ratified the instrument to do so.⁸³ The representative of Mexico welcomed the fact that Kenya would host in 2004 the first review conference of the Convention, as African countries had been severely affected by the scourge of landmines.⁸⁴

**Decision of 19 November 2003
(4864th meeting): statement by the President**

At the 4864th meeting, on 19 November 2003,

⁸² Ibid., pp. 8-9.

⁸³ Ibid., pp. 14-15.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

the President (Angola) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁸⁵ by which the Council, inter alia:

Expressed its grave concern at the harmful and widespread impact of landmines and unexploded ordnance on civilian populations, especially children, and on humanitarian workers and United Nations staff;

Urged all Member States to respect relevant international law that addressed landmines and unexploded ordnance;

Urged all parties to armed conflicts to abide by their mine-related commitments and to cooperate with mine-risk education and mine-clearing activities;

Called upon the Secretary-General to provide information on the scope and humanitarian impact of the mine and unexploded ordnance problem;

Urged Member States to provide adequate and sustained financial assistance to support mine action, and to increase their contributions to the Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Action.

⁸⁵ S/PRST/2003/22.

48. Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach

Initial proceedings

**Decision of 20 February 2001 (4278th meeting):
statement by the President**

By a letter dated 25 January 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General,¹ the representative of Tunisia informed the Secretary-General that, during its presidency of the Security Council in February 2001, Tunisia intended to organize on 5 February 2001 a debate, open to States which were not members of the Council, on the topic "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach". Annexed to the letter was a note with suggestions on specific subjects for the debate, including disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants; refugees and displaced persons; poverty eradication and promotion of sustainable development; strengthening the rule of law and democratic institutions; a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy; and the role of the Council.

¹ S/2001/82.

At its 4272nd meeting, on 5 February 2001, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach", and included also the above-mentioned letter. At the meeting, the Council heard a statement by the Secretary-General, following which statements were made by all members of the Council, and the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Croatia, Egypt, Guatemala, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Romania, the Republic of Korea, Senegal and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union²).

The Secretary-General stated that the overarching challenge of peacebuilding was to move societies towards sustainable peace, and was the sum of many initiatives, projects, activities and sensitivities.

² Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

Peacebuilding was the process of building the pillars of peace from the ground up. He stated that, to ensure the coherence of those efforts, the United Nations was also trying to improve its internal arrangements, so that peacebuilding was not only comprehensive, but also done in an integrated way. He noted that the goals were to consolidate peace, reinforce an often hard-won and fragile stability and to prevent a slide back into conflict. However, he also saw peacebuilding as a preventive instrument, which could address the underlying root causes of conflict, and which could also be used before the actual outbreak of war. He emphasized that the problem was that the international community did not practise prevention as often as it could or should. He also emphasized that peacebuilding needed to be seen as a long-term exercise, while there was also a need to achieve tangible progress on a number of fronts in a short period of time. He mentioned that both the General Assembly and the Security Council had recognized the importance of peacebuilding and the need to work with a range of partners, including non-governmental organizations and the private sector. He noted that the Council had recognized that peacebuilding could be a vital component of peacekeeping missions, and that it needed to include such preventive tools as early warning, diplomacy, preventive deployment and disarmament. He stressed that the Council had a prime role to play, and that among the major challenges of peacebuilding was the mobilization of political will and resources on the part of the international community. He called on the members to do more politically to give peacebuilding a higher priority and a higher profile by bringing it closer to the forefront of their awareness.³

In their statements, representatives touched on a wide variety of issues and concurred, *inter alia*, on the need to develop a common approach between the United Nations and all participating actors in order to develop a practical, comprehensive and integrated strategy to promote peace, taking into account the primary responsibility of the State concerned; to support the capabilities of the Secretary-General; to take into account the necessity of focusing efficiently on the deep roots of conflicts, especially the economic and social roots, owing to the close links between security, stability and development; to eliminate poverty as a collective international responsibility and

³ S/PV.4272, pp. 2-4.

develop an innovative approach and mechanism to address poverty and economic backwardness; and to focus on governance, democracy and the building of State institutions as essential ingredients for promoting peace. They also stressed the importance of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, while paying special attention to children, refugees, internally displaced persons and the promotion of the role of women in peacebuilding; coordination among all active parties and apportionment of responsibilities in the area of peacebuilding, especially in respect of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council;⁴ in particular the importance of the Security Council in mobilizing international political will, given its special responsibility in the area of international peace and security and the close relationship between the maintenance of peace and security, conflict prevention and peacebuilding; the initiation of consultations among all active parties at an early stage, before establishing any peacekeeping mission, for better preparation and coordination towards that goal; and the promotion of sustainable and continuous international partnership in all phases of conflict prevention and peacebuilding.

Most of the representatives highlighted the need to develop a comprehensive and integrated strategy within the United Nations system to address the root causes of conflict. They also expressed appreciation for a number of recommendations and reports on the issue of the development of a comprehensive and integrated peacebuilding strategy by the United Nations, *inter alia*, the report of the Secretary-General entitled “An Agenda for Peace”⁵ and the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (the Brahimi report).⁶

In discussing the role of the Council in peacebuilding, the representative of France noted that though peacekeeping operations were authorized by the Council and included elements of peacebuilding, the Council was not competent to be the “project manager”. In relation to the Council’s role in the coordination of the many different actors involved in peacebuilding, he suggested that the division of roles and financing could be clearly defined at the time the

⁴ For more information on the discussion relating to the Economic and Social Council, see chap. VI, part II, case 11.

⁵ S/24111.

⁶ S/2000/809.

Council established an operation, and could even appear in an annex to the resolution. From the outset the Council would establish a double partnership with the troop-contributing countries and financial institutions entrusted with carrying out the Council's decisions.⁷ The representative of Ukraine noted that once peace efforts in a zone of conflict reached the stage of long-term preventive peacebuilding, the Council needed to pass the responsibility on to other entities of the United Nations system, such as the United Nations Development Programme, to coordinate further international efforts.⁸ The representative of Egypt expressed the belief that sustainable development and poverty eradication needed to be dealt with through other bodies of the United Nations, although the Council should take those dimensions into consideration when intervening in conflicts. He stressed that his delegation did not want the Council to be transformed into the Economic and Social Council or a private, miniature General Assembly, particularly since there was a high degree of politicization in the work of the Security Council.⁹ Similarly, the representative of India stated that, while the Council had a role to play in setting up the peacekeeping operations that were part of the process of building peace, it did not follow that those operations must take on the work of economic and social reconstruction, or that the Council should ask them to do so. He argued that the majority of peacekeeping missions were still groups of observers or formed contingents observing a truce, and that in recent years the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone, the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) were the three exceptions to that rule. Trying to draw general conclusions from those very exceptional cases was dangerous and one of the more serious shortcomings of the Brahimi report. In the cases of UNMIK and UNTAET, the United Nations had stepped into a political vacuum and set up transitional administrations. However, where a Government was in place, no matter how weak, the United Nations should do nothing to give the impression that the Government was not in control and that authority resided in the

peacekeeping operation, which would undermine peace.¹⁰

The representative of the United States stressed that, while conflicts had underlying structural causes, the international community must not forget that their immediate causes were often individual ambition and greed. He also stated that his country did not believe that a Security Council mandate should focus on reconstruction and development as that was not the responsibility of the Council. However, he mentioned that all elements of the United Nations system needed to work together, and regional organizations, international financial institutions, donor Governments and non-governmental organizations all had roles, although better coordination was needed. He noted that the Council should be clear and should encourage clarity on this issue.¹¹

At its 4278th meeting, on 20 February 2001, the Council again included the letter dated 25 January 2001 from the representative of Tunisia in its agenda.¹²

At the same meeting, the President (Tunisia) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹³ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Recognized that peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding were often closely interrelated;

Stressed that, to be successful, such a peacebuilding strategy should meet, *inter alia*, the following basic criteria: relevance, coherence and consistency of programmes and actions; the consent and cooperation of the authorities of the State concerned, where they existed; continuity in and conclusion of the process; cooperation and coordination among organizations and other actors involved; and cost-effectiveness of the overall peacebuilding operation;

Strongly encouraged the United Nations system and regional and subregional organizations, donor countries and the international financial institutions to consider undertaking initiatives such as: utilizing of the mechanism of consolidated appeals and holding joint pledging conferences to mobilize expeditiously international political support and essential resource requirements; ensuring prompt financing of quick start-up peacebuilding projects; and strengthening mechanisms that promoted development and self-reliance by improving capacity-building activities.

⁷ S/PV.4272, pp. 4-7.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁹ S/PV.4272 (Resumption 1), p. 11.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹¹ S/PV.4272, pp. 9-10.

¹² S/2001/82.

¹³ S/PRST/2001/5.

49. Nobel Peace Prize

Initial proceedings

Decision of 12 October 2001 (4390th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4390th meeting, on 12 October 2001, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled “Nobel Peace Prize”. At the meeting, the Council heard a statement by the Secretary-General.

The Secretary-General stated that the Norwegian Nobel Committee had honoured the Security Council, which had, under the Charter, the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security and that it had honoured all parts of the Organization, and the men and women who worked for the United Nations in the service of peace, wherever they might be. He stressed that in a world that was growing ever closer and more interconnected, and yet was still torn by brutal conflicts and cruel injustice, it was more important than ever that humanity travel that route, the route described by the Nobel Committee. He also stated that all who worked at the United Nations should feel proud, but also humble, because even more would be expected of them in the near future. He concluded by stating that the award was a tribute, above all, to those United Nations staff members who had made the supreme sacrifice in the service of humanity.

At the same meeting, the President (Ireland) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Celebrated, together with the rest of the United Nations family, the award of the 2001 Nobel Peace Prize to the United Nations and to its Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan;

Paid special tribute to all the men and women who worked for the United Nations, whatever their tasks of duty, wherever they might be in the service of peace;

In warmly congratulating the Secretary-General, Mr. Annan, the Council reiterated its own strong support for his efforts in upholding the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and for his role in assuring to the Organization its full and rightful place in the world and in leading its search for new ways forward for all men and women in all countries to live their lives with dignity and peace.

¹ S/PRST/2001/28.

50. Items relating to food and security

A. Food aid in the context of conflict settlement: Afghanistan and other crisis areas

Initial proceedings

Deliberations of 4 April 2002 (4507th meeting)

At its 4507th meeting, on 4 April 2002, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled “Food aid in the context of conflict settlement: Afghanistan and other crisis areas”. The Council heard a briefing by the Executive Director of the World Food Programme (WFP).

In her briefing, the Executive Director provided a broad overview of the subject of food aid in the context of crises. Using examples from around the world, she outlined a number of ways in which food aid could assist in conflict settlement by saving lives; acting as a stabilizing factor; and contributing to long-term recovery. While there would still be hunger, malnutrition and localized and sometimes severe shortages of food in the future, she noted that the international community had achieved one part of the goal set out at the World Summit for Children: ending major famines. She also raised the issue of the security of humanitarian staff, expressing disappointment over the small number of cases in which perpetrators of violence against United Nations staff had been brought to justice.¹

In their statements, Council members paid tribute to the outgoing Executive Director of the World Food Programme, the first woman to hold that position, for her 10 years of service, and welcomed her successor. Most speakers agreed that the issue of food aid was relevant to the work of the Council, acknowledging that WFP delivered food to many States whose names appeared on the Council’s agenda.

Several members also touched on WFP efforts to define food security strategies in the context of conflict prevention.² In that respect, the representative of France, echoed by the representative of the Syrian Arab

Republic, saluted the development of a WFP “hunger map” as a way to better prevent crises.³

A number of speakers focused on the need for United Nations humanitarian agencies to improve coordination and hire local resources and personnel.⁴ In that respect, the representative of the Russian Federation was convinced that a leading role in ensuring such coordination in Afghanistan should be played by the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan.⁵

Several speakers concurred with the Executive Director on the need to ensure the security of United Nations humanitarian workers.⁶ The representative of the United Kingdom maintained that 188 unsolved cases involving the deaths of United Nations staff was a scandal.⁷

The representative of Mexico stated that humanitarian assistance should be granted within the context of respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of States, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.⁸ The representative of the Russian Federation similarly held that food aid should in no instance be used as a tool for interference or for influencing the course of conflicts.⁹

³ S/PV.4507, p. 6 (France); and p. 7 (Syrian Arab Republic).

⁴ Ibid., p. 8 (Mexico); S/PV.4507 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Bulgaria); p. 3 (Guinea); p. 4 (Mauritius); and p. 7 (Cameroon).

⁵ S/PV.4507 (Resumption 1), p. 7.

⁶ S/PV.4507, p. 10 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4507 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Guinea); and pp. 4-5 (Mauritius).

⁷ S/PV.4507, p. 10.

⁸ Ibid., p. 8.

⁹ S/PV.4507 (Resumption 1), p. 8.

¹ S/PV.4507, pp. 2-5.

² Ibid., p. 6 (France); p. 7 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 9 (Norway); S/PV.4507 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Bulgaria); and pp. 2-3 (Guinea).

The representative of the United Kingdom cautioned that one had to be careful in using food aid outside acute emergency situations, because food aid in conflict situations was highly sensitive and, if misused, could have a direct and immediate effect on the dynamics of violence. He held that systems had to be put in place to minimize food aid diversion, and the use of food aid should have a clear exit strategy. He expressed the view, echoed by the representative of the Russian Federation, that the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council should work towards a

closer and more comprehensive understanding of conflict issues and how the system could deal with them more effectively.¹⁰

The representative of Bulgaria stressed the need for the international community to intervene at the right time to mobilize awareness about a crisis and believed that the Council should take appropriate measures, including targeted sanctions, when access to those who needed humanitarian aid was denied.¹¹

¹⁰ S/PV.4507, pp. 10-11 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4507 (Resumption 1), pp. 7-8 (Russian Federation).

¹¹ S/PV.4507 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

B. Africa's food crisis as a threat to peace and security

Initial proceedings

Deliberations of 3 December 2002 and 7 April 2003 (4652nd and 4736th meetings)

At its 4652nd meeting, on 3 December 2002, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Africa's food crisis as a threat to peace and security" and heard a briefing by Mr. James Morris, Executive Director of the World Food Programme. Statements were made by the representatives of Bulgaria, Cameroon, Guinea, Ireland, Mauritius, the Russian Federation, Singapore, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The Executive Director declared that the challenge for the World Food Programme was to respond to emergencies in a way that strengthened individual educational opportunities, health, nutrition, livelihoods, food security and the creation of assets. Referring to the causes of severe hunger in Africa, he pointed to bad weather in the greater Horn of Africa region that threatened to put as many as 15 million people at risk, and HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa that had resulted in 11 million orphans. Civil strife, a large number of refugees and internally displaced persons, landmines, the issue of genetically modified organisms, and issues related to governance and macroeconomic policy further complicated the state of affairs. He held that stronger and more consistent funding for humanitarian aid was required in the short term, while a major opening up of economies, a strengthening of the free market and substantial investment in basic agricultural infrastructure and

nutrition were necessary in the long haul. The Executive Director stated that the focus of WFP was to feed hungry poor people, while abiding by the principles of accessibility, accountability, transparency and a zero-tolerance policy for foolishness or the inability to work throughout a country. As an example of the Programme's ability to stay away from political issues, he pointed to the fact that WFP was the only international agency that had offices outside the capital of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In conclusion, the Executive Director observed that 40 to 50 million children of school age in Africa were not in school but could be drawn there by a school feeding programme. He stressed that education was crucial in addressing the HIV/AIDS issue and providing children with an opportunity to think about alternative lifestyles.¹²

Following the briefing, most speakers expressed concern at the gravity of the situation in Southern Africa and the Horn of Africa. The representative of the United Kingdom emphasized the importance of addressing the link between conflict and food insecurity, as in his view each could cause or reinforce the other.¹³ Similarly, the representative of the Russian Federation observed that overcoming the food crisis in African countries was a comprehensive, multifaceted challenge, requiring both the resolution of armed

¹² S/PV.4652, pp. 2-5.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

conflicts and the achievement of sustainable development.¹⁴

The representative of the United Kingdom, echoed by the representatives of Mauritius and Singapore, expressed interest in discussing the role played by government policies in worsening food crises.¹⁵ Observing that famine was neither a natural occurrence nor an inevitable condition, the representative of the United States called for the international community to look at failures of governance, development and assistance in explaining the existence of famine. In his view, productive investment in agricultural and rural development was essential for overcoming famine, but in the short term the immediate adequate assistance of the international community was critical for averting widespread famine in Africa.¹⁶ The representative of Bulgaria emphasized the responsibility of recipient States to coordinate and use the assistance provided by the international community.¹⁷

In agreement with the Executive Director, the representative of Ireland affirmed that the humanitarian situation in Africa not only constituted a threat to international peace and security, but was also intolerable from a moral and humanitarian perspective. He also drew attention to the reduction in the level of long-term development funding by the international community, and enquired about the possible role of WFP in encouraging donors to return to long-term agriculture support programmes. In connection with the debate surrounding globalization and protectionism, he noted existing criticism in some African countries that the liberalization of their economies had not been met with a reciprocal response by developed countries in terms of reduced tariffs and an easing of protectionism in agriculture.¹⁸

The representative of Mauritius raised concerns about the safety of genetically modified food products sent by WFP to members of the Southern Africa Development Community, noting that several countries had expressed reservations with regard to receiving such products.¹⁹ Arguing that government policies over

genetically modified food aid had hindered the food aid distribution process, the representative of the United States expressed concern that efforts to provide desperately needed assistance could be delayed, if not derailed, by the confusion over biotechnology food issues.²⁰

Responding to comments and questions from the representatives, the Executive Director insisted that African countries needed the ability to produce and export their own food, and advocated consideration of the issues of tariffs, use of surpluses and trade, with that goal in mind. On the issue of support levels and long-term development, he acknowledged that the trend had been against long-term development, but suggested that an investment in short-term emergency work could become a very powerful long-term investment. The Executive Director further informed the Council that WFP was focusing on long-term health issues by working with the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Development Programme and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). On the topic of genetically modified organisms, he explained that the policy of WFP was to ask the donor Government to certify that genetically modified food met the health and safety standards for consumption by its own citizens. In response to enquiries about the use of modern information technologies and early warning systems to prevent further famine, the Executive Director stated that WFP was making large investments in information technology to provide a vulnerability assessment map of every country in the world. In conclusion, the Executive Director asked Council members to support WFP financially, to make the case to their Governments as to the importance of its work in terms of the peace and security agenda, and to take the longer view regarding investment in development.²¹

At its 4736th meeting, on 7 April 2003, at which statements were made by a majority of Council members,²² the Council again heard a briefing by Mr. James Morris, Executive Director of the World Food Programme.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (United Kingdom); p. 6 (Mauritius); and p. 7 (Singapore).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-16.

²² The representative of the Russian Federation did not make a statement.

The Executive Director stated that the causes of Africa's food crises — recurring droughts, failed economic policies, hostility and conflict, and the extraordinary impact of HIV/AIDS — had not changed. He informed the Council that FAO had reported an increase in chronic hunger in the developing world outside China, and WHO deemed hunger to be the greatest factor in poor health in the world. On the positive side, he welcomed the placement of hunger at the top of the Secretary-General's agenda, and the announcement made by France and the United States that they were working together, within the framework of the Group of Eight, to focus the world on the African food crises. He also told the Council that the issue of genetically modified food was no longer delaying or disrupting deliveries. Referring to the situation in Zimbabwe, he underlined that the WFP goal was to depoliticize food aid in that country, on the rationale that food should be available to all, on the basis of humanitarian principles. He further drew attention to the situation created by drought in the Horn of Africa and the deterioration of food security in the western Sahel. He announced that the Programme's early response, assessment and surveillance systems enabled it to respond more effectively.

With respect to the Council's role in addressing food crises, the Executive Director stated that the Council could help to put humanitarian issues at the centre of the world's agenda, as humanitarian issues were also security issues. In response to questions asked by representatives, he emphasized that leadership and governance were pivotal and basic to everything, as demonstrated by the AIDS crisis in southern Africa, and reported that WFP was focusing on the importance of agricultural investment and broadening the donor base.

He expressed regret that even though WFP sought to invest as many of its resources as possible in long-term development, over the years an increase in its emergency work meant that only 20 per cent of its resources were aimed at the prevention of food shortages. On the issue of food as a means to prevent conflict, he said that although such efforts had been successful in Angola and Sierra Leone, WFP tried to stay focused on the humanitarian agenda and absent itself from all other political debates in progress. He also called for a stronger donor commitment to emergency food aid based on better targeting and more sophisticated early-warning systems, and for a substantial increase in support for investment in basic agricultural infrastructure.²³

The representative of the United Kingdom expressed the view that while the United Nations system should address the structural causes of food crises, the proposals put forth by the Executive Director did not fall within the Council's responsibility, but to the United Nations family, the donor countries and the Governments on the ground.²⁴ While acknowledging the limits to the Council's mandate, in the light of the food crisis, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic insisted the Council should clarify the role it could play in resolving that important problem.²⁵ Stressing that the Council should have the knowledge and the capacity necessary for integrating food security into its approach to conflicts in Africa, the representative of Bulgaria believed that the Council should not be timid, nor worry about going beyond its area of competence.²⁶

²³ S/PV.4736, pp. 2-6, 8-9, and 13-16.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

51. Kimberley Process Certification Scheme

Initial proceedings

Decision of 28 January 2003 (4694th meeting): resolution 1459 (2003)

At its 4694th meeting, on 28 January 2003, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled “Kimberley Process Certification Scheme”. The President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution;¹ it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1459 (2003), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Strongly supported the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme, as well as the ongoing process to refine and implement the regime, adopted at the Interlaken conference as a valuable contribution against trafficking in conflict diamonds, looked forward to its implementation, and strongly encouraged the participants to further resolve outstanding issues;

Welcomed the voluntary system of industry self-regulation, as described in the Interlaken Declaration;

Stressed that the widest possible participation in the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme was essential and should be encouraged and facilitated, and urged all Member States to participate actively in the Scheme.

¹ S/2003/54.

52. The Security Council and regional organizations: facing the new challenges to international peace and security

Initial proceedings

Deliberations of 11 April 2003 (4739th meeting)

At its 4739th meeting, on 11 April 2003, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled “The Security Council and regional organizations: facing the new challenges to international peace and security”.¹

During the meeting, there was an interactive discussion, and statements were made by most members of the Council,² the Secretary-General, the representative of Greece (on behalf of the European Union³), and the representatives of the Organization of

American States, the African Union, the League of Arab States, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS).⁴

In his statement, the Secretary-General stressed the joint interest of regional organizations and the United Nations in addressing current challenges to peace and security. He stated that, in its endeavours to deal with a range of crises, the United Nations had relied on regional partners in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America, and that from those experiences, a great

¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. XII, part III, sect. A, with regard to general considerations of the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter.

² The representative of Mexico did not make a statement.

³ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and

Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

⁴ Mexico was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs; the European Union by the Deputy Minister for Foreign Relations of Greece; and the African Union by the Minister for Provincial and Local Government of South Africa. Also present were a group of parliamentarians from Mexico and the President of the General Assembly.

deal had been learned about the need to transform a sense of collective insecurity into a system of collective security. He added that this was precisely the purpose of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations.⁵

The Secretary-General of the Organization of American States pointed out that the principal challenges to security in the Americas lay in non-military threats such as terrorism, drug trafficking, illicit trade in arms or natural disasters. He detailed the different regional instruments that had been created to tackle those threats and that dealt with prevention of conflicts primarily through peaceful means.⁶

Referring to the questions of Iraq and the Middle East as cases in point, the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States detailed the engagement by his organization and discussed the role of the Council vis-à-vis such efforts. He regretted that the Council had remained silent after the war in Iraq had started since that had affected its credibility and role. He also regretted that the Council did not act on the League's peace initiative to bring an end to the Arab-Israeli dispute. While agreeing with the importance of peacekeeping, peacemaking and peacebuilding operations, he pressed for different and quicker mechanisms to deal with the current reality. In view of the deteriorating situation in the Middle East, as accentuated by the invasion of Iraq, and the failure by the Council and the General Assembly to address the conflict, he proposed the convening of an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations on international peace, its maintenance and the challenges facing it.⁷

The Secretary-General of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe stated that to increase the organization's responsiveness to modern security challenges, OSCE had decided to develop a strategy to address threats in the twenty-first century and to identify options for potential OSCE involvement in peacekeeping in the OSCE region. He highlighted a number of examples of cooperation and operational flexibility with multiple partners, including United Nations missions in the region such as those in Kosovo and Georgia, where OSCE had paid special attention to the complementarity of its efforts with those of the

United Nations which was indeed the vital cornerstone of multilateral responsibility and action.⁸

The representative of the African Union pointed out that initiatives taken in the spirit of Africans taking responsibility for the stability of their own region, including the establishment of the Peace and Security Council, must be encouraged as an important development. In the light of those developments, he stated that the African Union would work with the Council to assume collective responsibility for the identification of problems and the formulation of appropriate strategies to solve them.⁹

The representative of Greece, speaking on behalf of the European Union, stated that the European Union aimed to support the primary responsibility of the Council for the maintenance of international peace and security by developing a crisis management capacity. He further added that the European Union had made a concerted effort to develop its organizational capacity to respond effectively to the challenges posed by internal disputes. He elaborated on the ways in which the European Union was intensifying practical cooperation in crisis management operations with the United Nations system, which included the European Union Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina.¹⁰

The Executive Secretary of the Economic Community of West African States stated that the major challenge facing the West African region was the spate of conflicts to which ECOWAS was responding within the context of its Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management, Resolution, Peacekeeping and Security. He referred to the situations in Côte d'Ivoire and Liberia to illustrate the pressing need for collaboration between ECOWAS and the Council in the area of conflict resolution. In the case of Côte d'Ivoire, the Executive Secretary called for the Council to provide the necessary support to sustain the operations of the ECOWAS mission. Regarding Liberia, whose instability posed a threat to neighbouring countries, he urged the Council to consider an appropriate monitoring mechanism for the ceasefire.¹¹

In their statements, all representatives agreed that in addressing new challenges and threats, regional organizations had an essential role to play and that

⁵ S/PV.4739 and Corr.1, pp. 3-4.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

⁷ Ibid., pp. 13-17.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 19-21.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 25-26.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 29-31.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 33-34.

cooperation between them and the United Nations, particularly the Council, had to be strengthened. The main challenges that the United Nations and regional organizations must face together had been identified as terrorism¹² and conflict prevention and management, in particular in Africa.¹³

Many speakers touched on the primary responsibility of the Council for the maintenance of international peace and security. Some considered it indisputable that regional security operations remained mandated by the Council.¹⁴ The representative of Pakistan was of the view that regional organizations could be helpful and viable only so long as they acted on the basis of the principles of the Charter and in response to the legality established by Council resolutions.¹⁵ In a similar vein, the representative of Chile opined that the work of regional organizations should be done through a dynamic and energetic relationship with the Council in the framework of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations.¹⁶ At

the same time, several speakers pointed out the importance of complementarity between the United Nations and regional organizations.¹⁷ In that context, the representative of France stressed that each organization should intervene first and foremost in the area where it could provide real added value.¹⁸ The representative of China stated that before taking any decision on African issues, the Security Council should strive to coordinate and cooperate with the respective regional organizations so that its decisions better reflected the positions of those organizations and the countries involved, given they had the first say in the settlement.¹⁹

Some representatives outlined concrete proposals on how to strengthen the relationship between regional organizations and the United Nations system, including information exchange through a structured dialogue on a regular and substantive basis²⁰ and capacity development for local and regional dispute settlement.²¹

In closing, the President (Mexico) indicated his intention to circulate the conclusions of the meeting.²²

¹² Ibid., p. 9 (Chile); p. 11 (United States); p. 18 (United Kingdom); p. 22 (Russian Federation); p. 23 (Bulgaria); and p. 27 (Cameroon).

¹³ Ibid., p. 5 (Germany); p. 9 (Chile); pp. 10-11 (United States); p. 27 (Cameroon); p. 28 (China); p. 31 (Spain); and p. 35 (France).

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 5 (Germany); p. 22 (Russian Federation); and p. 23 (Bulgaria).

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 5 (Germany); p. 22 (Russian Federation); p. 28 (China); and p. 35 (France).

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 35.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 28.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 5 (Germany); p. 18 (United Kingdom); and p. 35 (France).

²¹ Ibid., p. 18 (United Kingdom).

²² Ibid., p. 37; see S/2003/506, annex.

53. The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes

Initial proceedings

Decision of 13 May 2003 (4753rd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4753rd meeting,¹ on 13 May 2003, the Security Council included the item entitled “The role

of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes” in its agenda. At the meeting, statements were made by the Secretary-General, Sir Brian Urquhart (former Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs), Mr. Jamsheed Marker (former Personal Representative of the Secretary-General for East Timor), Mr. Nabil Elaraby (judge of the International Court of Justice) and by all Council members and the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Colombia, Ethiopia, Greece (on behalf of the European Union²), Honduras, India and Indonesia.

¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. X, part III, sect. A, with regard to the decisions of the Security Council concerning the pacific settlement of disputes; and part IV, with regard to the constitutional discussion bearing on the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter, sections relating to the relevance of the provisions of Chapter VI in relation to the prevention of conflicts and the relevance of the provisions of Chapter VI in comparison to the provisions of Chapter VII.

² Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania,

In his opening remarks, the Secretary-General noted that Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations stood at the heart of the Organization's system of collective security, and stressed that the Council could play a key role in conflict prevention, as the Council itself recognized in resolution 1366 (2001). He added that the Council could help to identify and address root causes early, when opportunities for constructive dialogue and other peaceful means were greatest, and ensure an integrated approach that brought together all factors and all actors, including civil society. Furthermore, he added, the Council could support the other United Nations organs in their efforts to resolve disputes or address volatile situations before they erupted into full-fledged threats to international peace and security.³

The former Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, noted, *inter alia*, that pacific settlement could be a long and untidy process, with different problems calling for different approaches, and stressed that it was seldom newsworthy, especially when successful. When, as had happened not long before, disagreements of the Council members were blamed on the institution of the Council itself, the Council's standing in pacific settlement and in other matters was inevitably diminished. At the same time, he underlined that an essential prerequisite for moving forward in an infinitely complex world was the growing effectiveness of the pacific settlement of disputes.⁴

The former Personal Representative of the Secretary-General for East Timor noted that while Chapter VII constituted the iron fist of the Council, its latent efficacy could be considerably enhanced through a timely and judicious application of the velvet glove of Chapter VI. Among several suggestions on ways to promote the pacific settlement of disputes, he encouraged the Council to utilize its mandatory enforcement authority under Chapter VII to persuade parties to engage in the processes for pacific settlement envisaged under Chapter VI.⁵

Mr. Elaraby highlighted that it was important for the Council and the International Court of Justice to act in tandem, emphasizing, *inter alia*, that the Council

Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³ S/PV.4753, pp. 2-3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

should consider strict application of the provisions of Articles 27 (3) and 36 (3) of the Charter. He underlined the importance of increasing the acceptance by States of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, recalling that that recommendation was contained in the report of the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Peace".⁶

In their reactions to the briefings, the majority of speakers recognized the primary role of the Council in the pacific settlement of disputes and voiced the need for the Council to increasingly explore and revert to the provisions of Chapter VI. They acknowledged that, unlike Chapter VII, Chapter VI provided more flexibility in the use of instruments to resolve disputes, such as investigative and recommendatory powers. Although emphasizing that the responsibility to prevent and resolve conflicts and disputes rested first and foremost with the parties, several speakers stressed the importance of the Council playing a more active role in conflict prevention and preventive diplomacy efforts, and making the shift from a culture of reaction to a culture of prevention. Many speakers, *inter alia*, recognized the mandated role of other United Nations organs in the pacific settlement of disputes, notably the General Assembly, the Secretariat and the International Court of Justice; expressed support for the efforts of the Secretary-General and his envoys to conduct "good offices" and mediation; underlined the importance of the Council's coordination with regional organizations in the pacific settlement of disputes; cited the role of peacekeeping operations and observer missions in preventing the outbreak of further conflict and stabilizing a military situation; and highlighted the importance of addressing the root causes of conflicts.

The President then made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁷ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its commitment to maintain international peace and security through effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace or other breaches of the peace and to bring about, by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, the adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

Recognized that the United Nations and its organs could play an important role in preventing disputes arising between parties, in preventing existing disputes escalating into conflicts and in containing and resolving the conflicts when they occur;

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9. For the report, see S/24111

⁷ S/PRST/2003/5.

Reiterated its commitment to make a wider and more effective use of the procedures and means enshrined in the provisions of the Charter regarding the pacific settlement of disputes, as one of the essential components of its work to promote and maintain international peace and security.

54. Security Council mission

Overview

During the period under review the Security Council completed 13 missions. Destinations included several African countries as well as Yugoslavia, East Timor, Indonesia and Afghanistan¹. Prior to 2003, missions were discussed at Council meetings under the items pertaining to the specific country or situation.² From 2003 onward, all missions were discussed under the item entitled “Security Council mission”. The table provides an overview of the missions completed during the review period. For missions discussed in 2003 under the item “Security Council mission”, summaries of the corresponding reports and meetings are presented by region.

Security Council missions 2000-2003

<i>Mission</i>	<i>Duration</i>	<i>Composition</i>	<i>Reports and terms of reference</i>	<i>Meeting No.</i>	<i>Item</i>
Implementation of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999)	27-29 April 2000	Bangladesh (head of mission), Argentina, Canada, China, Jamaica, Malaysia, Russian Federation and Ukraine	S/2000/363	4138	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
Special Mission visit to Eritrea and Ethiopia	9-10 May 2000	United States (head of mission), France, Mali, Namibia, Netherlands, Tunisia and United Kingdom	S/2000/413	4142	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
Democratic Republic of the Congo	4-8 May 2000	United States (head of mission), France, Mali, Namibia, Netherlands, Tunisia and United Kingdom	S/2000/416	4143	The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo
Sierra Leone	7-14 October 2000	United Kingdom (head of mission), Bangladesh, China, France, Jamaica, Mali, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Ukraine and United States	S/2000/992	4216	The situation in Sierra Leone
East Timor and Indonesia	9-17 November 2000	Namibia (head of mission), Argentina, Malaysia, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom and United States	S/2000/1105	4244	The situation in East Timor
Great Lakes region	15-26 May 2001	France (head of mission), China, Colombia, Ireland, Jamaica, Mali, Mauritius, Singapore,	S/2001/521 and Add.1	4323	The situation in the Great Lakes region

1 Angola, Burundi, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

2 For Security Council missions from 2000 to 2002, see the section of chap. VIII that relates to the specific country or situation. .

Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

<i>Mission</i>	<i>Duration</i>	<i>Composition</i>	<i>Reports and terms of reference</i>	<i>Meeting No.</i>	<i>Item</i>
Kosovo	16-18 June 2001	Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom and United States Bangladesh (head of mission), China, Colombia, France, Ireland, Jamaica, Mali, Mauritius, Norway, Russian Federation, Singapore, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom and United States	S/2001/600	4331	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
Ethiopia and Eritrea	21-25 February 2002	Norway (head of mission), Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Colombia, France, Guinea, Ireland, Mauritius, Mexico, Russian Federation, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom and United States	S/2002/205	4485	The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
Great Lakes region	27 April-7 May 2002	France (head of mission), Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Guinea, Ireland, Mauritius, Mexico, Norway, Russian Federation, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom and United States	S/2002/537 and Add.1	4532	The situation in the Great Lakes region
Kosovo and Belgrade	14-17 December 2002	Norway (head of mission), Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Colombia, France, Guinea, Ireland, Mauritius, Mexico, Russian Federation, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom and United States	S/2002/1376	4676	Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)
Central Africa	7-16 June 2003	France (head of mission), Angola, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, China, Germany, Guinea, Mexico, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom and United States	S/2003/653	4775, 4794	Security Council mission
West Africa	26 June-5 July 2003	United Kingdom (head of mission), Angola, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, China, France, Germany, Guinea, Mexico, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic and United States	S/2003/688	4785, 4794	Security Council mission
Afghanistan	31 October - 7 November 2003	Germany (head of mission), Angola, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, China, France, Guinea, Mexico, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom and United States	S/2003/1074	4855	Security Council mission

Africa

Missions to Central Africa (7-16 June 2003) and West Africa (26 June-5 July 2003)

Deliberations of 18 June 2003 (4775th meeting)

The Security Council mission to Central Africa from 7 to 16 June 2003 was led by the representative of France and visited Pretoria, Luanda, Kinshasa, Bunia (Democratic Republic of the Congo), Bujumbura, Kigali, Dar-es-Salaam and Entebbe (Uganda). The mission met with the President of South Africa; the President of Angola; the President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo; the President of Burundi; the President of Rwanda; the President of the United Republic of Tanzania; and the President of Uganda. The mission also met with a number of other Government officials and was briefed in Kinshasa, Bujumbura and Kigali by the United Nations Observer Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), the United Nations Office in Burundi and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes Region, respectively. In addition, some members of the mission met with representatives of international non-governmental organizations and representatives of women's organizations in Burundi. In its report to the Council dated 20 June 2003,³ found that urgent attention should be given to finishing the establishment of a transitional Government and the creation of a unified national army in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It was also stressed that the situation in Bunia and North Kivu required regional efforts to stabilize security and end impunity for crimes committed in the region. Regarding Burundi, the mission strongly encouraged the international community to provide logistic and financial assistance to the peace process to ensure its successful outcome. In addition, the mission advocated immediate budgetary support to the transitional Government so as to not compromise the progress made, and stressed the importance of examining the Government's request to establish an international judicial commission of inquiry, as stipulated in the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi.

At its 4775th meeting held on 18 June 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the

Security Council mission to Central Africa from 7 to 16 June 2003.³ During the meeting, the Council heard a briefing by the head of mission (France), followed by statements by the representatives of Rwanda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Republic of Tanzania.

In his briefing, the representative of France noted that the main goal of the mission had been to bring support to the peace processes in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Burundi, in a context of persistent hostilities in both countries. With regard to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the mission had requested the President to facilitate the establishment of a transitional Government, with a focus on national reconciliation. While the mission took place only shortly after a humanitarian crisis in the Ituri region, and in the context of intensified attacks in North and South Kivu, the head of mission underlined that the mission had called for a cessation of all hostilities and emphasized the need for regional cooperation to halt transborder support to armed groups. He commended the cooperation between MONUC and the Interim Emergency Multinational Force in stabilizing the security situation in Bunia. However, he emphasized that resolving the conflict required a political solution. In that respect, he raised the question of the role MONUC could play in the peace process and mentioned the possibility of providing the mission with a stronger mandate, particularly in the context of the Multinational Force's departure from Bunia. Regarding Burundi, the representative of France reported that the mission had welcomed the Presidential transition while also showing concern over the absence of a complete ceasefire. He underlined that, consequently, peace remained fragile and that for the transition to be a success, the rebels had to end hostilities and join the peace talks. As for the reconciliation process, he added that it was necessary for the Government to implement fully a number of reforms, particularly in the areas of justice and security. He concluded his briefing by declaring that although the mission had raised high expectations among the visited countries, it was ultimately the responsibility of each government to achieve peace by implementing the provisions of the Peace agreement. He stressed that both parties had acknowledged the need to restore confidence on both sides of the border and that the mission would welcome a declaration of good neighbourliness, in

³ S/2003/653.

addition to an international conference on peace in the Great Lakes region.⁴

In his statement, the representative of Rwanda expressed his hope that the recommendations made by the mission would help to resolve such pending issues as the complete disarmament of the former Rwandese Armed Forces and Interahamwe militias. He denied all allegations of support by the Rwandan Defence Forces to the Union des patriotes congolais and the Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie (RCD) in the Ituri region. He argued that Rwanda had not sent troops to the Democratic Republic of the Congo since October 2002 and that the withdrawal of the Rwandan troops had been acknowledged by the Third Party Verification Mechanism following the signing of the Pretoria Agreement on 30 July 2002. He further argued that the Rwandan presence prior to the withdrawal had been beneficial to the population in stopping the former Rwandese Armed Forces and Interahamwe from crossing the borders, protecting Rwandan territory and averting the risk of renewed genocide. He also criticized the lack of cooperation from the Congolese leadership in re-establishing a climate of trust between the two Governments, in spite of Rwandan efforts and good will. Consequently, he requested that the Council pressure the government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to, inter alia, honour its commitment under the various agreements and Council resolutions, stop the supply of weapons to the former Rwandese Armed Forces and Interahamwe militias and commit to establishing an inclusive, power-sharing government.⁵

In her statement, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo argued that her government was actively engaged in the establishment of transitional institutions but that the attacks of the RCD-Goma forces and their control over the Eastern region was putting a break on the State-building efforts. She held the view that RCD-Goma received support from the government of Rwanda and asked the Council to maintain its pressure on them and their supporters. In addition, she stated that the emergency situation in Bunia required a long-term solution and that the temporary action of the Interim Emergency Multinational Force, as mandated, was insufficient. Rather, she argued, the mandate of MONUC should be amended and Chapter VII invoked in order to allow the

mission to restore the peace and then maintain the peace.⁶

Finally, the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania expressed the hope that the Council would make every effort to maintain the momentum created through its mission to Central Africa. She argued that the efforts accomplished by Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo would not suffice without decisive actions and the support of the international community. She concurred with the Congolese delegate that the Council should reinforce the mandate of MONUC to ensure viable and sustained peace and security in the volatile areas. She concluded by reiterating the four-point proposal made by the President of the United Republic of Tanzania to promote peace and good governance in the region. The proposal included the adoption of a non-aggression pact, the promotion of the New Partnership for Africa's Development, an increased level of contacts and exchanges within the region and the cessation of arms proliferation.⁷

Deliberations of 9 July 2003 (4785th meeting)

The Security Council mission to West Africa was led by the representative of the United Kingdom, visited Guinea-Bissau, Nigeria, Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea and Sierra Leone. The mission was scheduled to visit Liberia but, owing to the conflict in Liberia at that time, the mission instead travelled to Accra and met with the parties to the Liberian peace talks gathered under the auspices of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). The mission met with the President of Guinea-Bissau; the President of Côte d'Ivoire; the President of Ghana and Chairman of ECOWAS (Economic Community of West African States); the President of Nigeria; and the President of Sierra Leone. The mission also met with ministers, Government officials and parliamentarians, leaders of political parties and representatives of civil society. In addition, the mission met with a number of representatives of the United Nations missions, programmes and agencies of the United Nations system.

In its report to the Council dated 11 July 2003,⁸ the mission emphasized, inter alia, the need to increase

⁴ S/PV. 4775, pp. 2-4.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 4-6.

⁶ Ibid., p. 7.

⁷ Ibid., p. 8.

⁸ S/2003/688.

international support to and coordination with ECOWAS, and stressed the important role of the new Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for West Africa in that regard. In addition, the mission stated that security sector reform was a priority in the region and that both donor countries and the United Nations system should deliver financial and training assistance in that area. The mission also proposed measures to be taken or strengthened to address such issues as the proliferation of small arms, the protection of civilians in armed conflict and the economic factors of instability and war in the region.

At its 4785th meeting, on 9 July 2003, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Report of the Security Council mission to West Africa from 26 June to 5 July 2003". The Council heard a briefing, delivered jointly by the representative of the United Kingdom, in his capacity as head of the Security Council mission to West Africa, and the representative of Mexico, in his capacity in his capacity as head of mission in Guinea-Bissau.

In his briefing, the representative of the United Kingdom underlined that the objective of the mission had been to generate within and outside of the United Nations a new momentum of support, assistance and partnership with West Africa. He was hopeful that the mission, as well as other important events such as the official visit of the President of the United States to Africa and the Summit of the African Union in Maputo, would help to trigger a new stage of effective action on African development. In Côte d'Ivoire, he stated that the mission had encouraged the President to speed the national reconciliation process and adopt an amnesty law. The mission also invited the Forces armées nationales de Côte d'Ivoire and Forces nouvelles to engage in closer dialogue, and welcomed the declaration of permanent end to hostilities issued by both groups. In respect of Liberia, the mission took stock of the call formulated by civil society groups and political parties to see an increased international involvement in their country. The head of mission expressed hope for a deployment of forces by ECOWAS, although he stressed that the effective implementation of a ceasefire and the basics of a peace agreement between the parties were a necessary prerequisite for such a deployment to be successful. He noted that, in Sierra Leone, the conditions for self-sustained stability still needed to be attained, and that the focus should be given to the diamond industry and

the security sector. He added that the drawdown of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone should be decided with regard to the progress made in the field of national institution-building. He concluded his briefing by stressing that at the regional level, the strong desire to tackle peace and development issues was weakened by a lack of resources. He therefore encouraged the international community to fund and support ECOWAS.⁹

Regarding the situation in Guinea-Bissau, the representative of Mexico informed the Council that the main goal of the visit had been to urge the government to achieve concrete steps in the political process and encourage the prompt holding of legislative elections. He stressed the distinctive, joint nature of the mission as a partnership between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. He stated that, this particular configuration allowed the mission to approach the situation of Guinea-Bissau from a double perspective: development and security. While highlighting the combined effect of economic, social and political development on peace and security, he stressed the need to adopt a regional approach to assess the impact of West African dynamics on the future of Guinea-Bissau. He stated that the process of post-conflict political reconstruction remained uncertain and warned that the national institutions were at risk owing to a very high level of instability in the country. In response, a clear commitment from the government was needed as well as increased support from the international community, in particular from the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and donor countries.¹⁰

**Decision of 25 July 2003 (4794th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 4794th meeting, on 25 July 2003, the Council included in its agenda the item reports of the Security Council missions to Central Africa from 7 to 16 June 2003 and of the Security Council mission to West Africa from 26 June to 5 July 2003.¹¹ At the meeting, the President (Spain) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹² by which the Council, inter alia:

⁹ S/PV.4785, pp. 2-5.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 5-7.

¹¹ S/2003/653 and S/2003/688.

¹² S/PRST/2003/12.

Welcomed the recommendations made in the reports of its mission to Central Africa undertaken from 7 to 16 June 2003 and its mission to West Africa undertaken from 26 June to 5 July 2003;

Endorsed the recommendations which fall within its area of responsibility and wished to see them implemented;

Emphasized the importance of a subregional approach to issues such as small arms and light weapons, mercenaries, child soldiers and humanitarian access, and stressed that follow-up activity by the United Nations would require close cooperation and coordination throughout the United Nations system.

Asia

Mission to Afghanistan (31 October-7 November 2003)

Deliberations of 11 November 2003 (4855th meeting)

The Security Council mission to Afghanistan, was led by the representative of Germany and was based in Kabul but travelled to Herat and Mazar-e-Sharif. A visit to Kandahar was cancelled owing to the prevailing security situation. The mission held discussions with the Afghan Transitional Administration, regional leaders, the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan, United Nations agencies, the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), the coalition forces, the diplomatic community, non-governmental organizations and civil society. In its report to the Council of 11 November 2003,¹³ the mission found that the withdrawal of all factional forces from Kabul should be addressed as a matter of urgency; that security sector reform should receive prompt financial support from the international community; and that the reform of the Afghan Ministry of Defence should be adapted and applied to the other key State institutions. The mission also recommended that a national reconciliation process be initiated and a conference be organized in follow-up to the Bonn Agreement of 5 December 2001.¹⁴

At its 4855th meeting, held on 11 November 2003, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Security Council mission to Afghanistan from 31 October to 7 November 2003.¹³ During the meeting,

¹³ S/2003/1074.

¹⁴ Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan pending the Re-establishment of Permanent Government Institutions (see S/2001/1154).

the head of the mission (Germany) briefed Council members on the visit.

In his briefing, the head of mission noted that the mission had given the Council an opportunity to collect information on the ongoing constitutional process, in particular the release of a draft constitution, two years after the signature of the Bonn Agreement. He stressed that the purpose of the mission had been to assure the Afghan people that the Council and the international community would continue to promote and support reconstruction and stabilization efforts in the country. The mission had requested that the various parties and local political actors stop factional fighting, engage in the Bonn process and cooperate with the central Government. The head of mission noted that significant progress had been made towards the reconstruction of the country. However terrorism, factional fighting and drug-related crimes, which were identified by all interlocutors as the three main causes of insecurity, had slowed down the reconstruction efforts and challenged the national institution-building processes. On the crucial issue of security in Afghanistan, he pointed out the destructive effect of terrorist activities on reconstruction efforts. Similarly, he noted that the issue of local factionalism required greater cooperation between the provinces and the central Government and the strengthening of the rule of law. To that end, the mission had strongly encouraged the authorities to apply reforms, already conducted in the northern region, such as the integration of local forces into a national army, the demilitarization of Mazar-e-Sharif and the appointment of staff in key positions in the local administration. In regard to international assistance in the security sector, he recalled that Afghan ownership over its national security was crucial. He acknowledged, however, that the deployment of international forces would be necessary until Afghan security institutions could be developed. In that respect, the mission commended the positive role of the International Security Assistance Force in maintaining security in Kabul and providing reconstruction assistance in Mazar-e-Sharif, and expressed its hope with regard to the contribution of ISAF in supporting the adoption of the new Afghan constitution and the upcoming electoral process. In conclusion, he noted that the mission had also met with representatives of civil society, who underlined the importance of establishing a mechanism for transitional justice, owing to the continued presence of perpetrators of grave human rights violations at a high

level in public institutions. However, senior officials of the Government and others suggested that Afghanistan was too weak to face the challenges of the past and that measures to enhance good governance should be given priority. Finally, representatives of women's

organizations pointed out that their active participation in the public arena was being hampered, and expressed special concern over the lack of explicit guarantees for women's rights in the draft constitution.¹⁵

¹⁵ S/PV.4855, pp. 2-6.

55. Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role

Initial proceedings

Decision of 24 September 2003 (4833rd meeting): statement by the President

At its 4833rd meeting, on 24 September 2003, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role". Statements were made by the Secretary-General and by all members of the Council.¹

The Secretary-General observed that the United Nations, through many complex operations, had learned that the rule of law was not a luxury and that justice was not a side issue. He advocated a comprehensive approach to justice and the rule of law, which needed to encompass the entire criminal justice chain. He pointed out that the actions of the United Nations needed to be based in its standards for human rights and the administration of justice and in the principles of international humanitarian law, human rights law, refugee law and criminal law. He stated that the United Nations needed, wherever possible, to guide rather than direct, and reinforce rather than replace, with the aim of leaving behind strong local institutions when it departed. He asserted that ending the climate of impunity was vital to restoring public confidence, and that transitional justice mechanisms needed to concentrate not only on individual responsibility for serious crimes, but also on the need to achieve national reconciliation. He recognized that at times, the goals of justice and reconciliation competed with each other, and added that, in each case, the Council needed to attempt to balance the demands of peace and justice.²

¹ At the meeting, Bulgaria, Chile, China, France, Guinea, Mexico, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Spain and the Syrian Arab Republic were represented by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs. The United Kingdom was represented by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs.

² S/PV.4833, pp. 2-4.

In their statements, participants called for, inter alia, a more intensive use of measures for the pacific settlement of disputes, as contemplated in Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations; greater compliance with the resolutions of the Council; ensuring application of international human rights and humanitarian law and all the provisions of the Geneva Conventions; and greater coordination within the United Nations system, as well as with other international institutions, regional organizations, local partners and non-governmental organizations. Many speakers commended the creation of the ad hoc tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, the Special Court for Sierra Leone, and the International Criminal Court. A number of representatives advocated the formation of a pool of experts for emergency situations in the areas of justice and the rule of law. A number of speakers held the view that justice and the rule of law needed to be given earnest attention in United Nations peacekeeping operations and post-conflict reconstruction. Some representatives emphasized the need for development, which was a necessary condition for justice and the rule of law.

The representative of Pakistan observed that the resolutions and decisions of the Council needed to be implemented uniformly and without discrimination and also with equal force, irrespective of their falling within Chapter VI or Chapter VII of the Charter. He warned that selective implementation eroded confidence in the system and undermined the credibility of the United Nations.³ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic expressed the view that a number of the resolutions adopted by the Council had been imposed on some States while not truly imposed on others.⁴

³ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

The representative of the Russian Federation believed that joint efforts needed to be made to ensure that the legal bases for peacekeeping were strengthened, in accordance with the Charter and the decisions of the Council. He also remarked that the work of United Nations structures needed to be conducted in strict accordance with the decisions of the Council and that it needed to preclude any arbitrary or broader interpretation of those decisions, which could have negative consequences for the success of peacekeeping efforts and for the credibility of the United Nations in general.⁵

The representative of the United States expressed the view that launching prosecutions in the midst of negotiations might not be the best route to post-conflict development, whereas flexibility in approach was needed.⁶ The representative of the United Kingdom expressed the hope that the International Criminal Court would eventually remove the need for separate international tribunals.⁷

The representative of Cameroon stressed that the United Nations should give priority to providing security to assuring State reform and preventing the breakdown of the State, and to laying down the basis for the establishment of a modern State. In other words, the United Nations was expected to work for the reconstruction of the State, as understood under Articles 2 and 4 of the Charter.⁸

At the same meeting, the President (United Kingdom) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁹ which read, in part:

The Security Council met at the ministerial level on 24 September 2003 to consider "Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role". Ministers expressed their respective views and understandings on, and reaffirmed the vital importance of, these issues, recalling the repeated emphasis given to them in the work of the Council, for example in the context of the protection of civilians in armed conflict, in relation to peacekeeping operations and in connection with international criminal justice;

The statements made on 24 September demonstrated the abundant wealth of relevant experience and expertise that exists within the United Nations system and in the Member States. Ministers considered that it would be appropriate to examine

further how to harness and direct this expertise and experience so that it would be more readily accessible to the Council, to the wider United Nations membership and to the international community as a whole, so that the lessons and experience of the past could be, as appropriate, learned and built on. The Council welcomed in particular the offer by the Secretary-General to provide a report which could guide and inform further consideration of these matters.

Deliberations of 30 September 2003 (4835th meeting)

At its 4835th meeting, on 30 September 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, following which statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Brazil, Canada, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Finland, Italy (on behalf of the European Union¹⁰), Japan, Jordan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago and Uruguay, as well as the Legal Counsel of the United Nations.

The Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, on behalf of several Secretariat departments and United Nations entities that were engaged in supporting justice and the rule of law in post-conflict societies, affirmed that the United Nations could no longer afford to treat the rule of law as a side activity in which they engaged "longside political objectives. He advocated ensuring that the rule of law figured more prominently from the early stages of peace negotiations onwards. He believed that it had become clear that the effectiveness of the United Nations in promoting the rule of law in many parts of the world had been hampered by the inadequacy of mandates and resources. He commented that the international tribunals had so far not always proved to be efficient or effective instruments for prosecuting and trying those suspected of the most serious crimes. He expressed support for, inter alia, a move towards broader assistance and support to national justice systems, and stressed the need to ensure that any amnesty clauses in peace agreements exclude amnesties for war crimes, genocide, crimes against

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁹ S/PRST/2003/15.

¹⁰ Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

humanity and other serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian law. Finally, he pointed out that any strategy adopted needed to have as its primary objective the promotion of national ownership of justice systems and capacity-building, and that international norms and standards needed to be the reference point of all their work.¹¹

Most of the speakers agreed on the importance of, *inter alia*, the strengthening and consolidation of local rule-of-law capacity; the involvement of local actors; the promotion of national ownership and capacity-building; the core of the peaceful settlement of disputes; the establishment of the International Criminal Court, which was based on the principle of complementarity, as well as the other international tribunals; the inclusion of justice and the rule-of-law elements in peace operations and mission mandates; the mainstreaming of rule-of-law aspects into the work of the United Nations; and the need for better resources and technical assistance. Many representatives welcomed the offer by the Secretary-General to provide a report on the issue. Several speakers supported, *inter alia*, the formation of a pool of experts in the rule of law; stronger cooperation between the United Nations and international organizations; and closer coordination between donors.

Some representatives suggested that the Council was well positioned to make use of article 13 (b) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and refer relevant situations to the Court as a tool for fighting impunity.¹² The representative of New Zealand

expressed the hope that the Council would cooperate with the International Criminal Court within the framework of the Rome Statute and the Charter, and would refrain from actions that would undermine the effective operation of the Court.¹³ The representative of Canada suggested that the concerns in some quarters about the theoretical possibility of the International Criminal Court investigating nationals of certain non-State parties were unwarranted. He added that his delegation assumed that in cases where the jurisdiction of Court was clearly accepted by the State affected, and where that State was unwilling or unable to respond to massive crimes, the Council would support the Court in bringing justice for victims.¹⁴ The representative of Sweden suggested that there should be no obstacles to the Court eventually achieving universal application.¹⁵

The representative of Uruguay expressed the view that justice and the maintenance of international peace and security could sometimes be incompatible goals, and in that context he recalled that article 16 of the Statute of the International Criminal Court authorized the Council to request that the Court suspend investigations or prosecutions that had been initiated if those proceedings interfered with the Council's mission to maintain international peace and security. Nonetheless, he held that resolutions 1422 (2002) and 1487 (2003)¹⁶ were not correct applications of that article of the Statute.¹⁷

¹¹ S/PV.4835, pp. 3-7.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 20 (Jordan); and p. 22 (Sweden).

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹⁶ For information on these resolutions, see sect. 47.D, of the present chapter, on United Nations peacekeeping.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-26.

56. Briefings

During the period under review, the Security Council heard a number of briefings that were not explicitly connected to any item on the Council's agenda. Where appropriate, the briefings have been covered in the sections of chapter VIII dealing with the regions.¹ Briefings held in closed meetings and those that touched on issues cutting across regions are covered here.

The Council heard briefings in closed meetings from the President of the International Court of Justice,² the Secretary-General,³ and the Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.⁴

At its 4673rd and 4888th meetings, respectively, the Council heard briefings under the item entitled "Briefings by the Chairmen of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia, the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa, and the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations"⁵ and under the item entitled "Briefings by Chairmen of Security Council Committees and Working Groups".⁶ During the briefings, the Chairmen provided an overview of the work of their respective committees and working groups.⁷

At the 4219th meeting on 10 November 2000, and the 4470th meeting, on 7 February 2002, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees briefed the Council and made proposals in the areas of peace operations and peacebuilding. The briefings touched on a number of areas relating to refugees, including, inter alia, the need to initiate and implement peace operations more rapidly; the importance of peacebuilding and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration; the gap between emergency, short-term humanitarian activities and the implementation of medium to long-term development and reconstruction programmes; and an overview of the situations in several countries and regions, including Afghanistan and Sierra Leone, and the Balkans and the Great Lakes region. Following the briefings, members of the Council made statements and asked questions, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees responded to points raised by the members of the Council.

1 See sect. 30.E, with regard to the briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans; and sect. 30.D, footnote 236, with regard to the briefing by His Excellency Mr. Nebojša Čović, Deputy Prime Minister of Serbia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the present chapter.

2 4212th, 4398th and 4636th meetings, held on 31 October 2000, 29 October 2001 and 29 October 2002, respectively.

3 4226th meeting, held on 17 November 2000.

4 4266th meeting, held on 29 January 2001.

5 4673rd meeting, held on 18 December 2002.

6 4888th meeting, held on 22 December 2003. The Council was briefed by the Chairmen of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait; the Committee established pursuant to resolution 751 (1992) concerning Somalia; the Committee established pursuant to resolution 918 (1994) concerning Rwanda; the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone; and the Working Group on General Issues on Sanctions.

7 For more information on the above-mentioned committees, see chap. V, part I, sect. A, with regard to standing committees and ad hoc committees.

Chapter IX

Decisions taken by the Security Council in the exercise of its other functions and powers

Note

During the period under review, the Security Council took a number of decisions in the exercise of its functions and powers other than those relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. The Council's practice relating to these decisions has been addressed elsewhere in this Supplement.

The practice of the Council in connection with (a) the appointment of the Secretary-General, and (b) the election of members of the International Court of Justice is dealt with in chapter VI (the relations of the Council with other organs of the United Nations).

Decisions of the Security Council on the question of the admission of new Members to the United Nations are dealt with in chapter VII.

Chapter X

Consideration of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introductory note	843
Part I. Referral of disputes and situations to the Security Council	846
Note	846
Part II. Investigation of disputes and fact-finding	854
Note	854
Part III. Decisions of the Security Council concerning the pacific settlement of disputes	858
Note	858
A. Decisions of the Security Council on general and thematic issues relating to the pacific settlement of disputes	860
B. Recommendations relating to methods, procedures or terms of the pacific settlement of disputes	862
C. Decisions involving the Secretary-General in the Council's efforts at the pacific settlement of disputes	878
D. Decisions involving regional arrangements or agencies	891
Part IV. Constitutional discussion bearing on the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter	891
Note	891

Introductory note

Chapter X deals with the practice of the Security Council aimed at promoting and implementing recommendations and methods or procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes within the framework of Articles 33 to 38 of Chapter VI and Articles 11 and 99 of the Charter.

The period under review was marked by a considerable expansion of the scope of Council action within the framework of Chapter VI of the Charter. Furthermore, following the issuance of the first report of the Secretary-General on the prevention of armed conflict,¹ the Council, by a number of decisions, recalling its key role in the peaceful settlement of disputes under Chapter VI of the Charter, emphasized the importance of finding better ways to prevent the outbreak as well as the recurrence of conflicts. Highlighting its continuing commitment to addressing the prevention of armed conflict in all regions of the world, the Council endorsed the need to create a culture of prevention and reaffirmed that early warning, preventive diplomacy, preventive deployment, preventive disarmament and post-conflict peacebuilding were interdependent and complementary components of a comprehensive conflict prevention strategy. Against this background, mindful of the need to respect the principle of sovereignty and non-interference in matters of domestic jurisdiction of States, the Council increasingly expanded the use of a number of instruments aimed at preventing the outbreak and/or the recurrence of conflicts, including, inter alia, Security Council missions and fact-finding missions, in order to determine whether any dispute or any situation might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute; support for the good offices of the Special Representatives and Envoys of the Secretary-General; establishment of special political missions in post-conflict situations which included in their mandates elements relating to the implementation of peace agreements and/or ceasefire agreements as well as to political dialogue, national reconciliation and capacity-building; and the inclusion of elements of conflict prevention and peacebuilding in integrated peacekeeping operations.

As chapter VIII of this Supplement sets out a full account of Council proceedings with regard to the peaceful settlement of disputes, the present chapter will not discuss the practice of the Security Council aimed at the peaceful settlement of disputes in a comprehensive manner. Instead, chapter X will focus on selected material which may best serve to highlight the ways in which the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter were applied and interpreted in the relevant decisions and deliberations of the Council.

The manner of presenting and classifying the relevant material has been devised to set forth the practices and procedures to which the Council has had recourse in a readily accessible form. In line with the previous Supplement of the *Repertoire* covering the period from 1996 to 1999, the material has been categorized under thematic headings rather than individual Articles of the Charter, so as to avoid ascribing to specific Articles of the Charter Council proceedings or decisions, which do not themselves refer to any such Article.

Part I illustrates how, under Article 35, Member States and States which are not members of the United Nations have brought new disputes and situations to the attention of the Security Council. That part also touches upon the functions and

¹ S/2001/574.

practice of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General, under Articles 11 (3) and 99 of the Charter respectively, in calling the attention of the Security Council to matters which are likely to threaten the maintenance of international peace and security. Part II sets out investigative and fact-finding activities initiated and performed by the Council that may be deemed to fall under the scope of Article 34. Part III provides an overview of the recommendations and decisions of the Council with regard to the pacific settlement of disputes. Specifically, it illustrates the recommendations of the Council to the parties to a conflict, and its support for the endeavours of the Secretary-General in the peaceful settlement of disputes. Finally, part IV reflects constitutional discussions within the Security Council on the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter.

The following Articles of the Charter are cited in chapter X:

Article 11

3. The General Assembly may call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security.

Article 33

1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

Article 34

The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 35

1. Any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly.

2. A state which is not a Member of the United Nations may bring to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly any dispute to which it is a party if it accepts in advance, for the purposes of the dispute, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the present Charter.

3. The proceedings of the General Assembly in respect of matters brought to its attention under this Article will be subject to the provisions of Articles 11 and 12.

Article 36

- 1. The Security Council may, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 or of a situation of like nature, recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.*
- 2. The Security Council should take into consideration any procedures for the settlement of the dispute which have already been adopted by the parties.*
- 3. In making recommendations under this Article the Security Council should also take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Court.*

Article 37

- 1. Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that Article, they shall refer it to the Security Council.*
- 2. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under Article 36 or to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.*

Article 38

Without prejudice to the provisions of Articles 33 to 37, the Security Council may, if all the parties to any dispute so request, make recommendations to the parties with a view to a pacific settlement of the dispute.

Article 99

The Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security.

Part I

Referral of disputes and situations to the Security Council

Note

Within the framework of the Charter, Articles 35 (1) and (2) and 37 (1) are generally regarded as the provisions on the basis of which States may or, in the case of Article 37 (1), shall, refer disputes to the Security Council. The practice of the Council in this regard is described below in five sections.

The first section, entitled “Referrals by States”, provides an overview of the referrals of disputes and situations to the Council under Article 35 (1) and (2). During the period under review, disputes and situations were mainly referred to the Council, generally by means of a communication, by members of the United Nations, either by those directly affected and/or through third States and regional groups. The section also outlines, in the form of a table, new disputes or situations referred to the Council and on the basis of which the Council convened meetings under new agenda items during the period under consideration. Following the trend of previous periods, the number of new referrals to the Council further decreased during the period 2000-2003.

The second section, entitled “Nature of matters referred to the Security Council”, outlines the subject matter of the relevant communications referred by Member States to the Council. This is followed by another section entitled “Action requested of the Security Council” which analyses the type of action requested of the Security Council by Member States submitting a dispute or a situation to the Council.

The last two sections, entitled respectively “Referrals by the Secretary-General” and “Referrals by the General Assembly”, refer to Articles 11 (3) and 99 of the Charter, according to which the General Assembly and the Secretary-General, respectively, may refer matters which are likely to endanger international peace and security to the Council. During the period under review, neither the General Assembly nor the Secretary-General explicitly referred any matters to the Council.

Referrals by States

According to Article 35, which, in the absence of evidence pointing to other Charter provisions, is commonly regarded as the basis on which matters are referred to the Council by States, any Member State may bring to the Council’s attention any “dispute” or “situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute”. While Article 35 was expressly referred to in a small number of communications, most communications did not cite any specific Article as the basis on which they were submitted.²

According to Article 35 (2) of the Charter, a State which is not a member of the United Nations may bring to the attention of the Security Council any dispute to which it is a party if it accepts in advance, for the purposes of the dispute, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the Charter. During the period under consideration, States which were not members of the United Nations did not submit any dispute or situation to the attention of the Council. Situations were referred to the Security Council exclusively under the provisions of Article 35 (1), directly by the affected Member States, either on their own³ or through communications from third States and/or regional groups.⁴

² For explicit references to Article 35, see the following communications: identical letters dated 14 September 2001 from the representative of Afghanistan addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council in connection with the situation in Afghanistan (S/2001/870); and letter dated 13 April 2000 from the representative of Germany addressed to the President of the Security Council in connection with the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia (S/2000/312).

³ See, for example, the following letters addressed to the President of the Security Council: letter dated 13 February 2000 from the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia requesting an urgent meeting of the Council to discuss the deterioration of the situation of the Serbs and other non-Albanians in Kosovo and Metohija (S/2000/111); letter dated 20 May 2000 from the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia requesting an urgent meeting of the Council following the failure of the Presidency of the European Union to extend an invitation to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to participate in the Ministerial Meeting of

the Peace Implementation Council in Brussels on 23 and 24 May 2000 (S/2000/458); letter dated 6 June 2000 from the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia requesting an urgent meeting of the Council to discuss the “crime of ethnic Albanian terrorists and the failure of the international presences to prevent the crime, as well as the abuse of power by the British members of KFOR (Kosovo Force) who shot at unarmed Serbian civilians” (S/2000/543); letter dated 29 June 2000 from the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia requesting a meeting of the Council to consider the situation in Kosovo and Metohija (S/2000/636); letter dated 19 July 2000 from the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia requesting an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the intention of the United Nations Interim Administration in Kosovo (UNMIK) to “take over the Metallurgical Section of the RMHK Trepca Shareholding Corporation in Kosovska Mitrovica, Kosovo and Metohija” (S/2000/716); and letter dated 14 August 2000 from the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia requesting an urgent meeting of the Council to consider “the armed attack on and the usurpation of the RMHK Trepca Shareholding Corporation by the Kosovo Force” (S/2000/801). See also identical letters dated 6 February 2001 from the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council requesting a meeting of the Council to debate the opportunity to mandate a conference to review the implementation of the Dayton Agreement (S/2001/114); and the following letters addressed to the President: letter dated 4 March 2001 from the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia requesting the convening of an emergency session of the Council to present an action plan of his Government containing measures for the cessation of violence and for lasting stabilization on the border with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (S/2001/191); letter dated 14 March 2001 from the representative of Burundi requesting an urgent meeting of the Council to discuss the “intensification of the war” and the “serious setback” for the peace process in the country (S/2001/221); letter dated 1 August 2001 from the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo requesting an urgent meeting of the Council to discuss the “violations of the integrity of the Congolese territory by Rwanda and Uganda” (S/2001/759); letter dated 18 March 2002 from the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo requesting a meeting to discuss the alleged violations by Rwanda of the Lusaka ceasefire agreement (S/2002/286); letter dated 23 May 2002 from the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia requesting an urgent meeting of the Council regarding the implementation of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) (S/2002/574); and letter dated 14 August 2003 from the representative of Serbia

and Montenegro requesting an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the latest developments in Kosovo and Metohija, especially the terrorist attack that took place in the village of Goradevac in the Peć region on 13 August 2003 (S/2003/815). See, in addition, letter dated 5 October 2003 from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic requesting an emergency meeting of the Council to consider the “violations of Syrian and Lebanese airspace committed on 5 October 2003 by the Israeli airforce and the missile attack carried out by the latter on the same day against a civilian site situated inside Syrian territory” (S/2003/939); the same situation was brought to the attention of the Security Council by a letter dated 5 October 2003 from the representative of Lebanon (S/2003/943).

⁴ See, for example the following letters addressed to the President of the Security Council: letter dated 10 May 2000 from the representative of Eritrea, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States, requesting an open emergency meeting of the Council to address the situation in Sierra Leone (S/2000/408), and a letter dated 11 May 2000 from the representative of Namibia (S/2000/410) bringing to the attention of the Council the same situations; letter dated 2 October 2000 from the representative of South Africa, in his capacity as Chair of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement, requesting an urgent meeting of the Council to respond to “the critical situation in Occupied East Jerusalem, other parts of the Occupied Palestinian Territory and parts of Israel” (S/2000/934), and the same situation was brought to the attention of the Council by letters dated 2 October 2000 from the representative of Iraq, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group and on behalf of the States members of the League of Arab States; the representative of Malaysia, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement; the Permanent Observer of Palestine; and the representative of Malaysia in his capacity as Chairman of the Islamic Group (S/2000/928, S/2000/929, S/2000/930 and S/2000/935, respectively); letter dated 21 November 2000 from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group, requesting an urgent meeting of the Council to discuss the deteriorating situation in the occupied Palestinian territory (S/2000/1109); letter dated 15 June 2001 from the representative of the Russian Federation, requesting an open meeting of the Council to consider ways of improving the humanitarian situation in Iraq (S/2001/597); and letter dated 15 August 2001 from the representatives of Qatar and Mali, on behalf of the Islamic Group, requesting a meeting to discuss the deteriorating situation in the occupied Palestinian territory (S/2001/797). See also identical letters dated 20 February 2002 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine addressed to the Secretary-General and the President, requesting an urgent meeting of the Council to

discuss the deteriorating situation in the occupied Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem (S/2002/182), and the following letters addressed to the President: letter dated 20 February 2002 from the representative of Yemen, on behalf of the League of Arab States (S/2002/184) bringing to the attention of the Council the same situation; letter dated 29 March 2002 from the representative of Qatar, in his capacity as Chairman of the Islamic Summit Conference, requesting an urgent meeting of the Council to discuss the developments in the occupied Palestinian territory (S/2002/331); letter dated 1 April 2002 from the representative of Tunisia, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group, requesting a meeting to discuss the “dangerous” situation in the occupied Palestinian territory (S/2002/336); letter dated 2 May 2002 from the representative of the Sudan in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group and on behalf of the States Members of the League of Arab States, requesting a meeting of the Council to discuss the deteriorating situation in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem (S/2002/510), and the same situation was brought to the attention of the Council by a letter dated 11 June 2002 from the representative of Bahrain in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group and on behalf of the States members of the League of Arab States (S/2002/655); letter dated 10 October 2002 from the representative of South Africa, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, requesting an emergency meeting of the Council on the situation in Iraq (S/2002/1132); letter dated 23 July 2002 from the representative of Saudi Arabia, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group and on behalf of the States members of the League of Arab States, requesting the convening of an immediate meeting of the Council to discuss the deteriorating situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem (S/2002/828); letter dated 7 March 2003 from the representative of Malaysia, in his capacity as Chairman of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement, requesting an open debate of the Council on the new developments pertaining to Iraq (S/2003/283); letter dated 12 September 2003 from the representative of the Sudan, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group and on behalf of the States members of the League of Arab States, requesting the convening of an immediate meeting of the Council to consider the “continued Israeli escalation against the Palestinian people and their leadership” (S/2003/880); letter dated 9 October 2003 from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group, requesting an urgent meeting of the Council to discuss the Israeli decision to construct a wall in the occupied Palestinian territory (S/2003/973), and, in regard to the same situation, letters dated 9 October 2003 from the representatives of Malaysia, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Group, and the Islamic Republic of Iran,

Disputes and situations were generally submitted to the Security Council by means of a communication addressed to the President of the Council. In several instances, however, matters were brought to the Council’s attention through communications addressed to both the President of the Council and the Secretary-General.⁵

Communications by which new disputes or situations were referred to the Council and on the basis of which the Council convened meetings under new agenda items during the period under review are listed in the table below, entitled “Communications bringing disputes or situations to the attention of the Security Council during the period 2000-2003”. It should be borne in mind that the designation of a new agenda item does not necessarily imply the existence of a new dispute or situation, as it can simply be a change in the formulation of the item on the agenda which has been before the Council. Communications by which Member States merely conveyed information, but did not request a Council meeting or other specific Council action, have not been included in the table, as such communications cannot be considered as referrals under Article 35. Furthermore, as was the case in the previous Supplement, the table does not include communications referring to disputes or situations considered under the then existing agenda items by the Council, so as not to codify or classify new developments and deterioration of situations in the ongoing conflicts. It should be noted that the delimitation criteria mentioned above are being used only for the purpose of the following table.

on behalf of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (S/2003/974 and S/2003/977, respectively).

⁵ For example, in connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, identical letters were submitted on two occasions to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council; see identical letters dated 2 October 2000 and 20 February 2002, respectively, from the Permanent Observer of Palestine addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (S/2000/930 and S/2002/182). In connection with the situation in Afghanistan, identical letters were also submitted to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council; see identical letters dated 14 September 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Afghanistan addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (S/2001/870).

Communications bringing disputes or situations to the attention of the Security Council during the period 2000-2003

<i>Communication</i>	<i>Action requested of the Security Council</i>	<i>Meeting and date</i>
The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question		
Letter dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq ^a to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/928)	The convening of the Security Council to discuss the Israeli aggression on the Haram Al-Sharif in the occupied Holy Jerusalem and against Palestinian civilians in the occupied Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem.	4204th meeting 3-5 October 2000
Letter dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Malaysia ^b to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/929)	The convening of an urgent meeting of the Security Council to discuss the latest incidents in Occupied East Jerusalem following a visit of the leader of the Likud Party Ariel Sharon to Al-Haram Al-Sharif.	
Identical letters dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/930)	The convening of an immediate meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in the occupied East Jerusalem as well as the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory.	
Letter dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of South Africa ^c to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/934)	The convening of an urgent meeting of the Security Council to respond to the critical situation in the occupied East Jerusalem, other parts of the Occupied Palestinian Territory and parts of Israel.	
Letter dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Malaysia ^d to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/935)	The convening of an emergency meeting of the Security Council to consider the recent Israeli aggression against Al-Haram Al-Sharif and the attacks by Israeli security forces against Palestinian civilians.	
Letter dated 4 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/191)		
Letter dated 4 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/191)	The convening of an emergency session of the Security Council, in which the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia would present an action plan of his Government to bring about a cessation of violence and lasting stabilization on the border of Kosovo to prevent spillover of violence into Macedonia.	4289th meeting 7 March 2001

Letter dated 29 November 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1317)

<p>Letter dated 29 November 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1317)</p>	<p>Request by the Government of Chad to address the Security Council through a representative of the Government concerning the position of Chad on the issue of the Central African crisis.</p>	<p>4659th meeting (private) 9 December 2002</p>
---	---	---

Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic and to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/939) and letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/943)

<p>Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/939)</p>	<p>The convening of an emergency meeting of the Security Council to consider the violation of Syrian and Lebanese airspace on 5 October by Israeli military aircraft and the missile attack carried out by the latter on the same day against a target inside the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic.</p>	<p>4836th meeting 5 October 2003</p>
--	--	--

<p>Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/943)</p>	<p>The convening of an emergency meeting to consider the violation of Lebanese airspace by Israeli military aircraft targeting a site situated inside the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic.</p>	
---	--	--

^a In his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group and on behalf of the States members of the League of Arab States.

^b On behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

^c In his capacity as Chair of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement.

^d In his capacity as Chairman of the Islamic Group.

Nature of matters referred to the Security Council

During the period under review, matters that were brought to the Council's attention were usually referred to as "situations".⁶ In some instances, the subject

matter of the relevant communications was referred to as "developments"⁷ or "violations of international law",⁸ or described in narrative form.⁹

⁶ See, for example, the following letters addressed to the President of the Security Council: in connection with the situation in Sierra Leone, letter dated 10 May 2000 from the representative of Eritrea, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States (S/2000/408), and letter dated 11 May 2000 from the representative of Namibia (S/2000/410); in connection with the situation in the former Yugoslavia, letter dated 29 June 2000 from the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (S/2000/636); in connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, letter dated 2 May 2002 from the representative of the Sudan,

in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group and on behalf of the States members of the League of Arab States (S/2002/510), and letter dated 11 June 2002 from the representative of Bahrain in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group and on behalf of the States members of the League of Arab States (S/2002/655); in connection with the alleged violations of the territory and airspace of Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic by Israeli forces, letter dated 5 October 2003 from the representative of Lebanon (S/2003/943).

⁷ See, for example, the following letters addressed to the President of the Security Council: in connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, letter dated 21 November 2000 from the

It should also be noted that, while the Charter provisions setting out the basis on which States may bring matters likely to endanger international peace and security to the attention of the Council form part of Chapter VI of the Charter, the subject matter of communications submitted to the Council and the type of action requested in relation thereto are not limited by the scope of that Chapter. For instance, during the period under review, several communications submitted to the Council described situations as threatening or endangering regional peace and security,¹⁰ and/or as acts of aggression.¹¹ However, in

representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group (S/2000/1109), and letter dated 29 March 2002 from the representative of Qatar, in his capacity as Chairman of the Islamic Summit Conference (S/2002/331); in connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, letter dated 7 March 2003 from the representative of Malaysia, in his capacity as Chairman of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement (S/2003/283); in connection with the situation in the former Yugoslavia, letter dated 14 August 2003 from the representative of Serbia and Montenegro (S/2003/815).

⁸ See, for example, the following letters addressed to the President of the Security Council: in connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, three letters dated 9 October 2003, from the representative of, respectively, the Syrian Arab Republic, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group (S/2003/973), the representative of Malaysia, in his capacity as Chairman of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement (S/2003/974), and the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (S/2003/977).

⁹ See, for example, the following letters addressed to the President: in connection with the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, letter dated 18 March 2002 from the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (S/2002/286); in connection with the situation in the former Yugoslavia, letter dated 19 July 2000 from the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (S/2000/716) and letter dated 14 August 2003 from the representative of Serbia and Montenegro (S/2003/815); in connection with the alleged violations of the territory and airspace of Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic by Israeli forces, letter dated 5 October 2003 from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic (S/2003/939).

¹⁰ In a letter dated 21 November 2000 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group, stated that the “new acts of aggression” reflected the continued determination of the occupation

forces to use military force in an unacceptable manner and that the deteriorating situation in the occupied Palestinian territories was a “threat to the stability of the whole region” (S/2000/1109). In a letter dated 5 October 2003 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of Lebanon stated that the violations of the Lebanese airspace by Israeli military aircraft targeting a site situated inside the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic posed “serious threats to the security and stability of the region” (S/2003/943 and annex). By a letter dated 14 August 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia referred to the activities of the Kosovo Force (KFOR) and the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and their “policy of fait accompli” as threatening “peace and security in the region” (S/2000/801).

¹¹ By a letter dated 5 October 2003 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of Lebanon denounced the violation of Lebanese airspace by Israeli military aircraft targeting a site situated inside the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic as “acts of aggression” and requested the Security Council to “convene an emergency meeting to consider these acts of aggression” (S/2003/943 and annex). By a letter dated 1 August 2001 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo referred to the “Rwandan aggressors and their RCD allies” (Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie (RCD-Goma); S/2001/759 and annex). By a letter dated 14 August 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider “the armed attack on and the usurpation of the RMHK Trepca Shareholding Corporation by the Kosovo Force” (S/2000/801). By a letter dated 2 October 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Malaysia, in his capacity as Chairman of the Islamic Group, requested an emergency meeting of the Security Council to discuss the deteriorating situation following the “Israeli aggression against Al-Haram Al-Sharif and the attacks by Israeli security forces against Palestinian civilians” (S/2000/935). Similar letters, with reference to “acts of aggression”, were addressed to the President of the Security Council, on 2 October 2000, by the representatives of Iraq, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group and on behalf of the States members of the League of Arab States, and the Permanent Observer of Palestine, respectively (S/2000/928 and S/2000/930). By a letter dated 21 November 2000 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group, while requesting an urgent meeting of the Council, referred to the air attacks by the Israeli forces on the Gaza Strip as “acts of aggression”

connection with those communications, the Council did not always determine the existence of a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace or an act of aggression.

Action requested of the Security Council

In their communications to the Security Council, States mostly requested the Council to convene an urgent meeting to consider the matters.¹² In a number of cases, the submitting States also called upon the Council, in general terms, to take “action” or “concrete measures” on the specific issue brought to its attention.¹³

For example, in a letter dated 14 August 2003 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of Serbia and Montenegro requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider “developments in Kosovo and Metohija, especially the terrorist attack that took place in the village of Gorazdevac on 13 August 2003”. In his communication, the representative stated that the “terrorist attacks” were aimed at further destabilizing the situation in the province and represented a serious

(S/2000/1109). By a letter dated 23 July 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Saudi Arabia, on behalf of the League of Arab States, requested the convening of an immediate meeting of the Security Council to consider the “continued Israeli military aggression against the Palestinian people and the Palestinian Authority” (S/2002/828).

¹² See table entitled “Communications bringing disputes or situations to the attention of the Security Council during the period 2000-2003”.

¹³ See, for example, the following letters addressed to the President of the Security Council: in connection with the situation in the former Yugoslavia, letters dated 13 February 2000 and 14 August 2000 from the representative of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (S/2000/111 and S/2000/801); in connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, letter dated 20 February 2002 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine (S/2002/182), letter dated 20 February 2002 from the representative of Yemen on behalf of the League of Arab States (S/2002/184), letter dated 23 July 2002 from the representative of Saudi Arabia in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group and on behalf of the States members of the League of Arab States (S/2002/828), and letter dated 12 September 2003 from the representative of the Sudan in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group and on behalf of the States members of the League of Arab States (S/2003/880).

challenge to the authority of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and the Kosovo Force (KFOR) and therefore required, in the view of his Government, an “appropriate action” by the Council.¹⁴

In other instances, which are presented below as examples, more concrete actions requested of the Council were specified by submitting States. In connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, the representative of the United Arab Emirates, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group and on behalf of the members of the League of Arab States (LAS), by a letter dated 13 March 2001 addressed to the President of the Council, appealed to the Council to take the necessary steps to safeguard peace and security in the region and to protect the Palestinian people by deploying a United Nations protection force in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem.¹⁵

¹⁴ S/2003/815.

¹⁵ S/2001/216. In connection with the same agenda item, throughout the period under review, a number of Member States requested the Council to take unspecified “actions” or “measures”. See, for instance, the following letters addressed to the President of the Council requesting the Council to convene a meeting and to take “measures” or “actions”: identical letters dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine (S/2000/930); letter dated 21 November 2000 from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (S/2000/1109); letter dated 13 December 2001 from the representative of Egypt, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group (S/2001/1191); letter dated 20 February 2002 from the representative of Yemen, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group (S/2002/184); letter dated 29 March 2002 from the representative of Jordan, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group (S/2002/329); letters dated, respectively, 1 April 2002, 6 April 2002 and 17 April 2002 from the representative of Tunisia, on behalf of the League of Arab States (S/2002/336, S/2002/359, S/2002/431); letter dated 23 July 2002 from the representative of Saudi Arabia, on behalf of the League of Arab States (S/2002/828); letter dated 20 September 2002 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine, on behalf of the States members of the League of Arab States (S/2002/1055); letter dated 12 September 2003 from the representative of the Sudan, as Chairman of the Arab Group and on behalf of the States members of the League of Arab States (S/2003/880); and letter dated 9 October 2003 from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, as Chairman of the Arab Group (S/2003/973).

In connection with the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, by identical letters dated 6 February 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina requested a meeting of the Council to debate “the opportunity to mandate a conference to review the implementation of the Dayton Peace Accords and necessary revision thereto”.¹⁶

In connection with the situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, by a letter dated 4 March 2001, addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia requested an emergency session of the Council for his country’s Minister for Foreign Affairs to present an action plan for the cessation of violence and to secure lasting stabilization on the border with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.¹⁷

In another instance, in connection with the situation in Burundi, by a letter dated 14 March 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Burundi, after requesting a meeting of the Council to discuss the escalation of war and the peace process in Burundi and outlining his expectations for the meeting, called on the Council to adopt a resolution or a statement by the President before the holding in Arusha, from 19 to 24 March 2001, of the meeting of the parties and that of the Implementation Monitoring for the Agreement.¹⁸

In connection with the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, by a letter dated 1 August 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, while drawing the attention of the Council to violations of its territorial integrity and requesting an urgent meeting of the Council, called upon the Council, *inter alia*, to demand, under Chapter VII of the Charter, the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Ugandan and Rwandan forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and to take enforcement action against Rwanda and the *Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie* (RCD-Goma).¹⁹ By a subsequent letter dated 18 March 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the

representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, bringing to the attention of the Council a number of violations of the Lusaka ceasefire agreement, called on the Council urgently to meet to denounce Rwanda and RCD-Goma for the resumption of hostilities and demand a halt of the hostilities immediately and unconditionally and withdraw their troops to their initial positions.²⁰

With regard to the situation in Côte d’Ivoire, the representative of Senegal, in his capacity as representative of the Chairman of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), by a letter dated 19 December 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council, appealed to the Council to provide assistance to ECOWAS in its efforts to find a solution to the crisis.²¹ At its 4680th meeting held on 20 December 2002, the Council considered for the first time the item “The situation in Côte d’Ivoire” and, in that connection, the President of the Council, in his introductory remarks, drew the attention of members of the Council to the letter from the representative of Senegal.

Finally, in another instance, in the context of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, the representative of Pakistan, by identical letters dated 19 August 2003 addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, respectively, brought to the attention of the Council matters relating to “peace and security in Asia”. By the same letter, he called upon the Council to facilitate the resumption of a serious, substantive and sustained dialogue between India and Pakistan for the peaceful resolution of the dispute.²²

Referrals by the Secretary-General

While Article 99 stipulates that the Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security, he did not invoke Article 99, either expressly or by implication, during the period under review. However, he drew the attention of the Security Council to a number of deteriorating situations which were already on the Council’s agenda, and requested the Council to consider taking appropriate action. For example, in connection with the situation in the Democratic

¹⁶ S/2001/114.

¹⁷ S/2001/191.

¹⁸ S/2001/221.

¹⁹ S/2001/759 and annex.

²⁰ S/2002/286.

²¹ S/2002/1386.

²² S/2003/823.

Republic of the Congo, by a letter dated 15 May 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General expressed his concern at the rapidly deteriorating situation in and around Bunia, which had become the stage of major violent clashes between Hema- and Lendu-based militia groups, exacerbated by outside interference. Referring to the likely further worsening of the situation and its serious humanitarian consequences, the Secretary-General requested the Security Council urgently to consider his proposal for the rapid deployment to Bunia of a multinational force, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, aimed at stabilizing the situation in Bunia and protecting the civilian population.²³ In response, the Council convened a meeting and adopted resolution 1484 (2003), authorizing the deployment of such a multinational force in Bunia.²⁴

In connection with the situation in Liberia, by a letter dated 28 June 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General expressed his concern regarding the flagrant violations of the ceasefire which shook the foundations of the Accra peace talks. He therefore demanded “urgent and decisive action from the Security Council”, by requesting it to authorize the deployment to Liberia of a multinational force, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to prevent a major humanitarian tragedy and to stabilize the situation in that country.²⁵ By a subsequent letter dated 8 July 2003 addressed to the

President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General recalled his letter of 28 June 2003 and, in the light of the rapidly unfolding political situation, appealed again to the Council to take urgent action to authorize the deployment to Liberia of a multinational force with the primary objective of preventing a major humanitarian tragedy in the country. He also brought to the attention of the Council a number of urgent initiatives he had taken, such as appointing a new Special Representative for Liberia to lead and coordinate the activities of the United Nations in the country and dispatching his Special Representative for West Africa to Accra.²⁶ In response, the Council convened a meeting and adopted resolution 1497 (2003), authorizing the deployment of such a multinational force in Liberia.²⁷

In addition to the above-mentioned communications, the Secretary-General, as part of his general reporting obligations, regularly informed the Security Council of relevant developments on matters of which the Council was seized.

Referrals by the General Assembly

Under Article 11 (3) of the Charter, the General Assembly may call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security. During the period under review, the General Assembly did not refer any matters to the Security Council under this Article.²⁸

²³ S/2003/574.

²⁴ S/PV.4764.

²⁵ S/2003/678.

²⁶ S/2003/695.

²⁷ S/PV.4803.

²⁸ See, chapter VI, part I, section B for more details.

Part II

Investigation of disputes and fact-finding

Note

Article 34 of the Charter provides that “the Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuation of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security”. However, Article 34 does not exclude other organs from performing investigative functions nor does it limit the Council’s general competence to

obtain knowledge of the relevant facts of any dispute or situation by dispatching a fact-finding mission.

During the period under consideration, the Council performed and initiated, or requested the Secretary-General to undertake, a number of investigative and fact-finding activities that may be deemed to fall within the scope of Article 34 or be related to its provisions. The following part will provide an overview of the practice of the Security Council in connection with Article 34 of the Charter, including the presentation of two case studies in which

the Security Council endorsed the Secretary-General's initiative to establish bodies entrusted with fact-finding and investigative functions.²⁹ The first case study sets out, in connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, the details of the decision-making process leading to the approval by the Council of the decision of the Secretary-General to deploy a fact-finding team to develop accurate information regarding events in the Jenin refugee camp in April 2002, as well as the subsequent developments owing to which the fact-finding team was disbanded. The second case study, in connection with the situation in Côte d'Ivoire, concerns the dispatch, upon reports of mass killings and grave violations of human rights, of a fact-finding mission to the country.

In addition to the above-mentioned fact-finding and investigative missions, the Council continued to request the Secretary-General to report on relevant developments in connection to matters of which the Council was seized. Furthermore, in a number of instances, the Council dispatched missions consisting of Council members to conflict areas, including Afghanistan,³⁰ Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo,³¹ East Timor and Indonesia,³² Eritrea and Ethiopia,³³ Sierra Leone,³⁴ Central Africa,³⁵ the Great

Lakes Region,³⁶ West Africa,³⁷ Belgrade, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Kosovo.³⁸ In general terms, during the period under consideration, the Council noted with satisfaction, in connection with the prevention of armed conflicts, the increased recourse, with the consent of receiving Member States, to Security Council missions to areas of conflict or potential conflict.³⁹ The Council missions were not expressly charged with investigative tasks, but did serve, *inter alia*, to form an impression of the respective situations on the ground.

Finally, during the period under consideration, the Security Council adopted two decisions by which it underlined the importance that it attached to fact-finding missions of the Secretary-General in the context of the prevention of armed conflict. In relation to the item entitled "Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security", the Council, recalling the statements by the President of 30 November 1999 and 20 July 2000 on the prevention of armed conflicts,⁴⁰ by resolution 1327 (2000) of 30 November 2000, welcomed the intention of the Secretary-General to send fact-finding missions to areas of tension more

²⁹ In one instance during the period under consideration, the Council requested the Secretary-General to initiate or perform fact-finding or investigative functions. In connection with the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, by a statement of the President dated 18 October 2002, the Council, condemning the continuing violence in the east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in particular the attack on Uvira by Mai Mai and other forces, invited the Secretary-General to report further on the events in the region of Uvira (S/PRST/2002/27).

³⁰ The mission of the Council visited Afghanistan from 31 October to 7 November 2003. For details, see the terms of reference (S/2003/930) and the final report (S/2003/1074).

³¹ The mission of the Council visited the Democratic Republic of the Congo from 4 to 8 May 2000. For details, see the terms of reference (S/2000/344) and the final report (S/2000/416).

³² The mission of the Council visited East Timor and Indonesia from 9 to 17 November 2000. For details, see the terms of reference (S/2000/103) and the final report (S/2000/1105).

³³ Missions of the Council visited Eritrea and Ethiopia from 9 to 10 May 2000 and from 21 to 25 February 2002, respectively. For details, see the terms of reference (S/2000/392 and S/2002/129) and the final reports

(S/2000/413 and S/2002/205).

³⁴ The mission of the Council visited Sierra Leone from 7 to 14 October 2000. For details, see the terms of reference (S/2000/886) and the final report (S/2000/992).

³⁵ The mission visited Central Africa from 7 to 16 June 2003. For details, see the terms of reference (S/2003/558) and the final report (S/2003/653).

³⁶ Missions of the Council visited the Great Lakes region from 15 to 26 May 2001 and from 27 April to 7 May 2002. For details, see the terms of reference (S/2001/408 and S/2002/430) and the final reports (S/2001/521 and Add. 1; and S/2002/537 and Add. 1).

³⁷ The mission of the Council visited West Africa from 26 June to 5 July 2003. For details, see the terms of reference (S/2003/525) and the final report (S/2003/688).

³⁸ Missions of the Council visited Kosovo from 27 to 29 April 2000 and from 16 to 18 June 2001, respectively; for details, see the terms of reference (S/2000/320 and S/2001/482) and the final reports (S/2000/363 and S/2001/600). The mission of the Council visited Kosovo and Belgrade, from 13 to 17 December 2002; for details, see the terms of reference (S/2002/1271) and the final report (S/2002/1376).

³⁹ Resolution 1366 (2001), ninth preambular paragraph.

⁴⁰ S/PRST/1999/34 and S/PRST/2000/25.

frequently.⁴¹ Similarly, by resolution 1336 (2001) of 30 August 2001, in connection with the role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts, the Council supported the enhancement of the role of the Secretary-General in the field of conflict prevention including by increasing the use of United Nations interdisciplinary fact-finding and confidence-building missions to regions of tension, by developing regional prevention strategies with regional partners and appropriate United Nations organs and agencies, and by improving the capacity and resource base for preventive action in the Secretariat.⁴²

Case 1

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

By identical letters dated 10 April 2002 addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, respectively, the Permanent Observer of Palestine stated that the critical situation in the occupied cities of Jenin and Nablus and the adjacent refugee camps that had come under attack by Israeli occupying forces was of profound concern. He therefore called upon the international community to take action to ensure the implementation of resolutions 1402 (2002) and, most recently, resolution 1403 (2002), and to “bring an immediate halt to the Israeli onslaught against the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory”.⁴³

In response to the request contained in a letter from the representative of Tunisia dated 17 April 2002 addressed to the President of the Council, the Council met on 18 and 19 April 2002 to consider the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question.⁴⁴ During the meeting, several speakers expressed their support for an investigation into the events in the Jenin refugee camps, and some explicitly requested it.⁴⁵ The representative of Egypt stated that the Council had to act decisively and immediately

dispatch a mission of its members to investigate the facts and held that such a mission should be accompanied by representatives of all the bodies and organs of the United Nations system, the Secretary-General and humanitarian and human rights agencies due to submit a report to the Council within two weeks. He further argued that on the basis of that report, the Council could consider the international community’s options with respect to legal measures to address recent and ongoing events.⁴⁶ The representative of France maintained that the extreme seriousness of the eyewitness reports made it absolutely necessary to find out the truth, in an objective manner and that an international fact-finding committee had to be sent to Jenin.⁴⁷

On the same day, at the 4516th meeting, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 1405 (2002), welcoming the initiative of the Secretary-General to develop accurate information regarding recent events in the Jenin refugee camp through a fact-finding team and requesting him to keep the Council informed.⁴⁸

By a letter dated 22 April 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General informed the Council that, pursuant to resolution 1405 (2002), he had established a fact-finding team, which would begin its work without delay by traveling to the region to initiate its mission on the ground. He stated that he had called on the team to report to him expeditiously its findings and conclusions. He further informed the Council that he expected that the Government of Israel and the Palestinian Authority would fully cooperate with the team and provide free and complete access to all sites, sources of information and individuals that the team considered necessary for the exercise of the functions of the mission.⁴⁹

On 1 May 2002, by a letter addressed to the President of the Council, the Secretary-General informed the Council that, soon after he had announced his plan to deploy the fact-finding team, the Government of Israel began to express concerns related to the composition of the team, the scope of its mandate, how the mandate would be carried out and various procedural matters. He further informed the

⁴¹ Resolution 1327 (2000), annex V.

⁴² Resolution 1366 (2001), para. 18.

⁴³ S/2002/370.

⁴⁴ S/PV.4515 and resumption 1.

⁴⁵ S/PV.4515, p. 12 (Pakistan); pp. 12-13 (South Africa); pp. 16-17 (Morocco); p. 18 (Algeria); p. 29 (the Sudan); p. 37 (Islamic Republic of Iran); and p. 38 (Mauritania); S/PV.4515 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (China); p. 6 (France); p. 7 (Mauritius); p. 9 (Colombia); p. 10 (Ireland); p. 11 (United Kingdom); p. 12 (Mexico); and p. 14 (Singapore).

⁴⁶ S/PV.4515, p. 10.

⁴⁷ S/PV.4515 (Resumption 1), p. 6.

⁴⁸ Resolution 1405 (2002), para. 2.

⁴⁹ S/2002/475.

Council of an announcement made by the Government of Israel, that, as long as essential issues raised by the delegation of Israel and terms of a fair examination had not been met, it would not be possible for the clarification process to begin. In his letter, the Secretary-General stated that, throughout the process, the United Nations had made every effort to accommodate the concerns of the Government of Israel within the mandate given to him by the Security Council. However, in the light of the announcement by the Government of Israel and of additional issues raised by high-level Israeli officials, it seemed evident that the team would not be able to proceed to the area to begin its mission in the near future. For those reasons, the Secretary-General informed the Council of his intention to disband the fact-finding team the following day. He stated that he regretted being unable to provide the information requested by the Council in resolution 1405 (2002), and especially that the long shadow cast by recent events in the Jenin refugee camp would remain in the absence of such a fact-finding exercise.⁵⁰

At the 4525th meeting of the Council, held on 3 May 2002, the Permanent Observer of Palestine stated that the Council should “order” Israel not to impede the fact-finding team, request the Secretary-General to dispatch the team immediately, in pursuance of resolution 1405 (2002), and require the two sides to cooperate with the team without conditions. He noted that a resolution by the Arab Group drafted along those lines had not gained enough support in the face of opposition by one permanent member, and he expressed the view that backtracking by the Council would constitute a “genuine scandal”, a breach of the Charter and the abdication by the Council of its responsibility. He hoped that the Council would be able to adopt an appropriate resolution and, if it failed to do so, his delegation would seek a resumption of the tenth emergency session of the General Assembly.⁵¹ In response, the representative of Israel expressed his country’s reservations about the fact-finding mission which should have been aimed at developing, in his view, “accurate information” and not reaching any conclusion nor making recommendations, in line with the fact-finding principles set out in General Assembly resolution 46/59 of 1991. He added that his country would have expected the fact-finding team to address

the activities of “both sides”, including the use of a United Nations-administered camp as a centre for terrorist activity.⁵²

During the subsequent debate, the representative of the Sudan, speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, called on the Council to bring about respect for its authority by condemning the rejection of the Secretary-General’s initiative to dispatch a fact-finding mission and insisting on obtaining the details of the “heinous crimes” committed in Jenin, and of “all the massacres committed against the Palestinian people”. Failure by the Council to fulfill its duty, he added, would prompt the Arab Group to resort to the General Assembly.⁵³ Similarly, a number of other speakers condemned Israel’s “disdain” for the Council and its decisions.⁵⁴ The representative of the United Kingdom “deplored” Israel’s failure to cooperate with the United Nations in allowing the deployment of the fact-finding team, while the representative of France stated that the Council and the Secretary-General must be respected and deplored Israel’s “serious error” in failing to do so.⁵⁵ The representative of the United States, while regretting Israel’s decision to deny access to the Secretary-General’s fact-finding team, supported the Secretary-General in his decision to disband the team.⁵⁶

Case 2 The situation in Côte d’Ivoire

By a letter dated 19 December 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Senegal, in his capacity as representative of the Chairman of Economic Community of West African States, appealed to the Security Council to provide assistance to ECOWAS in its efforts to find a solution to the crisis in Côte d’Ivoire. In view of the extreme urgency, he requested the Council to consider without delay the specific

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁵⁴ S/PV.4525, pp. 8-10 (Tunisia); and pp. 12-13 (Egypt); S/PV.4525 (Resumption 1), and Corr.1 pp. 10-11 (the United Arab Emirates); p. 12 (Indonesia); pp. 15-16 (Islamic Republic of Iran); and pp. 28-30 (Mauritius).

⁵⁵ S/PV.4525 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 33 (United Kingdom); and p. 34 (France).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

⁵⁰ S/2002/504.

⁵¹ S/PV.4525, p. 3.

forms and modalities of United Nations support for the efforts actively undertaken by ECOWAS.⁵⁷

In response to that request, the Council met on 20 December 2002 to consider the situation in Côte d'Ivoire.⁵⁸ By a statement of the President, adopted at that meeting, the Council, expressing its grave concern at the situation in Côte d'Ivoire and at reports of mass killings and grave violations of human rights, commended the Secretary-General for his efforts to promote a negotiated settlement, in coordination with ECOWAS, and requested the Secretary-General to keep it regularly informed about the situation. By the same statement, the Council further called on all parties to

ensure full respect for human rights and international humanitarian law and welcomed the decision by the Secretary-General to request the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to gather precise information about violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in Côte d'Ivoire, including through the dispatch of a fact-finding mission to the country.⁵⁹

A multidisciplinary technical assessment mission visited Côte d'Ivoire from 24 February to 7 March 2003 seeking an assessment of the role the United Nations could play in the implementation of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement of 23 January 2003⁶⁰.

⁵⁷ S/2002/1386.

⁵⁸ S/PV.4680.

⁵⁹ S/PRST/2002/42.

⁶⁰ For details of the mission's findings see S/2003/374, paras. 31-67.

Part III

Decisions of the Security Council concerning the pacific settlement of disputes

Note

Chapter VI of the Charter contains various provisions according to which the Security Council may make recommendations to the parties to a dispute or situation. According to Article 33 (2) of the Charter, the Council may call on the parties to settle their disputes by such peaceful means as provided for in Article 33 (1). According to Article 36 (1) the Council may "recommend appropriate methods or procedures of adjustment". Article 37 (2) envisages that the Council may "recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate", and Article 38 provides that it may "make recommendations to the parties with a view to a pacific settlement of the dispute".

As part of its efforts aimed at the peaceful settlement of conflicts within the framework of Chapter VI of the Charter, the Council frequently endorsed or supported peace agreements concluded by the parties to a conflict, or recommended various methods or procedures of settlement, such as bilateral

or multilateral negotiations,⁶¹ political settlement or dialogue aimed at achieving national reconciliation,⁶² democratic means such as elections⁶³ or the establishment of a representative government, as well as peace-consolidating activities such as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes for former combatants.⁶⁴ In several instances, the Council made recommendations with regard to good offices, mediation or conciliation efforts to be undertaken by

⁶¹ See, for instance, the following decisions of the Council: in connection with the situation in Somalia, S/PRST/2003/19; in connection with the situation in Afghanistan, S/PRST/2000/12; in connection with the situation in Georgia, resolutions 1287 (2000) and 1393 (2002); in connection with the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia, resolution 1297 (2000); and in connection with the situation in Croatia, resolution 1285 (2000).

⁶² See, for example, in connection with the situation in Somalia, S/PRST/2001/1 and S/PRST/2001/30; and in connection with the situation in Angola, S/PRST/2002/7.

⁶³ See, for example, in connection with the situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border, S/PRST/2000/9 and S/PRST/2000/17; and in connection with the situation in East Timor, S/PRST/2001/32.

⁶⁴ See, for example, in connection with the situation in Sierra Leone, S/PRST/2001/38.

the Secretary-General,⁶⁵ or with regard to such efforts undertaken by Governments of neighboring countries,⁶⁶ regional leaders,⁶⁷ or undertaken by regional arrangements,⁶⁸ by expressing its support and calling upon the parties to a conflict to cooperate with such efforts. In one instance, in connection with its consideration of the agenda item “Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security”, the Council welcomed the subregional efforts to promote conflict prevention, management and resolution in Central Africa. In that context, the Council recognized the steps taken by Central African countries to settle conflicts by peaceful means

including through the conclusion, with the strong support of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa, of a Protocol⁶⁹ establishing, on 24 June 2000, the Council for Peace and Security in Central Africa, comprising a Mutual Assistance Pact and a Non-Aggression Pact.⁷⁰

During the period under review, the Council dealt with a growing number of intra-State conflicts characterized by inter-ethnic and interreligious violence, collapse of central State authority, humanitarian crises and implications threatening the stability of neighbouring countries. For example, in connection with the situation in Angola, the Council reiterated the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola’s (UNITA) primary responsibility for the continuing conflict in Angola and recognized that the fulfillment by the latter of the “Accordos de Paz”, the Lusaka Protocol and the relevant resolutions of the Security Council was the only viable basis for a political settlement of the conflict in Angola.⁷¹ In connection with the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, by resolution 1468 (2003), the Council welcomed the agreement reached by the Congolese parties in Pretoria, on 6 March 2003, on the transitional arrangements and called upon them to establish as soon as possible a Transitional Government.⁷²

In setting out the parameters for a peace process or settlement to achieve its objective and to prevent a relapse into conflict, the Council often made precise recommendations. For instance, in connection with the situation in Western Sahara, explicitly acting under Chapter VI of the Charter, the Council supported the peace plan for self-determination of the people of Western Sahara put forward by the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy as an “optimum political solution” on the basis of agreement between the two parties.⁷³ Similarly, in connection with the situation in Cyprus, the Council expressed its support for the “carefully balanced” settlement plan proposed by the Secretary-General on 26 February 2003.⁷⁴ In connection with the situation in Somalia, the Council stated that the Arta peace process continued to be the

⁶⁵ See, for example, in connection with the situation in Western Sahara, resolutions 1301 (2000) and 1309 (2000). See also, in connection with the situation in Cyprus, resolution 1475 (2003).

⁶⁶ See, for example, in connection with the situation in Somalia, S/PRST/2002/8.

⁶⁷ See, for instance, in connection with the situation in Burundi, resolution 1286 (2000).

⁶⁸ See Chapter XII, part III of this volume, for further details on the manner in which the Council has encouraged efforts undertaken by regional arrangements in the pacific settlement of disputes. By way of example, in connection with the situation in Côte d’Ivoire, the Council supported the efforts by ECOWAS to achieve a pacific settlement of the conflict, which included support for the deployment of a subregional peacekeeping force. By a statement of the President dated 20 December 2002 (S/PRST/2002/42), the Council strongly supported the efforts of ECOWAS to promote a peaceful resolution of the conflict and urged the leaders of ECOWAS to continue their efforts in a coordinated manner. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Council supported the efforts by the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the Organization of African Unity (OAU)/African Union to advance the peace process. By a statement of the President dated 26 January 2000, the Council valued the vital contribution of SADC and expressed its appreciation for the role of OAU in the Lusaka process (S/PRST/2000/2). During the period under review, by a series of decisions, the Council continued to support and encourage the efforts made by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the Organization of African Unity/African Union and the League of Arab States to find a political solution to the crisis in Somalia and called for closer interaction between those organizations and the Council to achieve national reconciliation (S/PRST/2000/22, S/PRST/2001/1, S/PRST/2001/30, S/PRST/2002/8, S/PRST/2002/35 and resolution 1425 (2002)).

⁶⁹ Resolution 55/34 B.

⁷⁰ S/PRST/2002/31.

⁷¹ S/PRST/2001/24.

⁷² Resolution 1468 (2003), para. 1.

⁷³ Resolution 1495 (2003), para. 1.

⁷⁴ Resolution 1475 (2003), para. 4.

most viable basis for peace and national reconciliation in the country.⁷⁵

In a number of instances, the Council, acting on the basis of relevant Security Council decisions, dispatched Security Council missions to conflict areas to, *inter alia*, express its support for efforts towards peaceful settlement of disputes undertaken either by the local actors or regional organizations and to examine how those efforts could be best supported. Thus, for instance, in the terms of reference for its mission to Sierra Leone from 7 to 14 October 2000, the Council stated as its objective to “support the efforts of the Government of Sierra Leone and review with it the progress made with regard to certain aspects of the implementation of the Peace Agreement signed in Lomé on 7 July 1999, and to explore the possibilities for support on the part of the Council”.⁷⁶ In the terms of reference for its mission to Eritrea and Ethiopia in 2000, the Council stated that the mission would strongly urge both parties to refrain from resorting to force and further hostilities, and to commit “immediately, seriously and without precondition” to negotiations to achieve final consolidated technical arrangements for implementation of the OAU Framework Agreement and its Modalities for Implementation.⁷⁷ In the terms of reference of its subsequent mission to Eritrea and Ethiopia, the Council noted that the objective of the mission was to support the peace process between the two neighbouring countries and the efforts to implement the Algiers Agreements and the relevant Council resolutions.⁷⁸

This part of the chapter will provide an overview of the Council’s practice in relation to the peaceful settlement of disputes by highlighting relevant decisions adopted by the Council during the period under review. As it is not always possible to ascertain the specific provisions of the Charter on which individual Council decisions have been based, the following overview will aim to set out relevant decisions in a systematic order, without ascribing them to specific Articles of the Charter. Since Council decisions related to investigation and fact-finding missions have been already covered in part II of this chapter, they will not be reflected here.

⁷⁵ S/PRST/2001/30.

⁷⁶ S/2000/886.

⁷⁷ S/2000/392.

⁷⁸ S/2002/129.

The practice of the Council under Chapter VI of the Charter is described below in four sections. Section A captures the relevant decisions of the Council on general and thematic issues touching upon the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter. In particular, it outlines the decisions of the Council relating to the prevention of armed conflicts as well as their recurrence. Section B illustrates various ways in which the Council, in dealing with specific situations under its consideration, encouraged and supported efforts in the peaceful settlement of disputes. Section C provides, within the framework of the Council’s efforts towards the pacific settlement of disputes, an overview of the decisions of the Council involving the Secretary-General. Finally, section D briefly illustrates various ways in which the Council, in dealing with specific situations under its consideration, encouraged and supported efforts by regional organizations in the peaceful settlement of disputes.

A. Decisions of the Security Council on general and thematic issues relating to the pacific settlement of disputes

The following section provides an overview of the decisions of the Council on general and thematic issues relating to the pacific settlement of disputes. By such decisions, the Council underscored the centrality of Chapter VI of the Charter in the United Nation’s system of collective security and emphasized its commitment to address the prevention and recurrence of armed conflicts in all regions of the world. Furthermore, during the period under review, the Council established the Ad hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa with the mandate to, *inter alia*, monitor the implementation of previous statements by the President and resolutions regarding conflict prevention and resolution in Africa.⁷⁹

The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes

At the end of its first thematic debate on the item entitled “The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes”, by a statement of the President dated 13 May 2003, the Council reaffirmed its commitment to maintain international peace and

⁷⁹ S/2002/207.

security through effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, the adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace. It further recognized that the United Nations and its organs could play an important role in preventing disputes from arising between parties, in preventing existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and in containing and resolving the conflicts when they occurred. The Council also recalled that the Charter of the United Nations, particularly Chapter VI, set forth the means and a framework for the pacific settlement of disputes and underscored that the efforts to strengthen the process of the peaceful settlement of disputes should be continued and made more effective. Finally, the Council reiterated its commitment to make wider and more effective use of the procedures and means enshrined in the provisions of the Charter on the pacific settlement of disputes, particularly Articles 33 to 38, as one of the essential components of its work to promote and maintain international peace and security.⁸⁰

Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts

By a statement of the President dated 20 July 2000, the Council recalled its key role in the peaceful settlement of disputes under Chapter VI of the Charter and reaffirmed the importance of its consideration of all situations that might deteriorate into armed conflict, and of considering follow-up action, as appropriate. In that regard, it expressed continued willingness to consider the use of Council missions, with the consent of host countries, in order to determine whether any dispute, or any situation that might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, and to make recommendations for action by the Council, as appropriate. By the same statement, the Council underlined the importance of the peaceful settlement of disputes and recalled the obligation of parties to disputes to seek actively a peaceful solution in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter. It also recalled the obligation of all Member States to accept and carry out its decisions, including those for the prevention of armed conflict. The Council

⁸⁰ S/PRST/2003/5.

stressed the need for the maintenance of regional and international peace and stability and friendly relations among all States, and underlined the overriding humanitarian and moral imperative as well as the economic advantages of preventing the outbreak and escalation of conflicts. It highlighted, in that regard, the need to create a culture of prevention and reaffirmed that early warning, preventive diplomacy, preventive deployment, preventive disarmament, and post-conflict peacebuilding were interdependent and complementary components of a comprehensive conflict prevention strategy. The Council therefore emphasized its continuing commitment to addressing the prevention of armed conflicts in all regions of the world.

Recognizing the importance of effective post-conflict peacebuilding strategies in preventing the re-emergence of conflicts, the Council also recognized the need for close cooperation among bodies of the United Nations system and with other organizations and arrangements in the area of post-conflict peacebuilding, and expressed its willingness to consider ways to improve such cooperation. It also stressed that the design of peacekeeping mandates could help prevent the re-emergence of conflicts. Finally, underlining the importance of long-term development of post-conflict societies and the maintenance of lasting peace, the Council highlighted the importance of strengthening its cooperation with the Economic and Social Council in the area of the prevention of armed conflicts. The Council also emphasized the importance of preventive deployment in armed conflicts and reiterated its willingness to consider the deployment, with the consent of the host country, of preventive missions in appropriate circumstances.⁸¹

By resolution 1366 (2001) of 30 August 2001, having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the prevention of armed conflict and the recommendations contained therein,⁸² the Council, while reiterating that conflict prevention was one of the primary responsibilities of Member States and emphasizing the importance of a comprehensive strategy for the prevention of armed conflicts, which included elements of early warning, preventive diplomacy, preventive deployment, practical

⁸¹ S/PRST/2000/25.

⁸² S/2001/574 and Corr. 1.

disarmament measures and post-conflict peacebuilding, expressed its determination to pursue the objective of prevention of armed conflict as an integral part of its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. It also reaffirmed its role in the peaceful settlement of disputes, and reiterated its call upon Member States to settle their disputes by peaceful means as set forth in Chapter VI of the Charter, including by use of regional preventive mechanisms and more frequent resort to the International Court of Justice.⁸³

Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach

By a statement of the President dated 20 February 2001, the Council reaffirmed that the quest for peace required a comprehensive, concerted and determined approach addressing the root causes of conflicts, including their economic and social dimensions. Recognizing that peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding were often closely interrelated, the Council stressed that this interrelationship required a comprehensive approach in order to preserve the results achieved and prevent the recurrence of conflicts. To that effect, the Council reiterated the value of including, as appropriate, peacebuilding elements in the mandates of peacekeeping operations. Further recognizing that peacebuilding aimed at preventing the outbreak, the recurrence or continuation of armed conflict and therefore encompassed a wide range of political, developmental, humanitarian and human rights programmes and mechanisms, the Council underlined that short- and long-term actions, tailored to address the particular needs of societies sliding into conflict or emerging from it, were required. The Council specified that such actions should focus on fostering sustainable institutions and processes in areas such as sustainable development, the eradication of poverty and inequalities, transparent and accountable governance, the promotion of democracy, respect for human rights and the rule of law and the promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence. To that end, the Council recognized the need for the early involvement on the ground of peacebuilding actors and an orderly assumption of their responsibilities. To avoid any gap between peacekeeping and peacebuilding, the Council expressed its determination, where appropriate, to consult at various stages of any

⁸³ Resolution 1366 (2001), paras. 1 and 9.

peacekeeping operation, peacebuilding elements within the State concerned and with relevant actors primarily responsible for coordinating and implementing aspects of peacebuilding activities.⁸⁴

B. Recommendations relating to methods, procedures or terms of the pacific settlement of disputes

Section B provides an overview of the Council's practices aimed at the pacific settlement of disputes in application of Chapter VI of the Charter. It lists decisions, within the regional context, by agenda item and in chronological order, in which the Council requested or called upon parties to settle their disputes by peaceful means; recommended procedures or methods of settlement; or proposed or endorsed, welcomed or supported terms of settlement. Although the relevant decisions are presented by agenda item, it should be noted that, during the period under review, the Council increasingly demonstrated in its decisions a regional approach to the prevention and resolution of conflicts.⁸⁵

Africa

The situation in Angola

By a statement of the President dated 20 September 2001, while expressing its concern at the continuing conflict in Angola, the Council reiterated its position that the primary responsibility for the continued fighting rested with the leadership of the armed faction of UNITA, which was refusing to fulfill its obligations under the "Accordos de Paz", the Lusaka Protocol and the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, the only viable basis for political settlement of the conflict in Angola. The Council considered the agenda for peace proposed by the Government of Angola as a useful indication of areas where an agreement should be reached or progress made. It therefore called on UNITA to cease all military action and to enter into a dialogue with the Government of Angola on how to conclude the implementation of the Lusaka Protocol.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ S/PRST/2001/5.

⁸⁵ See, for instance, S/PRST/2002/36 and S/PRST/2001/38.

⁸⁶ S/PRST/2001/24.

By a statement of the President dated 28 March 2002, the Council welcomed the communiqué issued by the Government of Angola on 13 March 2002 as a positive, constructive and forward-looking approach to ending the conflict and resuming the process of national reconciliation. It called upon UNITA to show a similar position, with the aim of achieving national reconciliation including through a general ceasefire in Angola. The Security Council urged UNITA to give a clear and positive response to the Government's offer of peace to implement fully the Lusaka Protocol.⁸⁷

By resolution 1412 (2002) of 17 May 2002, the Council welcomed the historic step taken by the Government of Angola and UNITA, on 4 April 2002, in signing the Memorandum of Understanding Addendum to the Lusaka Protocol for the Cessation of Hostilities and the Resolution of the Outstanding Military Issues under the Lusaka Protocol.⁸⁸ In view of the developments, by resolution 1433 (2002) of 15 August 2002, the Council terminated the mandate of the United Nations Office in Angola (UNOA), established pursuant to resolution 1268 (1999), and established the United Nations Mission in Angola (UNMA), whose mandate included, *inter alia*, assisting the parties in concluding and implementing the Lusaka Protocol.

Subsequently, the Council welcomed the steps taken by the Government of Angola and UNITA towards the full implementation of the "Accordos de Paz", the Lusaka Protocol, the Complementary Memorandum of Understanding to the Lusaka Protocol for the Cessation of Hostilities and the Resolution of the Remaining Military Issues Pending by its resolution 1439 (2002) of 18 October 2002.⁸⁹

The situation in Burundi

By resolution 1286 (2000) of 19 January 2000, the Council warmly endorsed and strongly supported the designation by the Eighth Arusha Regional Summit on 1 December 1999 of Nelson Mandela, former President of the Republic of South Africa, as the new

Facilitator of the Arusha peace process. The Council expressed its strongest support for his efforts to achieve a peaceful solution to the conflict in Burundi, and welcomed the successful meeting in Arusha on 16 January 2000 launching his initiative. While reiterating its strong support for the renewed Arusha peace process, the Council endorsed the call at the Eighth Arusha Regional Summit for all parties to the conflict in Burundi to extend maximum cooperation to the new peace process Facilitator, and called for increased efforts to build an internal political partnership in Burundi. It further commended those Burundian parties, including the Government, which had demonstrated their commitment to continue negotiations, and called on all parties remaining outside the Arusha peace process to cease hostilities and to participate fully in the process.⁹⁰

By a statement of the President dated 29 September 2000, the Council welcomed the signature, on 28 August 2000, of the Arusha Peace Accord, as well as the signatures added to the Accord at a regional summit, held on 20 September 2000, in Nairobi. The Council stressed that the key to achieving a lasting peace agreement rested with the Burundian parties and urged all parties to work towards resolving any remaining differences over the Peace Accord, and to proceed to its implementation. It also renewed its call to all parties that remained outside the peace process to cease hostilities and join the process. In that regard, the Council supported the call of the Facilitator to the rebel groups to clarify their positions by 20 October 2000. By the same statement, the Council also requested the Secretary-General urgently to report to it on specific actions the United Nations could undertake in the consolidation of peace and economic recovery in Burundi.⁹¹ To that end, on the basis of recommendations by the Secretary-General, the Council revised and expanded the mandate of the United Nations Office in Burundi (UNOB), established in November 1993, to help to implement the Arusha Peace Accord.⁹²

By a number of subsequent resolutions and statements, the Council reiterated its support for the Arusha peace process and its call on all parties that remained outside the peace process to cease hostilities

⁸⁷ S/PRST/2002/7.

⁸⁸ Resolution 1412 (2002), third preambular paragraph. The Council reiterated its support for the Lusaka Protocol by resolution 1432 (2002) of 15 August 2002. By resolution 1404 (2002) of 18 April 2002, the Council had already welcomed, in the preambular paragraphs of the resolution, the ceasefire agreement signed in Luanda on 4 April 2002.

⁸⁹ Resolution 1439 (2002), third preambular paragraph.

⁹⁰ Resolution 1286 (2000), paras. 1, 2 and 4.

⁹¹ S/PRST/2000/29.

⁹² S/2001/1207. For details, see chapter V, sect. I.E.

and to participate fully in the process.⁹³ For instance, by a statement of the President dated 26 September 2001, while welcoming the installation of the transitional government, the Council expressed its concern regarding the recent increase in violence and recalled the urgent need to bring about a negotiated settlement of the conflict. It thus called upon the Facilitation, the Regional Peace Initiative on Burundi, the Government of Burundi, the signatory parties, and the armed groups to devote their full attention to the achievement of a ceasefire.⁹⁴

By a statement of the President dated 7 February 2002, the Council welcomed the steps taken by the Governments of Burundi and of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to normalize their relations. In that regard, it welcomed the joint communiqué they issued on 7 January and called on them to implement as soon as possible the elements agreed upon.⁹⁵

By a statement of the President dated 18 December 2002, the Council welcomed the signing of the Ceasefire Agreement between the Transitional Government of Burundi and the National Council for the Defence of Democracy — Forces for the Defence of Democracy, in Arusha, on 2 December 2002.⁹⁶ Subsequently, by another statement of the President dated 4 December 2003, the Council welcomed the progress made by the Burundian parties, in particular by the signing, in Pretoria, of the protocols of 8 October and 2 November 2003 and by the conclusion, on 16 November 2003, in Dar-es-Salaam, of the Global Ceasefire Agreement between the Transitional Government of Burundi and the National Council for the Defence of Democracy — Forces for the Defence of Democracy.⁹⁷

The situation in Côte d'Ivoire

By resolution 1464 (2003) of 4 February 2003, the Council endorsed the agreement signed by political forces of Côte d'Ivoire in Linas-Marcoussis, on

23 January 2003, and called upon all Ivorian political forces to implement it fully and without delay.⁹⁸

In view of those developments, by resolution 1479 (2003) of 13 May 2003, the Council established the United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (MINUCI) to facilitate the implementation by the Ivorian parties of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement,⁹⁹ complementing the operations of the French forces and the Economic Community of West African States forces.¹⁰⁰

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

By resolutions 1291 (2000) of 24 February 2000 and 1304 (2000) of 16 June 2000, the Council reiterated its strong support for the Ceasefire Agreement signed at Lusaka on 10 July 1999 and called upon the parties to fulfill their obligations under the Agreement.¹⁰¹ By the former resolution, the Council also expanded the mandate of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUC), established pursuant to resolution 1279 (1999), to monitor the implementation of the Ceasefire Agreement and to investigate violations of the ceasefire.¹⁰²

By resolution 1332 (2000) of 14 December 2000, the Council welcomed the agreements reached at Maputo, on 27 November 2000, concerning the disengagement of forces, as well as the signing, on 6 December 2000, of the Harare Agreement, pursuant to the Kampala Disengagement Plan of 8 April 2000.¹⁰³ It further called upon all parties to the Ceasefire Agreement signed at Lusaka to cease hostilities and to continue to intensify their dialogue to

⁹³ S/PRST/2001/6; S/PRST/2001/17; S/PRST/2001/26; resolution 1375 (2001); S/PRST/2001/33; and S/PRST/2002/40.

⁹⁴ S/PRST/2001/26.

⁹⁵ S/PRST/2002/3. By a statement of the President dated 18 December 2002, the Council recalled the communiqué and renewed its appeal to the parties to implement and finalize the accord (S/PRST/2002/40).

⁹⁶ S/PRST/2002/40.

⁹⁷ S/PRST/2003/30.

⁹⁸ Resolution 1464 (2003), para. 1. The Council reaffirmed its endorsement of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement by resolution 1479 (2003) of 13 May 2003.

⁹⁹ The Linas-Marcoussis Agreement was signed in January 2003 by all political forces in Côte d'Ivoire. For details, see S/2003/99, annex 1.

¹⁰⁰ Resolution 1479 (2003), para. 2.

¹⁰¹ Following the continuation of hostilities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Council reiterated such call by a statement of the President dated 7 September 2000 (S/PRST/2000/28).

¹⁰² Resolution 1291 (2000), paras. 4 and 7.

¹⁰³ Resolution 1332 (2000), seventh preambular paragraph. The Council reiterated its support of the Lusaka Protocol as well as the Kampala and Harare plans by resolutions 1341 (2001) of 22 February 2001 and 1355 (2001) of 15 June 2001.

implement the Agreement, as well as the Kampala, Maputo and Harare agreements, and to take additional steps, within the framework of these agreements, to accelerate the peace process.¹⁰⁴

By a statement of the President dated 3 May 2001, the Council affirmed that the only viable solution to the crisis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo remained the full implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and the relevant Security Council resolutions. Furthermore, it emphasized the importance of a comprehensive approach addressing all the root causes of the conflict to achieve a lasting peace settlement in the country.¹⁰⁵

By a statement of the President dated 15 August 2002, the Council welcomed the signing in Pretoria on 30 July 2002 of the Peace Agreement between the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Rwandese Republic on the Withdrawal of the Rwandan Troops from the Territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the dismantling of the ex-Rwandese Armed Forces and Interahamwe Forces in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.¹⁰⁶ By resolution 1445 (2002) of 4 December 2002, the Council reiterated its support for the aforementioned Peace Agreement and also welcomed the signing by the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda of the Luanda Agreement.¹⁰⁷

By a statement of the President dated 16 May 2003, the Council welcomed the Agreement on the Engagement to Relaunch the Ituri Pacification Process, signed in Dar-es-Salaam on 16 May 2003, and called upon the parties to implement it fully and without delay.¹⁰⁸

The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia

By resolution 1297 (2000) of 12 May 2000, while condemning the renewed fighting between Eritrea and Ethiopia, the Council demanded the earliest possible reconvening, without preconditions, of substantive peace talks, under the auspices of the Organization of African Unity, on the basis of the Framework Agreement approved on 17 December 1998 and the

Modalities for Implementation.¹⁰⁹ The Council also endorsed the communiqué issued by the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity on 5 May 2000, which recorded the achievements of the negotiations led by OAU, including the areas of convergence already established between the two parties.¹¹⁰

By resolution 1312 (2000) of 31 July 2000, following a ceasefire agreement between Ethiopia and Eritrea on 18 June 2000,¹¹¹ and on the basis of the report of the Secretary-General of 30 June 2000,¹¹² as well as communications received from both parties,¹¹³ the Council established the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) mandated to, inter alia, establish and put into operation the mechanism for verifying the cessation of hostilities.¹¹⁴

By resolution 1320 (2000) of 15 September 2000, the Council expressed its strong support for the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities between the Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia and the Government of the State of Eritrea, signed on 18 June 2000 in Algiers, and the official communications by each Government requesting United Nations assistance in the implementation of the Agreement.¹¹⁵ The Council also called upon the parties to fulfill all their obligations under international law, including the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities.¹¹⁶ In addition, the Council called on the parties to

¹⁰⁹ Resolution 1297 (2000), para. 3.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, para. 7.

¹¹¹ On 30 May 2000, proximity talks started between the two parties under the chairmanship of the Minister of Justice of Algeria and the Personal Envoy of the Chairman of OAU in Algiers, which culminated in Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities (S/2000/601, annex). On 12 December 2000, the Governments of Ethiopia and Eritrea signed the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (S/2000/1183), by which the parties agreed permanently to terminate military hostilities and to respect and implement fully the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities. The Agreement also provided for, inter alia, the establishment of a neutral boundary commission mandated to delimit and demarcate the colonial treaty border based on pertinent colonial treaties and applicable international law.

¹¹² S/2000/643.

¹¹³ S/2000/612 and S/2000/627.

¹¹⁴ Resolution 1312 (2000), para. 1.

¹¹⁵ Resolution 1320 (2000), fifth preambular paragraph.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 1.

¹⁰⁴ Resolution 1332 (2000), para. 2.

¹⁰⁵ S/PRST/2001/13.

¹⁰⁶ S/PRST/2002/24.

¹⁰⁷ Resolution 1445 (2002), para. 1.

¹⁰⁸ S/PRST/2003/6.

continue negotiations and conclude without delay a comprehensive and final peace settlement.¹¹⁷

Following that appeal, by a statement of the President dated 21 November 2000, the Council noted with appreciation the rounds of proximity talks that had taken place and, pursuant to paragraph 14 of resolution 1320 (2000), called upon the parties to continue negotiations and to conclude without delay a final and comprehensive peace settlement.¹¹⁸

In a subsequent statement by the President dated 9 February 2001, the Council, reiterating its strong support for the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities, strongly welcomed and supported the subsequent Peace Agreement between the parties signed in Algiers on 12 December 2000 ("Algiers Agreement"). The Council also encouraged both parties to continue working towards the full and prompt implementation of the Algiers Agreement and, in that connection, it also welcomed the agreement reached by the parties on 6 February 2001 to move forward with the establishment of the temporary security zone (TSZ) on 12 February 2001.¹¹⁹

By resolution 1344 (2001) of 15 March 2001, the Council called upon the parties to continue working towards the full and prompt implementation of their agreements, including an expeditious completion of the remaining steps, in particular the rearrangement of forces necessary for the establishment of the temporary security zone.¹²⁰

By a statement of the President dated 15 May 2001, the Council encouraged both parties to continue working towards the full and prompt implementation of the Agreements and, in that context, to take concrete confidence-building measures. While reaffirming its continued commitment to a peaceful definitive settlement of the conflict, the Council noted with satisfaction that the parties had agreed to the Secretary-General's proposal of 1 May 2001 on the composition

of the Boundary and Claims Commissions, as critical components to the peaceful definitive settlement of the conflict. It therefore called on the parties to cooperate fully with the Boundary Commission and to fulfil their financial responsibilities regarding the Boundary Commission's work.¹²¹

By resolution 1369 (2001) of 14 September 2001, the Council called upon the parties urgently to resolve the outstanding issues in accordance with the Algiers Agreements and fulfil, *inter alia*, the following obligations: (a) to provide freedom of movement and access for personnel and supplies of UNMEE as required for the performance of its duties; (b) to facilitate the establishment of a secure and practicable air corridor between Addis Ababa and Asmara, by accepting the proposal made in that regard by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General; (c) to provide full information on the local militia and police in the temporary security zone as well as on the minefields; (d) to conclude the status-of-forces agreement; and (e) to release and return the remaining prisoners of war and detainees under the auspices of the International Committee of the Red Cross.¹²² By the same resolution the Council also encouraged all States and international organizations to support the peace process.¹²³

By resolution 1434 (2002) of 6 September 2002, the Council decided to review frequently the progress made by the parties in the implementation of their commitments pursuant to the Algiers Agreements, including through the Boundary Commission.¹²⁴

By resolution 1466 (2003) of 14 March 2003, noting that the peace process was entering its crucial phase of demarcation, and emphasizing the importance of ensuring expeditious implementation of the Boundary Decision while maintaining stability in all areas affected by the Decision, the Council urged both Ethiopia and Eritrea to continue to assume their responsibilities and fulfil their commitments under the Algiers Agreements. It further called upon them to cooperate fully and promptly with the Boundary

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, para. 14.

¹¹⁸ S/PRST/2000/34.

¹¹⁹ S/PRST/2001/4. The Council reiterated its support for the Algiers Agreements by several subsequent decisions. See, for example, resolution 1344 (2001) of 15 March 2001; S/PRST/2001/14; resolution 1369 (2001) of 14 September 2001; S/PRST/2002/1; resolution 1398 (2002) of 15 March 2002; resolution 1430 (2002) of 14 August 2002; resolution 1434 (2002) of 6 September 2002; and resolution 1466 (2003) of 14 March 2003.

¹²⁰ Resolution 1344 (2001), para. 2.

¹²¹ S/PRST/2001/14.

¹²² Resolution 1369 (2001), para. 5.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, para. 7.

¹²⁴ Resolution 1434 (2002), para. 2. By resolution 1430 (2002) of 14 August 2002, the Security Council adjusted the mandate of UNMEE to assist the Boundary Commission in the expeditious and orderly implementation of its Delimitation Decision.

Commission to enable it to fulfill its mandate of delimiting and demarcating the boundary.¹²⁵

By a statement of the President dated 17 July 2003, the Council welcomed the public commitment of both parties to a full and expeditious implementation of the Algiers Agreement of 12 December 2000, and reaffirmed its commitment to contribute to the completion of the peace process. The Council also welcomed the parties' acceptance of the 13 April 2002 delimitation decision as final and binding.¹²⁶

By resolution 1507 (2003) of 12 September 2003, the Council urged the Governments of Ethiopia and Eritrea to assume their responsibilities and to take further concrete steps to fulfill their commitments under the Algiers Agreements, and therefore renewed its call upon the parties to cooperate fully with the Boundary Commission.¹²⁷

The situation in Guinea-Bissau

By a statement of the President dated 5 May 2003, the Council welcomed the initiative of the President of Guinea-Bissau to host negotiations on the issue of Casamance and appealed to him to continue to cooperate constructively with the Government of Senegal in order to contribute to a solution of the issue.¹²⁸

The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone

By a statement of the President dated 21 December 2000, the Council, while condemning the incursions into Guinea by rebel groups coming from Liberia and Sierra Leone, noted with interest the common undertakings assumed by Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone at the twenty-fourth ordinary session of the Authority of Heads of State and Government of ECOWAS held in Bamako on 15 and 16 December 2000, and called upon them to implement those undertakings fully and without delay.¹²⁹

¹²⁵ Resolution 1466 (2003), fifth preambular paragraph and para. 2.

¹²⁶ S/PRST/2003/10.

¹²⁷ Resolution 1507 (2003), paras. 3 and 4.

¹²⁸ S/PRST/2003/8.

¹²⁹ S/PRST/2000/41.

The situation in Liberia

By a statement of the President dated 27 August 2003, the Council welcomed the Comprehensive Peace Agreement reached by the Government of Liberia, rebel groups, political parties and civil society leaders in Accra on 18 August 2003. The Council urged all parties to respect fully the ceasefire and implement their commitments under the Comprehensive Peace Agreement.¹³⁰

By resolution 1509 (2003) of 19 September 2003, the Council reaffirmed its support for the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the Liberian ceasefire agreement signed at Accra on 17 June 2003 and urged the parties to move forward with the implementation of those agreements immediately in order to ensure the peaceful formation of a transitional government.¹³¹ By the same resolution, the Council established the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), to support, inter alia, the implementation of the ceasefire agreement and the peace process.¹³²

The situation in Sierra Leone

By resolution 1289 (2000) of 7 February 2000, the Council reiterated its call upon the parties to fulfil all their commitments under the Peace Agreement, signed in Lomé on 7 July 1999, to facilitate the restoration of peace, stability, national reconciliation and development in Sierra Leone, and stressed that the responsibility for the success of the peace process ultimately lay with the people and leaders of Sierra Leone.¹³³

By resolution 1334 (2000) of 22 December 2000, the Council took note of the ceasefire agreement signed in Abuja on 10 November 2000 between the Government of Sierra Leone and the Revolutionary United Front (RUF). Expressing its concern at the failure of RUF fully to meet its obligations under the agreement, the Council called upon the latter to give a more convincing demonstration of its commitment to the ceasefire and the peace process.¹³⁴

¹³⁰ S/PRST/2003/14.

¹³¹ Resolution 1509 (2003), thirteenth preambular paragraph. The Council reiterated its support for the Comprehensive Peace Agreement by resolution 1521 (2003) of 22 December 2003.

¹³² Resolution 1509 (2003), paras. 1 and 3.

¹³³ Resolution 1289 (2000), para. 3.

¹³⁴ Resolution 1334 (2000), para. 2.

By resolution 1346 (2001) of 30 March 2001, the Council expressed its deep concern that the ceasefire agreement of 10 November 2000 had not been fully implemented, and demanded that RUF take immediate steps to fulfil its commitments under the agreement.¹³⁵ It called upon all the parties to the Sierra Leone conflict to intensify their efforts towards the full and peaceful implementation of the ceasefire agreement and the resumption of the peace process, taking into account the basis of the agreement and relevant Council resolutions.¹³⁶ By the same resolution, the Council revised the concept of operations for the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL), including assisting the Government of Sierra Leone in the promotion of a political process which should lead to a renewed disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme and the holding, in due course, of free and fair elections.¹³⁷

By a statement of the President dated 19 December 2001, the Council welcomed the holding in New York, on 16 November 2001, of the fifth meeting of the United Nations-ECOWAS-Sierra Leone coordination mechanism and the progress made in the peace process in Sierra Leone. It appealed to the international community for substantial financial assistance for the programme for the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants and other peace consolidating activities in Sierra Leone.¹³⁸

By resolution 1400 (2002) of 28 March 2002, the Council encouraged the Government of Sierra Leone and RUF to strengthen their efforts towards the full implementation of the ceasefire agreement.¹³⁹ The Council also welcomed the summit meeting of the Mano River Union Presidents and urged the Presidents to continue the dialogue and to implement their commitments to building regional peace and security, including through the efforts of ECOWAS.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁵ Resolution 1346 (2001), para. 7.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 10.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, para. 3.

¹³⁸ S/PRST/2001/38.

¹³⁹ Resolution 1400 (2002), para. 4.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, para. 11. The Council renewed such appeals by subsequent resolutions (for example, resolutions 1436 (2002) and 1508 (2003)).

The situation in Somalia

By a statement of the President dated 29 June 2000, the Council expressed its full support for the efforts exerted by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) to find a political solution to the crisis in Somalia. It also welcomed and fully supported the initiative of the President of Djibouti aimed at restoring peace and stability in the country and urged States and international organizations, in a position to do so, to give those efforts political support and to provide financial and technical assistance to the Government of Djibouti to this end. Finally, the Council strongly urged the representatives of all social and political forces of Somali society to participate actively and in a constructive spirit in the work of the Somalia National Peace and Reconciliation Conference in Arta, Djibouti. In this regard, it also urged the warlords and faction leaders to desist from obstructing and undermining efforts to achieve peace.¹⁴¹

By a statement of the President dated 11 January 2001, the Council welcomed and supported the outcome of the Somalia National Peace and Reconciliation Conference held in Arta, the establishment of the Transitional National Assembly and the Transitional National Government. It also strongly urged all political groups in the country, in particular those remaining outside the Arta peace process, to engage in peaceful and constructive dialogue with the Transitional National Government in order to promote national reconciliation and facilitate the democratic elections scheduled for 2003.¹⁴²

By a statement of the President dated 31 October 2001, reaffirming that the Arta peace process continued to be the most viable basis for peace and national reconciliation in Somalia, the Council urged the Transitional National Government, political and traditional leaders and factions in Somalia to make every effort to complete, without preconditions, the peace and reconciliation process through dialogue and involvement of all parties in a spirit of mutual accommodation and tolerance. It also called upon all parties to refrain from actions that would undermine the Arta peace process. The Council then called upon

¹⁴¹ S/PRST/2000/22.

¹⁴² S/PRST/2001/1. The Council reiterated its support for the Arta peace process by several subsequent statements by the President (for example, S/PRST/2001/30 and S/PRST/2002/8).

the concerned States in the Horn of Africa to contribute constructively to the peace efforts in Somalia and acknowledged Djibouti's major contribution to the Arta peace process, while welcoming its continued role in this regard.¹⁴³

By a statement of the President dated 28 March 2002, the Council strongly supported the decisions of the ninth Summit of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, held in Khartoum on 10 and 11 January 2002, and by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development Foreign Ministers Committee on 14 February 2002 to convene, without conditions, a national reconciliation conference for Somalia in Nairobi in April 2002, including the Transitional National Government and all other Somali parties. The Council strongly supported the call upon Kenya, Ethiopia and Djibouti (the "frontline States") by the ninth Summit to coordinate their efforts for national reconciliation in Somalia under the supervision of the Chairman of IGAD, to hold the reconciliation conference under the auspices of the President of Kenya, as the coordinator of the frontline States. Stating that the constructive and coordinated involvement by all frontline States was crucial for the restoration of peace and stability in Somalia, the Council called upon all States in the region, including States that were not members of IGAD, to contribute constructively to the peace efforts for Somalia, including by using their influence to bring on board Somali groups that had not yet joined the peace process. Finally, the Council endorsed the establishment of the Somalia Contact Group, responsible, *inter alia*, for promoting the completion of the Arta peace process, as well as a working mission to the region, consisting of interested members of the Council and Secretariat staff. In connection with the latter, the Council expressed its determination to address, based on the report to be submitted by the mission and the upcoming report by the Secretary-General, how it might further support in a practical and concrete manner the peace efforts in Somalia on a comprehensive basis.¹⁴⁴

By resolution 1425 (2002) of 22 July 2002, while underlining the role played by IGAD and the frontline States, the Council expressed its support and expectation that the planned national reconciliation

conference for Somalia, to be held in Nairobi, would move forward as a matter of urgency with the pragmatic and result-oriented involvement of the frontline States.¹⁴⁵

By a statement of the President dated 12 December 2002, the Council firmly supported the unified approach of IGAD to national reconciliation in Somalia, and reiterated its strong support for the Somalia National Reconciliation Process and the ongoing Somalia National Reconciliation Conference in Eldoret, Kenya. The Council urged all parties throughout Somalia to participate in the process in accordance with the framework established by IGAD, and expected the decisions adopted throughout the process to be abided by and implemented expeditiously, including the Declaration on Cessation of Hostilities and the Structures and Principles of the Somalia National Reconciliation Process, signed by all delegates in Eldoret on 27 October 2002 (the "Eldoret Declaration"). Welcoming the Eldoret Declaration as an important step towards ending violence, the Council called upon all parties to cease all acts of violence and to respect the cessation of hostilities. The Council also welcomed the Joint Declaration issued by the involved parties in Mogadishu on 2 December 2002 (the "Mogadishu Declaration"). The Council also noted with satisfaction the commencement of the second phase of the Somalia National Reconciliation Process in Eldoret on 2 December 2002 and welcomed it as a significant step forward. The Council therefore strongly encouraged all parties to continue to participate constructively, in accordance with the framework established by the Technical Committee of IGAD, in a spirit of tolerance and mutual accommodation during each phase of the process. Finally, the Council renewed its commitment to assist the parties in the implementation of the steps and conclusions for peace, as adopted throughout the Somalia National Reconciliation Process.¹⁴⁶

By a statement of the President dated 12 March 2003, while reiterating its firm support for the Somalia National Reconciliation Process and the ongoing Somalia National Reconciliation Conference in Kenya, the Council strongly encouraged all parties throughout Somalia to participate in the process, as a unique opportunity to restore peace and stability in the

¹⁴³ S/PRST/2001/30.

¹⁴⁴ S/PRST/2002/8.

¹⁴⁵ Resolution 1425 (2002), fourth preambular paragraph.

¹⁴⁶ S/PRST/2002/35.

country. The Council demanded that the Somali parties abide by and implement expeditiously the decisions adopted throughout the process, including the Declaration on Cessation of Hostilities and the Eldoret Declaration, as well as the Mogadishu Declaration.¹⁴⁷

By a statement of the President dated 11 November 2003, while reiterating again its support for the Somali National Reconciliation Process, the Council commended the progress made and acknowledged the challenges ahead. It further welcomed the relevant decisions made by the tenth Summit of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development and the first meeting of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development Ministerial Facilitation Committee on the Somali peace process in October 2003. The Council urged all Somali leaders to participate constructively in the meeting of leaders planned by the Facilitation Committee in Kenya in November 2003 to bridge their differences and to reach agreements on a viable government and a durable and inclusive solution to the conflict in Somalia.¹⁴⁸

Letter dated 2 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

By a statement of the President dated 10 October 2003, the Council welcomed the agreement on security arrangements reached in Naivasha, Kenya, between the Government of the Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army. Reiterating its welcome for the signing of the Machakos Protocol as a viable basis for a resolution of the conflict in the Sudan, the Council looked forward to the successful conclusion of a comprehensive peace agreement, based on the Machakos Protocol. The Council also welcomed the continuation of the ceasefire and assured the parties of its readiness to support them in the implementation of the comprehensive peace agreement.¹⁴⁹

The situation concerning Western Sahara

By resolution 1292 (2000) of 29 February 2000, while noting the concerns expressed in the latest report of the Secretary-General on the possibility of achieving

consensual implementation of the settlement plan and agreements adopted by the parties, the Council urged the parties to cooperate so as to achieve a lasting solution.¹⁵⁰

By resolution 1301 (2000) of 31 May 2000, the Council decided to extend the mandate of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) for a further period of two months, with the expectation that the parties would offer the Personal Envoy of the Secretary-General specific and concrete proposals to resolve the multiple problems relating to the implementation of the settlement plan and explore all ways and means to achieve an early, durable and agreed resolution to their dispute over Western Sahara.¹⁵¹

By resolution 1359 (2001) of 29 June 2001, the Council took into consideration a number of documents: the official proposals submitted by the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguía el Hamra y de Río de Oro on the implementation of the settlement plan, the draft framework agreement on the status of Western Sahara contained in annex I to the report of the Secretary-General, and the memorandum of the Government of Algeria on the draft status for Western Sahara.¹⁵² The Council therefore encouraged the parties, under the auspices of the Secretary-General's Personal Envoy, to discuss the draft framework agreement on the status of Western Sahara and negotiate any specific changes they would like to see in the proposal, as well as discuss any other proposal for a political solution which might be put forward by the parties, to arrive at a mutually

¹⁵⁰ Resolution 1292 (2000), sixth preambular paragraph.

¹⁵¹ Resolution 1301 (2000), para. 1. By a series of subsequent resolutions, the Security Council continued to extend the mandate of MINURSO for additional periods of two to six months, with the expectation that the parties would meet in direct talks under the auspices of the Personal Envoy of the Secretary-General to try to resolve the multiple problems relating to the implementation of the settlement plan, and to try to agree upon a mutually acceptable political solution to their dispute over Western Sahara. See resolutions 1309 (2000), 1324 (2000), 1342 (2001), 1349 (2001), 1359 (2001), 1380 (2001), 1394 (2002), 1406 (2002), 1429 (2002), 1463 (2003), 1469 (2003), 1485 (2003), 1495 (2003) and 1513 (2003).

¹⁵² Resolution 1359 (2001), seventh, eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs.

¹⁴⁷ S/PRST/2003/2.

¹⁴⁸ S/PRST/2003/19.

¹⁴⁹ S/PRST/2003/16.

acceptable agreement.¹⁵³ It also affirmed that, while the aforementioned discussion continued, the official proposals submitted by the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Sagüfa el-Hamra y de Río de Oro (Frente Polisario) to overcome the obstacles preventing implementation of the settlement plan should be considered and recalled that, given that nothing would be agreed until everything had been agreed, by engaging in these negotiations the parties would not prejudice their final positions.¹⁵⁴

By resolution 1429 (2002) of 30 July 2002, following the presentation of the report of the Secretary-General dated 19 February 2002 and the four options contained therein,¹⁵⁵ the Council called upon the parties and the States of the region to cooperate fully with the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy.¹⁵⁶

By resolution 1495 (2003) of 31 July 2003, acting under Chapter VI of the Charter, having considered the report of the Secretary-General of 23 May 2003¹⁵⁷ and the peace plan for self-determination of the people of Western Sahara presented by his Personal Envoy,¹⁵⁸ as well as the responses of the parties and the neighbouring States,¹⁵⁹ the Council supported the peace plan for self-determination of the people of Western Sahara put forward by the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy as an optimum political solution on the basis of agreement between the two parties.¹⁶⁰ It further called upon the parties to work with the United Nations and with each other towards acceptance and implementation of the peace plan.¹⁶¹

Asia

The situation in Afghanistan

By a statement of the President dated 7 April 2000, the Council reiterated that there was no military solution to the conflict in Afghanistan and that only a

negotiated political settlement aimed at the establishment of a broad-based, multi-ethnic and fully representative government acceptable to all Afghans could lead to peace and national reconciliation. Noting that the United Front of Afghanistan was willing to talk with the Taliban, the Council recalled its demand that the parties, and in particular the Taliban, resume negotiations under the auspices of the United Nations without delay or preconditions in full compliance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Council.¹⁶² In addition, the Council urged the members of the “six plus two” group¹⁶³ and the Afghan parties to implement the Tashkent Declaration on Fundamental Principles for a Peaceful Settlement of the Conflict in Afghanistan,¹⁶⁴ particularly the agreement of members of the group not to provide military support to any Afghan party and to prevent the use of their territories for such purposes.¹⁶⁵

By resolution 1383 (2001) of 6 December 2001, the Council endorsed the Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan Pending the Re-establishment of Permanent Government Institutions, as reported in the letter from the Secretary-General dated 5 December 2001,¹⁶⁶ and called upon all Afghan groups to implement the Agreement in full, in particular through full cooperation with the Interim Authority.¹⁶⁷ By several subsequent resolutions, the Council reiterated its endorsement of the aforementioned Agreement.¹⁶⁸

By resolution 1453 (2002) of 24 December 2002, the Council welcomed and endorsed the Declaration on Good-Neighbourly Relations signed by the Transitional Administration of Afghanistan and the Governments of China, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, the States neighbouring Afghanistan, in Kabul on 22 December 2002. It also called on all States to respect the

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, para. 2.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 3 and 4.

¹⁵⁵ S/2002/178.

¹⁵⁶ Resolution 1429 (2002), para. 2.

¹⁵⁷ S/2003/565.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, annex II.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, annex III.

¹⁶⁰ Resolution 1495 (2003), para. 1.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, para. 2.

¹⁶² S/PRST/2000/12.

¹⁶³ The “six plus two group” consisted of China, Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, plus the Russian Federation and the United States.

¹⁶⁴ S/1999/812, annex.

¹⁶⁵ S/PRST/2000/12.

¹⁶⁶ S/2001/1154 (also known as the “Bonn Agreement”).

¹⁶⁷ Resolution 1383 (2001), paras. 1 and 2.

¹⁶⁸ Resolutions 1386 (2001), 1401 (2002) and 1419 (2002).

Declaration and to support the implementation of its provisions.¹⁶⁹

The situation in East Timor

By a statement of the President dated 3 August 2000, paying tribute to the progress made by the Transitional Administration, the Council welcomed the significant progress made in building healthy relations between East Timor and Indonesia. Furthermore, the Council strongly supported the steps taken by the Transitional Administration to strengthen the involvement and direct participation of the East Timorese people in the administration of their territory and, in particular, the establishment of the National Council and the reorganization of the Transitional Administration, with a view to building capacity in the territory in the run-up to independence.¹⁷⁰

Following the murder of three United Nations staff members in Atambua, West Timor, by armed militias on 6 September 2000, the Council responded to the deteriorating security situation by adopting resolution 1319 (2000) on 8 September 2000. By that resolution, the Council called on the Government of Indonesia to take immediate steps, in fulfilment of its responsibilities, to disarm and disband militia immediately, restore law and order in the affected areas in West Timor, ensure safety and security in the refugee camps and for humanitarian workers, and prevent cross-border incursions into East Timor.¹⁷¹

By resolution 1338 (2001) of 31 January 2001, the Council extended the mandate of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), a multidimensional peacekeeping operation fully responsible for the administration of East Timor during its transition to independence, and encouraged efforts to achieve the goal of independence by the end of 2001, acknowledging that it was the responsibility of UNTAET to ensure free and fair

elections in collaboration with the people of East Timor.¹⁷²

By a statement of the President dated 10 September 2001, the Council expressed its appreciation to UNTAET for facilitating a smooth and representative election process and called upon all parties to respect fully and implement the election results, which provided the basis for a broad-based Constituent Assembly. The Council urged all parties to work together to draft a constitution which reflected the will of the East Timorese people and to cooperate for the successful completion of the final steps towards independence, in a complex process of stabilization in East Timor.¹⁷³

By a statement of the President dated 31 October 2001, the Council welcomed the political progress achieved towards establishing an independent East Timorese State and endorsed the recommendation by the Constituent Assembly that independence be declared on 20 May 2002. The Council concurred with the assessment of the Secretary-General that premature withdrawal of the international presence could have a destabilizing effect in a number of crucial areas and that the United Nations should remain engaged in East Timor to protect the major achievements so far realized by the Transitional Administration, to build upon those achievements in cooperation with other actors and to assist the East Timorese Government in ensuring security and stability.¹⁷⁴

By resolution 1410 (2002) of 17 May 2002, noting the existence of challenges to the short- and long-term security and stability of an independent East Timor and determining that ensuring the security of the boundaries of East Timor and preserving its internal and external stability was necessary for the maintenance of peace and security in the region, the Council established the United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISSET), whose mandate included the implementation of programmes for “stability, democracy and justice”.¹⁷⁵

¹⁶⁹ Resolution 1453 (2002), paras. 1 and 2. The Council reiterated its endorsement of the Declaration on Good-Neighbourly Relations and renewed its call to the parties to respect the Declaration by resolution 1471 (2003) of 28 March 2003 and its statement by the President dated 17 June 2003 (S/PRST/2003/7).

¹⁷⁰ S/PRST/2000/26.

¹⁷¹ Resolution 1319 (2000), para. 1. The call upon the Government of Indonesia to disarm and disband the militia was reiterated by the Council in a statement by the President dated 6 December 2000 (S/PRST/2000/39).

¹⁷² Resolution 1338 (2001), fifth preambular paragraph and para. 2.

¹⁷³ S/PRST/2001/23.

¹⁷⁴ S/PRST/2001/32.

¹⁷⁵ Resolution 1410 (2002), fifteenth preambular paragraph and paras. 1 and 4. The mandate was subsequently extended by resolution 1480 (2003).

Following the entry into force of East Timor's first Constitution on 22 March and the presidential elections on 14 April, by a statement of the President dated 20 May 2002, the Council welcomed the attainment of independence by East Timor and expressed its strong support for the leadership of East Timor as it assumed authority for governing the new, sovereign State of East Timor.¹⁷⁶

**Letter dated 10 November 2000 from the
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission
of Solomon Islands to the United Nations
addressed to the President of the Security
Council**

By a statement of the President issued at the 4224th meeting on 16 November 2000, the Council strongly supported the Townsville Peace Agreement, concluded on 15 October 2000, for the cessation of hostilities between the Malaita Eagle Force and the Isatabu Freedom Movement and for the restoration of peace and ethnic harmony in Solomon Islands. The Council also encouraged all parties to cooperate in promoting reconciliation, so that the objectives of the Townsville Peace Agreement could be met, and urged all parties to continue to cooperate in accordance with the Peace Agreement, namely, to restore and maintain peace and ethnic harmony, to renounce the use of armed force and violence, to settle their differences through consultation and peaceful negotiation, and to confirm their respect for human rights and the rule of law.¹⁷⁷

**The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-
Afghan Border**

By a statement of the President dated 21 March 2000, the Council welcomed the decisive progress in the implementation of the General Agreement on the Establishment of Peace and National Accord in Tajikistan achieved owing to the efforts of the President of the Republic of Tajikistan and the leadership of the Commission on National Reconciliation. The Council welcomed, in particular, the holding on 27 February 2000 of the first multiparty and pluralistic parliamentary election in Tajikistan, in spite of serious problems and shortcomings, as noted by the Joint Electoral Observation Mission for

Tajikistan. It also noted that, with the holding of the election, the transition period envisaged in the General Agreement came to a close. In that connection, the Council noted with satisfaction that the United Nations had played an important role in this success and welcomed the instrumental efforts of all the actors involved in the implementation of the General Agreement, namely: the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT), supported by the Contact Group of Guarantor States and International Organizations, the Mission of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the collective peacekeeping forces of the Commonwealth of Independent States.¹⁷⁸

Europe

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

By resolution 1305 (2000) of 21 June 2000, underlining its commitment and support for the implementation of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the annexes thereto,¹⁷⁹ as well as for the Dayton Agreement on Implementing the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina of 10 November 1995,¹⁸⁰ the Council called upon the parties to comply strictly with their obligations under those Agreements, and reminded the parties that, in accordance with the Peace Agreement, they had committed themselves to cooperate fully with all entities involved in the implementation of the peace settlement.¹⁸¹ By the same resolution, and by a series of subsequent resolutions,¹⁸² the Council extended the mandate of the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH) to implement the reform and

¹⁷⁸ S/PRST/2000/9. The Council welcomed once again the success achieved by the peace process in Tajikistan by a statement of the President dated 12 May 2000 (S/PRST/2000/17).

¹⁷⁹ The Peace Agreement (S/1995/999, annex) was negotiated in Dayton and signed in Paris on 14 December 1995. It has become customary to refer to this agreement as the "Dayton Agreement".

¹⁸⁰ S/1995/1021, annex.

¹⁸¹ Resolution 1305 (2000), preambular paragraph 3 and paras. 1 and 3. The Council reiterated its support for the Peace Agreement and continued to call upon the parties to respect the Peace Agreement by several subsequent resolutions. See resolution 1357 (2001) and 1423 (2002).

¹⁸² Resolutions 1305 (2000), 1357 (2001), 1418 (2002), 1420 (2002), 1421 (2002), and 1423 (2002).

¹⁷⁶ S/PRST/2002/13.

¹⁷⁷ S/PRST/2000/33.

restructuring of law enforcement agencies in Bosnia and Herzegovina and thus to contribute to strengthening the rule of law, as set out by the Dayton Agreement.¹⁸³

The situation in Croatia

By resolution 1285 (2000) of 13 January 2000, the Council reiterated its concern about the lack of substantive progress towards a settlement of the disputed issue of Prevlaka in the continuing bilateral negotiations between the parties pursuant to the Agreement on Normalization of Relations between the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of 23 August 1996 and noted that the presence of the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (UNMOP) continued to be essential to maintain conditions conducive to a negotiated settlement of the issue of Prevlaka.¹⁸⁴ Calling for the resumption of the discussions, the Council also urged the parties to abide by their mutual commitments and implement fully such Agreement and stressed, in particular, the urgent need for the parties to fulfil rapidly and in good faith their commitment to reach a negotiated resolution of the disputed issue of Prevlaka.¹⁸⁵ By several subsequent resolutions the Council renewed its call upon the parties to reach a negotiated solution to the issue.¹⁸⁶

By resolution 1335 (2001) of 12 January 2001, welcoming the commitment by the parties to resume as soon as possible bilateral talks on the disputed issue of Prevlaka,¹⁸⁷ the Council called on the parties to resume talks and encouraged them to make use of the recommendations and options to develop confidence-building measures with which they were provided in resolution 1252 (1999).¹⁸⁸

By resolution 1387 (2002) of 15 January 2002, the Council welcomed the continuing progress in the normalization of relations between the Governments of the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the establishment of an interstate Border Commission, and urged the parties to accelerate efforts towards a negotiated settlement on the disputed issue of Prevlaka.¹⁸⁹

By resolution 1437 (2002) of 11 October 2002, noting with satisfaction that the overall situation in the UNMOP area of responsibility had remained stable and calm, and encouraged by the progress made by the parties in normalizing their bilateral relationship, in particular through negotiations aimed at finding a transitional arrangement for the Prevlaka peninsula, the Council commended the role played by the Mission and decided to terminate it on 15 December 2002.¹⁹⁰

By a statement of the President dated 12 December 2002, the Council welcomed the protocol signed by the Governments of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on 10 December 2002, establishing a provisional cross-border regime on the Prevlaka peninsula.¹⁹¹ The Council stressed that the protocol represented a further step forward in the process of strengthening of confidence and good neighbourly relations between both countries and welcomed the commitment of both Governments to continue negotiations on the Prevlaka dispute with a view to amicably resolving all outstanding issues.¹⁹²

The situation in Cyprus

By resolution 1475 (2003) of 14 April 2003, expressing its support for the “carefully balanced” settlement plan proposed by the Secretary-General on 26 February 2006, the Council called on all concerned to negotiate within the framework of the good offices of the Secretary-General, using the plan to reach a comprehensive settlement.¹⁹³

¹⁸³ Resolution 1305 (2000), para. 19.

¹⁸⁴ Resolution 1285 (2000), eighth and tenth preambular paragraphs Established by resolution 1038 (1996), UNMOP was mandated to monitor the demilitarization of the Prevlaka peninsula and of the neighbouring areas in Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and to hold regular meetings with the local authorities in order to strengthen liaison, reduce tensions, improve safety and security and promote confidence between the parties.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 4.

¹⁸⁶ Resolutions 1307 (2000) of 13 July 2000, 1335 (2001) of 12 January 2001 and 1362 (2001) of 11 July 2001.

¹⁸⁷ See S/2000/1265 and S/2001/13.

¹⁸⁸ Resolution 1335 (2001), ninth preambular paragraph and

para. 3.

¹⁸⁹ Resolution 1387 (2002), para. 3. The Council renewed such call by resolutions 1424 (2002) of 12 July 2002 and 1437 (2002) of 11 October 2002.

¹⁹⁰ Resolution 1437 (2002), fifth preambular paragraph and para. 1.

¹⁹¹ S/2002/1348.

¹⁹² S/PRST/2002/34.

¹⁹³ Resolution 1475 (2003), para. 4.

During the period under review, the Council continued to extend the mandate of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), which, according to resolution 186 (1964), was to prevent a recurrence of fighting between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities and to contribute to the maintenance and restoration of law and order and a return to normal conditions.¹⁹⁴

The situation in Georgia

By resolution 1287 (2000) of 31 January 2000, while welcoming the decision on further measures for the settlement of the conflict in Abkhazia adopted by the Council of Heads of State of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) on 30 December 1999, the Council encouraged the parties to seize the opportunity of the appointment of a new Special Representative of the Secretary General to renew their commitment to the peace process.¹⁹⁵ In addition, the Council reiterated its call for the parties to the conflict to deepen their commitment to the United Nations-led peace process, to continue to expand their dialogue, and to display without delay the necessary will to achieve substantial results on the key issues of the negotiations, in particular on the distribution of constitutional competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi as part of a comprehensive settlement, with full respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia within its internationally recognized borders.¹⁹⁶ Finally, the Council demanded that both sides observe strictly the Agreement on a Ceasefire and Separation of Forces.¹⁹⁷ By the same resolution, and seven other subsequent resolutions, the Council extended the mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG), established pursuant to resolution 858 (1993), to verify compliance with the ceasefire agreement between the Government of Georgia and the Abkhaz authorities in Georgia, to investigate reported or alleged violations of the Agreement and to resolve or contribute to the resolution of such incidents.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁴ Resolution 186 (1964), para. 5.

¹⁹⁵ Resolution 1287 (2000), fourth preambular paragraph and para. 2.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 4.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, para. 9.

¹⁹⁸ Resolutions 1287 (2000), 1311 (2000), 1339 (2001), 1364 (2001), 1427 (2002), 1393 (2002), 1462 (2003), and 1494 (2003).

By a statement of the President dated 11 May 2000, believing that the resolution of issues related to the improvement of the humanitarian situation, to socio-economic development and to ensuring stability in the conflict zone would facilitate the peace process, the Council called upon the parties to finalize and sign a draft agreement on peace and guarantees for the prevention of armed confrontation and a draft protocol on the return of refugees to the Gali region and measures for economic rehabilitation.¹⁹⁹

By resolution 1311 (2000) of 28 July 2000, the Council welcomed the decision of the parties to accelerate work on the draft protocol on the return of refugees to the Gali region and on the draft agreement on peace and guarantees for the prevention and non-resumption of hostilities.²⁰⁰ Welcoming the commitment of the parties not to use force for the resolution of any disputed question, the Council renewed its demand to both sides to strictly observe the Agreement on a Ceasefire and Separation of Forces.²⁰¹

By resolution 1339 (2001) of 31 January 2001, the Council called upon the parties, in particular the Abkhaz side, to undertake immediate efforts to move beyond the impasse and to engage in negotiations on the core political questions of the conflict and all other outstanding issues in the United Nations-led peace process.²⁰²

By a statement of the President dated 21 March 2001, while encouraging the two sides to engage with renewed commitment in the peace process, the Council welcomed the successful holding of the third meeting on confidence-building measures between the Georgian and Abkhaz sides, in Yalta, on 15 and 16 March 2001, and the resumption of dialogue between them, as well as the documents signed there.²⁰³ The Council also expressed its hope that such developments would lead to a narrowing of the positions of the two sides and stimulate further constructive dialogue aimed at achieving a comprehensive political settlement of the conflict, including a settlement of the political status of Abkhazia within the State of Georgia and other key issues.²⁰⁴

¹⁹⁹ S/PRST/2000/16.

²⁰⁰ Resolution 1311 (2000), sixth preambular paragraph.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 5 and 11.

²⁰² Resolution 1339 (2001), para. 5.

²⁰³ S/2001/242, annex.

²⁰⁴ S/PRST/2001/9.

By resolution 1393 (2002) of 31 January 2002, the Council welcomed and supported the finalization of the document on “Basic Principles for the Distribution of Competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi” and its letter of transmittal as positive elements for launching the peace process and facilitating meaningful negotiations between the parties.²⁰⁵ The Council therefore strongly urged the parties, in particular the Abkhaz side, to receive the document and its letter of transmittal in the near future, to give them full and open consideration, and to engage in constructive negotiations on their substance without delay.²⁰⁶ In addition, while condemning violations of the Agreement on a Ceasefire and Separation of Forces, the Council welcomed and strongly supported the protocol signed by the two sides, on 17 January 2002, regarding the situation in the Kodori Valley and called for its full implementation.²⁰⁷ Finally, the Council urged the parties to ensure the necessary revitalization of the peace process in all its major aspects, to resume their work in the Coordinating Council and its relevant mechanisms, to build on the results of the third meeting on confidence-building measures between the Georgian and Abkhaz sides held in Yalta and to implement the proposals agreed to on that occasion, in a purposeful and cooperative manner.²⁰⁸

By resolution 1427 (2002) of 29 July 2002, recalling its support for the document on “Basic Principles for the Distribution of Competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi”, the Council regretted the lack of progress on the initiation of political status negotiations and, in particular, the refusal of the Abkhaz side to agree to a discussion on the substance of the document.²⁰⁹

**Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998),
1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999)
and 1244 (1999)**

By a statement of the President dated 19 December 2000, expressing its grave concern at the situation in certain municipalities in southern Serbia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and particularly in the

Ground Safety Zone, the Council strongly condemned the violent action by ethnic Albanian extremist groups in southern Serbia, and called for an immediate and complete cessation of violence in the area. The Council also welcomed the start of a dialogue between the Serbian and Yugoslav authorities and representatives of the affected communities which could facilitate a lasting settlement to the problem. In that regard, the Council equally welcomed the commitment of the Yugoslav authorities to work towards a peaceful settlement, based on democratic principles, and to respect the provisions of resolution 1244 (1999) and the military-technical Agreement contained therein. Finally, the Security Council welcomed specific measures taken by the international security presence (the Kosovo Force) to address the problem as well as the constructive dialogue between the Kosovo Force (KFOR) and the Yugoslav and Serbian authorities, including through the Joint Implementation Commission.²¹⁰

By a statement of the President dated 16 March 2001, the Council called for an end to all acts of violence in Kosovo, in particular those ethnically motivated, and urged all political leaders in Kosovo to condemn these acts and to increase their efforts to create inter-ethnic tolerance. It called on all parties to support the efforts of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) to build a stable multi-ethnic democratic society in Kosovo and to ensure suitable conditions for Kosovo-wide elections. By the same statement, the Council expressed its concern about the security situation in certain municipalities in Southern Serbia as a result of the violent actions of ethnic Albanian armed groups. It welcomed the ceasefire agreements signed on 12 March 2001 and called for strict compliance with their provisions. It also stressed that a peaceful settlement of this crisis could only be achieved through substantial dialogue and therefore welcomed the plan of the Government of Yugoslavia for Southern Serbia and supported its initiative to find a peaceful and durable solution through a process of dialogue and confidence-building measures. Finally, the Council noted that the swift implementation of confidence-building measures would be an important element in a peaceful settlement, and underlined the importance of continued

²⁰⁵ Resolution 1393 (2002), paras. 3 and 4.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 6.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, paras. 8 and 9.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 10.

²⁰⁹ Resolution 1427 (2002), paras. 3, 4 and 6. The Council reiterated its regret for the lack of progress by resolution 1462 (2003) of 30 January 2003.

²¹⁰ S/PRST/2000/40.

political and financial support for this process by the international community.²¹¹

By a statement of the President dated 9 November 2001, the Security Council welcomed the signing, on 5 November 2001, of the UNMIK-Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Common Document. The Council also encouraged the further development of a constructive dialogue between UNMIK and the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.²¹²

By a statement of the President dated 13 February 2002, the Council, noting the progress made in the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999) and the Constitutional Framework for Provisional Self-Government, called on Kosovo's elected representatives to resolve the deadlock over the formation of executive structures of the provisional self-governing institutions and to allow the functioning of those institutions, in accordance with the Constitutional Framework and the outcome of the elections.²¹³

By a statement of the President dated 24 April 2002, welcoming the progress made in the formation of the executive bodies of the Provisional Institutions of Self-Government in Kosovo to include representatives of all communities, the Council encouraged the Provisional Institutions of Self-Government, in full cooperation with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and in strict compliance with resolution 1244 (1999), to take on the tasks assigned to them by the Constitutional Framework.²¹⁴

By a statement of the President dated 6 February 2003, condemning all attempts to establish and maintain structures and institutions as well as initiatives inconsistent with resolution 1244 (1999) and the Constitutional Framework, the Council called for the authority of UNMIK to be respected throughout Kosovo, and encouraged the establishment of direct dialogue between Pristina and Belgrade on issues of practical importance to both sides. Condemning the violence within the Kosovo Albanian community, as well as the violence against the Kosovo Serb community, the Council urged local institutions and leaders to exert influence on the climate for the rule of law by condemning all violence and actively

supporting the efforts of the police and the judiciary. The Council also stressed that all communities should make renewed efforts to inject momentum into improving inter-ethnic dialogue and promoting the reconciliation process, not least through full cooperation with the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991.²¹⁵

Middle East

The situation in the Middle East

During the period under review, the Council continued to extend the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF), established pursuant to resolution 350 (1974), to monitor the ceasefire between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic and supervise the disengagement of Israeli and Syrian forces.²¹⁶

The Council also continued to extend the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), established pursuant to resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), to confirm the withdrawal of Israeli forces, restore international peace and security and assist the Government of Lebanon in restoring its effective authority in the area.²¹⁷

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

By resolution 1322 (2000) of 7 October 2000, the Council expressed concern for the events that had taken place at Haram Al-Sharif in Jerusalem on 28 September 2000 that lead to numerous deaths and injuries. The Council called for the immediate cessation of violence and for all necessary steps to ensure that violence ceased, that new provocative actions were avoided, and that the situation returned to normality. It further called for the immediate resumption of negotiations within the Middle East

²¹¹ S/PRST/2001/8.

²¹² S/PRST/2001/34.

²¹³ S/PRST/2002/4.

²¹⁴ S/PRST/2002/11.

²¹⁵ S/PRST/2003/1.

²¹⁶ Resolutions 1300 (2000), 1328 (2000), 1351 (2001), 1381 (2001), 1415 (2002), 1451 (2002), 1488 (2003) and 1520 (2003).

²¹⁷ Resolutions 1288 (2000), 1310 (2000), 1337 (2001), 1365 (2001), 1391 (2002), 1428 (2002), 1461 (2003) and 1496 (2003).

peace process on its agreed basis with the aim of achieving an early final settlement between the Israeli and Palestinian sides.²¹⁸

By resolution 1397 (2002) of 12 March 2002, the Council demanded the immediate cessation of all acts of violence, including all acts of terror, provocation, incitement and destruction, and called upon the Israeli and Palestinian sides to cooperate in the implementation of the Tenet work plan and the recommendations contained in the Mitchell report with the aim of resuming negotiations on a political settlement.²¹⁹

By resolution 1402 (2002) of 30 March 2002, following the further deterioration of the situation, including the suicide bombings in Israel and the military attacks against the headquarters of the President of the Palestinian Authority, the Council called upon both parties to move immediately to a meaningful ceasefire. It further called upon the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Palestinian cities and urged the parties to cooperate fully with the Special Envoy to implement the Tenet work plan and the recommendations contained in the Mitchell report with the aim of resuming negotiations on a political settlement.²²⁰

By a statement of the President dated 10 April 2002, the Council supported the Joint Statement issued in Madrid on 10 April 2002 by the Secretary-General, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain and the High Representative for European Union Common Foreign and Security Policy. The Council called upon the Government of Israel, the Palestinian Authority and all States in the region to cooperate with the efforts to achieve the goals set out in the Joint Statement.²²¹ Similarly, by a statement of the President dated 18 July 2002, the Council supported the Joint Statement of the “Quartet” on 16 July 2002 and called upon the parties to achieve the goals set out in the Statement.²²²

By resolution 1435 (2002), expressing its concern at the reoccupation of the headquarters of the President

²¹⁸ Resolution 1322 (2000), second preambular paragraph, paras. 4 and 6.

²¹⁹ Resolution 1397 (2002), paras. 1 and 2.

²²⁰ Resolution 1402 (2002), para. 1.

²²¹ S/PRST/2002/9, annex.

²²² S/PRST/2002/20.

of the Palestinian Authority in the city of Ramallah on 19 September 2002, as well as of other Palestinian cities, the Council reiterated its demand for the complete cessation of all acts of violence and demanded that Israel cease measures in and around Ramallah and withdraw its forces from the Palestinian cities towards the return to the positions held prior to September 2000. It also called upon the Palestinian Authority to meet its expressed commitment to ensure that those responsible for terrorist acts were brought to justice. Finally, the Council expressed its full support for the efforts of the Quartet and called upon the Government of Israel, the Palestinian Authority and all States in the region to cooperate with those efforts, recognizing in this context the continuing importance of the initiative endorsed at the Arab League Summit, held in Beirut on 27 and 28 March 2002.²²³

By resolution 1515 (2003) of 19 November 2003, the Council endorsed the Quartet performance-based road map to a permanent two-State solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and called upon the parties to fulfil their obligations under the road map in cooperation with the Quartet.²²⁴

C. Decisions involving the Secretary-General in the Council's efforts at the pacific settlement of disputes

While Article 99 of the Charter provides that the Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security, the Charter does not otherwise describe or define the role of the Secretary-General in relation to matters of peace and security. Nevertheless, the Council's efforts, aimed at the peaceful settlement of disputes, frequently require the involvement of the Secretary-General, who, in coordination with the Council or at its request, facilitates peace efforts in various ways.

During the period under review, the Council increasingly recognized, in a number of decisions, the important role that the Secretary-General was called upon to play in the prevention of armed conflicts and requested him to submit proposals relating to early warning and preventive measures. By a statement of

²²³ Resolution 1435 (2002), paras. 1-5.

²²⁴ Resolution 1515 (2003), paras. 1 and 2.

the President dated 20 July 2000, in connection with the Council's consideration of the item entitled "Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts", the Council recalled the essential role of the Secretary-General in the prevention of armed conflicts, in accordance with Article 99 of the Charter, and expressed its willingness to take appropriate preventive action in response to matters brought to its attention by States or the Secretary-General and which it deemed likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. The Council further encouraged the ongoing efforts within the United Nations system to enhance its early warning capacity, and noted in that regard the importance of drawing on information from a variety of sources, given the multiple factors that contribute to conflict. It thus invited the Secretary-General to make recommendations to the Council, taking into account the views of Member States, and in light of past experiences, on the most effective and appropriate early warning strategies, bearing in mind the need to link early warning with early response. The Council invited the Secretary-General to present to the Council reports on such disputes, including, as appropriate, early warning and proposals for preventive measures.²²⁵

The Council also recognized, by resolution 1366 (2001) of 30 August 2001, the role of the Secretary-General in the prevention of armed conflict, and the importance of enhancing his role in accordance with Article 99 of the Charter. By that resolution, while acknowledging that the attempt to prevent armed conflict was an integral part of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and emphasizing the importance of a comprehensive strategy comprising operational and structural measures for prevention of armed conflict, the Council recognized the 10 principles outlined by the Secretary-General in his report on prevention of armed conflicts²²⁶ as well as his essential role in the prevention of armed conflict and the importance of efforts to enhance his role in accordance with Article 99 of the Charter.²²⁷ By the same resolution, the Council called upon Member States, as well as regional and subregional organizations and arrangements, to support the development of a comprehensive conflict

prevention strategy as proposed by the Secretary-General, and expressed its willingness to give prompt consideration to early warning or prevention cases brought to its attention by the Secretary-General.²²⁸ The Council therefore encouraged the Secretary-General to convey to the Security Council his assessment of potential threats to international peace and security with due regard to relevant regional and subregional dimensions, as appropriate, in accordance with Article 99 of the Charter.²²⁹ The Council also invited the Secretary-General to refer to the Council information and analyses from within the United Nations system on cases of serious violations of international law, including international humanitarian law and human rights law and on potential conflict situations arising, *inter alia*, from ethnic, religious and territorial disputes, poverty and lack of development, and expressed its determination to give serious consideration to such information and analyses regarding situations which it deemed to represent a threat to international peace and security.²³⁰ The Council also supported the enhancement of the role of the Secretary-General in conflict prevention, including by increased use of United Nations interdisciplinary fact-finding and confidence-building missions to regions of tension, developing regional prevention strategies with regional partners and appropriate United Nations organs and agencies, and improving the capacity and resource base for preventive action in the Secretariat.²³¹

During the period under review, in accordance with the provisions of Article 33 of the Charter, the Council frequently called on the parties to a dispute or situation to cooperate in negotiations held under the auspices of the Secretary-General, expressed support for conciliation efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General, expressly requested the Secretary-General to assume an active role in the process of achieving a political settlement, or endorsed the initiative of the Secretary-General within the framework of his mission of good offices. In that context, the Secretary-General made increased use of special envoys, advisers and representatives to assist him in his efforts.²³² For

²²⁵ S/PRST/2000/25.

²²⁶ S/2001/574.

²²⁷ Resolution 1366 (2001), eighth and eleventh preambular paragraphs.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 3.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, para. 5.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, para. 10.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, para. 18.

²³² For example, the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Africa, the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Cyprus, the Special Representative for the

instance, through an exchange of letters, the Security Council took note of the intention of the Secretary-General to appoint a Special Representative for the Great Lakes region.²³³ The Special Representative was given the tasks, *inter alia*, of representing the Secretary-General at the meetings and deliberations under the Arusha peace process in Burundi and addressing the regional dimensions of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Furthermore, with respect to Burundi, following the signing of the Arusha peace agreement, the Special Representative had been mandated to stay engaged within the overall efforts of the international community to address the grave political and humanitarian situation in Burundi and its regional dimensions.²³⁴

Beyond the discharge of his good offices, the Secretary-General increasingly proposed the establishment or continuation of special political missions in a number of places around the world to undertake peacebuilding efforts to prevent conflicts or the re-emergence of conflicts, including political, humanitarian and development assistance as well as assistance to transitional national governments in establishing viable institutions. The Council formally endorsed the efforts of the Secretary-General in that context by a statement of the President dated 20 February 2001, issued in connection with the Council's consideration of the item entitled "Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach". By the statement, the Council underlined the importance of the presence of special representatives of the Secretary-General or other suitable United Nations coordination arrangements, such as the resident coordinator system, in coordinating the elaboration and implementation of peacebuilding programmes by

Great Lakes region and the Adviser to the Secretary-General for Special Assignments in Africa. During the period under consideration, the Council, by a statement of the President dated 31 October 2001

(S/PRST/2001/31), urged the Secretary-General to appoint women as Special Representatives and Special Envoys to pursue good offices on his behalf in accordance with his strategic plan of action.

²³³ S/2000/907 and S/2000/908. The Council subsequently took note, through an exchange of letters, of the Secretary-General's intention to appoint another Special Representative for the Great Lakes region in 2002 (S/2002/1174 and S/2002/1175).

²³⁴ S/2000/907.

international organizations and donor countries in close cooperation with local authorities.²³⁵

The following overview sets out examples, by region and in chronological order, of decisions by which the Security Council specifically requested, supported, endorsed, encouraged or welcomed the Secretary-General's endeavours in the peaceful settlement of disputes and the prevention of conflict or its recurrence.

Africa

The situation in Angola

By resolution 1294 (2000) of 13 April 2000, while reaffirming its view that a continued presence of the United Nations in Angola could contribute greatly to the promotion of peace, national reconciliation, human rights and regional security, the Council extended the mandate of the United Nations Office in Angola and requested the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to implement the tasks of UNOA as outlined in resolution 1268 (1999), which included, *inter alia*, exploring effective measures for restoring peace, assisting the Angolan people in the area of capacity-building, humanitarian assistance and the promotion of human rights. The Council further requested the Secretary-General to provide every three months a report on developments in Angola, including his recommendations about additional measures the Council might consider to promote the peace process in Angola.²³⁶

By a statement of the President dated 20 September 2001, the Council noted the positive contribution that UNOA was making towards finding a solution to the Angolan conflict and reiterated its full support for the work of the Office of the Representative of the Secretary-General.²³⁷

²³⁵ S/PRST/2001/5.

²³⁶ Resolution 1294 (2000), paras. 1, 2 and 3. Through subsequent exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, the Council agreed to the extension of the UNOA mandate until 15 August 2002. For details, see S/2000/977, S/2000/987, S/2001/351, S/2001/387, S/2001/956, S/2001/973, S/2002/411, S/2002/412, S/2002/768 and S/2002/769.

²³⁷ S/PRST/2001/24.

Following the signing of the Lusaka Protocol, by resolution 1433 (2002) of 15 August 2002, the Council, while expressing its appreciation for the work of UNOA and underlining that the presence of the United Nations in Angola could contribute to the consolidation of peace through the promotion of political, military, human rights, humanitarian and economic goals, terminated the mandate of UNOA and established the United Nations Mission in Angola as a follow-on mission.²³⁸ The mandate of UNMA was (a) to assist the parties in concluding the Lusaka Protocol by chairing the Joint Commission and leading the completion of the agreed list of tasks which remained pending under the Lusaka Protocol; and (b) to assist the Government of Angola in undertaking a number of tasks which included, inter alia, the building of institutions to consolidate peace and enhance the rule of law.²³⁹ By the same resolution, the Council welcomed the appointment of a resident Special Representative of the Secretary-General to serve as the head of UNMA and oversee a coordinated and integrated approach to United Nations activities in Angola, as reflected in the UNMA mandate.²⁴⁰

The situation in Burundi

By a statement of the President dated 29 June 2001, the Council encouraged the Secretary-General, through his representatives, to continue to engage the armed groups which remained outside the Arusha peace process and to contribute to coordinated efforts to bring about a political settlement to the conflict.²⁴¹

By resolution 1375 (2001) of 29 October 2001, the Council supported the efforts of the Secretary-General, in particular the work of his Special Representative for the Great Lakes region in his capacity as Chairman of the Arusha Agreement Implementation Monitoring Committee.²⁴²

In addition, by an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, the Council continuously extended the mandate of the United Nations Operation in Burundi, established in November 1993, whose mandate

included, inter alia, the facilitation of the restoration of constitutional rule in Burundi through the implementation of the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi and subsequent ceasefire agreements.²⁴³

By a statement of the President dated 22 December 2003, the Council welcomed the Secretary-General's decision to examine the situation in Burundi with a view to submitting recommendations to the Council, and requested him to undertake in that regard the appropriate preparatory work and assessment of ways in which the United Nations might provide the most efficient support for the full implementation of the Arusha peace agreement. By the same statement, the Council took note of the latest report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Burundi and welcomed the work carried out, in often difficult conditions, by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the staff of UNOB. The Council therefore approved the renewal of the Office's mandate.²⁴⁴

The situation in the Central African Republic

By a statement of the President dated 10 February 2000, while recognizing the significant progress made by the Government of the Central African Republic in implementing the Bangui Agreements and the National Reconciliation Pact as the foundations of peace and stability in the country, the Council commended the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA) and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the contribution they had made to the resolution of peace and security in the country.²⁴⁵ By the same statement, the Council also welcomed the decision by the Secretary-General to establish the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic (BONUCA).²⁴⁶

²⁴³ See S/2000/1096, S/2000/1097, S/2001/1076 and S/2001/1027. See also S/PRST/2009/30.

²⁴⁴ S/PRST/2003/30.

²⁴⁵ S/PRST/2000/5.

²⁴⁶ BONUCA was established on 15 February 2000 for one year through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council. See S/1999/1235 and S/1999/1236. During the period under review, on the basis of the recommendations of the Secretary-General, the Council decided to extend the mandate of BONUCA for four further periods, the last of which terminated on 31 December 2004. See S/2000/943, S/2000/944,

²³⁸ Resolution 1433 (2002), para. 1.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, para 3.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, para. 2.

²⁴¹ S/PRST/2001/17.

²⁴² Resolution 1375 (2001), sixth preambular paragraph.

The Council reiterated its support by a statement of the President dated 8 November 2001 (S/PRST/2001/33).

The mandate of BONUCA was to support the Transitional Government's efforts to consolidate peace and national reconciliation, strengthen democratic institutions, and facilitate the mobilization at the international level of political support and resources for national reconstruction and economic recovery in the country.²⁴⁷ By a statement of the President dated 26 September 2001, the Council approved a revision to the mandate of BONUCA to include various measures for the strengthening of the mandate of BONUCA, particularly in the areas of the judicial system, institution-building, enhancing the effectiveness of its early warning capabilities and human rights.²⁴⁸

The situation in Côte d'Ivoire

By a statement of the President dated 20 December 2002, the Council commended the Secretary-General for his efforts to promote a negotiated settlement, in coordination with the Economic Community of West African States. The Council requested him to continue those efforts, particularly by providing all necessary support and assistance to the mediation efforts of ECOWAS, and to keep it regularly informed about the situation.²⁴⁹

By resolution 1464 (2003) of 4 February 2003, while endorsing the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement, the Council expressed its gratitude to the Secretary-General for the vital role he had played in the smooth conduct of the meetings held, and encouraged him to continue to contribute to a final settlement of the crisis in Côte d'Ivoire. The Council further requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Council recommendations on how the United Nations could support fully the implementation of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement, in accordance with the request by the Round Table of Ivorian political forces and by the Conference of Heads of State on Côte d'Ivoire. Finally, the Council welcomed the intention of the Secretary-General to appoint a Special Representative for Côte d'Ivoire, based in Abidjan, and requested him to do so as soon as possible.²⁵⁰

S/2001/886, S/2002/929, S/2002/930, S/2003/889, S/2003/890 and S/PRST/2001/25.

²⁴⁷ For further details, see S/1999/35.

²⁴⁸ S/PRST/2001/25. See also S/PRST/2001/18 and S/2001/886.

²⁴⁹ S/PRST/2002/42.

²⁵⁰ Resolution 1464 (2003), paras. 4, 5 and 6.

By resolution 1479 (2003) of 13 May 2003, the Council reaffirmed its strong support for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and approved his full authority for the coordination and conduct of all the activities of the United Nations system in Côte d'Ivoire. By the same resolution, the Council established the United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire with a mandate to facilitate the implementation by the Ivorian parties of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement. It further approved the establishment of a small staff to support the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on political, legal, civil affairs, civilian police, elections, media and public relations, humanitarian and human rights issues.²⁵¹

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

By resolution 1291 (2000) of 24 February 2000, the Council reiterated its strong support for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and his overall authority over United Nations activities in the country, and called on all parties to cooperate fully with him.²⁵²

By a statement of the President dated 23 July 2002, the Council welcomed the efforts and good offices of the Republic of South Africa,²⁵³ in its capacity as chair of the African Union, and of the Secretary-General in helping the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda to reach an agreement to tackle the problem of the armed groups and to take forward the withdrawal of Rwandan troops, in the context of the full withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in accordance with the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and relevant Council resolutions.

By a subsequent statement of the President dated 18 October 2002, the Council encouraged all local actors, including the parties to the conflict as well as civil society and religious organizations, to engage in talks to end the hostilities and agree on a basis for peaceful coexistence in the region during the transitional period in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In that regard, the Council encouraged the Secretary-General to consider using his good offices to

²⁵¹ Resolution 1479 (2003), paras. 1, 2 and 3.

²⁵² Resolution 1291 (2000), para. 2.

²⁵³ S/PRST/2002/22.

promote and facilitate such talks, with the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo providing support where applicable.²⁵⁴

By resolution 1445 (2002) of 4 December 2002, while supporting the signature of the Pretoria Agreement between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Rwandese Republic on 30 July 2002, as well as the Luanda Agreement between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda, the Council welcomed, *inter alia*, the efforts of the Secretary-General in facilitating the adoption of those agreements.²⁵⁵

The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia

By resolution 1320 (2000) of 15 September 2000, the Council welcomed the intention of the Secretary-General to appoint a special representative who would be responsible for all aspects of the work of the United Nations in the fulfilment of the mandate of the United Nations mission. The Council further requested the Secretary-General to coordinate with the Organization of African Unity in the implementation of the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities.²⁵⁶

By a statement of the President dated 21 November 2000, the Council expressed its continuing support for, among others, the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Envoy to find a peaceful and lasting solution to the conflict.²⁵⁷

By a subsequent statement of the President dated 9 February 2001, the Council expressed its strong support for the role of the Secretary-General in continuing to help in the implementation of the Algiers Agreement, including through his own good offices, for the efforts of his Special Representative and for the contributions of relevant United Nations entities.²⁵⁸

By resolution 1398 (2002) of 15 March 2002, expressing its resolve to support the parties in the implementation of the decision of the Boundary

Commission, the Council invited the Secretary-General to submit recommendations to the Council on how the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea could play an appropriate role in the border demarcation process, including with regard to demining for demarcation.²⁵⁹

By resolution 1466 (2003) of 14 March 2003, the Council expressed its strong support for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for his work in support of the peace process.²⁶⁰

The situation in Guinea-Bissau

By an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Council during the period under review, the Security Council took note of the intention of the Secretary-General to extend the mandate of the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNOGBIS), established pursuant to resolution 1233 (1999).²⁶¹ The mandate of the mission included, *inter alia*, the facilitation of the implementation of the Abuja agreement of 1 November 1998 and dialogue among all actors, and the promotion of national reconciliation in order to support national efforts to consolidate and maintain peace, democracy and the rule of law, including the strengthening of democratic institutions.²⁶²

The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone

By a statement of the President dated 21 December 2000, while paying tribute to ECOWAS and its Chairman for the important role played towards restoring peace and security in the three countries of the Mano River Union, the Council requested the Secretary-General to consider what support the international community, and in particular the United Nations, might provide to ECOWAS in order to ensure security on the border between Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone.²⁶³

²⁵⁴ S/PRST/2002/27.

²⁵⁵ Resolution 1445 (2002), para. 1.

²⁵⁶ Resolution 1320 (2000), paras. 3 and 4.

²⁵⁷ S/PRST/2000/34.

²⁵⁸ S/PRST/2001/4. The Council reiterated its support for the Secretary-General's good offices by several subsequent decisions. See, for example, resolutions 1344 (2001), 1369 (2001), 1398 (2002) and 1340 (2002), and S/PRST/2001/14.

²⁵⁹ Resolution 1398 (2002), para. 9.

²⁶⁰ Resolution 1466 (2003), para. 17.

²⁶¹ S/2000/201 and S/2000/202; S/2000/941 and S/2000/942; S/2001/960 and S/2001/961; S/2002/916 and S/2002/917; and S/2003/1096 and S/2003/1097.

²⁶² S/2000/201.

²⁶³ S/PRST/2000/41.

The situation in Liberia

By a statement of the President dated December 2002, with a view to achieving the objectives of ending the violence and promoting national reconciliation, the Council stated that it was committed to promote an expanded role for the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Liberia (UNOL), along with the more active participation of the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for West Africa (UNOWA). The tasks outlined by the Council included, *inter alia*, offering assistance to the Liberian authorities and to the public for strengthening democratic institutions and the rule of law; contributing to and monitoring the preparation of free and fair elections in 2003; promoting national reconciliation and resolution of the conflict, including through support for initiatives on the ground; and supporting the Government of Liberia in the implementation of peace agreements to be adopted.²⁶⁴

By resolution 1509 (2003) of 19 September 2002, the Council, while noting the intention of the Secretary-General to terminate UNOL and transfer its major functions to the United Nations Mission in Liberia relating to supporting the implementation of the peace agreement and of the peace process welcomed the appointment by the Secretary-General of his Special Representative for Liberia to direct the operations of UNMIL and coordinate all United Nations activities in Liberia.²⁶⁵

The situation in Sierra Leone

By resolution 1436 (2002) of 24 September 2002, the Council welcomed the commitment of the Secretary-General to find a solution to the conflict in Liberia in order to build peace in the subregion, including through the establishment of a contact group.²⁶⁶

²⁶⁴ S/PRST/2002/36. Following an agreement with the Government of Liberia, the mandate of UNOL was revised through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (S/2003/468 and S/2003/469).

²⁶⁵ Resolution 1509 (2003), nineteenth and twentieth preambular paragraphs and para. 2.

²⁶⁶ Resolution 1436 (2002), para. 13.

The situation in Somalia

By a statement of the President dated 11 January 2001, the Council invited the Secretary-General to prepare a proposal for a peacebuilding mission in Somalia, outlining possible ways to advance the peace process further, with specific attention to the security situation in the country.²⁶⁷ In his report of 11 October 2001, however, the Secretary-General indicated that the security situation did not make it possible to deploy a peacebuilding office in the country and recommended that, owing to the valuable role it played in monitoring and reporting on the situation in Somalia, the mandate of the United Nations Political Office for Somalia (UNPOS) be renewed for two years.²⁶⁸ The mandate of UNPOS included, *inter alia*, assisting in advancing the cause of peace and reconciliation through contacts with Somali leaders, civic organizations and the States and organizations concerned; monitoring the situation in Somalia; and supporting the initiative taken by the Government of Djibouti that led to the formation of the Transitional National Government.

By a statement of the President dated 31 October 2001, the Council requested the Secretary-General to take a number of steps in support of the peace process in Somalia, including the following: (a) dispatching a Headquarters-led inter-agency mission to carry out a comprehensive assessment, based on existing general United Nations standards, of the security situation in Somalia, including in Mogadishu; (b) preparing proposals for ways in which the United Nations might further assist in the demobilization of militia members and the training of police personnel from the Transitional National Government; (c) considering the scope for adjustments, as appropriate, to the mandate for the United Nations Political Office for Somalia; and (d) consulting all those concerned on finding practical and constructive ways to, *inter alia*, promote coherency of policy approaches to Somalia and consolidate support for peace and reconciliation in the country.²⁶⁹

By a statement of the President dated 28 March 2002, the Council encouraged the Secretary-General,

²⁶⁷ S/PRST/2001/1.

²⁶⁸ S/2001/963. Through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, the Council further extended the mandate of UNPOS for the biennium 2002/2003 (S/2001/1097 and S/2001/1098).

²⁶⁹ S/PRST/2001/30.

through his Special Adviser and the United Nations Political Office for Somalia, to support actively the initiative of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development in the period ahead. The Council also requested the Secretary-General to utilize to the fullest his Representative, in close cooperation with the United Nations Resident Coordinator for Somalia, to coordinate ongoing peacebuilding activities and provide for their incremental expansion. The Council reiterated that a comprehensive post-conflict peacebuilding mission should be deployed once security conditions permitted.²⁷⁰

By a statement of the President dated 12 December 2002, the Council encouraged the Secretary-General to support actively the Somalia National Reconciliation Process sponsored by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development and the Conference in Eldoret. In addition, recognizing that a comprehensive post-conflict programme for disarmament, demobilization, rehabilitation and reintegration would be an important contribution for peace and stability in Somalia, the Council requested the Secretary-General to continue putting into place, in a coherent manner, preparatory activities on the ground for a comprehensive post-conflict peacebuilding mission in Somalia once security conditions permitted.²⁷¹

The situation concerning Western Sahara

By resolution 1292 (2000) of 29 February 2000, the Council reiterated its full support for the continued efforts exerted by the Secretary-General, his Personal Envoy, his Special Representative and the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara to implement the settlement plan and agreements adopted by the parties to hold a free, fair and impartial referendum for the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara. The Council also supported the intention of the Secretary-General to ask his Personal Envoy to consult the parties and, taking into account existing and potential obstacles, to explore ways and means to achieve an early, durable and agreed resolution of the dispute.²⁷²

By resolution 1359 (2001) of 29 June 2001, following the presentation of the official proposals submitted by the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguía el-Hamra and Río de Oro (Frente Polisario), and of the memorandum of the Government of Algeria, the Council fully supported the efforts of the Secretary-General to invite all the parties to meet directly or through proximity talks, under the auspices of his Personal Envoy.²⁷³

By resolution 1429 (2002) of 30 July 2002, having considered the report of the Secretary-General dated 19 February 2002 and the four options contained therein,²⁷⁴ the Council strongly supported the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy to find a political solution to the long-standing dispute. It further invited the Personal Envoy to pursue those efforts, taking into account the concerns expressed by the parties, and expressed its readiness to consider any approach providing for self-determination that might be proposed by the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy, consulting, as appropriate, others with relevant experience.²⁷⁵

By resolution 1495 (2003) of 31 July 2003, acting under Chapter VI of the Charter, having considered the report of the Secretary-General of 23 May 2003²⁷⁶ and the peace plan for self-determination of the people of Western Sahara presented by his Personal Envoy,²⁷⁷ as well as the responses of the parties and the neighbouring States,²⁷⁸ the Council continued to support strongly the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy and similarly supported their peace plan for self-determination of the people of Western Sahara as an optimum political solution on the basis of agreement between the two parties.²⁷⁹

Secretary-General. See, for example, resolutions 1301 (2000), 1309 (2000), 1324 (2000), 1342 (2001), 1349 (2001) and 1359 (2001).

²⁷³ Resolution 1359 (2001), para. 2.

²⁷⁴ S/2002/178.

²⁷⁵ Resolution 1429 (2002), para. 1.

²⁷⁶ S/2003/565.

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, annex II.

²⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, annex III.

²⁷⁹ Resolution 1495 (2003), para. 1.

²⁷⁰ S/PRST/2002/8.

²⁷¹ S/PRST/2002/35.

²⁷² Resolution 1292 (2000), fifth preambular paragraph and para. 2. By several subsequent decisions, the Council renewed its full support to the Personal Envoy of the

Letter dated 2 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

By a statement of the President dated 10 October 2003, while welcoming the signing of the Machakos Protocol and looking forward to the successful conclusion of a comprehensive peace agreement on that basis, the Council requested the Secretary-General, in that connection, to initiate preparatory work, in consultation with the parties, the IGAD facilitators and the International Observers, on how the United Nations could best fully support the implementation of a comprehensive peace agreement.²⁸⁰

Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/434)

By an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, the Council welcomed the intention of the Secretary-General to establish the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for West Africa.²⁸¹ The mandate of the office included, inter alia, carrying out good offices roles and special assignments in countries of the subregion on behalf of the Secretary-General, including in the areas of conflict prevention and peacebuilding efforts.²⁸²

By a statement of the President dated 19 December 2001, the Council welcomed the establishment of UNOWA to ensure, inter alia, the strengthening of harmonization and coordination of the activities of the United Nations system in an integrated regional perspective and to the development of a fruitful partnership with ECOWAS, other subregional organizations and international and national actors, including civil society. The Council also emphasized that greater subregional integration must remain a key goal for the United Nations system in the search for lasting solutions to the conflicts in West Africa.²⁸³

The situation in Africa

By a statement of the President dated 31 January 2002, the Council called on the United Nations system

²⁸⁰ S/PRST/2003/16.

²⁸¹ S/2001/1128 and S/2001/1129.

²⁸² S/2001/1128.

²⁸³ S/PRST/2001/38.

to intensify its cooperation, including assistance within existing resources, with the Organization of African Unity and subregional organizations in Africa in the field of capacity-building, particularly in early warning conflict prevention and peacekeeping. It also stressed the importance of the following: (a) effective interaction between the United Nations system and OAU and subregional organizations through the exchange of information and analysis at the conflict prevention stage; (b) coordination and clear understanding of respective roles in forwarding peace processes; and (c) coordinated support to national and regional peacebuilding efforts. In that regard, the Council welcomed the establishment of UNOWA and requested the Secretary-General to take all necessary measures for that Office to be fully operational. The Council further noted with satisfaction that good offices missions carried out by prominent political leaders of Africa facilitated significant progress in the political settlement of certain conflicts; it encouraged OAU and subregional organizations, taking into account the specific situation of conflicts, to seek appointment of such figures as special envoys as well as to employ where appropriate the traditional methods of conflict resolution including the establishment of councils of elders. Finally, the Council stressed the importance of the preventive character of such efforts and emphasized the need for their proper coordination.²⁸⁴

Asia

The situation in Afghanistan

By a statement of the President dated 7 April 2000, the Council, reiterating its position that the United Nations should continue to play its central and impartial role in international efforts towards a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Afghanistan, welcomed the appointment of a new Personal Representative of the Secretary-General and the activities of the United Nations Special Mission to Afghanistan (UNSMA) to facilitate a political process aimed at achieving a lasting political settlement to the conflict.²⁸⁵

By resolution 1333 (2000) of 19 December 2000, the Council supported the efforts of the Personal

²⁸⁴ S/PRST/2002/2.

²⁸⁵ S/PRST/2000/12.

Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan to advance the peace process through political negotiations between the Afghan parties aimed at the establishment of a broad-based, multi-ethnic and fully representative government, and called upon the warring factions to cooperate fully with the efforts to conclude a ceasefire and begin discussions leading to a political settlement.²⁸⁶

By resolution 1378 (2001) of 14 November 2001, the Council welcomed the intention of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to convene an urgent meeting of the various Afghan processes and called upon the United Front of Afghanistan and all Afghans represented in those processes to participate in good faith and without preconditions.²⁸⁷ The Council also endorsed the approach outlined by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. Finally, affirming that the United Nations should play a central role in supporting the efforts of Afghanistan to establish a new and transitional administration leading to the formation of a new government, the Council expressed its full support for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the accomplishment of his mandate. Similarly, by resolution 1383 (2001) of 6 December 2001, while endorsing the Bonn Agreement, the Council reaffirmed its full support for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and endorsed his mission.²⁸⁸

By resolution 1401 (2002) of 28 March 2002, the Council endorsed the establishment of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA), in accordance with the mandate and structure contained in the report of the Secretary-General.²⁸⁹ The core mandate of the mission included, *inter alia*, the promotion of national reconciliation through the good offices of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.²⁹⁰

The situation in East Timor

By resolution 1338 (2001) of 31 January 2001, the Council commended the work of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor and

the leadership of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. It further requested the Special Representative to continue to take steps to delegate progressively further authority within the East Timor Transitional Administration to the East Timorese people until authority was fully transferred to the Government of an independent State of East Timor. It also encouraged UNTAET to continue to support fully the transition to independence.²⁹¹

By a statement of the President dated 31 October 2001, the Council expressed its appreciation to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for East Timor and to UNTAET for their efforts in developing detailed plans for the future United Nations presence in East Timor. It further took note of the observation of the Secretary-General that the mandate of the Transitional Administration should be extended until independence and endorsed his plans for adjusting the size and configuration of UNTAET in the months prior to independence. The Council further endorsed the recommendations of the Secretary-General for a continued and appropriately reduced United Nations integrated mission in the post-independence period, and requested the Secretary-General to continue planning and preparation for this mission, in consultation with the East Timorese people, and to submit further and more detailed recommendations to the Council.²⁹²

By resolution 1392 (2002) of 31 January 2002, the Council commended the work of UNTAET and the leadership of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in assisting the people of East Timor in laying the foundation for the transition to independence.²⁹³

By resolution 1410 (2002) of 17 May 2002, the Council welcomed the Secretary-General's intention to appoint the Resident Coordinator of the United Nations Development Programme as his deputy Special Representative and underlined the importance of a smooth transition of the United Nations role towards traditional development assistance.²⁹⁴

Following the entry into force of East Timor's first Constitution on 22 March and the presidential

²⁸⁶ Resolution 1333 (2000), fourth preambular paragraph.

²⁸⁷ Resolution 1378 (2001), fifth and eighth preambular paragraphs, and para. 3.

²⁸⁸ Resolution 1383 (2001), para. 3.

²⁸⁹ S/2002/278.

²⁹⁰ Resolution 1401 (2002), para. 1.

²⁹¹ Resolution 1338 (2001), third preambular paragraph and paras. 3 and 4.

²⁹² S/PRST/2001/32.

²⁹³ Resolution 1392 (2002), second preambular paragraph.

²⁹⁴ Resolution 1410 (2002), twelfth preambular paragraph.

elections on 14 April, by a statement of the President dated 20 May 2002, the Council expressed its deep appreciation for the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, and noted with satisfaction the role played by the United Nations and UNTAET in restoring peace to East Timor, and in building a solid foundation for a democratic, viable and stable East Timor.²⁹⁵

The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border

By a statement of the President dated 12 May 2000, the Council expressed its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his intention to inform the Council of the modalities of the establishment and functioning of a United Nations post-conflict peacebuilding office in Tajikistan, to consolidate peace and promote democracy.²⁹⁶ Following the termination of the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan on 15 May 2000, the United Nations Tajikistan Office of Peacebuilding (UNTOP) was subsequently established through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council.²⁹⁷ The mandate of UNTOP was to provide the political framework and leadership for post-conflict peacebuilding activities of the United Nations system in the country, and to that end, mobilize international support.²⁹⁸

Letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1998/287)

By an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, the Council took note of the intention of the Secretary-General to extend the mandate of the United Nations Political Office in Bougainville (UNPOB), which included, inter alia, monitoring and reporting on the

²⁹⁵ S/PRST/2002/13.

²⁹⁶ S/PRST/2000/17.

²⁹⁷ S/2000/519 and S/2000/518. During the period under review, through exchanges of letters between the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, the mandate of UNTOP was extended three times until 1 June 2004. See S/2001/445, S/2001/446, S/2002/501, S/2002/502, S/2003/542 and S/2003/543.

²⁹⁸ S/2000/518.

implementation of the Lincoln Agreement on Peace, Security and Development in Bougainville and the Arawa Agreement as well as chairing the Peace Process Consultative Committee.²⁹⁹

Following the expiration of the final extension of the mandate of UNPOB, by a letter dated 23 December 2003 addressed to the Secretary-General, the Council took note of the Secretary-General's intention to establish a small, follow-on United Nations Observer Mission in Bougainville (UNOMB) to finish the residual tasks of UNPOB and support the efforts of the parties in the transitional period leading to the elections.³⁰⁰

Americas

The question concerning Haiti

By a statement of the President dated 15 March 2000,³⁰¹ the Council commended the Representative of the Secretary-General, the United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (MIPONUH), whose mandate had been terminated, the International Civilian Mission in Haiti (MICIVIH) and all the previous missions deployed in Haiti to assist the Government of Haiti in supporting the professionalization of the Haitian National Police force, consolidating Haiti's system of justice and other national institutions and promoting human rights.

Europe

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

By resolution 1305 (2000) of 21 June 2000, the Council emphasized its full support for the continued role of the High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina in monitoring the implementation of the Peace Agreement and giving guidance to and coordinating the activities of the civilian organizations and agencies involved in

²⁹⁹ S/2000/1139 and S/2000/1140; S/2001/1202 and S/2001/1203; and S/2002/1379 and S/2002/1380. In a letter dated 22 October 2001, the Secretary-General informed the Council that UNPOB would perform additional functions in the area of weapons collection and disposal as spelled out in part E of the Bougainville Peace Agreement (S/2001/988).

³⁰⁰ S/2003/1199.

³⁰¹ S/PRST/2000/8.

assisting the parties to implement the Peace Agreement.³⁰²

By a statement of the President dated 12 December 2002, the Council expressed its deep appreciation for the efforts of the Secretary-General, his Special Representative and the personnel of the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina for their contributions to the implementation of the Peace Agreement.³⁰³

The situation in Cyprus

By a series of letters from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General, the Council took note of the missions of good offices carried out by the Secretary-General and his Special Adviser in Cyprus.³⁰⁴

By resolution 1475 (2003) of 14 April 2003, the Council welcomed the report of the Secretary-General of 1 April 2003 on his mission of good offices in Cyprus³⁰⁵ and commended the extraordinary effort made by the Secretary-General, his Special Adviser and his team since 1999 in pursuance of his good offices mission and within the framework of Security Council resolution 1250 (1999). The Council further commended the Secretary-General for taking the initiative to present to the parties a comprehensive settlement plan aimed at bridging the gaps between them, drawing upon the talks that began in December 1999 under the auspices of the United Nations and, following negotiations, to revise the plan on 10 December 2002 and 26 February 2003. Subsequently, the Council gave its full support to the Secretary-General's plan of 26 February 2003 as a unique basis for further negotiations and asked him to continue to make available his good offices for Cyprus.³⁰⁶

The situation in Georgia

By resolution 1287 (2000) of 31 January 2000, the Council strongly supported the sustained efforts of

the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, with the assistance of the Russian Federation in its capacity as facilitator as well as of the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), to promote the stabilization of the situation and the achievement of a comprehensive political settlement, including a settlement on the political status of Abkhazia within the State of Georgia. It also supported the efforts of the Secretary-General to find ways to improve the observance by the parties of human rights as an integral part of the work towards a comprehensive political settlement.³⁰⁷

By a statement of the President dated 11 May 2000, the Council welcomed the efforts by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to enhance contacts at all levels between the Georgian and Abkhaz sides, and called upon the parties to continue to expand such contacts. It further supported the appeal by the Secretary-General to both sides to make more active use of the Coordinating Council machinery, and actively to consider the paper prepared by the Special Representative concerning the implementation of the agreed confidence-building measures. The Council also joined the Secretary-General in encouraging the parties to be ready to consider proposals, based on the decisions of the Council, to be presented in due course by the Special Representative on the question of the distribution of constitutional competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi.³⁰⁸

By a statement of the President dated 14 November 2000, the Council welcomed all the efforts that had been undertaken, in particular by the Special Representative, with a view to alleviating tensions and increasing confidence between the parties.³⁰⁹

By resolution 1339 (2001) of 31 January 2001, the Council strongly supported the intention of the Special Representative to submit, in the near future, the draft paper containing specific proposals to the parties on the question of the distribution of constitutional

³⁰² Resolution 1305 (2000), para. 4. The Council subsequently reiterated its support by resolutions 1357 (2001), 1396 (2002), 1423 (2002) and 1491 (2003).

³⁰³ S/PRST/2002/33.

³⁰⁴ S/2000/1189, S/2001/557, S/2001/1183 and S/2002/1403.

³⁰⁵ S/2003/398.

³⁰⁶ Resolution 1475 (2003), paras. 1, 2, 4 and 5.

³⁰⁷ Resolution 1287 (2000), paras. 3 and 7. Such support was renewed by several subsequent decisions of the Council. See, for example, resolutions 1311 (2000) of 28 July 2000, 1339 (2001) of 31 January 2001 and 1364 (2001) of 31 July 2001, and S/PRST/2000/32.

³⁰⁸ S/PRST/2000/16. This support was renewed by the Council through resolution 1311 (2000) of 28 July 2000 (see resolution 1311 (2000), para. 3).

³⁰⁹ S/PRST/2000/32.

competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi as a basis for meaningful negotiations.³¹⁰ By a statement of the President dated 24 April 2001, the Council called upon the parties to constructively accept the aforementioned proposals and, subsequently, by resolution 1364 (2001) of 31 July 2001, regretted that the Special Representative had not been in a position to submit them.³¹¹

By resolution 1393 (2002) of 31 January 2002, while welcoming and supporting the finalization of the document “Basic Principles for the Distribution of Competences between Tbilisi and Sukhumi”, the Council supported the efforts of the Special Representative in this regard.³¹²

Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)

By a statement of the President dated 16 March 2001, the Council commended the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the commander of the Kosovo Force for their ongoing efforts, undertaken under difficult circumstances, to implement fully resolution 1244 (1999) and welcomed the priority areas of work identified by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. The Council further welcomed the establishment of a working group under the authority of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General aimed at developing a legal framework for provisional institutions for democratic and autonomous self-government in Kosovo and stressed the need for all ethnic groups to be represented in the work of this group.³¹³

By a statement of the President dated 9 November 2001, the Council welcomed the progress made in preparing the Kosovo-wide elections on 17 November 2001 and called on the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and all parties

concerned to continue to strive for full implementation of resolution 1244 (1999).³¹⁴

By a statement of the President dated 13 February 2002, the Council expressed its full support for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General upon his assumption of the position as Head of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo, as well as its appreciation to all the personnel of UNMIK for their “untiring efforts” in ensuring the full implementation of resolution 1244 (1999).³¹⁵

By a statement of the President dated 24 April 2002, the Council commended the efforts of the Special Representative and welcomed the priorities outlined in the Secretary-General’s report as well as his request to develop benchmarks to measure progress in Kosovo’s institutional development, consistent with resolution 1244 (1999) and the Constitutional Framework for Provisional Self-Government in Kosovo.³¹⁶

By a statement dated 6 February 2003, the Council, welcoming the latest report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the activities of UNMIK and recent developments in Kosovo,³¹⁷ reiterated its full support for the “standards before status” policy with postulated targets in the eight key areas: functioning of democratic institutions, the rule of law, freedom of movement, the return of refugees and internally displaced persons, the economy, property rights, dialogue with Belgrade, and the Kosovo Protection Corps. The Council welcomed the presentation of a detailed plan for its implementation that would provide the appropriate baseline against which progress could be measured, as discussed with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General during the Council’s mission in December 2002. The Council further welcomed the intention of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to transfer remaining competencies to the provisional institutions of self-government by the end of the year, except those reserved for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General under resolution 1244 (1999). The Council concluded the statement by reiterating its full support for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and by urging

³¹⁰ Resolution 1339 (2001), para. 3.

³¹¹ S/PRST/2001/12 and resolution 1364 (2001), para. 5.

³¹² Resolution 1393 (2002), para. 3.

³¹³ S/PRST/2001/8. The Council reiterated its support to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the commander of KFOR for their ongoing efforts to implement fully resolution 1244 (1999) by several subsequent statements of the President. See, for example, S/PRST/2001/27, S/PRST/2002/11, S/PRST/2002/16 and S/PRST/2002/29.

³¹⁴ S/PRST/2001/34.

³¹⁵ S/PRST/2002/4.

³¹⁶ S/PRST/2002/11.

³¹⁷ S/2003/113.

Kosovo's leaders to work in close cooperation with UNMIK and KFOR for a better future for Kosovo and stability in the region.³¹⁸

Middle East

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

By resolution 1397 (2002) of 12 March 2002, the Council welcomed and encouraged the diplomatic efforts of, inter alia, the United Nations Special Coordinator to bring about a comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East.³¹⁹ It also expressed its support for the efforts of the Secretary-General to assist the parties to halt the violence and resume the peace process.³²⁰

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

By resolution 1500 (2003) of 14 August 2003, the Security Council established the United Nations

Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI) to support the Secretary-General in the fulfilment of his mandate under resolution 1483 (2003). The mandate included, inter alia, working intensively with the Authority, the people of Iraq and others concerned to advance efforts to restore and establish national and local institutions for representative governance, including by working together to facilitate a process leading to an internationally recognized, representative Government of Iraq.

D. Decisions involving regional arrangements or agencies

During the period under review, the Security Council not only called upon the parties to the conflict to cooperate with regional arrangements, but also, in accordance with Article 52 of the Charter, frequently expressed its support and appreciation for the peace efforts undertaken by regional arrangements or requested the Secretary-General to undertake such efforts in conjunction with regional arrangements. Decisions of the Council regarding the joint or parallel efforts undertaken by the Council and regional agencies or arrangements in the pacific settlement of disputes during the period under review are covered in detail in chapter XII of this supplement.

³¹⁸ S/PRST/2003/1.

³¹⁹ Resolution 1397 (2002), sixth preambular paragraph.

The Council renewed its encouragement of the efforts of the United Nations Special Coordinator by resolution 1403 (2002) of 4 April 2002.

³²⁰ Resolution 1397 (2002), para. 3. The Council renewed its support for the efforts of the Secretary-General by resolution 1402 (2002) of 30 March 2002.

Part IV Constitutional discussion bearing on the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter

Note

This part of chapter X highlights the important arguments raised in the deliberations of the Council with regard to the interpretation of specific provisions of the Charter concerning the role of the Council in the peaceful settlement of disputes. It includes in particular discussions regarding the competence of the Council to consider a dispute or situation and its power to make appropriate recommendations within the framework of Chapter VI of the Charter.

During the course of thematic debates held in the Council, several speakers emphasized the potential of

new approaches to the role of the Security Council as defined under Chapter VI. The idea of early warning and conflict-prevention mechanisms, likely to enable the Council to take early action with respect to emerging disputes, was the most noteworthy example of the evolving interpretation of Chapter VI. In that regard, underscored many delegations the role that regional organizations could play.³²¹ Furthermore,

³²¹ See, for example, the 4753rd and the 4174th meetings on "The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes" and the "Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts", respectively.

during those debates, speakers addressed the potential and usefulness of instruments provided under Chapter VI of the Charter in comparison to those provided for under Chapter VII.

The text that follows is divided into eight subsections, focusing on the provisions of Chapter VI and on Article 99, which deals with the role of the Secretary-General in bringing to the attention of the Security Council matters that might threaten international peace and security as follows: (a) relevance of the provisions of Chapter VI in relation to the prevention of conflicts; (b) relevance of the provisions of Chapter VI in comparison to the provisions of Chapter VII; (c) obligation of Member States to settle their disputes by peaceful means in the light of Article 33 (1) and recommendations for the settlement of disputes by the Security Council in the light of Article 33 (2); (d) recourse to investigation by the Security Council in the light of Article 34; (e) referral of disputes to the Security Council in the light of Article 35; (f) referral of legal disputes in the light of Article 36 (3); (g) referrals by the Secretary-General in the light of Article 99; and (h) efforts of the Secretary-General for the peaceful settlement of disputes in the light of Article 33. Entries in each of the subsections correspond to items on the agenda of the Council. In some cases, it is difficult to establish a clear-cut distinction between the constitutional discussions relevant to Chapter VI and those relevant to Chapter VII.

Relevance of the provisions of Chapter VI in relation to the prevention of conflicts

The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes

At its 4753rd meeting, on 13 May 2003, underscoring that Chapter VI of the Charter stood at the heart of the Organization's system of collective security, the Secretary-General outlined the lessons that could be learned from the experience in recent years and how improvements could be achieved. In particular, the Secretary-General recalled several recommendations from his June 2001 report on the prevention of armed conflict,³²² including the

³²² S/2001/574.

following: (a) the use of regional prevention mechanisms; (b) more frequent resort to the International Court of Justice; and (c) increased reporting by the United Nations system to the Council about serious violations of international law and about human rights and potential conflict situations arising from ethnic, religious and territorial disputes, poverty or other factors. While recognizing that the primary responsibility for the pacific settlement of disputes rested with Governments and the parties to a dispute, the Secretary-General emphasized that the Council had many tools at its disposal and could play a key role in conflict prevention while pressing those directly involved to make peace, as the Council itself had recognized in resolution 1366 (2001). He added that the Council could help identify and address root causes early, when opportunities for constructive dialogue and other peaceful means were greatest, and ensure an integrated approach bringing together all factors and all actors, including civil society. Furthermore, he added, the Council could support the other United Nations organs in their efforts to resolve disputes or address volatile situations before they erupted into full-fledged threats to international peace and security.³²³

In their reactions to the remarks of the Secretary-General, several speakers recognized the primary role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes and voiced the need for the Council increasingly to explore and revert to the provisions of Chapter VI. Although recognizing that other actors had a role to play in the field of conflict prevention, several speakers particularly stressed the importance of the Council's role and hoped for a more active involvement of the Council in conflict prevention and preventive diplomacy efforts.³²⁴ For instance, the representative of Germany underscored the need to shift "from a culture of reaction to a culture of prevention" and that it was important for the Security Council to revisit its role in the pacific settlement of disputes, an area in which, pursuant to Chapter VI of the Charter, the Security Council was vested with a primary, though not exclusive role.³²⁵ The

³²³ S/PV.4753, p. 3.

³²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11 (Mexico); p. 12 (Spain); pp. 12-13 (United Kingdom); pp. 14-15 (Germany); p. 18 (Chile); p. 21 (France); pp. 25-26 (Russian Federation); p. 27 (Cameroon); and p. 29 (Pakistan); S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Greece, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 10 (Colombia).

³²⁵ S/PV.4753, p. 14.

representative of Cameroon noted that the thrust of Chapter VI of the Charter meant, *inter alia*, that the Council should in all circumstances act in a “resolute and preventive” manner in order to “forestall the guns from sounding”.³²⁶ The representative of Spain stated that it was not possible to speak of the pacific settlement of disputes without attaching equal importance to measures of preventive diplomacy.³²⁷

Against that background, many delegations also stressed that the responsibility to prevent and resolve conflicts and disputes rested first and foremost with the parties.³²⁸ While recognizing the necessity of focusing on conflict prevention, the representative of the United Kingdom cautioned that “prevention is difficult” as early action could be taken as interference.³²⁹

With regard to the mechanisms and instruments for conflict prevention, several delegations suggested ways for the Council to improve its action with respect to the of prevention of conflict, including those related to early warning.³³⁰ The representative of the United States noted that over the years, mechanisms have been developed to enable the Council to prevent some disputes from reaching the stage where Chapter VII action was required. He further noted that Chapter VI had stretched to accommodate the emergence of peacekeeping, a concept not mentioned in the Charter but one which had been a valuable tool in dispute settlement.³³¹

A number of speakers expressed support for the efforts of the Secretary-General and his envoys to conduct “good offices” and mediation,³³² and underlined the importance of the Council’s coordination with regional organizations in the pacific

settlement of disputes.³³³ The role of peacekeeping operations and observer missions in preventing the outbreak of further conflict and stabilizing a military situation was also cited during the discussion.³³⁴ Finally, several delegations highlighted the importance of addressing the root causes of conflicts. The representative of Mexico noted that peacekeeping operations had proven to be very useful in preventing future conflicts, addressing underlying causes, creating confidence-building mechanisms and bringing parties to the negotiating table.³³⁵ The representative of Germany noted that certain lessons from the experience of the United Nations in the field of post-conflict peacebuilding could well be suited to being applied also to pre-conflict situations or to situations of emerging conflict. Explaining that the management of pre- and post-conflict situations required some identical ingredients necessary to produce sustained peace and stability, he emphasized that the interrelationship of peace and security, the rule of law, human rights and the enhancement of the material well-being of people must be taken into account.³³⁶

At the same meeting, the President of the Council made a statement in which, the Council recognized that the United Nations and its organs could play an important role in preventing disputes from arising between parties, in preventing existing disputes from escalating into conflicts, and in containing and resolving the conflicts when they occurred.³³⁷

Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts

At the 4174th meeting of the Council, on 20 July 2000, opening the discussion, the Secretary-General noted that there was an emerging consensus that conflict prevention strategies must address the root causes of conflict, not simply their violent symptoms. He described prevention as multidimensional, stating that to be effective, it had to address the structural faults that predisposed a society to conflict. He stressed that the best form of long-term conflict prevention was

³²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

³²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

³²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 13 (United Kingdom); p. 19 (Bulgaria); p. 26 (Russian Federation); and p. 27 (Cameroon); S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Colombia).

³²⁹ S/PV.4953, pp. 12-13.

³³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Mexico); p. 12 (Spain); pp. 12-13 (United Kingdom); p. 15 (Germany); p. 20 (Bulgaria); and p. 24 (Syrian Arab Republic); S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Greece) on behalf of the European Union and the associated countries.

³³¹ S/PV.4753, p. 17.

³³² *Ibid.*, p. 13 (United Kingdom); p. 15 (Germany); p. 17 (United States); pp. 19-20 (Bulgaria); p. 21 (France); and p. 29 (Pakistan); S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Greece, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 14 (Ethiopia).

³³³ For more details on the role of regional organizations in the pacific settlement of disputes, see chap. XII, part III, sect. B.

³³⁴ S/PV.4753, p. 10 (Mexico); p. 14 (China); p. 17 (United States); p. 22 (France); and p. 25 (Russian Federation).

³³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

³³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

³³⁷ S/PRST/2003/5.

healthy and balanced economic development. signalling the various initiatives that he had undertaken since taking office, the Secretary-General observed that any type of work in post-conflict peacebuilding constituted prevention, since it was designed to prevent the resurgence of conflict. Noting recent indications that the Council itself was also taking prevention more seriously, he suggested that the Council (a) hold periodic meetings at the Foreign Minister level to discuss thematic or actual prevention issues; (b) work more closely with the other principal organs; and (c) examine ways of interacting more closely with non-State actors with expertise and experience in prevention. While observing that prevention was costly, the Secretary-General pointed out that intervention, relief and rebuilding broken societies and lives was far more costly. He called for prevention to be made the cornerstone of collective security in the twenty-first century, a direction that would be achieved not by grand gestures or short-term thinking, but by changing deeply ingrained attitudes.³³⁸

In the ensuing discussion, the majority of speakers emphasized that the prevention of armed conflict was less costly than dealing with conflicts once they had erupted, from the human, political, economic and financial perspective. Several speakers therefore agreed with the Secretary-General on the importance of shifting from a “culture of reaction” to a “culture of prevention”.³³⁹ To that end, many delegations indicated that it was important to focus on the resolution of the root causes if conflicts were to be prevented in the first place or prevented from re-emerging. The social and economic causes of conflicts that had been flagged by the Secretary-General, as well as conflict-prevention through economic development, were therefore stressed.³⁴⁰ Other delegations remarked that the international community should address the issue of potential conflicts through a more

comprehensive, global and integrated strategy.³⁴¹ In that connection, a number of speakers emphasized the importance of post-conflict peacebuilding efforts aimed at preventing the recurrence of conflicts.³⁴²

The representative of the Russian Federation, supported by the representatives of China, Malaysia, Pakistan and Tunisia cautioned that preventive services to Member States should be granted on a voluntary basis with due regard to the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of States.³⁴³ In that regard, the representative of the Netherlands noted that while the Charter of the United Nations was geared towards inter-State conflict, the overwhelming majority of conflicts were of an internal nature. He was therefore of the opinion that the Council needed a more flexible interpretation of Article 2 (7) of the Charter to be able to take the necessary action in the face of conflicts.³⁴⁴

On the specific role of the Security Council in conflict prevention, many speakers pointed out that the Council had an important role to play in conflict prevention, given its responsibility to maintain international peace and security.³⁴⁵ According to the representative of China, the Council should play a “leading role” in conflict prevention.³⁴⁶ The representative of Argentina said that it was “incontestable” that the United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, had a “moral and legal obligation to prevent conflicts”.³⁴⁷ The need to improve the tools and means to prevent conflict was also stressed by several delegations.³⁴⁸ For instance, the representative of

³³⁸ S/PV.4174, pp. 2-4.

³³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Argentina); p. 11 (Netherlands); pp. 19-21 (Canada); p. 22 (Ukraine); and p. 28 (France, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Senegal).

³⁴⁰ S/PV.4174, p. 8 (Bangladesh); p. 9 (Argentina); p. 12 (Netherlands); p. 13 (China); p. 14 (Tunisia); p. 18 (Mali); and p. 25 (France, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Pakistan); p. 6 (Norway); p. 7 (Brazil); and p. 15 (Uganda).

³⁴¹ S/PV.4174, p. 10 (Russian Federation); pp. 14-15 (Tunisia); and p. 28 (Japan); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Norway); pp. 7-8 (Brazil); p. 11 (Indonesia); and p. 12 (Republic of Korea).

³⁴² S/PV.4174, p. 12 (Netherlands); p. 15 (Tunisia); and p. 28 (Japan); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Colombia); and p. 6 (Norway).

³⁴³ S/PV.4174, p. 10 (Russian Federation); p. 13 (China); pp. 14-15 (Tunisia); and p. 16 (Malaysia); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Pakistan).

³⁴⁴ S/PV.4174, p. 11.

³⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Netherlands); p. 14 (Tunisia); p. 22 (Ukraine); p. 27 (France, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 28 (Japan); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Brazil).

³⁴⁶ S/PV.4174, p. 13.

³⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

³⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Russian Federation); p. 16 (Malaysia); and pp. 27-28 (France, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), pp. 4-5 (Pakistan); and p. 10 (Senegal).

France, speaking on behalf of the European Union and associated countries,³⁴⁹ urged that the necessary resources be provided to strengthen the Secretariat's early warning, reaction and analysis capabilities and urged the Council to avail itself as much as necessary of the range of resources at its disposal, including missions to conflict areas, not only once hostilities had occurred, but further upstream.³⁵⁰ At the same meeting, the President of the Security Council made a statement,³⁵¹ in which the Council underlined the need for continued in-depth consideration of the issue of conflict prevention and invited the Secretary-General to submit to the Council, by May 2001, a report containing an analysis, and recommendations on initiatives within the United Nations, taking into account previous experience and the views and considerations expressed by Member States, on the prevention of armed conflict.

Pursuant to the presidential statement, the Secretary-General submitted a report dated 7 June 2001,³⁵² in which he observed that conflict prevention was one of the primary obligations of Member States set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. Adding that the United Nations efforts in conflict prevention must be in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter, he emphasized that conflict prevention was an activity best undertaken under Chapter VI of the Charter. However, the Secretary-General emphasized that the primary responsibility for conflict prevention rested with national Governments, with the United Nations and the international community supporting national efforts for conflict prevention and assisting in building national capacity in this regard. According to the Secretary-General, an effective preventive strategy required a comprehensive approach that encompassed both short-term and long-term political, diplomatic, humanitarian, human rights, developmental, institutional and other measures taken by the international community, in cooperation with national and regional actors. In particular, he stressed that one of the principal aims of preventive action should be to address the deep-rooted socio-economic, cultural, environmental, institutional and other structural causes that often underlie the immediate political symptoms of conflicts, and that conflict

prevention and sustainable and equitable development were mutually reinforcing activities.

At the 4334th meeting, on 21 June 2001, the Council again considered the report of the Secretary-General, in which he offered the Council recommendations on how the efforts of the United Nations system in the field could be further enhanced a more specifically, the Secretary-General identified four possible ways to enhance his traditional preventive role, as follows: (a) increasing the use of fact-finding and confidence-building missions to volatile regions; (b) developing regional prevention strategies with regional partners and United Nations organs and agencies; (c) establishing an informal network of eminent persons for conflict prevention; and (d) improving the capacity and resource base for preventive action in the Secretariat.³⁵³ Introducing the report, the Deputy Secretary-General reiterated the need to intensify efforts in order to move from a culture of "reaction" to one of "prevention". Highlighting that the "most useful" instruments of prevention were those described in Chapter VI, she highlighted 10 principles proposed by the Secretary-General, drawing on lessons learned, that should guide future approaches to conflict prevention. She also touched on proposals contained in the report for enhancing the role of the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Secretary-General. In particular, she drew attention to recommendations concerning regional organizations and the need for donor States to increase the flow of official development assistance, and noted that effective conflict prevention required both national and international political will. Stressing the high cost of conflict and of conflict intervention, both in human and material terms, she maintained that conflict prevention was the most desirable and cost-effective approach for maintaining peace.³⁵⁴

In the course of the discussion, the majority of speakers endorsed the Secretary-General's pledge to move the United Nations from a "culture of reaction" to a "culture of prevention", which should be the core of the Organization's mandate under the Charter.³⁵⁵ A

³⁴⁹ Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia; and Cyprus and Malta.

³⁵⁰ S/PV.4174, pp. 27-28.

³⁵¹ S/PRST/2000/25. See part III, sect. A.

³⁵² S/2001/574 and Corr. 1.

³⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-16.

³⁵⁴ S/PV.4334, pp. 2-4.

³⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (United Kingdom); p. 12 (Tunisia); p. 14 (Ireland); p. 17 (France); and pp. 25-26 (Mauritius); S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Republic of Korea); p. 9 (Japan); p. 17 (Malaysia); and p. 18 (Nigeria).

number of them also endorsed the Secretary-General's premise that the primary responsibility for conflict prevention rested with national Governments.³⁵⁶ The representative of the Russian Federation remarked upon the need for the consent and support of each interested Government and its internal political actors with regard to efforts to prevent conflicts.³⁵⁷ Similarly, the representative of China stated that, given the different social systems, ideologies, value systems and religious beliefs, it was necessary to abide by the basic principles of mutual respect for sovereign territorial integrity and non-interference in internal affairs of other States.³⁵⁸ The representative of Pakistan noted that, while Member States and civil society alone may have some responsibility in cases of intra-State conflicts, this did not hold true for cases of inter-State conflicts, where the ultimate responsibility rested with the United Nations.³⁵⁹

Several speakers underscored the need for a multidimensional approach to conflict prevention, including the repatriation of refugees, restrictions on the proliferation of small arms, and both short- and long-term development assistance to affected States.³⁶⁰ The need to address the root causes of conflicts and the premise that conflict prevention and sustainable and equitable development were mutually reinforcing activities were also pointed out during the discussion.³⁶¹ Therefore, during the discussion it was emphasized that the United Nations was not the only actor in prevention and might often not be the actor best suited to take the lead, and that of particular importance were United Nations efforts for enhancing the capacity of Member States for conflict prevention. In that connection, many delegations stressed the need for actors — be they the Council, the General Assembly, the Secretary-General, the Economic and Social Council other United Nations organs or regional organizations — to take the lead in coordinating

preventive responses to incipient conflicts.³⁶² The majority of speakers also underlined the importance of the role of regional organizations, non-governmental organizations, civil society and the business community in the field of conflict prevention. In addition, several representatives expressed support for the role of the Secretary-General in conflict prevention, under Article 99 of the Charter, as well as his intention to enhance that role.³⁶³ In that connection, some speakers welcomed the Secretary-General's intention to initiate a practice of providing periodic regional or subregional reports to the Security Council on threats to international peace and security.

With regard to the instruments for conflict prevention, it was generally acknowledged that Chapter VI of the Charter provided important instruments for conflict prevention. According to the representative of South Africa, in addition to Article 1 of the Charter, Chapter VI placed a “moral and legal responsibility” on the Security Council to play a key role in the prevention of armed conflict.³⁶⁴ While recognizing that conflict prevention was mostly viewed as “a Chapter VI issue”, the representative of Argentina stressed that conflict prevention did not preclude, in some specific cases, the application of Chapter VII of the Charter. He added that in some conflicts currently on the agenda of the Council, the application of an arms embargo in an early stage of the conflict would have helped prevent its worsening.³⁶⁵ A number of speakers supported the Secretary-General's recommendation urging the Council to support peacebuilding components within peacekeeping operations, as well as his recommendation that the Council include, as appropriate, a disarmament, demobilization and reintegration component in the mandates of United Nations peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations.³⁶⁶ Other speakers expressed support for the Secretary-General's recommendation encouraging Member States and the Security Council to make more active use of preventive deployments

³⁵⁶ S/PV.4334, p. 8 (United States); and p. 13 (Russian Federation); S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Costa Rica); and p. 18 (Nigeria).

³⁵⁷ S/PV.4334, p. 13.

³⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

³⁵⁹ S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 23.

³⁶⁰ S/PV.4334, p. 5 (Colombia); p. 12 (Tunisia); p. 18 (Norway); and p. 22 (Mali).

³⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Jamaica); p. 9 (United Kingdom); p. 11 (China); p. 14 (Ireland); p. 24 (Mauritius); and p. 26 (Bangladesh); S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Republic of Korea); p. 8 (Costa Rica); and p. 14 (Mexico).

³⁶² See chap. XII, part III, sect. B.

³⁶³ S/PV.4334, p. 7 (Jamaica); p. 9 (United States); p. 17 (France); p. 20 (Ukraine); and p. 22 (Singapore); S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Japan); p. 17 (Malaysia); and p. 18 (Nigeria).

³⁶⁴ S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 20.

³⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³⁶⁶ S/PV.4334, p. 7 (Jamaica); p. 12 (Tunisia); and p. 27 (Canada); S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Sweden, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries).

before the onset of conflict, as appropriate.³⁶⁷ More specifically, the representative of Japan, while noting that preventive deployments could make a crucial contribution to conflict prevention, expressed the view that it was essential for the Council to undertake a thorough appraisal and examination of its past efforts in this regard.³⁶⁸ A number of speakers also expressed support for the undertaking of fact-finding missions as part of preventive diplomacy.³⁶⁹

Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach

At the 4272nd meeting, on 5 February 2001, the President of the Security Council, who in his capacity as the representative of Tunisia had submitted the working paper that provided the basis for the debate,³⁷⁰ indicated in his opening remarks that the meeting was an extension of the discussions over the past 10 years on the report entitled “An agenda for peace” and its supplement,³⁷¹ the prevention of armed conflict and the issue of “exit strategies”, and was aimed at assessing the responsibilities of the United Nations for arriving at concrete proposals in the maintenance of international peace and security.³⁷²

In his statement, the Secretary-General observed that, while peacebuilding was viewed as taking place primarily in post-conflict settings, it could also be seen as a preventive instrument which could address the root causes of conflict. Pointing out that a major challenge to peacebuilding was the mobilization of sustained political will and resources by the international community, he suggested that the Council could incorporate a number of good ideas, including the implementation of peace agreements and the design of peacekeeping operations, into its future mandates. Adding that the Council had rightly recognized that peacebuilding could be a vital component of peacekeeping missions, and that it needed to include

such preventive tools as early warning, diplomacy, preventive deployment and disarmament, the Secretary-General emphasized that peacebuilding must not be seen as an add-on or an afterthought but rather as a central tool of proven worth. He appealed to Member States to do more politically to give the concept a higher profile and to develop, improve and use it in good time.³⁷³

In their statements, several speakers held that peacebuilding should be conceptualized as part of a continuum that recognized the relationship between poverty and conflict, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development.³⁷⁴ The representative of Jamaica, noted that, although it was often thought of in the context of post-conflict situations, peace-building could and must be employed in conflict prevention.³⁷⁵ Similarly, pointing at the strong link between conflict prevention on the one hand and the maintenance of peace and peacebuilding on the other, the representative of Colombia advocated for those elements to be “considered together and addressed comprehensively”.³⁷⁶ Several delegations underscored the need for an integrated strategy that addressed the underlying causes of conflict, so as to prevent its outbreak as well as its recurrence.³⁷⁷ With a view to developing a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy, some members therefore noted that an integrated approach required addressing the issues of the eradication of poverty and the promotion of sustainable development as an integral part of long-term peacebuilding and conflict prevention.³⁷⁸

³⁶⁷ S/PV.4334, p. 7 (Jamaica); p. 15 (Ireland); pp. 17-18 (France); p. 18 (Norway); p. 20 (Ukraine); and p. 24 (Mauritius); S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), pp. 9-10 (Japan); and p. 28 (Nepal).

³⁶⁸ S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 10.

³⁶⁹ S/PV.4334, p. 5 (Colombia); p. 7 (Jamaica); p. 9 (United States); p. 13 (Russian Federation); p. 20 (Ukraine); and p. 25 (Mauritius); S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Japan); p. 17 (Malaysia); and p. 18 (Nigeria).

³⁷⁰ S/2001/82, annex.

³⁷¹ S/24111 and S/1995/1, respectively.

³⁷² S/PV.4272, p. 2.

³⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-4.

³⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (United Kingdom); p. 21 (Norway); p. 23 (Ukraine); and p. 25 (Bangladesh); S/PV.4272 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Sweden, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 19 (Romania).

³⁷⁵ S/PV.4272, p. 7.

³⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

³⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 15 (Colombia); p. 21 (Norway); and p. 23 (Ukraine); S/PV.4272 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Sweden, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); p. 9 (Republic of Korea); p. 13 (Senegal); p. 19 (Romania); p. 20 (Mongolia); p. 24 (Argentina); and p. 33 (Tunisia).

³⁷⁸ S/PV.4272, pp. 16-17 (China); p. 18 (Russian Federation); and p. 21 (Norway); S/PV.4272 (Resumption 1), p. 21 (Mongolia); p. 34 (Tunisia).

No exit without strategy

At the 4223rd meeting of the Council, on 15 November 2000, the Council held an open debate on the Security Council's decision-making process with regard to the termination of peace operations. During the debate, several speakers pointed out that "exit" did not mean an end to the peace process but was rather part of a continuum from conflict prevention, peacemaking and peace enforcement to peacebuilding.³⁷⁹ Recalling that peace missions should be seen as a multifold continuum of tasks in the light of the increasingly more complex peace processes, the representative of Germany stated that it was important to address the integrated tasks that stretched "from conflict prevention all the way to peacebuilding", although in practice such clear distinctions did not always occur.³⁸⁰ The representative of the United States, echoed by the representatives of Ukraine and Thailand, noted that the term "exit strategy" should never be allowed to mean a "hasty or arbitrary departure from a strategically stated goal", but the implementation of a comprehensive strategy.³⁸¹ Against that background, the representative of Ukraine expressed this support for the development of a comprehensive United Nations strategy for conflict prevention on the basis of large-scale use of preventive diplomacy and peacebuilding.³⁸² The representative of Italy advocated the need for building a functional connection between the conflict prevention phase and the possible action to be undertaken if a crisis degenerated into a threat to international peace and security. Such a strategy, he added, must also include provisions for peacebuilding, a stage that was essential to achieving sustainable peace once an operation had ended, since well-planned peacebuilding could also have a preventive effect by stemming any potential relapses.³⁸³ Other speakers placed more emphasis on the link between peace and development, stating that a more sustained commitment of the international community to reducing poverty and promoting sustainable development was both a step towards

³⁷⁹ S/PV.4223, pp. 6-7 (France); p. 9 (Bangladesh); p. 19 (Ukraine); and p. 24 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4223 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Germany); p. 9 (South Africa); pp. 13-14 (Italy); and p. 20 (Finland).

³⁸⁰ S/PV.4223 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

³⁸¹ S/PV.4223, pp. 3-4 (United States); and p. 19 (Ukraine); S/PV.4223 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Thailand).

³⁸² S/PV.4223, p. 19.

³⁸³ S/PV.4223 (Resumption 1), pp. 13-14.

conflict prevention and a contribution to peacebuilding.³⁸⁴

Relevance of the provisions of Chapter VI in comparison to the provisions of Chapter VII

The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes

At the 4753rd meeting of the Council on 13 May 2003, the Secretary-General, opening the debate, underscored that Chapter VI of the Charter "stood at the heart of the Organization's system of collective security" and highlighted various ways in which the Council had used Chapter VI in recent years. Among them, he mentioned that the Council had more frequently entered into dialogue with the parties to the conflict, had worked more closely with the Economic and Social Council and with regional and subregional organizations, had sent fact-finding missions to the field, had called on the Secretary-General to use his good offices and had encouraged him to appoint a growing number of special representatives and envoys. He concluded by adding that, although recourse to Chapter VII might have increased in the past decade, the importance of Chapter VI had not been lessened and remained as "relevant" as before.³⁸⁵

Taking the floor after the Secretary-General, Mr. Jamsheed Marker, former Personal Representative of the Secretary-General for East Timor, noted that while Chapter VII constituted the "iron fist" of the Council, its latent efficacy could be considerably enhanced through a timely and judicious application of the "velvet glove" of Chapter VI. Among several suggestions on how to promote the pacific settlement of disputes, Mr. Marker encouraged the Council to utilize its mandatory enforcement authority under Chapter VII to persuade parties to engage in the processes for pacific settlement envisaged under Chapter VI.³⁸⁶

During the ensuing debate, several speakers recognized the primary role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes and voiced the need for the Council increasingly to explore and revert to

³⁸⁴ S/PV.4223, p. 17 (Tunisia); S/PV.4223 (Resumption 1), pp. 17-18 (Denmark).

³⁸⁵ S/PV.4753, pp. 2-3.

³⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

the provisions of Chapter VI.³⁸⁷ While acknowledging the role of the Council, some speakers emphasized that the responsibility to prevent and resolve conflicts and disputes rested first and foremost with the parties to the dispute.³⁸⁸ The representative of Germany, echoed by the representative of the United States, drew attention to the Council's ability to anticipate emerging disputes and conflicts, and commented that, to react to them in the most appropriate way, the Council was dependent to a significant extent on an "early and solid knowledge of the situation".³⁸⁹ The representative of China, supported by the representatives of Germany and the United States, acknowledged that, unlike Chapter VII, Chapter VI provided more flexibility in the use of instruments to resolve disputes.³⁹⁰ The representative of the United States added that, over the years, mechanisms had been developed to enable the Council to prevent some disputes from reaching the stage where Chapter VII action was required. Chapter VI had been stretched to accommodate the emergence of peacekeeping, a concept not mentioned in the Charter but one which had been a valuable tool in dispute settlement.³⁹¹ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, however, pointed out that there was not "a clear dividing line between the two chapters". In his opinion, the Council should take into consideration, when deciding its course of action, the "feelings and reactions of the peoples of the world", for whom the use of Chapter VII was "not in their interest". He therefore concurred with the opinion of many legal experts who favoured diplomatic instruments and solutions based on peaceful negotiations and the provisions of Article 33 and other articles of the Charter that referred to peaceful solutions.³⁹² The representative of Pakistan, echoing Mr. Marker's earlier statement, encouraged the Council to use its mandatory enforcement authority under Chapter VII to persuade parties to disputes to engage in the processes

for the peaceful settlement of disputes envisaged under Chapter VI.³⁹³ Focusing on the various tools available to the Council under Chapter VI, the representative of Bulgaria expressed the view that although some diversification in the use of those instruments was necessary, "a spirit of pragmatism and common sense" should always prevail in the face of the very varied situations the Council dealt with.³⁹⁴

Obligation of Member States to settle their disputes by peaceful means in the light of Article 33 (1) and recommendations for the settlement of disputes by the Security Council, in the light of Article 33 (2)

Article 33 stipulates the obligation of Member States to settle their disputes by peaceful means. Article 33 (1) gives primary responsibility in resolving a dispute to the parties concerned. Article 33 (2) gives the Security Council discretionary power to request the parties to settle their disputes by peaceful means, when it deems necessary. In the cases below, Article 33 was explicitly invoked by Council members mainly during debates on thematic issues related to conflict prevention and the pacific settlement of disputes. In one instance, an explicit reference to Article 33 was made by the representative of Pakistan in a letter dated 22 May 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council in connection with the situation between India and Pakistan with respect to the Kashmir dispute.³⁹⁵ Included with the case studies in this section is one relating to the Central African region and another that concerns the situation in the Great Lakes region, exemplifying the Council's, increasing focus on the regional and subregional dimension of the peaceful settlement of disputes.

³⁸⁷ S/PV.4753, p. 10 (Mexico); p. 14 (China); p. 17 (United States); p. 18 (Chile); p. 21 (France); and p. 22 (Angola); S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Greece, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 13 (Ethiopia).

³⁸⁸ S/PV.4753, p. 10 (Mexico); p. 12 (United Kingdom); p. 19 (Bulgaria); and p. 21 (France); S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (India).

³⁸⁹ S/PV.4753, p. 15 (Germany); and p. 17 (United States).

³⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 14 (China); p. 14 (Germany); and p. 17 (United States).

³⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

³⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.

³⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

³⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

³⁹⁵ S/2002/571. Similar letters bringing to the attention of the Security Council the situation between India and Pakistan in connection with the Jammu and Kashmir dispute were addressed to the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General by the representative of Mali, as Chairman of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) Contact Group on Jammu and Kashmir (S/2002/657), and the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (S/2002/13).

Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts

At the 4174th meeting of the Council, on 20 July 2000, a few speakers explicitly highlighted the significance of the provisions enshrined in Article 33, and how they could play an important role in settling many disputes and preventing armed conflicts. The representative of Namibia called for the existing tools of Article 33 to be “further strengthened and completed”.³⁹⁶ The representative of Pakistan noted that, according to Article 33, parties to any dispute were required to use peaceful means for settlement and that the Security Council was empowered to call upon the parties to settle their disputes by such means. He also added that responsibility in that regard should not be evaded on the pretext that bilateral disputes should be resolved by the concerned parties alone, as all bilateral disputes, particularly those with implications for global peace and security, were by definition “international disputes”.³⁹⁷

The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes

At the Council’s 4753rd meeting, on 13 May 2003, several speakers, in their statements, drew attention to the provisions enshrined in Article 33 and to the importance of the available tools for the settlement of disputes, including negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, resort to regional arrangements, judicial settlement and other peaceful means.³⁹⁸ In that regard, the representative of India commented that the means provided for in Article 33 were not intended to be “exhaustive”, and that the reference to “other peaceful means of their choice” provided the parties with greater freedom of choice. He added that the Council was not to be bound by the list included in Article 33 (1) in its choice of procedures to assist parties in the settlement of disputes.³⁹⁹ The representative of Spain highlighted that, in both Chapter VIII and Article 33 of the Charter, it was established that Member States should utilize existing regional organizations, among other means of peaceful

settlement, and therefore encouraged the Security Council to promote measures undertaken at the regional level.⁴⁰⁰

Central African region

At its 4871st meeting, on 24 November 2003, the Security Council discussed the interim report of the multidisciplinary assessment mission to the Central African subregion.⁴⁰¹ In its report, the mission pointed out a number of cross-border challenges, including ethnic tensions, refugee flows as well as cross-border movement of weapons, drugs and armed groups, which could be solved only through cooperation and an integrated, holistic subregional approach.

Introducing the report of the multidisciplinary assessment mission, the Assistant Secretary-General stressed, *inter alia*, the need for the United Nations to provide assistance to implement subregional policies to address the numerous cross-cutting challenges in the Central African region. Most speakers concurred with the report’s assessment concerning the primary challenges confronting the countries in Central Africa, and about the importance of a subregional approach to address the numerous cross-cutting challenges facing those countries. A number of speakers stressed the importance of strengthening existing subregional mechanisms and organizations, including the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS).⁴⁰² Moreover, several delegations welcomed the Secretary-General’s intention to appoint a Special Envoy for the region.⁴⁰³ The representative of Cameroon deplored the omission from the report of a recommendation in line with the request, which he believed had been made by all, and not just most, Governments in Central Africa during the mission’s visit, for a permanent United Nations presence in the subregion.⁴⁰⁴ The representative of France stated that the cross-border challenges confronting the countries in Central Africa made it necessary for the States of the region and the international community to coordinate appropriate

³⁹⁶ S/PV.4174, p. 19.

³⁹⁷ S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 4.

³⁹⁸ S/PV.4753, p. 12 (Spain); p. 18 (Chile); and p. 25 (Syrian Arab Republic); S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Greece, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and pp. 5-6 (India).

³⁹⁹ S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 6.

⁴⁰⁰ S/PV.4753, p.12.

⁴⁰¹ S/2003/1077.

⁴⁰² S/PV.4871, p. 4 (Cameron); p. 9 (Germany); p. 10 (Pakistan); p. 17 (Italy); and pp. 18-19 (Democratic Republic of the Congo).

⁴⁰³ S/PV.4871, p. 7 (Guinea); p. 8 (China); p. 11 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 14 (Russian Federation); and p. 25 (Chad).

⁴⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6.

responses. At the same time, France believed that the proposal to appoint a Special Envoy should be considered in the context of the international conference on the Great Lakes region.⁴⁰⁵ The representative of Germany stated that it was difficult to see how a mandate for an additional special envoy for Central Africa could avoid overlapping with the mandate of the Special Representative for the Great Lakes Region. His delegation therefore preferred that the United Nations missions in the Central African subregion identify possible areas of cooperation aimed at effectively addressing cross-cutting issues.⁴⁰⁶ The representative of Spain agreed with the report that it was preferable to make effective and coordinated use of existing structures in the region before considering the possibility of establishing new ones.⁴⁰⁷ The representative of the United Kingdom recognized the need for a comprehensive and concerted approach to the issues of peace, security and development in Central Africa, and stressed the importance of making effective operational linkages across the United Nations system and, where relevant, across borders. He stated that an integrated and holistic subregional approach was required to complement national solutions, but cautioned against imposing templates on different kinds of problems.⁴⁰⁸ The representative of the Russian Federation expressed concern that some African countries tended to appeal to the international community before fully exhausting national or regional possibilities. That applied to the “rather excessive approach for the establishment in Central Africa of a United Nations office”.⁴⁰⁹ The representative of the United States, noting that the international conference on the Great Lakes region might incorporate a number of the elements laid out in the report of the multidisciplinary mission, recommended that the decision on naming a Special Envoy be deferred until after the issuance of the results and recommendations of that conference. Moreover, he expressed concern about adding yet another layer of bureaucracy to the United Nations structures in the Central African region.⁴¹⁰ The representative of Chile recommended heeding the concern of the Secretary-General regarding the proliferation of United Nations offices in the

region.⁴¹¹ The representative of the Congo, speaking on behalf of the 11 member States of ECCAS, underlined that it was imperative to have a subregional, coordinated approach, and for the subregion to have a United Nations interlocutor with a regional perspective.⁴¹² The representative of Equatorial Guinea stressed the special responsibility of the Council to address the crises in the region, and also expressed appreciation for the work of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa. He underlined that despite recent positive developments, the countries of the region remained fragile, and he stressed the need for a permanent political United Nations presence with a subregional scope.⁴¹³ The Permanent Observer of the African Union, pointing to the abundance of subregional, regional and international organizations present in Central Africa, stressed the need to strengthen existing capacities, and hoped that a United Nations regional political presence could serve to enhance coordination among the various initiatives. As to what form the structure should take, he stated that the African Union relied on the flexibility shown by the countries in the subregion that were prepared to consider the issue further with the Special Envoy to be appointed by the Secretary-General. While supporting the request by the countries of the subregion, he emphasized that the form of coordination mattered less than its efficiency and effectiveness.⁴¹⁴ Finally, the Deputy Secretary-General for Political Affairs of ECCAS, noting the recent progress made towards consolidating peace and security in a number of countries in the region, argued that a new dynamic was under way in Central Africa and reiterated the call for a permanent United Nations regional office.⁴¹⁵

The situation in the Great Lakes region

At the 4865th meeting, on 20 November 2003, the Security Council convened a meeting to discuss the preparations for an international conference on the Great Lakes region, following the presentation of a report of the Secretary-General.⁴¹⁶ In his report, the Secretary-General stressed that the Council’s call for

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 9.

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 11.

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid., pp. 12-13.

⁴⁰⁹ Ibid., pp. 13-14.

⁴¹⁰ Ibid., p. 14.

⁴¹¹ Ibid., p. 15.

⁴¹² Ibid., pp. 18-21.

⁴¹³ Ibid., pp. 26-27.

⁴¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 27-28.

⁴¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 28-29.

⁴¹⁶ S/2003/1099.

an international conference on the Great Lakes region entailed the recognition of the fact that the internal problems in the region tended to spread because of the close social, economic and cultural links of the inhabitants of the entire region, which was why a regional approach was needed. The purpose of the conference, under United Nations and African Union partnership, was to begin a process to bring together the leaders of the countries of the Great Lakes region to reach an agreement on a set of principles and launch selected programmes to help end the cycle of conflict and ensure durable peace, democracy and development in the whole region. It would also establish a regional framework to facilitate the adoption of a stability, security and development pact. He noted that the conference was not a one-time event but a process consisting of several stages, and he urged the core countries to focus on the priorities of the conference in order to formulate concrete and feasible policies.⁴¹⁷

At the meeting, most speakers strongly supported the conference, agreeing that a regional approach was essential to address the crisis affecting the Great Lakes region. They expressed hope that holding the conference would help consolidate the gains that had been made in the recent peace processes in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Burundi. A number of speakers stressed that the conference would have to be judged on whether it produced concrete measures to ensure a safeguard against a future resurgence of violence, instability and criminality,⁴¹⁸ while others, emphasizing the need for sufficient financial support, called on donors to provide it in a timely manner.⁴¹⁹

Recourse to investigation by the Security Council in the light of Article 34

Article 34 of the Charter stipulates that the Security Council may investigate any dispute, or situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to

⁴¹⁷ S/PV.4865, p. 3.

⁴¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 16 (France); p. 11 (Italy, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 22 (Spain).

⁴¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (United Republic of Tanzania); p. 17 (China); and p. 20 (Syrian Arab Republic).

endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. In the following instances, the Article was implicitly and/or explicitly invoked, mainly in connection with the prevention of armed conflict.

Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts

At the 4174th meeting of the Council, on 20 July 2000, the representative of China noted that the Security Council had taken some positive measures in regard to conflict prevention and peaceful resolution of conflicts, including the sending of fact-finding missions to areas of conflict. He further noted that setting up early warning systems or the sending of fact-finding or other special missions, which bear on the sovereignty of a State, should follow only after consent had been obtained from the countries or parties concerned.⁴²⁰ The representative of Malaysia also called for more frequent use of fact-finding missions, either by the Secretary-General or by the Council itself.⁴²¹

At the 4334th meeting, on 21 June 2001, the Council met to discuss the report of the Secretary-General on conflict prevention, which included a number of proposals to further enhance the capacity of the United Nations system for preventive action.⁴²² Introducing the report on behalf of the Secretary-General, the Deputy Secretary-General suggested that the Council could send fact-finding missions with multidisciplinary expert support to potential conflict areas, with the aim of working out comprehensive prevention strategies.⁴²³ Several delegations supported the proposal of dispatching fact-finding missions to potential conflict areas.⁴²⁴ The representative of the Russian Federation commented that such missions had already and repeatedly proven their necessity and “played an important role in the research for necessary solutions”.⁴²⁵ The representative of Costa Rica, however, cautioned that the scope of such missions should not be exaggerated and that they would not be

⁴²⁰ S/PV.4174, p. 13.

⁴²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁴²² S/2001/574.

⁴²³ S/PV.4334, p. 3.

⁴²⁴ S/PV.4334, p. 7 (Jamaica); p. 13 (Russian Federation); p. 20 (Ukraine); and p. 25 (Mauritius); S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Costa Rica); p. 10 (Japan); p. 17 (Malaysia); and p. 20 (South Africa).

⁴²⁵ S/PV.4334, p. 13.

useful if they were “quick and superficial” and without expert members.⁴²⁶ Similarly, the representative of Japan stressed that clear criteria for such missions must be established, that their terms of reference must be specified and their financing well clarified.⁴²⁷ The representative of South Africa referred to the Secretary-General’s use of inter-agency task forces, and suggested that these could play a valuable role, complementary to that of the fact-finding missions of the Council. As a consequence, he added, consideration should be given to the harmonization of the two approaches.⁴²⁸

Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security

At the 4220th meeting of the Council, on 13 November 2000, the representative of Mali welcomed the Council’s initiative to more frequently deploy fact-finding missions to areas of tension as “a quick means of preventing crises”. At the same time, he acknowledged that conflict prevention measures should be taken in accordance with the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States.⁴²⁹

The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes

At the 4753rd meeting of the Security Council, on 13 May 2003, the representative of Germany, referring to the different means available to the Council in addressing disputes, welcomed the Council’s practice of dispatching fact-finding missions to fragile situations and added that this instrument “could benefit from some intensification”. Furthermore, he emphasized that such “special missions” not only conveyed to the parties the clear message that a situation was under observation and a matter of concern to the Council, but also helped to “prepare for adequate solutions”.⁴³⁰ The representative of Spain stated that the Council should make greater use of its prerogative under Article 34 and, in particular, of Council missions in conflict zones, which

would enable it to obtain “information first-hand while exerting pressure on the parties”.⁴³¹

Protection of civilians in armed conflict

At the 4130th meeting of the Security Council, on 19 April 2000, the Secretary-General, in his remarks, referred to a number of recommendations contained in his first report to the Security Council on the protection of civilians in armed conflict.⁴³² Recalling the successful deployment of a mission to the Central African Republic, he welcomed the Security Council’s willingness to consider the future establishment of preventive missions, including the dispatch of monitors and fact-finding missions in cases when such deployments could make a difference between peaceful settlement of disputes and violent conflict.⁴³³ The representative of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the European Union,⁴³⁴ supported the views expressed by the Secretary-General and added that early deployment of preventive missions such as fact-finding missions should be considered whenever possible.⁴³⁵ The representative of Egypt agreed that the Council could carry out certain actions, such as sending fact-finding missions to prevent conflicts and reach peaceful settlements, but noted that the consent of the State concerned was required, as those procedures “were in fact voluntary”.⁴³⁶

⁴³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁴³² In his report dated 8 September 1999, the Secretary-General recommended that the Security Council consider the deployment, in certain cases, of a preventive peacekeeping operation, or of another preventive monitoring presence. He also recommended that the Council increase its use of relevant provisions in the Charter, such as Articles 34 to 36, by investigating disputes at an early stage, inviting Member States to bring disputes to the Security Council’s attention and recommending appropriate procedures for dealing with disputes, and strengthen the relevance of Article 99 of the Charter by taking concrete action in response to threats against peace and security as these were identified by the Secretariat (see S/1999/957, paras. 12 and 13).

⁴³³ S/PV.4130 and Corr.1, p. 3.

⁴³⁴ Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia; Cyprus and Malta; and Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway.

⁴³⁵ S/PV.4130 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 3.

⁴³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁴²⁶ S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

⁴²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁴²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁴²⁹ S/PV.4220, p. 16.

⁴³⁰ S/PV.4753, p. 15.

At its 4312th meeting, on 23 April 2001, the Council met to discuss the second report of the Secretary-General on the above-mentioned topic.⁴³⁷ In her statement, the Deputy Secretary-General advocated for more frequent use of fact-finding missions to conflict areas with a view to identifying the specific requirements for humanitarian assistance.⁴³⁸ Subsequently, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights commented that “establishing the facts” could play a crucial part in the protection of civilians in armed conflict.⁴³⁹ Referring to a number of instances in which human rights fact-finding missions had taken place, including in relation to Afghanistan, East Timor, Sierra Leone and Kosovo, the Commissioner further added that the reports of those missions should be available to the Security Council.⁴⁴⁰ Subsequently, in the debate, several speakers endorsed the Secretary-General’s recommendation regarding more frequent use of fact-finding missions to conflict areas with a focus on humanitarian assistance.⁴⁴¹ The representative of Ukraine stated that it was crucial for Council members to have a regular exchange of views with other organs of the United Nations system, such as the Economic and Social Council. He stated that there was “ample room” for the latter not only to participate in such missions, but also to lead them.⁴⁴² The representative of the United Kingdom commented that the Security Council should engage the parties in conflict and undertake fact-finding missions, and expressed the opinion that “in practice, these actions are those which are most likely to be taken up by actors that are represented in the field”. As a consequence, he “noted with interest” the proposal by Ukraine that the Economic and Social Council join in fact-finding missions, and called for clear arrangements for coordination with the other United Nations bodies.⁴⁴³ The representative of Indonesia cautioned that the

⁴³⁷ S/PV.4312, pp. 3-4.

⁴³⁸ S/2001/331, p. 6.

⁴³⁹ S/PV.4312, p. 5.

⁴⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴¹ S/PV.4312, p.10 (Ukraine); p. 11 (Tunisia); and p. 24 (Ireland); S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 5 (Sweden, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 21 (Pakistan).

⁴⁴² S/PV.4312, p. 10.

⁴⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

deployment of fact-finding missions should be based on the consent of the countries concerned.⁴⁴⁴

Women and peace and security

At the 4208th meeting of the Security Council, on 24 and 25 October 2000, the representative of the United States, supported by the representative of New Zealand, stated that the presence of women in all phases of peacekeeping and peacebuilding missions, including fact-finding missions, should be “visible and consistent”.⁴⁴⁵ The representative of Indonesia suggested that the Council include gender issues in the terms of reference of fact-finding missions.⁴⁴⁶ Similarly, the representative of Namibia suggested that fact-finding missions should include “a senior gender expert” so that the Council could gain a full appreciation of the gender dimension of ongoing or potential conflicts.⁴⁴⁷

Children and armed conflict

At the 4684th meeting of the Security Council, on 14 January 2003, the representative of Costa Rica noted that there was a need for fact-finding missions in cases of accusations of serious violations of the rights of the child. Those missions, he added, could also offer early warning in the event of a situation that might potentially threaten the security of children.⁴⁴⁸

Referral of disputes to the Security Council in the light of Article 35

Article 35 (1) and (2) grants Member States and non-member States the right to bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the Security Council. Explicit references to that prerogative were made in the following instance.⁴⁴⁹

⁴⁴⁴ S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 33.

⁴⁴⁵ S/PV.4208, p. 13 (United States); S/PV.4208 (Resumption 1), p. 21 (New Zealand).

⁴⁴⁶ S/PV.4208 (Resumption 1), p. 25.

⁴⁴⁷ S/PV.4208 (Resumption 2), p. 13.

⁴⁴⁸ S/PV.4684 (Resumption 1), p. 24.

⁴⁴⁹ At the 4720th meeting of the Council, in connection with the agenda item “Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa”, the representative of Liberia referred to a formal complaint presented recently by his

The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes

At the 4753rd meeting of the Security Council, on 13 May 2003, in connection with the use of Article 35 by Member States, the representative of Greece, speaking on behalf of the European Union and associated countries, underlined the obligation of States to refer to the Council a dispute to which they were parties if they failed to reach an early solution by any of the means indicated in Article 33 of the Charter.⁴⁵⁰ Recalling the importance of diversifying the tools at the Council's disposal under Chapter VI, the representative of Bulgaria emphasized the importance of Article 35 of the Charter, which enables States to have greater recourse to the Council.⁴⁵¹

Referral of legal disputes in the light of Article 36 (3)

Article 36 (3) of the Charter stipulates that the Council, in making recommendations under Article 36, "should take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Court".

In the following instances, Member States debated the question of whether the Council could make more frequent recourse to the provisions of Article 36.

The role of the Security Council in the peaceful settlement of disputes

At the 4753rd meeting of the Council, on 13 May 2003, speakers discussed, *inter alia*, the role of the International Court of Justice and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in the context of the pacific settlement of disputes. During the debate, many delegations emphasized the importance of those judicial mechanisms in the prevention and resolution of legal disputes.

country to the Security Council, in line with Article 35 (1) of the Charter, which documented "Guinea's involvement in fuelling the war in Liberia" (see S/PV.4720, p. 19).

⁴⁵⁰ S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

⁴⁵¹ S/PV.4753, p. 20.

With regard to the role of the International Court of Justice, the Secretary-General, in his statement, recalled the recommendations included in his report dated 7 June 2001,⁴⁵² including the one pertaining to earlier and more frequent resort to the Court by Member States to solve their disputes.⁴⁵³ Similarly, Mr. Nabil Elaraby, judge of the Court, invited the Council to make a better use of the mechanisms provided by the Charter and involving the Court. Emphasizing that the Council could consider a "strict application" of the provisions of Article 36 (3), he recalled that the provision had been used only once, in the Corfu Channel case in 1947. He also added that the Council could consider requesting, whenever necessary, an advisory opinion from the Court to clarify legal questions, as occurred in 1970 with respect to Namibia. He further underlined the importance of increasing the acceptance by States of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, recalling that that recommendation was contained in the report entitled "Agenda for peace",⁴⁵⁴ together with two other proposals aimed at enhancing the role of the Court: that when the submission of a dispute to the full Court was not practical, its Chambers could be used; and that authority should be conferred on the Secretary-General to request advisory opinions from the Court.⁴⁵⁵

During the debate, several speakers echoed the recommendations of the Secretary-General by drawing attention to Article 36 (3) in the Charter and encouraging the Council to make more use of the Article's provisions.⁴⁵⁶ In that connection, the representative of Mexico commented that it was essential for States that had not yet done so to make a declaration recognizing the jurisdiction of the Court with respect to any other State accepting the same obligation.⁴⁵⁷ The representative of Cameroon stated that, to preserve the credibility of the machinery established in the Charter, the Security Council and the United Nations should adopt measures to compel

⁴⁵² S/2001/574 and Corr.1, para. 50.

⁴⁵³ S/PV.4753, p. 3.

⁴⁵⁴ S/24111.

⁴⁵⁵ S/PV.4753, pp. 8-9.

⁴⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Mexico); p. 13 (United Kingdom); p. 16 (Germany); p. 18 (Chile); p. 21 (Guinea); pp. 24-25 (Syrian Arab Republic); and pp. 27-28 (Cameroon); S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Greece on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 4 (Honduras).

⁴⁵⁷ S/PV.4753, p. 10.

States, if necessary and whenever circumstances so dictated, to implement forthwith and without equivocation the decisions established for peaceful procedures, especially decisions of the International Court of Justice.⁴⁵⁸ Similarly, the representative of Honduras noted that it was also a responsibility of the Security Council to make sure that the sentences from the Court were carried out.⁴⁵⁹ The representative of Pakistan underlined, *inter alia*, that particular consideration should be given to the suggestion of more frequently requesting advisory opinions of the Court.⁴⁶⁰

With regard to the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, during the debate, a few speakers mentioned the importance of such a judicial mechanism in the context of the pacific settlement of disputes.⁴⁶¹ More specifically, the representative of Mexico stated that the Tribunal was becoming increasingly important in the pacific settlement of conflicts pertaining to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, and in general in matters regarding ocean affairs.⁴⁶² The representative of Greece, speaking on behalf of the European Union and associated countries, expressed the view that early and more frequent resort to the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea would greatly contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security and the promotion of the primacy of international law in international relations.⁴⁶³

Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts

At its 4334th meeting, on 21 June 2001, the Council met to discuss the report of the Secretary-General on the prevention of armed conflict.⁴⁶⁴ In his report, the Secretary-General made four recommendations regarding the role of the International Court of Justice, as follows: (a) Member States should resort to the Court earlier and more often to settle disputes; (b) Member States that had not yet done so should accept the general

jurisdiction of the Court; (c) Member States should adopt, when signing treaties, clauses providing for disputes to be referred to the Court; and (d) the General Assembly should authorize the Secretary-General and other United Nations organs to take advantage of the advisory competence of the Court, and other United Nations organs that already enjoyed such authorization should resort to the Court more frequently for advisory opinions.⁴⁶⁵

In the debate, several speakers supported the Secretary-General's call for a strengthening of the Court's role.⁴⁶⁶ The representative of the United Kingdom supported the Secretary-General's first two recommendations and urged Members of the Organization that had not yet done so, to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.⁴⁶⁷ The representative of the United States, supported by the representatives of Nigeria and Belarus, expressed the view that the United Nations system needed to improve cooperation and coordination, and that the Court had a contribution to make to this end.⁴⁶⁸

Referrals by the Secretary-General in the light of Article 99

Article 99 of the Charter empowers the Secretary-General to bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security. In the discussions of the Council presented below, Member States generally welcomed the strengthening of the Secretary-General's prerogatives under Article 99, especially in connection with the prevention of armed conflicts and humanitarian crises, as well as the protection of civilians in armed conflict. In a number of instances, Article 99 was explicitly invoked by a Member State in communications addressed to the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General. For example, in connection with the alleged enforcement of no-flight zones by United States and British aircraft, the representative of Iraq, by identical letters dated 2 December 2002 addressed to the

⁴⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.

⁴⁵⁹ S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 4.

⁴⁶⁰ S/PV.4753, p. 29.

⁴⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Mexico); and p. 16 (Germany); S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Greece, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries).

⁴⁶² S/PV.4753, p. 11.

⁴⁶³ S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

⁴⁶⁴ S/2001/574 and Corr.1.

⁴⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁴⁶⁶ S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 15 (Mexico); p. 19 (Nigeria); p. 22 (Iraq); and p. 28 (Permanent Observer of Palestine).

⁴⁶⁷ S/PV.4334, p. 10.

⁴⁶⁸ S/PV.4334, p. 8 (United States); S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 19 (Nigeria); and p. 25 (Belarus).

President of the Council and the Secretary-General, expressed his hope that, in accordance with the Secretary-General's responsibilities as specified in Article 99 of the Charter, the Secretary-General would draw the attention of the Security Council to that situation and request the Council to carry out its duties under Article 39 of the Charter.⁴⁶⁹ Subsequently, in connection with the United States-led military action against Iraq, by two letters addressed to the Secretary-General dated 9 and 21 March 2003, respectively, the representative of Iraq appealed to the Secretary-General, under Article 99 of the Charter, to bring the new developments, posing a "threat to international peace and security", to the attention of the Security Council.⁴⁷⁰

Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council

At the 4109th meeting of the Security Council, on 9 March 2000, speakers recognized the importance of timely consideration of humanitarian issues in preventing the escalation of conflicts and in maintaining international peace and security. In that regard, the representative of the Netherlands encouraged the Secretary-General to include humanitarian issues in his briefings to the Council and underlined that the Secretary-General's exercise of his prerogative under Article 99 was an indispensable means for ensuring that the Council could discharge its duties in cases where humanitarian crises endangered international peace and security.⁴⁷¹ The representative of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the European Union and associated countries, called upon the Secretary-General to resort more often to the prerogative given to him under Article 99. In that connection, he commented that it was indispensable to improve and use the capacity of the Secretariat to enable the Security Council to consider ways in which it might regularly monitor potential conflicts or massive violations of human rights and humanitarian law either through the use of existing mechanisms, such as the International Humanitarian Fact-Finding Commission,

⁴⁶⁹ S/2002/1327. See also the following letters addressed to the Secretary-General in which the representative of Iraq explicitly invoked Article 99 of the Charter: S/2000/774, S/2000/776, S/2000/795, S/2000/820, S/2000/826, S/2000/848, and S/2001/559.

⁴⁷⁰ S/2003/358 and S/2003/296.

⁴⁷¹ S/PV.4109, p. 17.

or by other means.⁴⁷² The representative of Norway supported previous speakers in urging the Secretary-General to make full use of Article 99 and also stated that such use would require the establishment of mechanisms for early warning to provide time and opportunity for effective preventive diplomacy and pre-emptive conflict mediation.⁴⁷³

Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts

At the 4174th meeting of the Security Council, on 20 July 2000, many speakers underlined the critical role that the Secretary-General could play in making conflict prevention a more effective strategy.⁴⁷⁴ In that respect, a number of representatives explicitly invoked Article 99 and emphasized the importance of the role of the Secretary-General in using this prerogative.⁴⁷⁵ The representative of the United Kingdom, supported by the representative of Pakistan, commented that the Secretary-General needed to be given sufficient resources to make the early warning capacity of the Secretariat effective "in real life". He also noted that it was essential that the Secretariat be able to produce clear-sighted analysis, comprehensive and integrated planning and well-resourced implementation. Furthermore, he encouraged the Secretary-General to "act on his convictions" and when a situation merit the attention of the Council, to do so under his prerogatives under Article 99.⁴⁷⁶ Similarly, the representative of France reminded the Council of the role of the Secretary-General in alerting the Security Council to certain situations in accordance with Article 99 of the Charter, and remarked that the Secretariat's early warning, reaction and analysis capabilities should be bolstered so that the Secretary-General could be able to better perform that task.⁴⁷⁷ The representative of Pakistan stated that the Secretary-General should

⁴⁷² S/PV.4109 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

⁴⁷³ *Ibid.* p. 6.

⁴⁷⁴ S/PV.4174, p. 4 (United States); p. 6 (United Kingdom); p. 11 (the Netherlands); p. 14 (Tunisia); pp. 15-16 (Malaysia); and p. 27 (France, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), pp. 7-8 (Brazil); and p. 11 (Indonesia).

⁴⁷⁵ S/PV.4174, p. 13 (China); p. 14 (Tunisia); and p. 27 (France, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Pakistan); and p. 10 (Senegal).

⁴⁷⁶ S/PV.4174, p. 6.

⁴⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

play a more proactive role, as envisaged in Article 99, and not find himself inhibited by one party in a particular conflict situation.⁴⁷⁸ Echoing that statement, the representative of Malaysia added that, in case of political sensitivities, it would be more appropriate for the Secretary-General to arrange informal exchanges of views. He added that the Council would benefit tremendously from timely and in-depth briefings by the Secretariat on potential conflict situations that would be brought to the attention of the Council by the Secretary-General by virtue of Article 99 of the Charter, which should be invoked more frequently than it had been in the past. Noting that the Secretary-General had been empowered to do so by the Charter, he pointed out that the latter should be encouraged to invoke this prerogative to give substance to the concept of conflict prevention.⁴⁷⁹ Similarly, the representative of Ukraine believed that the Secretary-General played an essential role in conflict prevention in bringing to the attention of the Security Council any matter that might threaten international peace and security, in accordance with Article 99 of the Charter.⁴⁸⁰ The representative of Tunisia stated that the role of the Secretary-General in conflict prevention was an essential one, which he should exercise in accordance with Article 99 of the Charter.⁴⁸¹ The representative of Brazil stated that, as a contribution to prevention, Article 99 of the Charter offered the Secretary-General a most valuable instrument for engaging the Council in preventive action and that the role played by the special representatives of the Secretary-General and by his good offices missions should also be underscored.⁴⁸²

At the 4334th meeting, on 21 June 2001, the Council met to consider the report of the Secretary-General dated 7 June 2001 on the prevention of armed conflicts.⁴⁸³ In his report, the Secretary-General pointed out that he had had a role in the prevention of armed conflict since the earliest days of the Organization, through “quiet diplomacy” or “good offices of the Secretary-General”. The mandate for prevention was derived from Article 99 of the Charter of the United Nations, which provided that the

Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security.⁴⁸⁴ During the discussion, the representative of France reiterated that there was a need to strengthen the early warning, reaction and analysis capacities of the Secretariat so that the Secretary-General could be in a better position to perform his function according to Article 99.⁴⁸⁵ The representative of Singapore and the representative of Sweden echoed that view, and the representative of France welcomed the Secretary-General’s intention to initiate a practice of providing periodic regional or subregional reports to the Security Council on threats to international peace and security.⁴⁸⁶ The representative of Pakistan commented that, although under Article 99 the Secretary-General had a responsibility to bring to the notice of the Security Council any matter which might threaten international peace and security, this did not restrict the Secretary-General from using his good offices, fact-finding missions and personal envoys to prevent conflict.⁴⁸⁷

Protection of civilians in armed conflict

At its 4660th meeting, on 10 December 2002, the Council met to consider the latest report of the Secretary-General, dated 26 November 2002, on the protection of civilians in armed conflict.⁴⁸⁸ In the report, the Secretary-General outlined a number of practical initiatives to heighten awareness of the need to protect civilians in the daily work of the United Nations,⁴⁸⁹ inter alia, strengthening the relevance of Article 99 by taking concrete action in response to threats against peace and security identified by the Secretariat.⁴⁹⁰ During the debate, the representative of Mexico referred to Article 99 and to the power conferred to the Secretary-General in assisting the Security Council in matters of protecting civilians in

⁴⁷⁸ S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 5.

⁴⁷⁹ S/PV.4174, p. 16.

⁴⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p.22.

⁴⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁴⁸² S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 4.

⁴⁸³ S/2001/574 and Corr.1.

⁴⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 51-60.

⁴⁸⁵ S/PV.4334, p. 17.

⁴⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17 (France); and p. 22 (Singapore); S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Sweden, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries).

⁴⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁴⁸⁸ S/2002/1300.

⁴⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, annex, “Roadmap for the protection of civilians”.

⁴⁹⁰ This suggestion had already been made by the Secretary-General in his report dated 8 September 1999 on the protection of civilians in armed conflict (S/1999/957, para. 13; see also S/2002/1300, p.19).

armed conflict.⁴⁹¹ The representative of the United Kingdom, echoed by the representatives of Canada and Austria, encouraged the Secretary-General to make more use of his prerogative under Article 99 with the protection of civilians in mind.⁴⁹² Similarly, the representative of the Russian Federation remarked that the Secretary-General should act more promptly in conveying appropriate information to the Council about situations that could pose a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security, including instances of the deliberate denial of safe access by humanitarian personnel to civilians, as well as about other gross violations of the rights of civilians.⁴⁹³

Children and armed conflict

In his report of 19 July 2000 on children and armed conflict, the Secretary-General stated that it was his intention to pay particular attention to issues regarding the protection of children affected by armed conflict when preparing periodic reports on disputes that could threaten international peace and security, as mandated by Article 99.⁴⁹⁴ On the basis of that recommendation, the Council, by resolution 1379 (2001) of 20 November 2001, requested the Secretary-General to attach to his reports to the Council a list of parties to armed conflicts that recruited or used children in violation of international obligations, in situations that could be brought to the attention of the Council in accordance with Article 99.⁴⁹⁵ At the 4684th meeting of the Security Council, on 14 January 2003, the representative of Costa Rica remarked that it was essential for the Secretary-General to make full use of his powers under Article 99 by referring to the Council any situations of armed conflict in which young people under the age of 18 were recruited or used in fighting.⁴⁹⁶

⁴⁹¹ S/PV.4660, p. 12.

⁴⁹² S/PV.4660, p. 27 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4660 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Canada); and p. 17 (Austria).

⁴⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁴⁹⁴ S/2000/712, p. 34.

⁴⁹⁵ Resolution 1379 (2001), para. 16. For example, the Secretary-General provided the Security Council with a list of parties to armed conflicts recruiting or using children in violation of international obligations in his report of 26 November 2002 (S/2002/1299).

⁴⁹⁶ S/PV.4684 (Resumption 1), p. 25.

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

At the 4515th meeting of the Council on 19 April 2002, the representative of Singapore, recalling the Secretary-General's call for the deployment of an impartial, robust and credible multinational force to the Middle East, remarked that the Secretary-General had fulfilled his Charter obligation under Article 99 by bringing the situation in the Middle East to the Council's attention.⁴⁹⁷

Efforts of the Secretary-General for the peaceful settlement of disputes in the light of Article 33

Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts

At the 4174th meeting of the Security Council, on 20 July 2000, many speakers expressed appreciation for the analysis offered by the Secretary-General on conflict prevention strategies, and a number of delegations underlined the critical role that he had to play in order for prevention to be an effective strategy. They reiterated such previously identified conflict-prevention mechanisms as early warning systems and coordination within the United Nations system, and stressed that the Secretary-General, directly or through his special envoys, must enjoy both the authority and the resources to take action to prevent conflicts or their re-emergence.⁴⁹⁸ The representative of the United States stated that a possible means of strengthening the United Nations conflict-prevention and early warning capacity was to consider reinforcing the roles of the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, in particular their abilities to identify hot spots and intervene early.⁴⁹⁹ In addition, the representative of the Russian Federation attached paramount importance to improving the means of preventing armed conflicts such as early warning systems, using *inter alia* the

⁴⁹⁷ S/PV.4515 (Resumption 1), p. 14.

⁴⁹⁸ S/PV.4174, p. 5 (United States); p. 6 (United Kingdom); p. 12 (the Netherlands); p. 14 (Tunisia); p. 16 (Malaysia); p. 18 (Namibia); p. 22 (Ukraine); and p. 27 (France, speaking on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Brazil); p. 11 (Indonesia); and p. 14 (United Republic of Tanzania).

⁴⁹⁹ S/PV.4174, p. 5.

potential of the Secretary-General.⁵⁰⁰ The representative of Malaysia noted that truly preventive action or preventive diplomacy would involve the dispatch of a mission to a potential area of conflict that had not erupted and which resulted in averting the conflict. He added that such missions would more appropriately lie in the realm of preventive diplomacy, as opposed to preventive action, and might be best handled by the Secretary-General or his emissary in the context of his good offices or by individual Member States that were prepared to undertake such quiet and sensitive diplomacy.⁵⁰¹ The representative of Ukraine supported the Secretary-General's strategies for conflict prevention, involving the use of all available instruments, including confidence-building, early warning, fact-finding, good offices, mediation, citizen diplomacy measures, the naming of special representatives and the sending of envoys.⁵⁰² In addition, the representatives of Tunisia and Brazil underscored the role played by the special representatives of the Secretary-General and by his good offices missions in the prevention of armed conflicts.⁵⁰³

At the 4334th meeting of the Security Council, on 21 June 2001, the Council met to consider the report of the Secretary-General dated 7 June 2001 on the prevention of armed conflicts.⁵⁰⁴ In his report, the Secretary-General stressed that preventive diplomacy was an important part of his responsibilities, pursued through persuasion, confidence-building and information-sharing to find solutions to difficult problems at a very early stage. He saw the increasing demand for his engagement in this type of preventive action as recognition that the Secretary-General could do much quietly and discreetly outside the limelight, even though the results might not always be visible or easily assessed. He therefore intended to enhance in four ways, with the support of Member States, his traditional preventive role: first, by increasing the use of United Nations interdisciplinary fact-finding and confidence-building missions to volatile regions; second, by developing regional prevention strategies with regional partners and appropriate United Nations

organs and agencies; third, by establishing an informal network of eminent persons for conflict prevention; and fourth, by improving the capacity and resource base for preventive action in the Secretariat.⁵⁰⁵ Several speakers voiced their support for an enhancement of the role of the Secretary-General in conflict prevention, as proposed in the report.⁵⁰⁶ The representative of Ukraine supported the proposals of the Secretary-General, and highlighted the idea of identifying eminent persons to serve as an informal network for advice and action in support of the Secretary-General's efforts to prevent and resolve armed conflicts.⁵⁰⁷ The representative of Singapore commended the recent efforts of the Secretary-General to play a more active role in conflict prevention and underscored the need to strengthen the Secretariat's early warning analysis capacities. The Secretary-General's visit to the Middle East and active role in the Middle East process, he added, was the most recent contribution he had made to the ongoing efforts to achieve a just and lasting solution in the Middle East.⁵⁰⁸ The representative of Iraq also supported the Secretary-General's recommendations, and encouraged the Council to support his initiatives and refrain from any action that could cause him to fail in his task.⁵⁰⁹ The representative of Pakistan commented that, although under Article 99 the Secretary-General had a responsibility to bring to the notice of the Council any matter which may threaten international peace and security, this did not restrict the Secretary-General from using his good offices, fact-finding missions and personal envoys to prevent conflict.⁵¹⁰

The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes

At the 4753rd meeting of the Council, on 13 May 2003, the Secretary-General recalled that, in recent years, the Council had increasingly requested him to use his good offices and appoint special representatives and envoys, as well as to deploy fact-finding missions to the field.⁵¹¹ Several speakers expressed support for

⁵⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁵⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁵⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁵⁰³ S/PV.4174, p. 14 (Tunisia); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Brazil).

⁵⁰⁴ S/2001/574 and Corr.1.

⁵⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-16.

⁵⁰⁶ S/PV.4334, p. 7 (Jamaica); p. 9 (United States); p. 17 (France); and p. 22 (Singapore); S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Japan); and p. 13 (Egypt).

⁵⁰⁷ S/PV.4334., pp. 20-21.

⁵⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁵⁰⁹ S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 21.

⁵¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁵¹¹ S/PV.4753, pp. 2-3.

the efforts of the Secretary-General for the pacific settlement of disputes through his good offices and mediation.⁵¹² The representative of Mexico stated that the post of representative of the Secretary-General had become an effective and very powerful tool in promoting the pacific settlement of disputes.⁵¹³ Echoing that statement, the representative of the United States noted that a very significant contribution

to the Secretary-General's good offices role had been through his appointment of special representatives, who remained on the ground to work with the involved parties to find and implement peaceful solutions. He added that "strong, capable and experienced" special representatives could provide an extremely important link between peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding as a country moved from conflict to ceasefire and, then, reconstruction.⁵¹⁴

⁵¹² S/PV.4753, p. 13 (United Kingdom); p. 15 (Germany); p. 17 (United States); pp. 19-20 (Bulgaria); p. 21 (France); and p. 29 (Pakistan); S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Greece, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 14 (Ethiopia).

⁵¹³ S/PV.4753, p. 11.

⁵¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

Chapter XI

Consideration of the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introductory note	916
Part I. Determination of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression in accordance with Article 39 of the Charter	917
Note	917
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 39	917
B. Discussion relating to Article 39	922
Part II. Provisional measures to prevent the aggravation of a situation in accordance with Article 40 of the Charter	934
Note	934
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 40	934
B. Discussion relating to Article 40	939
Part III. Measures not involving the use of armed force in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter	940
Note	940
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 41	940
B. Discussion relating to Article 41	949
Part IV. Measures to maintain or restore international peace and security in accordance with Article 42 of the Charter	967
Note	967
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 42	967
B. Discussion relating to Article 42	969
Part V. Decisions and deliberations having relevance to Articles 43 to 47 of the Charter	980
Note	981
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 43	982
B. Discussion relating to Article 43	986
C. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 44	988
D. Discussion relating to Article 44	989
E. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Articles 46 and 47	991
F. Discussion relating to Articles 46 and 47	991
Part VI. Obligations of Member States under Article 48 of the Charter	992
Note	992
A. Obligations arising pursuant to Security Council decisions adopted under Article 41	993

B. Obligations arising pursuant to Security Council decisions adopted under Article 42.....	995
Part VII. Obligations of Member States under Article 49 of the Charter	996
Note	996
A. Calls for mutual assistance in the implementation of decisions adopted under Article 41.....	996
B. Calls for mutual assistance in the implementation of decisions adopted under Article 42.....	997
Part VIII. Special economic problems of the nature described in Article 50 of the Charter ...	998
Note	998
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 50	999
B. Discussion relating to Article 50	1000
C. Instances arising in Security Council subsidiary bodies	1003
Part IX. Right of self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter	1004
Note	1004
A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 51	1004
B. Discussion relating to Article 51	1005
C. Invocation of the right of self-defence in other instances	1014

Introductory note

This chapter deals with action taken by the Security Council with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace or acts of aggression, within the framework of Chapter VII of the Charter.

During the period under review, the Council invoked Chapter VII of the Charter in an increased number of its decisions. While most of the decisions related to Afghanistan, Iraq and Kuwait, and to acts of international terrorism, the Council also adopted measures under Chapter VII of the Charter in connection with Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, East Timor, Eritrea and Ethiopia, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Somalia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The chapter is divided into nine parts, focusing on selected material that may best serve to highlight how the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter were interpreted by the Council in its deliberations and applied in its decisions. Given the increase in the Council's practice under Chapter VII during the period under review, and to give due focus to the key elements that arose in its decisions or deliberations, individual Articles of the Charter have been dealt with in separate parts of the chapter. Thus parts I to IV of this chapter focus on the practice of the Council in accordance with Articles 39 to 42, while part V focuses on Articles 43 to 47. Parts VI and VII address, respectively, the obligations of Member States under Articles 48 and 49, and parts VIII and IX deal, respectively, with the practice of the Council with respect to Articles 50 and 51. Further, each part contains a section that focuses on the decisions of the Council and a section that highlights relevant excerpts of the Council's deliberations, illustrating the Council's practice with respect to the Article(s) considered. Each section treats the different aspects of the Council's consideration of the Article concerned, under different subheadings.

Part I

Determination of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression in accordance with Article 39 of the Charter

Article 39

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Note

During the period under review, the Council did not explicitly invoke Article 39 in any of its decisions. The Council, however, did adopt several resolutions determining, or expressing concern, at the “existence of threats to regional and/or international peace and security” in connection with Afghanistan, Eritrea and Ethiopia, Iraq and Kuwait, and Somalia and with acts of international terrorism. The “continuance of a threat to international peace and security” was determined in connection with the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In all of the above-mentioned cases, the Council adopted measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. In several other instances, in connection with Angola, Côte d’Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Sierra Leone and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Council determined “new or continuing threats to international peace and security in the region”.

In connection with its consideration of thematic issues, the Council also identified generic threats to peace and security. In a number of decisions, the Council recognized and expressed concern at a wide range of non-traditional threats that might constitute a threat to international peace and security, such as the deliberate targeting of civilian populations, including children, in armed conflicts; the widespread violations of international humanitarian and human rights law in situations of armed conflict; and the HIV/AIDS pandemic. The Council also expressed its concern over the threat posed by the proliferation of small arms, light weapons and mercenary activities in areas of conflict.

Several issues regarding the interpretation of Article 39 and the determination of threats to the peace

arose during the Council’s debates, mainly focusing on the threats constituted by the situations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Substantial discussion also emerged over non-traditional concepts of threats to the peace.

Section A outlines the decisions of the Council in which determinations were made regarding the existence or continuance of a threat to the peace. Section B reflects the constitutional discussion in the meetings of the Council arising in connection with the adoption of some of these resolutions.

A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 39

Africa

The situation in Angola

By resolution 1295 (2000) of 18 April 2000, the Council determined that the continuing conflict in Angola constituted “a threat to international peace and security in the region”.¹

The situation in Côte d’Ivoire

By resolution 1464 (2003) of 4 February 2003, the Council noted the existence of a challenge to the stability of Côte d’Ivoire and determined that threats to stability in Côte d’Ivoire constituted “a threat to international peace and security in the region”.²

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

By resolution 1291 (2000) of 24 February 2000, the Council noted with concern the illegal exploitation

¹ Resolution 1295 (2000), sect. A., first preambular paragraph. The Council reaffirmed that the situation in Angola constituted a threat to international peace and security in the region by resolutions 1336 (2001), 1348 (2001), 1374 (2001) and 1404 (2002).

² Resolution 1464 (2003), seventh preambular paragraph. By subsequent resolutions, the Council reiterated that the situation in Côte d’Ivoire constituted a threat to international peace and security in the region. See resolutions 1479 (2003), ninth preambular paragraph, and 1514 (2003), eleventh preambular paragraph.

of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the potential consequences of those actions on the conflict, and reiterated its call for the withdrawal of foreign forces. It therefore determined that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo constituted “a threat to international peace and security in the region”.³ By resolution 1304 (2000) of 15 June 2000, the Council expressed its deep concern and outrage at renewed fighting between Ugandan and Rwandan forces in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁴ By that and a number of subsequent resolutions, the Council determined that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to constitute a threat to international peace and security in the region.⁵

By resolution 1484 (2003) of 30 May 2003, the Council determined that the situation in the Ituri region and in Bunia in particular constituted a threat to the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and “to peace and security in the Great Lakes region”.⁶

The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia

By resolution 1297 (2000) of 12 May 2000, following the outbreak of renewed fighting between Eritrea and Ethiopia, the Council noted that the situation between the two countries constituted “a threat to peace and security” and stressed that renewed hostilities constituted “an even greater threat to the stability, security and economic development of the subregion”.⁷

By resolution 1298 (2000) of 17 May 2000, following the continuation of fighting between Eritrea and Ethiopia, the Council deplored the loss of human lives and regretted the diversion of resources to the conflict and its effects on the regional food crisis and

general humanitarian situation of the civilian populations of the two States. It stressed that the hostilities constituted “an increasing threat to the stability, security and economic development of the subregion”, and determined that the situation constituted “a threat to regional peace and security”.⁸

The situation in Liberia

In a statement by the President dated 13 December 2002, the Council expressed its concern at the situation in Liberia and the threat it constituted to “international peace and security in the region”, as a result of the activities of the Government of Liberia and the continuing internal conflict in the country. The Council noted that the failure of the Government of Liberia, other States and other non-State actors to respect the Council’s measures threatened the peace process in Sierra Leone and the stability of the entire West African region.⁹

By resolution 1478 (2003) of 6 May 2003, the Council expressed its serious concern at the evidence that the Government of Liberia continued to breach the measures imposed by the Council, particularly through the acquisition of arms. The Council determined that the active support provided by the Government of Liberia to armed rebel groups in the region, including to rebels in Côte d’Ivoire and former combatants of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) who continued to destabilize the region, constituted “a threat to international peace and security in the region”.¹⁰

By resolutions 1497 (2003) of 1 August 2003 and 1509 (2003) of 19 September 2003, the Council determined that the situation in Liberia constituted “a threat to international peace and security”, to “stability in West Africa” and “to the peace process for Liberia”.¹¹

³ Resolution 1291 (2000), nineteenth preambular paragraph.

⁴ Resolution 1304 (2000), seventeenth preambular paragraph.

⁵ Resolutions 1332 (2000), 1341 (2001), 1355 (2001), 1376 (2001), 1399 (2002), 1417 (2002), 1457 (2003) and 1468 (2003).

⁶ Resolution 1484 (2003), eighth preambular paragraph. By its subsequent resolutions 1493 (2003) and 1501 (2003), the Council reiterated that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo continued to constitute “a threat to international peace and security in the region”.

⁷ Resolution 1297 (2000), ninth and tenth preambular paragraphs.

⁸ Resolution 1298 (2000), twelfth and thirteenth preambular paragraphs. In a subsequent statement by the President dated 15 May 2001 (S/PRST/2001/14), Council members expressed their intent to take appropriate measures if the situation again threatened regional peace and security, and urged the parties to work to achieve stability in the Horn of Africa.

⁹ S/PRST/2002/36, second paragraph.

¹⁰ Resolution 1478 (2003), thirteenth preambular paragraph.

¹¹ Resolutions 1497 (2003), eighth preambular paragraph, and 1509 (2003), twenty-first preambular paragraph.

By resolution 1521 (2003) of 22 December 2003, the Council determined that the proliferation of arms and armed non-State actors, including mercenaries, in the subregion continued to constitute “a threat to international peace and security in West Africa, in particular to the peace process in Liberia”.¹²

The situation in Sierra Leone

By resolution 1289 (2000) of 7 February 2000, although noting the progress being made towards settling the conflict in Sierra Leone, the Council determined that the situation in the country continued to constitute “a threat to international peace and security in the region”.¹³

By resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001, the Council determined that the active support provided by the Government of Liberia to armed rebel groups in neighbouring countries, in particular its support for RUF in Sierra Leone, constituted “a threat to international peace and security in the region”.¹⁴

By resolution 1446 (2002) of 4 December 2002, the Council noted with concern that the situation in Liberia remained “a threat to security in Sierra Leone, especially the diamond-mining areas, and to other countries in the region” and reaffirmed that “the situation in the region continued to constitute a threat to international peace and security in the region”.¹⁵

¹² Resolution 1521 (2003), eighth preambular paragraph.

¹³ Resolution 1289 (2000), seventh preambular paragraph. By a number of subsequent resolutions, the Council reaffirmed its determination that the situation in Sierra Leone continued to constitute a threat to international peace and security in the region. See resolutions 1306 (2000), 1315 (2000), 1385 (2001), 1389 (2002), and 1400 (2002). In a statement by the President dated 3 November 2000 (S/PRST/2000/31), Council members expressed their concern at the fragile situation in Sierra Leone and the related instability in the wider subregion. They condemned the continued cross-border attacks along the border area of Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone, and stressed that only through a comprehensive regional approach could security and stability be restored.

¹⁴ Resolution 1343 (2001), ninth preambular paragraph. The Council reaffirmed this determination in resolution 1408 (2002), eleventh preambular paragraph.

¹⁵ Resolution 1446 (2002), ninth preambular paragraph. In a statement by the President dated 13 December 2002, in connection with the situation in Liberia (S/PRST/2002/836, second paragraph), the Council

The situation in Somalia

By resolution 1474 (2003) of 8 April 2003, noting with serious concern that the continued flow of weapons and ammunition supplies to Somalia from other countries was “undermining peace and security and the political efforts for national reconciliation in Somalia”, the Council determined that the situation in the country constituted “a threat to international peace and security in the region”.¹⁶

Asia

The situation in Afghanistan

By a statement of the President dated 7 April 2000,¹⁷ Council members reiterated their grave concern at the continuing Afghan conflict as “a serious and growing threat to regional and international peace and security”.¹⁸ They condemned the use of the Afghan territory for the sheltering and training of terrorists and planning of terrorist acts, and reaffirmed their conviction that the suppression of international terrorism was essential for the maintenance of international peace and security.¹⁹ They further condemned attacks and planned attacks by terrorists affiliated with Osama bin Laden, which constituted “a continuing threat to the international community”.²⁰

By resolution 1333 (2000) of 19 December 2000, the Council reaffirmed its conviction that the suppression of international terrorism was essential for the maintenance of international peace and security.²¹ It determined that the failure of the Taliban authorities in Afghanistan to respond to the demands of the Council constituted “a threat to international peace and security”.²²

reiterated that the failure of the Government of Liberia, other States and other non-State actors to respect the Council’s measures threatened the peace process in Sierra Leone and the stability of the entire West African region.

¹⁶ Resolution 1474 (2003), fifth and seventh preambular paragraphs. This determination was reiterated by resolution 1519 (2003).

¹⁷ S/PRST/2000/12.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, second paragraph.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, thirteenth paragraph.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, fourteenth paragraph.

²¹ Resolution 1333 (2000), eighth preambular paragraph.

²² Resolution 1333 (2000), fifteenth preambular paragraph. By a number of subsequent resolutions, the Council reaffirmed its determination that the situation in

The situation in Timor-Leste²³

By resolution 1410 (2002) of 17 May 2002, the Council reaffirmed “its previous resolutions on the situation in East Timor, in particular resolution 1272 (1999) of 25 October 1999”, by which it determined that the continuing situation in East Timor constituted a threat to peace and security.²⁴ The Council also noted the “existence of challenges to the short- and long-term security and stability of an independent East Timor” and determined that ensuring the security of the boundaries of East Timor and preserving its internal and external stability were necessary “for the maintenance of peace and security in the region”.²⁵

Europe

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

By resolution 1305 (2000) of 21 June 2000, while reaffirming its commitment to the political settlement of the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia and the Peace Agreement, the Council determined that the situation in the region continued to constitute “a threat to international peace and security”.²⁶

Letter dated 4 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

By two consecutive statements by the President dated 7 and 16 March 2001, respectively, Council members condemned the continuing extremist violence in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and stated that those acts constituted “a threat to the

Afghanistan continued to constitute a threat to international peace and security. See resolutions 1363 (2001), 1386 (2001), 1413 (2002), 1444 (2002) and 1510 (2003).

²³ As from the 4646th meeting, held on 14 November 2002, the item “The situation in East Timor” was revised to read “The situation in Timor-Leste”.

²⁴ Resolution 1410 (2002), first preambular paragraph.

²⁵ Resolution 1410 (2002), fifteenth preambular paragraph.

²⁶ Resolution 1305 (2000), eleventh preambular paragraph. By a number of subsequent resolutions, the Council reiterated its determination that the situation in the region continued to constitute a threat to international peace and security. See resolutions 1357 (2001), 1423 (2002) and 1491 (2003).

stability and security of the entire region”.²⁷ By resolution 1345 (2001) of 21 March 2001, the Council condemned extremist violence, including terrorist activities, in certain parts of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and certain municipalities in southern Serbia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. It noted that such violence had support from ethnic Albanian extremists outside those areas and constituted “a threat to the stability and security of the wider region”.²⁸

Middle East

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

By resolution 1441 (2002) of 8 November 2002, the Council recognized the threat that non-compliance by Iraq with Council resolutions and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles posed to “international peace and security”.²⁹ It deplored the fact that Iraq had not provided an accurate, full, final and complete disclosure of all aspects of its weapons programmes.³⁰ It also deplored the fact that Iraq repeatedly obstructed access to sites designated by the United Nations Special Commission and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and the absence of international monitoring, inspection and verification of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. It also deplored the failure of the Government of Iraq to comply with its commitments with regard to terrorism and to end repression of its civilian population.³¹ By resolution 1483 (2003) of 22 May 2003, the Council determined that the situation in Iraq, although improved, continued to constitute “a threat to international peace and security”.³² That determination was reiterated by the Council in two subsequent resolutions adopted on 16 October 2003 and 24 November 2003, respectively.³³

²⁷ S/PRST/2001/7, third paragraph, and S/PRST/2001/8, eighth paragraph.

²⁸ Resolution 1345 (2001), para. 1.

²⁹ Resolution 1441 (2002), third preambular paragraph.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, sixth preambular paragraph.

³¹ *Ibid.*, ninth preambular paragraph.

³² Resolution 1483 (2003), seventeenth preambular paragraph.

³³ Resolutions 1511 (2003) and 1518 (2003).

Thematic

Children and armed conflict

By resolution 1314 (2000) of 11 August 2000, the Council noted that the deliberate targeting of civilian populations or other protected persons, including children, and the committing of systematic, flagrant and widespread violations of international humanitarian and human rights law, including that relating to children, in situations of armed conflict might “constitute a threat to international peace and security”, and in that regard reaffirmed its readiness to consider such situations and, where necessary, to adopt appropriate steps.³⁴

Protection of civilians in armed conflict

By resolution 1296 (2000) of 19 April 2000, the Council noted that the deliberate targeting of civilian populations or other protected persons and the committing of systematic, flagrant and widespread violations of international humanitarian and human rights law in situations of armed conflict might constitute “a threat to international peace and security”, and reaffirmed its readiness to consider such situations and, where necessary, to adopt appropriate steps.³⁵

Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts

By resolution 1366 (2001) of 30 August 2001, the Council expressed serious concern over the “threat to peace and security caused by the illicit trade in and the excessive and destabilizing accumulation of small arms and light weapons in areas of conflict and their potential to exacerbate and prolong armed conflict”.³⁶

Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts

By resolution 1368 (2001) of 12 September 2001, the Council condemned the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 in New York, Washington, D.C. and Pennsylvania, and regarded such attacks, like any act of international terrorism, as “a threat to

international peace and security”.³⁷ By its subsequent resolution 1373 (2001) of 28 September 2001, the Council reaffirmed that such acts constituted a “threat to international peace and security”.³⁸

By resolution 1377 (2001) of 12 November 2001, the Council declared that acts of international terrorism constituted “one of the most serious threats to international peace and security in the twenty-first century” and “a challenge to all States and to all of humanity”.³⁹ It stressed that acts of and the financing, planning, preparation and support for international terrorism were contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.⁴⁰ It also underlined that acts of terrorism threatened “the social and economic development of all States” and undermined “global stability and prosperity”.⁴¹

In subsequent resolutions, the Council condemned the bomb attacks in Bali, Indonesia, on 12 October 2002; the taking of hostages in Moscow on 23 October 2002, the terrorist bomb attack at the Paradise Hotel in Kikambala, Kenya, on 28 November 2002; the bomb attack in Bogota on 7 February 2003; the terrorist acts in Iraq between August and October 2003; the bomb attacks in Istanbul on 15 and 20 November 2003; and other terrorist attacks in a number of countries, and regarded such acts, “like any act of international terrorism”, as “a threat to international peace and security”.⁴²

The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations

By resolution 1308 (2000) of 17 July 2000, the Council expressed its concern at the extent of the HIV/AIDS pandemic worldwide and, in particular, at the severity of the crisis in Africa. It recognized that

³⁷ Resolution 1368 (2001), para. 1.

³⁸ Resolution 1373 (2001), third preambular paragraph.

³⁹ Resolution 1377 (2001), third and fourth preambular paragraphs.

⁴⁰ Resolution 1377 (2001), sixth preambular paragraph.

⁴¹ Resolution 1377 (2001), seventh preambular paragraph. By resolutions 1390 (2002), 1455 (2003) and 1456 (2003), the Council reaffirmed that acts of international terrorism constituted a threat to international peace and security.

⁴² See, for example, resolutions 1438 (2002), 1440 (2002), 1450 (2002), 1465 (2003), 1511 (2003) and 1516 (2003).

³⁴ Resolution 1314 (2000), para. 9.

³⁵ Resolution 1296 (2000), para. 5.

³⁶ Resolution 1366 (2001), fourteenth preambular paragraph.

the spread of HIV/AIDS could have a uniquely devastating impact on all sectors and levels of society and stressed that, if unchecked, the pandemic might “pose a risk to stability and security”.⁴³

B. Discussion relating to Article 39

The situation in Afghanistan

At its 4251st meeting, on 19 December 2000, the Council adopted resolution 1333 (2000) by which it reaffirmed that the suppression of international terrorism was essential for the maintenance of international peace and security and determined that the failure of the Taliban authorities to respond to the demands of the Council constituted “a threat to international peace and security”.⁴⁴ During the debate, several speakers expressed their condemnation of the Taliban’s refusal to abide by Council decisions and their continuing harbouring of terrorists and support for terrorist activities.⁴⁵ The representative of the United States stated that the continuing support for terrorists by the Taliban, and in particular for Osama bin Laden, remained “a threat to international peace and security”.⁴⁶ The representative of Afghanistan argued that the resolution did not adequately deal with the threat of terrorism emanating from Afghanistan and that the Council needed to address the problem of Afghanistan in its entirety. He claimed that even though the draft clearly showed that outside elements were responsible for terrorist activities, it did not deal with “Pakistan’s well-known aggression in Afghanistan” which posed a “threat to regional security” and hampered “development and cooperation in the region”. He concluded that such acts constituted flagrant violations of the Charter and should be considered by the Council “under Chapter VII, Articles 39 to 42”.⁴⁷

⁴³ Resolution 1308 (2000), eighth and eleventh preambular paragraphs.

⁴⁴ Resolution 1333 (2000), fourteenth preambular paragraph.

⁴⁵ S/PV.4251, p. 5 (Netherlands); p. 6 (United Kingdom); p.6 (France); pp. 6-7 (Ukraine); pp. 7-8 (United States); p. 9 (Canada); and p. 9 (Russian Federation).

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3. At the 4325th meeting, on 5 June 2001, the representative of Afghanistan reiterated his conviction that “Pakistan’s direct involvement in Afghanistan and its aggressive policies in the region” posed a threat to

international peace and security, which the Council had failed to address “properly”. See S/PV.4325, p. 16. By identical letters dated 14 September 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/870), the representative of Afghanistan proposed “the convening of a special meeting of the Security Council to address the presence of foreign military and armed personnel in Afghanistan” and its “threat to regional and international peace and security”.

At the 4774th meeting, on 17 June 2003, the representative of France invited the Council to “do its share” in tackling the drug production and trafficking from Afghanistan, which posed “a serious threat to international peace and security”, among the ranks of terrorism, arms proliferation and organized crime.⁵⁰ The representative of Angola concurred that the illicit traffic in drugs posed “a security threat to the whole region”.⁵¹

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

At its 4568th meeting, on 10 July 2002, the Council discussed the legal responsibility of peacekeepers to be prosecuted for crimes committed during peacekeeping operations. During the debate, the representative of the United States expressed his Government’s concern over the legal exposure of its peacekeepers under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, which had come into force on 1 July 2002. He urged the Council, based on Article 16 of the Rome Statute, to address the concerns of some Member States about the implications of the Rome Statute for countries that were not parties to it, but which wanted to continue to contribute peacekeepers to United Nations missions. He further

international peace and security, which the Council had failed to address “properly”. See S/PV.4325, p. 16. By identical letters dated 14 September 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/870), the representative of Afghanistan proposed “the convening of a special meeting of the Security Council to address the presence of foreign military and armed personnel in Afghanistan” and its “threat to regional and international peace and security”.

⁴⁸ S/PV.4414 (Resumption 1), pp. 8-9.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁵⁰ S/PV.4774, p. 9.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

emphasized that Article 16 of the Rome Statute enabled the Security Council to “make a renewable request to the Court not to commence or proceed with investigations or prosecutions for a 12-month period on the basis of a Chapter VII resolution”.⁵² Several speakers objected to this proposition by arguing that this was not a viable course of action since the Court’s activities did not constitute a threat to international peace and security, and hence there was no basis for a resolution under Chapter VII, such an invocation of Chapter VII being *ultra vires*.⁵³

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

Discussions in connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait mainly focused on two issues with regard to the determination of threats to the peace: whether the non-compliance by Iraq with Council decisions posed a threat to the peace, and whether the United States-led military action against Iraq constituted a threat to the peace.

Non-compliance by Iraq with Security Council decisions

By a letter dated 9 August 2000 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁵⁴ the representative of Kuwait requested the Council to urge the Government of Iraq to desist from its maintenance of an aggressive attitude that posed a “threat to security and stability in Kuwait and the region”.⁵⁵

By a letter dated 24 September 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁵⁶ the representative of the United Kingdom highlighted the “violent and aggressive” nature of the Iraqi regime and conveyed his Government’s concern over Iraq’s possession of weapons of mass destruction. He asserted that the existing Iraqi regime posed a “unique danger” and that there was an urgent need for a further

concentrated international effort under the auspices of the United Nations to ensure that Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction could no longer pose an “international threat”.⁵⁷

At its 4625th meeting, on 16 October 2002, the Council discussed the situation between Iraq and Kuwait in the light of Iraq’s non-compliance with the Council’s resolutions. During the debate, while discussing the possibility of adopting a new resolution that would clearly set out the functions and powers of the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) for a new round of inspections of Iraq, several speakers expressed their concern at the potential or existing threat to international peace and security posed by Iraq’s non-compliance with its disarmament obligations.⁵⁸

At its 4644th meeting, on 8 November 2002, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 1441 (2002) by which it recognized the threat to international peace and security posed by the non-compliance of Iraq with Council resolutions and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles.⁵⁹ In the ensuing debate, the representative of Mexico stated that the resolution reflected the concerns of Member States in the Council about the need for Iraq to comply with its disarmament obligations and to renounce to weapons of mass destruction. He added that, should Iraq fail to comply, the Council’s response should be defined on the basis of its own determination as to the existence of a threat to international peace and security and proposed that that response be based on two clearly differentiated stages. The first stage would entail a credible process to evaluate the true military capability of Iraq and its intention to use its weapons or the ability of terrorist groups to have access to them. The second stage would entail the agreement of the Council and other States involved on the measures to be adopted, if the evaluation process detected a threat to international peace and security.⁶⁰

⁵² S/PV.4568, p. 10.

⁵³ S/PV.4568, p. 3 (Canada); p. 5 (New Zealand); p. 16 (Jordan); and p. 20 (Liechtenstein); S/PV.4568 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 2 (Fiji); p. 7 (Samoa); and p. 9 (Germany).

⁵⁴ S/2000/791.

⁵⁵ The representative of Kuwait reiterated his demand by subsequent letters dated 17 January 2001 (S/2001/53) and 1 October 2001 (S/2001/925), respectively, addressed to the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General.

⁵⁶ S/2002/1067.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁵⁸ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), pp. 9-11 (Australia); pp. 11-13 (Chile); and pp. 20-21 (Nigeria); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), pp. 19-20 (Albania); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, pp. 4-5 (Mexico); pp. 7-9 (United Kingdom); pp. 10-12 (United States); pp. 12-14 (France); and pp. 25-28 (Mauritius).

⁵⁹ Resolution 1441 (2002), third preambular paragraph.

⁶⁰ S/PV.4644 and Corr.1, p. 6.

By a letter dated 25 November 2002 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁶¹ the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq referred to resolution 1441 (2002) and defined it as an attempt to “impose a forced interpretation of the concept of a threat to international peace and security, as referred to in Article 39 of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to justify United States aggression against Iraq”. He went on to argue that the non-compliance was “unsupported by any evidence” and that the Council was attempting to construct a “broad new interpretation of international peace and security” by considering that any interference by Iraq with inspection activities constituted such a threat. He declared that this interpretation ran counter to the principles set out in Article 39 of the Charter.⁶²

At its 4701st meeting, on 5 February 2003, the Council reviewed the progress of Iraq in fulfilling its disarmament obligations under Security Council resolution 1441 (2002). The Council also discussed the information presented by the United States regarding Iraq’s possession of weapons of mass destruction, as well as Iraq’s involvement in terrorism.⁶³ During the debate, several speakers expressed the view that the situation in Iraq and the country’s non-compliance with Council resolutions regarding disarmament posed “a threat to international peace and security”.⁶⁴ Others noted that, while Iraq might be in violation of Council resolutions, more evidence and inspections were required before further judgments and decisions could be made.⁶⁵ By contrast, the representative of Iraq maintained that his country posed no threat to regional or international peace and security since it had disarmed.⁶⁶

At its 4707th meeting, on 14 February 2003, the Council heard reports from the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director-General of IAEA. Several representatives asserted that the situation in Iraq continued to pose a threat to international peace and security and that Iraq was in “material breach” of its Council obligations to disarm.⁶⁷ A number of speakers reaffirmed that, given the progress made by inspections and an increased degree of cooperation by Iraq, the inspections should be pursued further.⁶⁸ The representatives of France and the Russian Federation observed that since the 4701st meeting, held on 5 February 2003, the situation had ameliorated as a result of the greater effectiveness of inspections.⁶⁹ Given the absence of evidence of any forbidden activity, the representative of Iraq declared that some members of the Council were merely alleging, without any proof, the threat posed by Iraq to international peace and security.⁷⁰

At the 4709th meeting, on 18 February 2003, several speakers reiterated the view that Iraq’s possession of weapons of mass destruction and non-compliance with its obligations posed a threat to international peace and security.⁷¹ A number of representatives expressed the view that the links between States who possessed weapons of mass destruction and terrorists constituted a threat to international peace and security.⁷² The representative of Jordan insisted that the Security Council should find a peaceful solution to the crisis, and that the sanctions regime had proven to be of “unprecedented effectiveness”. He called for the sanctions regime to continue and, “if necessary, be enhanced, as its failure would constitute a threat to international peace and

⁶¹ S/2002/1294.

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 2-11.

⁶³ By a letter dated 19 February 2003 addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2003/203), the representative of Iraq deemed that the assessment given by the United States at the 4701st meeting of the Council was an attempt to mislead the Security Council and the United Nations by producing “false allegations and proof to serve as a cover for the American aggression” that was planned against Iraq.

⁶⁴ S/PV.4701, pp. 2-17 (United States); pp. 18-20 (United Kingdom); pp. 28-29 (Spain); and pp. 31-32 (Angola).

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18 (China); pp. 20-22 (Russian Federation); pp. 23-25 (France); pp. 30-31 (Chile); pp. 34-36 (Guinea); and pp. 36-37 (Germany).

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 37-39.

⁶⁷ S/PV.4707, pp. 16-17 (Spain); pp. 17-18 (United Kingdom); pp. 18-21 (United States); and pp. 28-29 (Bulgaria).

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-11 (Syrian Arab Republic); pp. 13-15 (Chile); pp. 22-23 (Mexico); pp. 24-25 (Pakistan); pp. 25-27 (Cameroon); and pp. 27-28 (Angola).

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-13 (France); and pp. 21-22 (Russian Federation).

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 30-32.

⁷¹ S/PV.4709, p. 24 (Japan); S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 7 (Republic of Korea); pp. 18-19 (Singapore); p. 20 (Nicaragua); p. 21 (Albania); pp. 27-28 (Iceland); pp. 28-29 (Canada); pp. 29-30 (Georgia); pp. 31-32 (Serbia and Montenegro); and p. 32 (Latvia).

⁷² S/PV.4709, pp. 31-32 (Argentina); S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, pp. 17-18 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); and p. 21 (Albania).

security”.⁷³ By contrast, other speakers stated that there was no evidence that the situation in Iraq constituted such a threat.⁷⁴

By a letter dated 24 February 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁷⁵ the representatives of France, Germany and the Russian Federation stated that while suspicions remained, no evidence had been given that Iraq still possessed weapons of mass destruction or capabilities in that field.⁷⁶

At its 4714th meeting, on 7 March 2003, the Council debated the latest reports presented by the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director-General of IAEA. Following the presentation, several speakers maintained that Iraq was not fully and unconditionally cooperating with the inspections regime and therefore remained in breach of its obligations.⁷⁷ Several representatives expressed the belief that, as a result of the progress made in the inspections regime, the inspections process needed to be continued and strengthened.⁷⁸ The representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Iraq noted that the latter had extensively cooperated with the inspectors and that there was no evidence of its non-compliance.⁷⁹ Similarly, the representative of Pakistan contended that the situation posed “no imminent threat to international peace and security”.⁸⁰

At its 4717th meeting, on 11 March 2003, the Council continued its debate on the compliance and implementation by Iraq of relevant Security Council resolutions. A number of speakers reiterated that Iraq was in material breach of its obligations and that the inspections could not continue indefinitely.⁸¹ The

representative of Australia noted that the Security Council should recognize that threats to international security had changed and had to deal with the threat caused by the borderless scourge of international terrorism and the risk of illicit trade in prohibited and dual use items. He therefore added that it was urgent that the Council confronted this risk by disarming nations that built those weapons and defied international non-proliferation norms. He concluded that failure to do so would “both increase the immediate threat and set a precedent that we will all come to regret”.⁸² Other speakers reaffirmed that, given the progress achieved, the inspection regime needed to be maintained and provided with more time and resources to fulfill its mandate.⁸³ The representative of South Africa stressed that the Council’s reaction in the case of Iraq would define “a new international order” that would determine how the international community addressed conflict situations in the future.⁸⁴

By a letter dated 18 March 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁸⁵ the representatives of Portugal, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States underlined that Saddam Hussein’s “brutal regime” still posed “a grave threat to the security of its region and the world”. They noted that Saddam Hussein had defied the resolutions of the Security Council and demanded the disarmament of his weapons of mass destruction.⁸⁶

At its 4721st meeting, on 19 March 2003, the Council heard briefings from the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director-General of IAEA. During the discussion, the representative of Spain recalled that resolution 1441 (2002) recognized that the non-compliance of Iraq with the Council’s resolutions constituted a threat to international peace and security and decided that Iraq had failed to comply with the demands imposed by the international community. He further noted that, despite the Council having met

⁷³ Ibid., p. 16.

⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 5-7 (Iraq); and pp. 25-26 (League of Arab States).

⁷⁵ S/2003/214.

⁷⁶ Ibid., pp. 2-3.

⁷⁷ S/PV.4714, pp. 14-17 (United States); pp. 23-25 (Spain); pp. 25-27 (United Kingdom); and pp. 30-31 (Bulgaria).

⁷⁸ Ibid., pp. 9-10 (Germany); pp. 17-18 (Russian Federation); pp. 18-21 (France); pp. 21-22 (China); pp. 22-23 (Chile); and pp. 27-28 (Angola).

⁷⁹ Ibid., pp. 10-12 (Syrian Arab Republic); and pp. 34-36 (Iraq).

⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 32-33.

⁸¹ S/PV.4717, pp. 27-28 (Singapore); pp. 28-29 (Republic of Korea); and pp. 30-31 (Albania); S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Japan); p. 4 (Philippines); pp. 9-10 (El Salvador); pp. 10-11 (Georgia); pp. 11-12 (Bolivia);

pp. 16-17 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); p. 22 (Peru); and pp. 22-23 (Colombia).

⁸² S/PV.4717, p. 18.

⁸³ Ibid., pp. 6-8 (Malaysia); pp. 9-10 (League of Arab States); pp. 11-13 (Algeria); pp. 13-14 (Egypt); pp. 14-15 (India); pp. 16-17 (Islamic Republic of Iran); pp. 19-21 (Canada); pp. 21-22 (Switzerland); pp. 24-25 (New Zealand); and pp. 29-30 (Indonesia).

⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 8-9.

⁸⁵ S/2003/335.

⁸⁶ Ibid., pp. 2-3.

several times to examine successive reports of the inspectors, Iraq had still not complied with the will of the international community, and, therefore, “peace and international security continue[d] unassured”.⁸⁷ By contrast, the representative of the Russian Federation argued that there was no evidence that Iraq posed such a threat. He stated that the Council, as the body bearing primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, fully shouldered its obligations by ensuring the deployment of international inspectors to Iraq and by establishing the conditions necessary for their activities. He added that if there were indisputable facts demonstrating that there was a direct threat from the territory of Iraq to the security of the United States, his country would be prepared to use “the entire arsenal of measures provided under the United Nations Charter to eliminate such a threat”. However, he concluded, the Council was not currently in possession of such evidence.⁸⁸

At its 4726th meeting, on 26 and 27 March 2003, the Council discussed the humanitarian situation in Iraq following the United States-led military action against Iraq. Several speakers maintained that Iraq had been in material breach of Council resolutions,⁸⁹ while others explicitly referred to this non-compliance as a threat to international peace and security.⁹⁰ In the view of a number of representatives, however, Iraq did not pose a threat to international peace and security.⁹¹ Several speakers pointed out that “pre-emptive” strikes had no foundation in international law.⁹²

United States-led military action against Iraq

⁸⁷ S/PV.4721, p. 16.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

⁸⁹ S/PV.4726, pp. 14-16 (Kuwait); pp. 24-25 (Poland); pp. 25-26 (Singapore); pp. 36-37 (Argentina); pp. 38-39 (Japan); pp. 39-40 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); p. 41 (Uzbekistan); p. 46 (Iceland); and pp. 47-48 (Mongolia); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), pp. 6-7 (El Salvador); pp. 8-9 (Micronesia); pp. 11-12 (East Timor); p. 15 (Ethiopia); pp. 25-26 (United States); pp. 29-30 (Spain); and pp. 31-32 (Bulgaria).

⁹⁰ S/PV.4726, pp. 26-27 (Australia); and pp. 42-43 (Nicaragua); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), pp. 13-14 (Uganda); and pp. 22-24 (United Kingdom).

⁹¹ S/PV.4726, pp. 21-23 (Cuba); and pp. 33-34 (Islamic Republic of Iran); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), pp. 26-28 (Russian Federation).

⁹² S/PV.4726, pp. 6-8 (Malaysia); pp. 13-14 (Yemen); pp. 31-32 (Viet Nam); and pp. 33-34 (Islamic Republic of Iran).

By identical letters dated 10 July 2000 addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council,⁹³ the representative of Iraq informed the Council that the United States supported and financed “terrorist activities aimed at overthrowing the national regime and fomenting civil war in Iraq”, which constituted “a threat to the security and stability of a sovereign State and could also undermine security and stability in the region”.

By a series of letters addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council between November 2000 and October 2001,⁹⁴ the representative of Iraq declared that the acts of “piracy” by the United States naval forces stationed in the Arabian Gulf region represented “a serious threat to regional and international peace and security”. By another series of letters addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council between November 2000 and October 2001,⁹⁵ the representative of Iraq renewed his call to the countries participating in the “aggression” against Iraq to desist forthwith from internationally prohibited acts that violated Iraq’s sovereignty, placed its security and integrity in grave danger and posed a direct and serious threat to international peace and security.

At its 4625th meeting, on 16 October 2002, the Council convened in response to the request by South Africa to hold an emergency meeting to voice concern regarding the possibility that the United Nations was at that time being asked to consider proposals that opened up the “possibility of a war against a Member State”.⁹⁶ The representative of Yemen expressed his Government’s “grave concern” over the approach to “invade Iraq” and insisted that it constituted a “direct threat to the security and stability of the region”.⁹⁷ The representative of Lebanon declared that the Arab leaders expressed their total rejection of an attack on

⁹³ S/2000/687.

⁹⁴ S/2000/1110, S/2001/32, S/2001/776 and S/2001/929.

⁹⁵ S/2000/1128, S/2000/1155, S/2000/1165, S/2000/1208, S/2000/1229, S/2000/1248, S/2001/18, S/2001/37, S/2001/79, S/2001/116, S/2001/122, S/2001/141, S/2001/161, S/2001/168, S/2001/227, S/2001/248, S/2001/297, S/2001/316, S/2001/369, S/2001/536, S/2001/554, S/2001/620, S/2001/638, S/2001/650, S/2001/692, S/2001/726, S/2001/756, S/2001/773, S/2001/807, S/2001/816, S/2001/846, S/2001/850, S/2001/878, S/2001/927, S/2001/954 and S/2001/995.

⁹⁶ See S/2002/1132 and S/PV.4625, p. 4.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-15.

Iraq and noted that a threat to the peace and security of “any Arab State” constituted “a threat to the national security of all Arab States”.⁹⁸

By identical letters dated 2 December 2002 addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁹ the representative of Iraq stated that the “imposition and enforcement of the two illegal no-flight zones” was a “tyrannical act and a flagrant breach of the Charter of the United Nations and the established principles of international law” and constituted “a serious threat to regional and international peace and security”. He also expressed the hope that the Secretary-General would “draw the attention of the Security Council” to the nature of the aggression and to the danger it posed “to peace and security in the region and throughout the world”.¹⁰⁰

At its 4709th meeting, on 18 February 2003, the Council debated Iraq’s compliance with the inspections regime regulated by resolution 1441 (2001). During the discussion, the representative of Iraq declared that the United States and the United Kingdom were continuing “their feverish efforts to launch an aggressive war” against Iraq. He held the belief that this would constitute “a dangerous precedent in international relations”, threatening the credibility of the United Nations and exposing international and regional peace and security to “grave dangers”.¹⁰¹ The representative of the League of Arab States indicated that the Arab Summit “categorically rejected any attack against Iraq or any threat against the peace and security of any Arab State” and that such “an attack was considered a threat to collective Arab national security”.¹⁰² The representative of Yemen concurred that the inspection and monitoring regime should continue and that a military “invasion” would lead to “the further destruction of Iraq and the further destabilization of the region”, which in turn would “constitute a threat to peace and security throughout the world”.¹⁰³

At the 4717th meeting, on 12 March 2003, the representative of Nigeria expressed his Government’s “deep concern over the consequences that the escalating situation regarding Iraq could have on

international peace and security, in particular the adverse effects its mishandling could have on Africa”. He appealed to the international community not to take any “precipitate action” against Iraq which would be “detrimental to international peace and security”.¹⁰⁴

By two letters dated 9 and 14 March 2003, respectively, addressed to the Secretary-General,¹⁰⁵ the representative of Iraq noted that the military action by joint American-British forces against Iraq posed a “threat to international peace and security”. By a subsequent letter dated 21 March 2003 addressed to the Secretary-General,¹⁰⁶ the representative of Iraq qualified as “regrettable and reprehensible” that the Secretary-General had not condemned or denounced the aggression against Iraq and had not addressed any letter to the Council, under Article 99 of the Charter, to bring to its attention that such an aggression constituted “the gravest threat to international peace and security” and threatened “the fate and future of the United Nations in its very core”.¹⁰⁷

By a letter dated 24 March 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹⁰⁸ the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, following the commencement of the United States-led military action against Iraq, transmitted a resolution of the League of Arab States which described the “aggression” against Iraq to be “a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, a departure from international legitimacy, a threat to international peace and security and an act of defiance against the international community and world public opinion”.¹⁰⁹

At its 4726th meeting, on 26 March 2003, the Council debated the situation in Iraq following the United States-led military action. During the debate, several representatives deplored the negative impact the joint American-British military intervention in Iraq would have on various aspects of regional and international peace, security and stability.¹¹⁰ The

⁹⁸ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 9.

⁹⁹ S/2002/1327.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 2. See also S/2002/1439, S/2003/14 and S/2003/107.

¹⁰¹ S/PV.4709, p. 5.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 26.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

¹⁰⁴ S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), p. 6.

¹⁰⁵ S/2003/296 and S/2003/319.

¹⁰⁶ S/2003/358.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3. See also S/2003/389.

¹⁰⁸ S/2003/365.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹¹⁰ S/PV.4726, pp. 4-6 (Iraq); pp. 6-8 (Malaysia); pp. 8-9 (League of Arab States); pp. 10-11 (Algeria); pp. 12-13 (Egypt); pp. 13-14 (Yemen); pp. 16-18 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); pp. 19-20 (Indonesia); pp. 31-32 (Viet

representative of the United Republic of Tanzania underlined that, according to Article 39 of the Charter, only the Council could determine the existence of a breach of the peace or aggression and decide on an action. He warned that the “decision to go to war without the authority of the Council” would not only weaken the United Nations, but also had “the potential to endanger international peace and security”.¹¹¹

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

Between 2001 and 2003, at a number of meetings of the Council, Member States characterized unfolding developments in the Middle East as threats to peace and security.

At its 4438th meeting, on 14 December 2001, the Council discussed the situation in the Middle East in the light of the announcement by the Government of Israel that it would sever all contact with the Palestinian Authority and its elected leader, President Yasser Arafat. In their statements, a number of representatives characterized the situation in the Middle East as “a threat to international peace and security”.¹¹² The representative of Israel, however, objected to a draft resolution sponsored by Egypt and Tunisia,¹¹³ on the grounds that it failed to recognize “terror as the primary obstacle to peace and security in the region”.¹¹⁴

At its 4506th meeting, on 3 April 2002, the Council discussed the situation in the Middle East after a military action taken by Israeli forces in the Palestinian territory. During the debate, the representative of Tunisia declared that Israel’s “excessive recourse to military force” did not guarantee its security and could lead to “further deterioration and to a flare-up in the region as a whole, thereby creating a clear threat to international peace and

security”.¹¹⁵ The representative of Chile condemned “both the horrific suicide attacks against the civilian population of Israel” and the military actions taken against Palestinian cities, labeling these events as “an affront to the civilized conscience of mankind and a threat to international peace and security”.¹¹⁶ The representative of Malaysia, speaking on behalf of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), pointed out that “Israeli terrorist actions and aggressive practices” posed “a threat to international peace and security” and urged the Council to take action under Chapter VII of the Charter.¹¹⁷ The representative of Morocco indicated that Israel had carried out the “collective murder of Palestinians” and that the situation had reached a level of danger that was “threatening international peace and security”.¹¹⁸ Similarly, the representative of Oman appealed to the Security Council “to fully shoulder its responsibilities” and “face up to the situation as a threat to international peace and security”.¹¹⁹ The representative of Bahrain warned that if “the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian and other occupied territories” did not end, international peace and security would be “constantly threatened”.¹²⁰ The representative of the Sudan concurred, indicating that Israel’s “real intentions” were to “push the region towards a total conflagration whose consequences, though as yet unknown, would definitely threaten international peace and security”.¹²¹ Along the same lines, the representative of Mauritius expressed his fear that an “Arab world in turmoil would have dire consequences for international peace and security, with eventual disastrous effects on the global economy”.¹²²

At its 4510th meeting, on 8 April 2002, the Council convened to discuss the situation in the Middle East after the Israeli occupation of Ramallah. The representative of Mauritius pointed out that Israel’s refusal to withdraw from the city constituted “a clear threat to international peace and security” and should not be tolerated by the Council.¹²³ Similarly, the representative of Tunisia declared that the “appalling

Nam); pp. 33-34 (Islamic Republic of Iran); pp. 35-36 (Lebanon); p. 36 (Tunisia); and pp. 46-47 (Lao People’s Democratic Republic); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), pp. 7-8 (Saudi Arabia); pp. 14-15 (Sri Lanka); pp. 26-28 (Russian Federation); p. 28 (China); and pp. 32-33 (Syrian Arab Republic).

¹¹¹ S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), pp. 9-10.

¹¹² S/PV.4438, p. 11 (Jamaica); p. 12 (Singapore); p. 14 (Colombia); and p. 21 (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People).

¹¹³ S/2001/1199.

¹¹⁴ S/PV.4438, p. 20.

¹¹⁵ S/PV.4506 and Corr.1, pp. 6-7.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹¹⁸ S/PV.4506 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 9.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

¹²² *Ibid.*, p. 36.

¹²³ S/PV.4510, p. 10.

Israeli conduct” amounted to a clear threat to international peace and security.¹²⁴

At its 4515th meeting, on 18 April 2002, the Council discussed the situation in the Middle East in connection with a number of Israeli military actions in the Palestinian territory. The representative of Brazil urged the Council to assert its legitimate authority in dealing with the “grave threat to international peace and security”.¹²⁵ The representative of the Sudan called for “the dispatch of a multinational force to Palestine”, in the hope that it would “receive support and be implemented rapidly by the Council in its quest to maintain international peace and security”.¹²⁶

At its 4552nd meeting, on 13 June 2002, the Council discussed the situation in the Palestinian territories after Israel reoccupied Ramallah on 10 June 2002. During the debate, the representative of Ireland noted that “injustice, instability, insecurity”, and “a frozen political landscape” posed an “unacceptable and continuous threat to the region and to international peace and security” and stressed the international community’s “clear responsibility and duty to move beyond rhetoric and language”.¹²⁷

At its 4588th meeting, on 24 July 2002, the Council debated the situation in the Middle East in the light of the latest Israeli attacks in the northern part of Gaza City. During the discussion, the representative of Saudi Arabia called upon the international community “to shoulder its responsibility” with regard to that grave situation, which “threatened international peace and security”, and “to move immediately and resolutely to confront Israel with its responsibilities in conformity with relevant Security Council resolutions and international conventions”.¹²⁸ The representatives of the League of Arab States and Iraq concurred that the Israeli military actions represented “a threat to international peace and security”.¹²⁹

At its 4614th meeting, on 23 September 2003, the Council was briefed by the Secretary-General on the developments in respect of the road map to achieve a permanent settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. During the debate, the representative of Saudi Arabia

emphasized that the Security Council had a responsibility to face the “injustice, denial of rights and threats to international peace and security stemming from Israeli practices”.¹³⁰

The situation in Africa

The impact of AIDS on peace and security in Africa

At its 4087th meeting, on 10 January 2000, the Council discussed the impact of HIV/AIDS on peace and security in Africa. The President of the Security Council (United States) pointed out that this was the first time the Council was discussing a health issue as a “security threat” which constituted a step away from the Council’s classic security agenda. He added that when a single disease threatened “everything, from economic strength to peacekeeping”, a security threat of the greatest magnitude was clearly to be faced.¹³¹ Taking the floor in his national capacity, the representative of the United States asserted that HIV/AIDS was “a global aggressor”, “one of the most devastating threats ever to confront the world community”.¹³² Following these opening remarks, in the ensuing debate, the majority of speakers acknowledged that HIV/AIDS posed a threat to security, economic, social, and political development in Africa and elsewhere. They highlighted that human security encompassed not only traditional threats to security but also humanitarian concerns.¹³³

¹³⁰ S/PV.4614 (Resumption 1), p. 17.

¹³¹ S/PV.4087, pp. 2-4.

¹³² *Ibid.*, pp. 5-8.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-15 (Namibia); pp. 15-17 (Bangladesh); and pp. 19-21 (Uganda); S/PV.4087 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Netherlands); pp. 2-4 (Argentina); pp. 4-5 (Canada); pp. 5-6 (Malaysia); pp. 7-8 (United Kingdom); pp. 8-9 (Tunisia); pp. 9-10 (Ukraine); pp. 10-12 (Mali); pp. 12-13 (Jamaica); pp. 14-15 (Algeria); pp. 15-16 (Portugal); pp. 17-18 (Cape Verde); pp. 18-19 (Norway); pp. 19-20 (South Africa); pp. 20-21 (Japan); pp. 23-24 (Brazil); pp. 24-25 (Republic of Korea); pp. 26-27 (Djibouti); pp. 27-28 (Mongolia); pp. 28-29 (Indonesia); p. 32 (Italy); pp. 32-33 (New Zealand); pp. 33-34 (Zambia); pp. 34-35 (Cyprus); pp. 35-36 (Nigeria); pp. 36-38 (Australia); pp. 38-39 (Ethiopia); pp. 39-40 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); and pp. 40-41 (Senegal).

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹²⁵ S/PV.4515, p. 21.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

¹²⁷ S/PV.4552 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

¹²⁸ S/PV.4588, p. 8.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 27 (League of Arab States); and p. 27 (Iraq).

Africa's food crisis as a threat to peace and security

At its 4652nd meeting, on 3 December 2002, the Council was briefed by the Executive Director of the World Food Programme (WFP) on the food crisis in Africa. During the ensuing debate, the representative of Ireland pointed out that the humanitarian situation in Southern Africa and the Horn of Africa was not only "intolerable from a moral and humanitarian perspective" but also posed "a threat to international peace and security of the most fundamental nature".¹³⁴

At its 4736th meeting, on 7 April 2003, the Council heard another report by the Executive Director of WFP. During the debate, the representative of Cameroon declared that the food crisis in Africa was a difficult and relevant issue which posed "a threat to international peace and security".¹³⁵

Children and armed conflict

At its 4176th meeting, on 26 July 2000, the Council considered the latest report of the Secretary-General on children and armed conflict.¹³⁶ During the debate, several speakers expressed the view that the threat posed by armed conflict to children was a serious one that had consequences for the maintenance of international peace and security and its humanitarian aspects.¹³⁷ By contrast, the representative of India stated that, while this was a serious matter, there was no evidence that the plight of children in armed conflict represented a threat to international peace and security, and that the violation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child could not automatically be construed as a threat to international peace and security.¹³⁸

At its 4422nd meeting, on 20 November 2001, the Council discussed another report by the Secretary-General on ways to alleviate the plight of children in war situations.¹³⁹ In his statement, the representative of France emphasized that finding a way to improve the situation of children in armed conflicts posed a moral responsibility for

¹³⁴ S/PV.4652, p. 9.

¹³⁵ S/PV.4736, p. 6.

¹³⁶ S/2000/712.

¹³⁷ S/PV.4176, pp. 9-10 (Argentina); pp. 15-16 (Malaysia); pp. 20-22 (Ukraine); pp. 22-23 (Tunisia); and pp. 26-27 (Jamaica); S/PV.4176 (Resumption 1), pp. 9-11 (Mozambique); pp. 16-18 (United Republic of Tanzania); and pp. 34-35 (Sierra Leone).

¹³⁸ S/PV.4176 (Resumption 1), pp. 18-20.

¹³⁹ S/2001/852.

the Council to take up a challenge that, under the Charter, constituted "a threat to peace and security".¹⁴⁰

Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role

At its 4833rd and 4835th meetings, on 24 and 30 September 2003 respectively, the Council discussed its responsibility to promote justice and the rule of law in its effort to maintain international peace and security. During the debate, a number of speakers recognized the relationship between the maintenance of peace and security and the promotion of the rule of law at both national and international levels.¹⁴¹

The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations

At its 4172nd meeting, on 17 July 2000, the Council heard a statement by the Executive Director of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS and adopted resolution 1308 (2000) by which it expressed its concern at the extent of the HIV/AIDS pandemic worldwide, and in Africa in particular. By the same resolution, the Council also recognized that the HIV/AIDS pandemic was exacerbated by conditions of violence and instability and, if unchecked, could pose a risk to stability and security.¹⁴² During the debate, the majority of speakers acknowledged that the HIV/AIDS pandemic was a global threat which had a security dimension and saluted the fact that the Council was addressing peacekeeping in the context of the HIV/AIDS issue, under the mantle of maintaining international peace and security.¹⁴³

¹⁴⁰ S/PV.4422 (Resumption 1), p. 7.

¹⁴¹ S/PV.4833, pp. 4-5 (Pakistan); pp. 9-10 (Mexico); pp. 11-12 (Bulgaria); pp. 12-13 (Guinea); pp. 14-15 (Spain); pp. 18-19 (Cameroon); pp. 20-21 (United States); and pp. 21-23 (Chile); S/PV.4835, pp. 22-23 (Philippines); pp. 23-24 (Australia); pp. 24-25 (Sierra Leone); and pp. 29-31 (Trinidad and Tobago).

¹⁴² Resolution 1308 (2000), tenth and eleventh preambular paragraphs.

¹⁴³ S/PV.4172, pp. 4-7 (United States); pp. 7-8 (Namibia); p. 8 (Argentina); pp. 8-9 (Tunisia); pp. 9-10 (United Kingdom); pp. 10-11 (Canada); pp. 11-13 (Malaysia); pp. 13-14 (Ukraine); pp. 14-15 (Mali); pp. 15-16 (Netherlands); pp. 16-17 (Bangladesh); pp. 17-18 (Jamaica); pp. 18-19 (France); pp. 19-21 (Zimbabwe); pp. 21-22 (Indonesia); pp. 22-24 (Malawi); and pp. 24-25 (Uganda).

At its 4259th meeting, on 19 January 2001, the Council continued its discussion of the threat posed by HIV/AIDS to international peace and security. During the debate, several representatives commended the Council for acknowledging the importance of the HIV/AIDS epidemic for peace and security, particularly in Africa.¹⁴⁴ The representative of Sweden emphasized that the spread of HIV/AIDS was not just a health issue, but also “a human development issue, an equity and equality issue and a significant threat to international peace and security” and therefore required the coordinated response of United Nations bodies, including the Council.¹⁴⁵ The representative of India pointed out that if the Council believed HIV/AIDS was a threat to international peace and security, it had “not only the right but also the duty, bearing in mind its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security”, to rule that Article 73 of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) must be invoked to urgently provide affordable medicines that help in the treatment of the epidemic.¹⁴⁶

At its 4859th meeting, on 17 November 2003, the Council reviewed the implementation of resolution 1308 (2000). During the debate, several speakers reiterated the threat posed by the HIV/AIDS pandemic to international peace and security.¹⁴⁷

Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council

At its 4109th meeting, on 9 March 2000, the Council discussed the humanitarian consequences of conflict and the threat posed by humanitarian crises for peace and security. During the debate, several speakers emphasized that violations of international humanitarian law and human rights could pose a threat to international peace and security.¹⁴⁸ Other representatives acknowledged the connection between the humanitarian aspects of the issues before the Council and the

maintenance of international peace and security.¹⁴⁹ The representative of the Russian Federation warned that, while the prevention and settlement of humanitarian crises had a direct bearing on the maintenance of regional and international stability, such violations could not be ended by taking actions that violated the Charter.¹⁵⁰ The representative of Belarus acknowledged the “human factor” as a central link in all activities to establish international peace and security, but stated that the concept of “humanitarian intervention”, which entailed ending war with war or stopping human rights violations with anti-humanitarian actions, was “illogical”.¹⁵¹ The representative of Norway endorsed the view that international law violations could threaten international peace and security and necessitated “the attention and action of the Security Council”, but insisted that the threat or use of force in international relations should have a legal basis in the Charter. He pointed out that, while a difficult humanitarian situation could be part of the Council’s assessment of whether a situation was a threat to international peace and security, it was not “in itself a sufficient legal basis for the threat or use of force”.¹⁵² The representative of Pakistan cautioned that such instances had to be assessed on a case-by-case basis and that the Council had to “be clear and certain about the purpose, scope and legitimacy” of international preventive actions in all humanitarian emergencies. He elaborated that for the humanitarian action to have general acceptance, it had to have legitimacy under international law and had to be taken in conformity with the Charter, after a breach or threat to international peace and security had been established. He also noted that a clear distinction had to be made between humanitarian crises as a result of wars, conflicts or disputes which, “by their very nature”, constituted threats to international peace and security, and other human rights issues.¹⁵³ The representatives of Brazil and the Islamic Republic of Iran urged the Council to take

¹⁴⁴ S/PV.4259, pp. 15-16 (Norway); and pp. 20-22 (Jamaica); S/PV.4259 (Resumption 1), pp. 3-4 (Ireland); and pp. 12-14 (India).

¹⁴⁵ S/PV.4259, p. 20.

¹⁴⁶ S/PV.4259 (Resumption 1), p. 14.

¹⁴⁷ S/PV.4859, pp. 10-12 (United States); pp. 16-17 (Bulgaria); and pp. 17-18 (France).

¹⁴⁸ S/PV.4109, pp. 6-7 (France); and pp. 8-10 (Jamaica); S/PV.4109 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-5 (Portugal); pp. 6-7 (Norway); and pp. 16-18 (Brazil).

¹⁴⁹ S/PV.4109, pp. 4-6 (Canada); pp. 7-8 (United States); pp. 10-11 (Malaysia); pp. 11-12 (Mali); pp. 12-13 (Tunisia); pp. 17-18 (Ukraine); pp. 18-19 (United Kingdom); and pp. 19-20 (Argentina); S/PV.4109 (Resumption 1), pp. 5-6 (South Africa); pp. 10-11 (Austria); pp. 15-16 (Bulgaria); and pp. 18-19 (Islamic Republic of Iran).

¹⁵⁰ S/PV.4109, p. 15.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

¹⁵² S/PV.4109 (Resumption 1), p. 6.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

action only in the cases that posed real threats to international peace and security.¹⁵⁴

Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa

At its 4720th meeting, on 18 March 2003, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 1467 (2003) by which it expressed its concern at the impact of the proliferation of small arms and light weapons on peace and security in West Africa.¹⁵⁵ During the debate, several speakers remarked that the proliferation of small arms, light weapons and mercenaries was a contributing factor to the conflicts and instability in West Africa. Other representatives stated that the proliferation of light weapons and the use of mercenaries in West Africa posed either a threat to international peace and security,¹⁵⁶ or a threat to peace and security in the subregion as a whole.¹⁵⁷ The representative of Cameroon asserted that the proliferation of such weapons in numerous regions of the world, particularly in West Africa, constituted “a grave threat to peace, security, stability, reconciliation and sustainable development at the individual, local, national, regional and international levels”.¹⁵⁸ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic added that this issue posed a threat to peace and security not only in West Africa, but also in other parts of the world.¹⁵⁹

Protection of civilians in armed conflict

At its 4130th meeting, on 19 April 2000, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 1296 (2000) by which it noted that the deliberate targeting of civilian populations or other protected persons as well as the systematic, flagrant, and widespread violations

of international humanitarian and human rights law in situations of armed conflict “may constitute a threat to international peace and security” and reaffirmed its readiness to consider such situations and, where necessary, “to adopt appropriate steps”.¹⁶⁰ During the debate preceding the adoption of the resolution, several representatives were in agreement that violence against civilians could pose a threat to international peace and security, and that in such cases the Council would have to act.¹⁶¹ The representative of China warned that attempts to “politicize humanitarian concerns” and interfere in other countries’ internal affairs would run counter to the principles of the Charter, and that the Council should treat the issue of civilians in armed conflict on a “case-by-case basis”.¹⁶²

At its 4312th meeting, on 23 April 2001, the Council heard a briefing by the Deputy Secretary-General who introduced the most recent report of the Secretary-General on the protection of civilians in armed conflict.¹⁶³ During the ensuing debate, the representative of the Russian Federation urged States to report “more quickly” to the Council any information on situations that could create a threat to international peace and security, including cases of deliberate refusal to provide safe and unhindered access for humanitarian personnel to civilians in need and gross violations of human rights, “where they may constitute a threat to international peace and security”.¹⁶⁴ The representative of Colombia urged the Council to consider the protection of civilians as one of the matters for which it was responsible when dealing with a situation that threatened international peace and security.¹⁶⁵ The representative of Yemen pointed out that the humanitarian dimension of conflicts had acquired special significance because of its potential “human tragedy and danger” at the national, regional and international levels, and its impact on international peace and security.¹⁶⁶

At its 4492nd meeting, on 15 March 2002, the Council continued its discussion on the protection of civilians in situations of armed conflict. In his statement, the representative of China noted that apart

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 17 (Brazil); and pp. 18-19 (Islamic Republic of Iran).

¹⁵⁵ S/PV.4720, pp. 12-15 (Gambia); pp. 15-16 (Angola); pp. 18-19 (Liberia); pp. 19-20 (Spain); pp. 20-21 (United Kingdom); pp. 22-24 (Senegal); pp. 24-26 (United States); and pp. 26-27 (Germany); S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), pp. 5-6 (Russian Federation); pp. 6-7 (Mexico); pp. 11-13 (France); pp. 14-15 (Chile); pp. 16-17 (Mali); pp. 18-19 (Bulgaria); pp. 20-21 (China); pp. 23-24 (Pakistan); pp. 24-25 (Nigeria); and pp. 27-29 (Guinea).

¹⁵⁶ S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Togo); and p. 10 (Burkina Faso).

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 22 (Sierra Leone).

¹⁵⁸ S/PV.4720, p. 17.

¹⁵⁹ S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), p. 16.

¹⁶⁰ Resolution 1296 (2000), para. 5.

¹⁶¹ S/PV.4130 and Corr.1, pp. 10-11 (France); and pp. 15-16 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4130 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 5 (Republic of Korea).

¹⁶² S/PV.4130 and Corr.1, p. 14.

¹⁶³ S/2001/331.

¹⁶⁴ S/PV.4312, p. 22.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

¹⁶⁶ S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 10.

from the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, many armed conflicts around the world continued “to endanger the safety and security of innocent civilians and thus threaten regional and international peace and security”.¹⁶⁷

At its 4660th meeting, on 10 December 2002, the Council discussed the most recent report of the Secretary-General on the protection of civilians.¹⁶⁸ During the discussion, the representative of the Russian Federation reiterated his call to Member States to “act more promptly in conveying appropriate information to the Council” about situations that might pose a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security, including gross violations of the rights of civilians, if these posed a threat to international peace and security.¹⁶⁹ The representative of Chile stressed that the “adverse humanitarian consequences” generated by armed conflicts constituted a threat to international peace and security.¹⁷⁰

Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts

At its 4174th meeting, on 20 July 2000, the Council discussed its role in the prevention of armed conflicts. The representative of the United States reiterated his Government’s concerns about the “illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons and the threat their uncontrolled proliferation and destabilizing accumulations” continued to pose to international peace and security.¹⁷¹ The representative of the Netherlands pointed out that, while “the overwhelming majority of present-day conflicts” on the Council’s agenda were of an internal and domestic nature, at the same time, they threatened international peace and security.¹⁷² The representative of Pakistan noted that an effective early-warning system should be developed with a view to identifying prospective conflict areas “without any discrimination” and that the international community must exercise “great care, caution and circumspection” in labeling situations as being threats to international peace and security.¹⁷³

At its 4334th meeting, on 21 June 2001, the Council considered the latest report of the Secretary-General on the prevention of armed conflict.¹⁷⁴ During the debate, the representative of Jamaica noted that the world was being constantly challenged by an increasing number of “deadly conflicts”, which threatened international peace and security as well as the social, political and economic well-being of the global community.¹⁷⁵

Small arms

By a letter dated 25 July 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹⁷⁶ the representative of Colombia noted that it had been generally recognized in the international community that the excessive accumulation and circulation of, and the illicit trade in, small arms and light weapons posed “a global threat to peace and security”, contributed to the intensification of conflict and violence, and constituted an obstacle to peace efforts.¹⁷⁷

At its 4355th meeting, on 2 August 2001, the Council discussed the impact of the proliferation of small arms on international peace and security. During the debate, several speakers emphasized that the issue of small arms and light weapons could not be viewed in isolation from its peace and security perspective.¹⁷⁸ The representative of the Russian Federation expressed his concern with regard to the fact that the uncontrolled spread of small arms and light weapons could “pose a threat to regional peace and security”.¹⁷⁹ The representative of Mauritius reminded the Council that, in Africa, the “heavily armed negative forces” had been undermining peace and security for decades.¹⁸⁰ That point was reinforced by the representative of the Sudan who declared that Africa was the continent most affected by the threat of the proliferation of small arms and light weapons in the hands of rebel groups, thereby

¹⁶⁷ S/PV.4492, pp. 11-12.

¹⁶⁸ S/2002/1300.

¹⁶⁹ S/PV.4660, p. 28.

¹⁷⁰ S/PV.4660 (Resumption 1), p. 11.

¹⁷¹ S/PV.4174, p. 5.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁷³ S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), pp. 4-5.

¹⁷⁴ S/2001/574.

¹⁷⁵ S/PV.4334, p. 8.

¹⁷⁶ S/2001/732.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

¹⁷⁸ S/PV.4355, pp. 8-10 (Bangladesh); pp. 12-14 (Russian Federation); pp. 16-18 (Mauritius); and pp. 19-20 (Mali); S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, pp. 2-3 (Mexico); pp. 10-12 (South Africa); pp. 16-18 (the Sudan); pp. 22-24 (Pakistan); pp. 27-29 (Costa Rica); pp. 29-30 (Belarus); and pp. 32-34 (Bulgaria).

¹⁷⁹ S/PV.4355, p. 12.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

“threatening peace and security in the continent”.¹⁸¹ The representative of Costa Rica drew attention to the fact that, in the hands of national armies, small arms were “a threat to international peace and security” and, in the hands of extremist groups or despotic regimes, light weapons became “a threat to internal peace and security”.¹⁸² The representative of Thailand emphasized that what made the problem of small arms an even greater threat to “international and national peace and stability” was its linkage with other problems of national and international concern, such as drug trafficking, money-laundering and cross-border terrorism. He further pointed out that when small arms were in the hands of these groups of people the threat to international and regional peace and stability increased manifold.¹⁸³

At its 4623rd meeting, on 11 October 2002, the Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs on the illicit proliferation and trade of arms and light weapons and their effects on international peace and security. During the debate, a number of representatives commented on the fact that the proliferation and illicit trade of small arms posed a threat to international peace and security.¹⁸⁴ Other speakers emphasized that, while the issue affected every region in the world, small arms were particularly prevalent in Africa.¹⁸⁵

United Nations peacekeeping

At its 4772nd meeting, on 12 June 2003, the Council discussed the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court to investigate or prosecute cases involving current or former peacekeeping personnel over acts or omissions relating to a United Nations operation. During the debate, several speakers voiced their concern with respect to resolution 1422 (2002), by which the Council had asked the Court not to commence any investigation or prosecution against peacekeeping personnel from a State not a party to the Rome Statute, unless the Council decided otherwise. They pointed out that a new resolution under

Chapter VII was about to be passed, despite the absence of any apparent threat to international peace and security, the fundamental precondition for action under Chapter VII of the Charter.¹⁸⁶

Women and peace and security

At its 4208th meeting, on 24 October 2000, the Council discussed the importance of integrating a gender perspective into the context of maintaining peace and security, as well as of considering the role of women in promoting peace and security. In his statement, the Executive Director of the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) stated that the topic of women and peace and security was a salient one especially considering that the “intertwining forces of conflict and gender inequality” threatened international peace and security.¹⁸⁷ The representative of Egypt noted that discussing “the conditions of women under occupation” would “prove the Council’s seriousness” when tackling humanitarian matters that might threaten international peace and security.¹⁸⁸ The representative of Australia felt that such a thematic debate contributed to “new ways of thinking about what constituted threats to international peace and security” and how to deal with them.¹⁸⁹

Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month

Conflicts in Africa: Security Council missions and United Nations mechanisms to promote peace and security

At its 4766th meeting, on 30 May 2003, the Council held a wrap-up meeting to discuss Security Council missions and United Nations mechanisms to promote peace and security in Africa. During the debate, the representative of the Russian Federation pointed out that armed groups were frequently manipulated from abroad and became “an extension of the interests of neighbouring countries”. He declared that this phenomenon had become “regional in nature”, and posed a threat to international peace and security.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸¹ S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 16.

¹⁸² Ibid., p. 27.

¹⁸³ Ibid., p. 36.

¹⁸⁴ S/PV.4623 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Cameroon); and p. 9 (Philippines).

¹⁸⁵ S/PV.4623, pp. 5-7 (Mauritius); pp. 9-11 (Mexico); pp. 11-12 (Guinea); pp. 12-13 (United States); and pp. 18-19 (France); S/PV.4623 (Resumption 1), pp. 2-3 (Cameroon); pp. 4-5 (Egypt); and pp. 29-30 (Namibia).

¹⁸⁶ S/PV.4772, pp. 3-5 (Canada); pp. 7-8 (Liechtenstein); pp. 14-15 (Trinidad and Tobago); and p. 20 (Netherlands).

¹⁸⁷ S/PV.4208, p. 7.

¹⁸⁸ S/PV.4208 (Resumption 1), p. 5.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 26.

¹⁹⁰ S/PV.4766 (Resumption 1), p. 18.

Part II

Provisional measures to prevent the aggravation of a situation in accordance with Article 40 of the Charter

Article 40

In order to prevent an aggravation of the situation, the Security Council may, before making the recommendations or deciding upon the measures provided for in Article 39, call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable. Such provisional measures shall be without prejudice to the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. The Security Council shall duly take account of failure to comply with such provisional measures.

Note

During the period under consideration, the Security Council did not adopt any resolution explicitly invoking Article 40. In a number of resolutions adopted under Chapter VII, the Council, without expressly referring to Article 40, called upon the parties to comply with certain provisional measures in order to prevent an aggravation of the situation concerned. During the period 2000 to 2003, types of measures that could be assumed as falling under Article 40 included the following: (a) the withdrawal of armed forces; (b) the cessation of hostilities; (c) the conclusion or observance of a ceasefire; (d) the negotiation of differences and disputes; (e) compliance with obligations under international humanitarian law; (f) the creation of the conditions necessary for unimpeded delivery of humanitarian assistance; and (g) cooperation with peacekeeping efforts and humanitarian assistance. Some of the specific measures that the Council called upon the parties concerned to take are outlined in section A. A number of Council resolutions contained the warning that, in the event of failure to comply with the terms of those resolutions, the Council would meet again and consider further steps. Those warnings, which might be considered as falling under Article 40, were expressed in various ways. In a number of instances, the Council warned that it would consider taking further measures if its calls were not heeded.¹⁹¹

¹⁹¹ See, for example, resolution 1355 (2001), para. 28.

During the Council's deliberations in the period under review there was no significant constitutional discussion regarding Article 40, but only occasional references by Member States in their statements.

A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 40

Africa

The situation in Côte d'Ivoire

By resolution 1479 (2003) of 13 May 2003, noting the existence of challenges to the stability of Côte d'Ivoire and determining that the situation in the country constituted a threat to international peace and security in the region, the Council appealed to all Ivorian political forces to implement fully and without delay the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement.¹⁹² The Council also requested all Ivorian parties to cooperate with the United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire in the execution of its mandate as well as to ensure the freedom of movement of its personnel throughout the country and the unimpeded and safe movement of the personnel of humanitarian agencies.¹⁹³

By a statement of the President dated 13 November 2003,¹⁹⁴ Council members urged all Ivorian political forces to implement fully, without delay or precondition all the provisions of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement, as well as those of the agreement reached in Accra on 8 March 2003 with a view to open, free and transparent elections being held in Côte d'Ivoire in 2005. In a subsequent statement by the President dated 4 December 2003,¹⁹⁵ the Council members strongly underscored to all the Ivorian parties their fundamental responsibility to respect the ceasefire in accordance with the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement, and called on all the parties to refrain from any act, as well as any incitement to such acts, that could compromise respect of the ceasefire. The Council also

¹⁹² Resolution 1479 (2003), para. 6.

¹⁹³ Resolution 1479 (2003), para. 10.

¹⁹⁴ S/PRST/2003/20.

¹⁹⁵ S/PRST/2003/25.

reiterated its call upon all parties in Côte d'Ivoire and countries of the region to guarantee the safety and full access of humanitarian agency personnel working in the field during the consolidation of the peace process.

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

By resolution 1291 (2000) of 24 February 2000, the Council called upon all parties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to ensure the safe and unhindered access of relief personnel to all those in need, and recalled that the parties should also provide guarantees for the safety, security and freedom of movement for United Nations and associated humanitarian relief personnel. The Council also called upon all parties to cooperate with the International Committee of the Red Cross to enable it to carry out its mandates as well as the tasks entrusted to it under the Ceasefire Agreement. Additionally, the Council called upon all parties to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to protect human rights and respect international humanitarian law.¹⁹⁶

By resolution 1304 (2000) of 16 June 2000, expressing its serious concern at the humanitarian situation and the continuation of hostilities in the country, the Council demanded, *inter alia*, (a) that Ugandan and Rwandan forces, as well as forces of the Congolese armed opposition and other armed groups, immediately and completely withdraw from Kisangani, and called upon all parties to the Ceasefire Agreement to respect the demilitarization of the city and its environs; (b) that Uganda and Rwanda, which had violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, withdraw all their forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo without further delay, in conformity with the timetable of the Ceasefire Agreement and the Kampala Disengagement Plan; (c) that each phase of withdrawal completed by Ugandan and Rwandan forces be reciprocated by the other parties in conformity with the same timetable; (d) that all other foreign military presence and activity, direct and indirect, in the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo be brought to an end, in conformity with the provisions of the Ceasefire Agreement; and (e) that all parties abstain from any offensive action during the process of disengagement and withdrawal of foreign forces. By

¹⁹⁶ Resolution 1291 (2000), paras. 12, 13 and 15.

the same resolution, the Council also demanded that the parties to the Ceasefire Agreement cooperate with the deployment of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) to the areas of operation deemed necessary by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, including by lifting restrictions on the freedom of movement of MONUC personnel and by ensuring their security. It further demanded that all parties comply in particular with the provisions of the Ceasefire Agreement relating to the normalization of the security situation along the borders of the Democratic Republic of the Congo with its neighbours.¹⁹⁷

By resolution 1341 (2001) of 22 February 2001, the Council demanded that the Ugandan and Rwandan forces, as well as all other foreign forces, withdraw from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in compliance with resolution 1304 (2000) and the Ceasefire Agreement, and urged those forces to take urgent steps to accelerate that withdrawal. The Council further demanded that all parties refrain from any offensive military action during the process of disengagement and withdrawal of foreign forces and that all armed forces and groups concerned bring an effective end to the recruitment, training and use of children in their armed forces. The Council also called upon the parties to extend full cooperation to MONUC, the United Nations Children's Fund and humanitarian organizations for the speedy demobilization, return and rehabilitation of such children.¹⁹⁸

By resolution 1355 (2001) of 15 June 2001, the Council reiterated its demand to the Ugandan and Rwandan forces and all other foreign forces to withdraw from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in compliance with previous Council's resolutions and the Ceasefire Agreement. Expressing concern at recent reports of military operations in North Kivu and South Kivu, the Council called upon all parties to refrain from any offensive action during the process of disengagement and withdrawal of foreign forces.¹⁹⁹ The Council also demanded that the *Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie* demilitarize Kisangani in accordance with resolution 1304 (2000), and that all parties respect the

¹⁹⁷ Resolution 1304 (2000), paras. 3, 4, 5, 8 and 12.

¹⁹⁸ Resolution 1341 (2001), paras. 2, 7 and 10.

¹⁹⁹ Resolution 1355 (2001), paras. 2 and 4.

demilitarization of the city and its environs.²⁰⁰ Finally, it demanded that all parties, including the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, cease immediately all forms of assistance and cooperation with all armed groups as referred to in the Ceasefire Agreement. The Council also expressed its readiness to consider possible measures which could be imposed, in accordance with its responsibilities and obligations under the Charter, in case of failure by parties to comply fully with the present resolution and other relevant resolutions.²⁰¹

By resolution 1399 (2002) of 19 March 2002, while condemning the resumption of fighting in the Moliro area and stressing that this constituted a major violation of the ceasefire, the Council demanded the immediate withdrawal of the *Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie*-Goma troops from the areas of Moliro and Pweto, and further demanded that all parties withdraw to the defensive positions called for in the Harare disengagement sub-plans.²⁰²

Welcoming the signature by the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda of the Peace Agreement at Pretoria on 30 July 2002, as well as the signature by the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda of the Luanda Agreement, by resolution 1445 (2002) of 4 December 2002, the Council called for a full cessation of hostilities involving regular forces and armed groups throughout the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in particular in South Kiwu and in Ituri, and also called for the cessation of all support to the armed groups as referred to in the Ceasefire Agreement. The Council also called upon all parties to provide full access to MONUC and the Third Party Verification Mechanism throughout the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including inside all ports, airports, airfields, military bases and border crossings. By the same resolution, the Council reiterated its demand for Kisangani to be demilitarized without further delay and demanded that all parties work to the immediate full restoration of freedom of movement on the Congo river.²⁰³

By resolution 1468 (2003) of 20 March 2003, the Council demanded that all parties to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and in particular in Ituri, ensure the security of civilian population and grant to MONUC and to humanitarian organizations full and unimpeded access to the populations in need.²⁰⁴

By resolution 1484 (2003) of 30 May 2003, while deploying an Interim Emergency Multinational Force in Bunia, the Council demanded that all parties to the conflict in Ituri, in particular in Bunia, cease hostilities immediately, and reiterated that international humanitarian law must be respected. It also demanded that all Congolese parties and all States in the Great Lakes region respect human rights, cooperate with the Multinational Force and with MONUC in the stabilization of the situation in Bunia. The Council further demanded that the parties provide full freedom of movement to the Multinational Force and refrain from any military activity or from any activity that could further destabilize the situation in Ituri. In that regard, the Council demanded also the cessation of all support, in particular weapons and any other military materiel, to the armed groups and militias, and further demanded that all Congolese parties and all States in the region actively prevent the supply of such support.²⁰⁵

By resolution 1493 (2003) of 28 July 2003, the Council demanded that all the parties desist from any interference with the freedom of movement of United Nations personnel, and recalled that all the parties had the obligation to provide full and unhindered access to MONUC to allow it to carry out its mandate. The Council further demanded that all parties provide full access to military observers from MONUC, including in ports, airports, airfields, military bases and border crossings.²⁰⁶

The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia

By resolution 1297 (2000) of 12 May 2000, while stressing that the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia constituted a threat to peace and security, the Council demanded that both parties cease immediately all military action and refrain from the further use of force and further demanded the earliest possible

²⁰⁰ Resolution 1355 (2001), para. 5. By resolution 1376 (2001) of 9 November 2001, the Council reiterated its demand that Kisangani be demilitarized rapidly and unconditionally in accordance with resolution 1304 (2000). See resolution 1376 (2001), para. 3.

²⁰¹ Resolution 1355 (2001), paras. 6 and 28.

²⁰² Resolution 1399 (2002), paras. 3 and 4.

²⁰³ Resolution 1445 (2002), para. 13.

²⁰⁴ Resolution 1468 (2003), para. 14.

²⁰⁵ Resolution 1484 (2003), paras. 5 and 7.

²⁰⁶ Resolution 1493 (2003), paras. 15 and 19.

reconvening, without preconditions, of substantive peace talks. The Council also called upon both parties to ensure the safety of civilian populations and to fully respect human rights and international humanitarian law.²⁰⁷

By resolution 1298 (2000) of 17 May 2000, the Security Council demanded that both parties immediately cease all military action and refrain from the further use of force as well as to withdraw their forces from military engagement and take no action that would aggravate tensions. The Council also reiterated its demand to reconvene as soon as possible, without preconditions, substantive peace talks, which would conclude a peaceful definitive settlement of the conflict.²⁰⁸

The situation in Liberia

By resolution 1497 (2003) of 1 August 2003, while authorizing the establishment of a Multinational Force in Liberia, the Council called upon all Liberian parties and Member States to cooperate fully with the Multinational Force in the execution of its mandate and to respect the security and freedom of movement of the Multinational Force, as well as to ensure the safe and unimpeded access of international humanitarian personnel to populations in need in Liberia.²⁰⁹

By a statement of the President dated 27 August 2003,²¹⁰ the Council expressed its concern at the humanitarian situation in Liberia and called upon all parties to allow full, secure and unimpeded access for humanitarian agencies and personnel. It further urged all parties to respect fully the ceasefire and to implement fully all their commitments under the Comprehensive Peace Agreement signed in Accra on 18 August 2003.

By resolution 1509 (2003) of 19 September 2003, the Council demanded that the Liberian parties cease hostilities throughout Liberia and fulfill their obligations under the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the ceasefire agreement, including cooperation in the formation of the Joint Monitoring Committee. The Council also called upon all parties to cooperate fully in the deployment and operations of the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), including by ensuring the

safety, security and freedom of movement of United Nations personnel, together with associated personnel, throughout Liberia. By the same resolution, the Council further called upon all parties to ensure, in accordance with relevant provisions of international law, the full, safe and unhindered access of relief personnel to all those in need and the delivery of humanitarian assistance, in particular to internally displaced persons and refugees.²¹¹

By resolution 1521 (2003) of 22 December 2003, the Council urged all parties to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement to implement fully their commitments and fulfill their responsibilities in the National Transitional Government of Liberia, and not to hinder the restoration of the Government's authority throughout the country, particularly over natural resources.²¹²

The situation in Sierra Leone

By resolution 1289 (2000) of 7 February 2000, determining that the situation in Sierra Leone continued to constitute a threat to international peace and security in the region, the Council reiterated its call upon the parties to fulfill all their commitments under the Peace Agreement to facilitate the restoration of peace, stability, national reconciliation and development in Sierra Leone.²¹³

By a statement of the President dated 13 March 2000,²¹⁴ the members of the Council demanded that the Revolutionary United Front end its hostile actions, release immediately and unharmed all detained United Nations and other international personnel, cooperate in establishing the whereabouts of those unaccounted for, and comply fully with the terms of the Peace Agreement signed in Lomé on 7 July 1999.

Asia

The situation in Afghanistan

By a statement of the President dated 7 April 2000,²¹⁵ while reiterating that the continued Afghan conflict was a serious and growing threat to regional

²⁰⁷ Resolution 1297 (2000), paras. 2, 3 and 8.

²⁰⁸ Resolution 1298 (2000), paras. 2-4.

²⁰⁹ Resolution 1497 (2003), para. 11.

²¹⁰ S/PRST/2003/14.

²¹¹ Resolution 1509 (2003), paras. 4, 5 and 8.

²¹² Resolution 1521 (2003), para. 14.

²¹³ Resolution 1289 (2000), para. 3.

²¹⁴ S/PRST/2000/14.

²¹⁵ S/PRST/2000/12.

and international peace and security, the members of the Council called upon all Afghan parties to comply with their obligations under international humanitarian law and to ensure full and unhindered access of international humanitarian assistance and personnel to all those in need.

By resolution 1333 (2000) of 19 December 2000, the Council demanded that the Taliban comply with resolution 1267 (1999) and, in particular, cease the provision of sanctuary and training for international terrorists and their organizations. The Council also demanded that the Taliban comply without further delay with its demand in paragraph 2 of resolution 1267 (1999) that required the Taliban to turn over Osama bin Laden to appropriate authorities. Further, it demanded that the Taliban act swiftly to close all camps training terrorists within the territory under its control. In addition, the Council called upon the Taliban to ensure the safe and unhindered access of relief personnel and aid to all those in need in the territory under their control, and underlined that the Taliban must provide guarantees for the safety, security and freedom of movement for United Nations and associated humanitarian relief personnel.²¹⁶

Europe

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

By resolution 1305 (2000) of 21 June 2000, determining that the situation in the region continued to constitute a threat to international peace and security, the Council demanded that the parties respect the security and freedom of movement of the Stabilization Force and of other international personnel.²¹⁷

²¹⁶ Resolution 1333 (2000), paras. 1-3 and 13.

²¹⁷ Resolution 1305 (2000), para. 15. The Council reiterated its demand that the parties respect the security and freedom of movement of the Force and other international personnel by its subsequent resolutions 1357 (2001), para. 15; 1423 (2002), para. 15; and 1491 (2003), para. 15.

Middle East

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

By resolution 1472 (2003) of 28 March 2003, the Council urged all parties concerned to allow full, unimpeded access by international humanitarian organizations to all people of Iraq in need of assistance, to make available all necessary facilities for their operations and to promote the safety, security and freedom of movement of United Nations and associated personnel and their assets, as well as personnel of humanitarian organizations in Iraq.²¹⁸

B. Discussion relating to Article 40

During the Council's deliberations in the period under review, there was no significant constitutional discussion regarding Article 40. However, there were occasional references made to it or its language in order to support a specific demand relating to the question under consideration. For instance, at the 4515th meeting, held on 18 April 2002 in connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, the representative of Morocco referred to Article 40 as a basis for the Council to adopt "provisional measures" to prevent the aggravation of the situation in the occupied Arab territories.²¹⁹

²¹⁸ Resolution 1472 (2003), para. 8.

²¹⁹ S/PV.4515, p. 16.

Part III

Measures not involving the use of armed force in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter

Article 41

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Note

During the period under review, the Security Council imposed or modified measures under Chapter VII, of the type provided for in Article 41, in connection with Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea and Ethiopia, Iraq, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Somalia, after having determined, in each case, the existence of a breach of the peace or a threat to the peace. During the period under consideration, the Council terminated measures imposed under Article 41 against Angola, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Sudan and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

In this part, section A outlines the decisions of the Security Council imposing, modifying or terminating measures under Article 41 of the Charter.²²⁰ Section B reflects the constitutional discussion in the meetings of the Council arising in connection with the adoption of some of those resolutions. It also includes salient issues raised in the Council's deliberations with reference to general matters relating to sanctions.

²²⁰ See Chapter V, part I, section B.

A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 41

The situation in Afghanistan

Strengthening of measures imposed against Al-Qaida and the Taliban

By resolution 1333 (2000) of 19 December 2000, the Council reaffirmed its previous resolution 1267 (1999) which had imposed limited air embargo and financial sanctions on the Taliban, and imposed a wider range of measures that would come into force after one month for a period of 12 months. More specifically, the Council decided that States should freeze the funds of Osama bin Laden and individuals and entities associated with him. The Council also imposed an arms embargo over the territory of Afghanistan under control by the Taliban.²²¹ By the same resolution, the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) was requested to fulfil its mandate, in addition to those set out in resolution 1267 (1999), by undertaking the following tasks: (a) to establish and maintain updated lists based on information provided by States, and by regional and international organizations, of all points of entry and landing areas for aircraft within the territory of Afghanistan under control by the Taliban and to notify Member States of the contents of such lists; (b) to establish and maintain updated lists, based on information provided by States and regional organizations, of individuals and entities designated as being associated with Osama bin Laden; (c) to give consideration to, and decide upon, requests for the exceptions set out in the resolution; (d) to establish and maintain an updated list of approved organizations and governmental relief agencies which were providing humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan; (e) to make relevant information regarding implementation of those measures publicly available through appropriate media; (f) to consider, where and when appropriate, a visit to countries in the region by the Chairman of the Committee and such other members as might be required to enhance the full and effective implementation of the measures imposed by resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000), with a view

²²¹ Resolution 1333 (2000), paras. 5, 8 and 11.

to urging States to comply with relevant Council resolutions; and (g) to make periodic reports to the Council on information submitted to it regarding resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000), including possible violations of the measures reported to the Committee and recommendations for strengthening the effectiveness of those measures.²²² Finally, the Council requested the Secretary-General to appoint a committee of experts to make recommendations on how the arms embargo and the closure of terrorist camps could be monitored and to review the humanitarian implications of the measures imposed by resolutions 1267 (1999) and by resolution 1333 (2000).²²³

By resolution 1363 (2001) of 30 July 2001, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish, in consultations with the Committee, a mechanism, comprised of a Monitoring Group, for a period of twelve months (a) to monitor the implementation of the measures imposed by resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000); (b) to offer assistance to States bordering the territory of Afghanistan under Taliban control and other States in order to increase their capacity regarding the implementation of the measures imposed by resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000); and (c) to collate, assess, verify wherever possible, report and make recommendations on information regarding violations of the measures imposed by resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000).²²⁴

Termination of aviation sanctions

By resolution 1388 (2002) of 15 January 2002, the Council noted that Ariana Afghan Airlines was no longer owned, leased or operated by or on behalf of the Taliban, nor were its funds and other financial resources owned or controlled by the Taliban. It thus decided that the aviation-related and financial measures of resolution 1267 (1999) did not apply to Ariana Afghan Airlines aircraft or its funds and other financial resources. The Council also decided to terminate the measures calling for the closure of the airline's foreign offices in resolution 1333 (2000).²²⁵

By resolution 1390 (2002) of 16 January 2002, the Council decided to terminate the aviation sanctions imposed by resolution 1267 (1999).²²⁶

Modification of financial, travel and arms sanctions imposed against Al-Qaida and the Taliban

By resolution 1390 (2002) of 16 January 2002, the Council determined that the Taliban had failed to respond to the demands contained in resolutions 1214 (1998), 1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000). By the same resolution, the Council modified the sanctions regime originally imposed by resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000) by further expanding the financial measures to include individuals and entities associated with Osama bin Laden, Al-Qaida and the Taliban as designated by the Committee. It decided that all States would ban the entry into or transit through their territories of those individuals, and decided also to review the travel ban in 12 months. The Council also requested the Secretary-General to assign the Monitoring Group to monitor, for a period of 12 months, the implementation of the measures, including the freezing of assets, the travel ban and the arms embargo, imposed and strengthened by the same resolution.²²⁷

By resolution 1452 (2002) of 20 December 2002, the Council decided that the financial measures imposed by resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1390 (2002) against the Taliban, Osama bin Laden, Al-Qaida and entities associated with them, did not apply to funds and other financial assets or economic resources that were determined by the relevant State(s) to be necessary for basic and extraordinary expenses.²²⁸

By resolution 1455 (2003) of 17 January 2003, the Council decided to improve the implementation of the freezing of assets, the travel ban and the arms embargo targeting Osama bin Laden, the Al-Qaida organization and the Taliban, as well as individuals and entities associated with them, as contained in the list maintained by the Committee, pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999), 1333 (2000) and 1390 (2002). In addition, the Council called for an updated report from Member States on the implementation of the measures

²²² Resolution 1333 (2000), paras. 6, 8, 11, 12 and 16.

²²³ Resolution 1333 (2000), para. 15.

²²⁴ Resolution 1363 (2001), para. 3.

²²⁵ Resolution 1388 (2002), second preambular paragraph and paras. 1 and 2.

²²⁶ Resolution 1390 (2002), para. 1.

²²⁷ Resolution 1390 (2002), sixth preambular paragraph and para. 9.

²²⁸ Resolution 1452 (2002), paras. 1 and 2.

referred to above and reappointed the Monitoring Group to monitor for a further period of 12 months the implementation of the measures and to follow up on relevant leads relating to any incomplete implementation of those measures²²⁹.

The situation in Angola

Modification of measures imposed in connection with the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola

By resolution 1295 (2000) of 18 April 2000, the Council expressed its concern at violations of the measures relating to arms, petroleum, diamonds, finance, travel and aviation, imposed against the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA) by resolutions 864 (1993), 1127 (1997) and 1173 (1998), at the reports of the supplying to UNITA of military assistance and of the presence of foreign mercenaries. The Council therefore requested the Secretary-General to establish a monitoring mechanism.²³⁰ By a number of subsequent resolutions the mandate of the monitoring mechanism was extended until 19 October 2002.²³¹

By resolution 1412 (2002) of 17 May 2002, welcoming the signing of a peace agreement by the Government of Angola and UNITA, the Council decided to suspend for 90 days the travel sanctions imposed against UNITA by resolution 1127 (1997).²³² The suspension was renewed by resolution 1432 (2002) of 15 August 2002 for an additional period of 90 days, with a view to encouraging further the peace process and national reconciliation in Angola.²³³

Termination of measures imposed against the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola

By resolution 1439 (2002) of 18 October 2002, the Council decided to lift the travel sanctions imposed against UNITA from 14 November 2002 onwards and

²²⁹ Resolution 1455 (2003), paras. 1, 6 and 8.

²³⁰ Resolution 1295 (2000), sixth preambular paragraph and para. 3.

²³¹ Resolutions 1336 (2001), 1348 (2001), 1374 (2001) and 1404 (2002).

²³² Resolution 1412 (2002), para. 1.

²³³ Resolution 1432 (2002), para. 1.

to extend the mandate of the Monitoring Mechanism until 19 December 2002.²³⁴

By resolution 1448 (2002) of 9 December 2002, the Council decided to terminate with immediate effect the arms and petroleum embargo imposed by resolution 864 (1993), the travel and aviation-related measures imposed by resolution 1127 (1997) and the financial, diplomatic and commodity measures imposed by resolution 1173 (1998). It also decided to dissolve the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning Angola.²³⁵

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Embargo on arms deliveries to the Democratic Republic of the Congo

By resolution 1493 (2003) of 28 July 2003, the Council decided that all States, for an initial period of 12 months, were to take the necessary measures to prevent the supply, sale or transfer of arms and any related materiel, and the provision of any assistance, advice or training related to military activities, to all foreign and Congolese armed groups and militias operating in the territory of North and South Kivu and of Ituri, and to groups not party to the Global and All-inclusive Agreement on the Transition in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Council also decided that exceptions to those measures were to be considered, including supplies to the United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Interim Emergency Multinational Force deployed in Bunia and the integrated Congolese national army and police forces, as well as supplies of non-lethal military equipment intended solely for humanitarian or protective use and related technical assistance and training.²³⁶

The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia

Embargo on arms deliveries to Eritrea and Ethiopia

By resolution 1298 (2000) of 17 May 2000, the Council, “deeply disturbed by the continuation of fighting between Eritrea and Ethiopia”, decided that all States were to prevent the sale or supply to Eritrea and

²³⁴ Resolution 1439 (2002), paras. 2, 8, and 9.

²³⁵ Resolution 1448 (2002), paras. 2 and 3.

²³⁶ Resolution 1493 (2003), paras. 20 and 21.

Ethiopia of arms and related materiel, and the provision of any related technical assistance or training. The Council further decided that the above measures should not apply to supplies of non-lethal military equipment intended solely for humanitarian use. By the same resolution, the Council established a committee to monitor the implementation and violations of these measures and decided that the measures imposed were established for 12 months, at the end of which the Council would decide whether the Governments of Eritrea and Ethiopia had complied with demands to cease all military action, withdraw from military engagement and convene peace talks, and, accordingly, whether to extend those measures.²³⁷ By resolutions 1312 (2000) of 31 July 2000 and 1320 (2000) of 15 September 2000, the Council decided that the measures imposed by resolution 1298 (2000) would not apply to the sale or supply of equipment for the use of the United Nations Mine Action Service and the United Nations in general.²³⁸

Termination of the embargo on arms deliveries to Eritrea and Ethiopia

By a statement of the President dated 15 May 2001,²³⁹ Council members noted that the arms embargo imposed on the parties by resolution 1298 (2000) would expire on 16 May 2001. The Council recognized that the Algiers Agreements were consistent with the demands of the Council in that resolution, and therefore decided that the measures imposed were not to be extended beyond 16 May 2001. The Council also expressed its intention to take appropriate measures if the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia again threatened regional peace and security.

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

Modification of measures imposed against Iraq

By resolution 1293 (2000) of 31 March 2000, the Council decided that up to a total of \$600 million from the escrow account established pursuant to resolutions 1242 (1999) and 1281 (1999) could be used to meet any reasonable expenses, other than expenses payable

in Iraq, pursuant to the provisions of paragraphs 28 and 29 of resolution 1284 (1999).²⁴⁰

By resolution 1302 (2000) of 8 June 2000, the Council, convinced of the need, as a temporary measure, to continue to provide for the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people, decided that the oil-for-food provisions of resolution 986 (1995) would be extended for a further period of six months.²⁴¹ That provision was renewed by several subsequent resolutions.²⁴²

By resolution 1352 (2001) of 1 June 2001, the Council expressed its intention to consider new arrangements for the sale or supply of commodities and products to Iraq and for the facilitation of civilian trade and economic cooperation with Iraq in civilian sectors, so that such new arrangements would improve significantly the flow of commodities and products to Iraq and improve the controls to prevent the sale or supply of prohibited or unauthorized items.²⁴³

By resolution 1382 (2001) of 29 November 2001, the Council noted the proposed Goods Review List and the procedures for its application, and decided to adopt the List and the procedures, subject to further modification, for implementation beginning on 30 May 2002.²⁴⁴

By resolution 1409 (2002) of 14 May 2002, the Council significantly changed the modalities of the oil-for-food programme, easing the supply of humanitarian goods to Iraq, while strengthening control over dual-use items. It decided to adopt, beginning on 30 May 2002, the proposed Goods Review List annexed to resolution 1382 (2001) and the revised procedures for its application attached to resolution 1409 (2002) as a basis for the humanitarian programme in Iraq.²⁴⁵ The Council, therefore, authorized States to permit the sale or supply of any commodities or products, other than those related to military products and subject to the procedures of the Goods Review List, and authorized the use of the funds in the escrow account to finance the sale or supply to Iraq of such goods.²⁴⁶

²³⁷ Resolution 1298 (2000), paras. 6, 7, 8 and 16.

²³⁸ Resolutions 1312 (2000), para. 5, and 1320 (2000), para. 10.

²³⁹ S/PRST/2001/14.

²⁴⁰ Resolution 1293 (2000), para. 1.

²⁴¹ Resolution 1302 (2000), para. 1.

²⁴² Resolutions 1330 (2000), 1352 (2001), 1360 (2001), 1382 (2001), 1409 (2002), 1443 (2002) and 1447 (2002).

²⁴³ Resolution 1352 (2001), para. 2.

²⁴⁴ Resolution 1382 (2001), para. 2.

²⁴⁵ Resolution 1409 (2002), para. 2.

²⁴⁶ Resolution 1409 (2002), paras. 3 and 4. By resolution 1443 (2002), the Council decided to renew those

By resolution 1472 (2003) of 28 March 2003, the Council, following the commencement of military action in Iraq, recognized that in view of the exceptional circumstances prevailing in Iraq, technical and temporary adjustments should be made to the oil-for-food programme so as to ensure the implementation of the approved funded and non-funded contracts concluded by the Government of Iraq for the humanitarian relief of the people of Iraq. The Council therefore authorized the Secretary-General to undertake various steps to establish those measures, and expressed its readiness to consider making additional funds available to meet the humanitarian needs of the people of Iraq. It further decided that all applications outside the oil-for-food programme for distribution or use in Iraq of emergency humanitarian supplies and equipment, other than medicines, health supplies and foodstuffs, would be reviewed by the Committee.²⁴⁷ Those measures were extended by resolutions 1476 (2003) of 24 April 2003 and 1483 (2003) of 22 May 2003.

Termination and replacement of measures imposed against Iraq

By resolution 1483 (2003) of 22 May 2003, the Council decided (a) with the exception of the arms embargo, to lift the civilian sanctions imposed on Iraq following its invasion of Kuwait in 1990; and (b) to request the Secretary-General to terminate the oil-for-food programme within six months of the adoption of the resolution. By the same resolution, the Council further reduced the level of proceeds of all export sales of Iraqi petroleum, petroleum products and natural gas to be deposited into the Compensation Fund to 5 per cent. The Council also decided that all Member States in which there were financial assets or funds of the previous Government of Iraq, Saddam Hussein or other senior officials of the former Iraqi regime and their immediate family members, including entities owned or controlled indirectly or directly by them, should freeze those financial assets or funds or economic resources and immediately transfer them to the

provisions until 4 December 2002; by its subsequent resolution, 1447 (2002), the Council decided to consider necessary adjustments to the Goods Review List for adoption within 30 days; and by resolution 1454 (2002), the Council approved the implementation of the adjustments to the Goods Review List specified in annex A to the resolution.

²⁴⁷ Resolution 1472 (2003), paras. 3, 4, 6 and 9.

Development Fund for Iraq. Finally, the Council decided that the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990) should be terminated within six months of the adoption of the resolution.²⁴⁸

By resolution 1518 (2003) of 24 November 2003, the Council established a committee to continue to identify, in accordance with paragraphs 19 and 23 of resolution 1483 (2003), individuals and entities referred to in paragraph 19 of that resolution, including by updating the list of individuals and entities identified by the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990), and to report on its work to the Council.²⁴⁹

The situation in Liberia

Termination of measures imposed against Liberia

By resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001, noting that the conflict in Liberia had been resolved, the Council decided to terminate the arms embargo imposed by resolution 788 (1992) and to dissolve the committee established under resolution 985 (1995).²⁵⁰

Imposition of arms, diamond and travel sanctions against Liberia

By resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001, after demanding that the Government of Liberia cease its support for the Revolutionary United Front in Sierra Leone and for other armed rebel groups in the region, the Council decided to establish a new set of sanctions measures. It decided that all States, for a period of 14 months, with a few exemptions, were to take the necessary measures to prevent the sale or supply to Liberia of arms and related materiel, technical training or assistance.²⁵¹ The Council also decided that all

²⁴⁸ Resolution 1483 (2003), paras. 19, 21 and 23.

²⁴⁹ Resolution 1518 (2003), para. 1.

²⁵⁰ Resolution 1343 (2001), para. 1.

²⁵¹ Resolution 1343 (2001), para. 5; the measures would not apply to supplies of non-lethal military equipment intended solely for humanitarian or protective use, and related technical assistance or training, or to protective clothing, including flak jackets and military helmets, temporarily exported to Liberia by United Nations personnel, representatives of the media and humanitarian and development workers and associated personnel, for their personal use only. Subsequently, by resolution 1509 (2003), the Council decided that the arms embargo imposed by resolution 1343 (2001) would not apply to

States were to take the necessary measures to prevent the direct or indirect import of all rough diamonds from Liberia and that this measure would come into force after two months for a period of 12 months unless the Council determined before that date that Liberia had complied with its demands.²⁵² The Council further decided that, unless otherwise decided by the Committee on a case-by-case basis, all States were to take the necessary measures to prevent the entry into or transit through their territories of senior members of the Government of Liberia and its armed forces and their spouses and any other individuals providing financial and military support to armed rebel groups in countries neighbouring Liberia, in particular RUF in Sierra Leone.²⁵³ The Council requested the Secretary-General to establish a Committee of the Security Council to monitor the implementation of the above measures as well as a Panel of Experts to investigate any violations of the measures imposed.²⁵⁴

By resolution 1408 (2002) of May 2002, the Council decided that the measures imposed by resolution 1343 (2001) would remain in force for a further period of 12 months. By the same resolution, the Council requested the Secretary-General to re-establish the Panel of Experts for a further period of three months to conduct a follow-up assessment mission to Liberia and neighbouring States, in order to investigate and compile a report (a) on the Government of Liberia's compliance with the Council's demand in resolution 1343 (2001) concerning cessation of the Government's support for RUF in Sierra Leone and other armed rebel groups in the region; (b) on the potential economic, humanitarian and social impact on the Liberian population of the measures imposed by

supplies of arms and related materiel and technical training and assistance intended solely for support of or use by UNMIL.

²⁵² Resolution 1343 (2001), paras. 6 and 8.

²⁵³ Resolution 1343 (2001), para. 7. By the same resolution, the Council decided that the Committee could determine that such travel was justified on the grounds of humanitarian need, including religious obligation, or where the exemption would promote Liberian compliance or assist in the peaceful resolution of the conflict in the subregion.

²⁵⁴ Resolution 1343 (2001), paras. 14 and 19. The Panel of Experts was subsequently re-established by resolution 1395 (2002).

resolution 1343 (2001); and (c) on any violations thereof.²⁵⁵

Imposition of timber sanctions against Liberia

By resolution 1478 (2003) of 6 May 2003, the Council decided that the Government of Liberia had not complied fully with the demands in resolution 1343 (2001). The Council therefore decided that the measures imposed by resolution 1343 (2001), namely the arms embargo, the ban on the import of rough diamonds and the travel restrictions, would remain in force for an additional period of 12 months. In addition, it decided that all States were to take the necessary measures to prevent the import into their territories of all round logs and timber products originating in Liberia, to come into force on 7 July 2003 for a period of ten months. By the same resolution, the Council requested the Secretary-General to re-establish the Panel of Experts, for a period of five months, to conduct a follow-up assessment mission to Liberia and neighbouring States.²⁵⁶

Modification of measures imposed against Liberia

By resolution 1521 (2003) of 22 December 2003, noting the changed circumstances in Liberia, in particular, the departure of former President Charles Taylor, the formation of the National Transitional Government of Liberia and progress with the peace process in Sierra Leone, the Council dissolved the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia and terminated the measures imposed by resolutions 1343 (2001) and 1478 (2003). By the same resolution, the Council decided to establish a new set of measures for a period of 12 months, and a new Committee to oversee the implementation of the newly imposed measures.²⁵⁷ The Council decided that, with a few exemptions, all States should take the necessary measures to prevent the sale or supply to Liberia of arms and related materiel of all types and related technical training or assistance.²⁵⁸ The Council also

²⁵⁵ Resolution 1408 (2002), paras. 5 and 16.

²⁵⁶ Resolution 1478 (2003), paras. 1, 17 and 25.

²⁵⁷ Resolution 1521 (2003), paras. 1 and 21.

²⁵⁸ Resolution 1521 (2003), para. 2. By the same resolution, the Council also decided that these measures would not apply to the following: (a) supplies of arms and related materiel and technical training and assistance intended solely for support of or use by UNMIL; (b) supplies of

decided that all States were to take the necessary measures to prevent the entry into or transit through their territories of individuals who constituted a threat to the peace process in Liberia or who were undermining peace and stability in Liberia and the subregion.²⁵⁹ In addition, the Council decided that all States should take the necessary measures to prevent the direct or indirect import of all rough diamonds, round logs and timber products from Liberia to their territory. By the same resolution, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish a five-member Panel of Experts, for a period of five months, (a) to conduct a follow-up assessment mission to Liberia and neighbouring States; (b) to report on the implementation of the sanctions measures, and to assess progress made towards the goals set out by the Council for the lifting of sanctions; and (c) to report to the Council through the Committee no later than 30 May 2004 with observations and recommendations, including, inter alia, how to minimize any humanitarian and socio-economic impact of the measures imposed by the same resolution.²⁶⁰

arms and related materiel and technical training and assistance intended solely for support of or use in an international training and reform programme for the Liberian armed forces and police; (c) supplies of non-lethal military equipment intended solely for humanitarian or protective use, and related technical assistance or training; and (d) protective clothing, including flak jackets and military helmets, temporarily exported to Liberia by United Nations personnel, representatives of the media and humanitarian and development workers and associated personnel, for their personal use only.

²⁵⁹ Resolution 1521 (2003), para. 4. By the same resolution, the Council further specified that these measures would be applicable (a) to those senior members of former President Charles Taylor's Government and their spouses and members of Liberia's former armed forces who retained links to former President Charles Taylor; (b) to those individuals determined to be in violation of the arms embargo; and (c) to any other individuals, or individuals associated with entities providing financial or military support to armed rebel groups in Liberia or in countries in the region. The Council decided that these measures would not apply where the Committee determined that such travel was justified on the grounds of humanitarian need or where the Committee concluded that an exemption would otherwise further the objectives of peace, stability and democracy in Liberia and lasting peace in the subregion.

²⁶⁰ Resolution 1521 (2003), paras. 6, 10 and 22.

The situation in Sierra Leone

Exemptions to the embargo on arms deliveries to Sierra Leone

By resolution 1299 (2000) of 19 May 2000, the Council decided that the arms embargo imposed by resolution 1171 (1998) did not apply to the sale or supply of arms and related materiel for the sole use in Sierra Leone of those Member States cooperating with the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) and the Government of Sierra Leone.²⁶¹

Embargo on diamond imports from Sierra Leone

By resolution 1306 (2000) of 5 July 2000, the Council expressed its concern at the role played by the illicit trade in diamonds in fuelling the conflict in Sierra Leone and at reports that such diamonds transited through neighbouring countries. The Council therefore decided that all States were to take the necessary measures to prohibit the import of all rough diamonds from Sierra Leone. It further decided that rough diamonds controlled by the Government of Sierra Leone through the certificate of origin regime would be exempt from these measures once the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone had reported that an effective regime was in operation. The Council decided to establish the measures for a period of 18 months, at the end of which the Council would review the situation in Sierra Leone, including the extent of the Government's authority over the diamond-producing areas, in order to decide whether to extend or modify the measures for a further period. It also requested the Secretary-General to establish a Panel of Experts to collect information on possible violations of the measures and the link between the trade in diamonds and the trade in arms and related materiel.²⁶² The Council renewed the above measures by resolutions 1385 (2001) and 1446 (2002), stressing that they should be terminated immediately whenever the Council deemed it appropriate.²⁶³

²⁶¹ Resolution 1299 (2000), para. 3.

²⁶² Resolution 1306 (2000), sixth preambular paragraph and paras. 1, 5, 6 and 19.

²⁶³ Resolutions 1385 (2001), para. 4, and 1446 (2002), para. 3.

The situation in Somalia

Exemptions to the embargo on arms deliveries to Somalia

By resolution 1356 (2001) of 19 June 2001, the Council decided on exemptions to the arms embargo imposed by resolution 733 (1992). In particular, it decided that those measures would not apply to protective clothing, including flak jackets and military helmets, temporarily exported to Somalia by United Nations personnel, representatives of the media and humanitarian and development workers and associated personnel for their personal use only, or to supplies of non-lethal military equipment intended solely for humanitarian or protective use.²⁶⁴

Strengthening of measures imposed against Somalia

By resolution 1407 (2002) of 3 May 2002, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish, in preparation for a Panel of Experts, a team of experts to provide the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 751 (1992) with an action plan detailing the resources and expertise that the panel of experts would require in order to generate independent information on violations of the arms embargo and for improving its enforcement.²⁶⁵

By resolution 1425 (2002) of 22 July 2002, the Council decided that the arms embargo imposed by resolution 733 (1992) should also prohibit the direct or indirect supply to Somalia of technical advice, financial and other assistance, and training related to military activities. It requested the Secretary-General to establish a panel of experts in order to generate independent information on violations of the arms embargo and as a step towards implementing and strengthening the embargo.²⁶⁶ The Panel was subsequently re-established by resolution 1474 (2003) of 8 April 2003.²⁶⁷

By resolution 1519 (2003) of 16 December 2003, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish a Monitoring Group to be based in Nairobi

²⁶⁴ Resolution 1356 (2001), paras. 2 and 3.

²⁶⁵ Resolution 1407 (2002), para. 1.

²⁶⁶ Resolution 1425 (2002), paras. 2 and 3.

²⁶⁷ Resolution 1474 (2003), para. 3.

which would, inter alia, investigate ongoing violations of the arms embargo.²⁶⁸

Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America

Termination of measures

By resolution 1506 (2003) of 12 September 2003, the Council welcomed the letter dated 15 August 2003 from the delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya,²⁶⁹ recounting steps taken by the Government to comply with resolutions 731 (1992), 748 (1992), 883 (1993) and 1192 (1998). The Council therefore decided to lift with immediate effect the aviation, travel, arms, diplomatic, representation, financial and petroleum-related measures imposed by resolution 748 (1992) and resolution 883 (1993). It also dissolved the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 748 (1992).²⁷⁰

Security Council resolution 1054 (1996) of 26 April 1996

Termination of measures

By resolution 1372 (2001) of 28 September 2001, the Council noted the steps taken by the Government of the Sudan to comply with the provisions of resolutions 1054 (1996) and 1070 (1996). It welcomed the accession of the Sudan to the relevant international conventions for the elimination of terrorism, its ratification of the 1997 International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings²⁷¹ and its signing of the 1999 International Convention for the Suppression of Financing of Terrorism. It therefore decided to lift with immediate effect the diplomatic,

²⁶⁸ Resolution 1519 (2003), para. 2.

²⁶⁹ S/2003/818. These steps related to the destruction of Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland and Union de transports aeriens flight 772 over Niger, and involved accepting responsibility for the actions of Libyan officials, payment of appropriate compensation, renunciation of terrorism and a commitment to cooperating with any further requests for information in connection with the investigation.

²⁷⁰ Resolution 1506 (2003), paras. 2 and 3.

²⁷¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2149, No. 37517.

travel and aviation measures imposed against the Sudan by resolutions 1054 (1996) and 1070 (1996).²⁷²

**Security Council resolution 1160 (1998)
of 31 March 1998**

Termination of measures

By resolution 1367 (2001) of 10 September 2001, emphasizing the continuing authority of the Secretary-General's Special Representative to restrict and strictly control the flow of arms into, within and out of Kosovo pursuant to resolution 1244 (1999), the Council decided to terminate the arms embargo and dissolve the Security Council Committee established by resolution 1160 (1998).²⁷³

Children and armed conflict

By resolution 1314 (2000) of 11 August 2000, in connection with the protection of children in situation of armed conflict, the Council indicated its willingness, when imposing measures under Article 41, "to consider assessing the potential unintended consequences of sanctions on children and to take appropriate steps to minimize such consequences".²⁷⁴

**Threats to international peace and security
caused by terrorist acts**

By resolution 1373 (2001) of 28 September 2001, the Council reaffirmed its unequivocal condemnation of the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 in New York, Washington, D.C. and Pennsylvania, and, acting under Chapter VII, decided that all States should cooperate in a wide range of areas, from suppressing the financing of terrorism to providing early warning, as well as cooperating in criminal investigations, exchanging information on possible terrorist acts, and reporting on the steps they had taken to implement that resolution. In particular, the Council decided that all States were to take the following actions: (a) to prevent and suppress the financing of terrorist acts; (b) to criminalize the wilful provision or collection of funds with the intention or knowledge that the funds would be used to carry out terrorist acts; (c) to freeze funds and other financial assets or economic resources of persons who committed or attempted to commit

terrorist acts or participate in or facilitate the commission of terrorist acts; and (d) to prohibit their nationals or any persons and entities within their territories from making any funds, financial assets or economic resources or financial or other related services available for the benefit of such persons.²⁷⁵

The Council further decided that States were (a) to refrain from providing any form of support to entities or persons involved in terrorist acts, including by suppressing recruitment of members of terrorist groups and eliminating the supply of weapons to terrorists; (b) to take the necessary steps to prevent the commission of terrorist acts, including by provision of early warning to other States through exchange of information; (c) to deny safe haven to those who finance, plan, support or commit terrorist acts, or provide safe havens; (d) to prevent those who finance, plan, facilitate or commit terrorist acts from using their respective territories for those purposes against other States or their citizens; (e) to bring to justice any person who participates in the financing, planning, preparation or perpetration of terrorist acts and establish such terrorist acts as serious criminal offences in domestic laws and regulations, and ensure that the punishment duly reflects the seriousness of such acts; (f) to afford one another the greatest measure of assistance in connection with criminal investigations or criminal proceedings relating to the financing or support of terrorist acts, including assistance in obtaining evidence in their possession necessary for the proceedings; and (g) to prevent the movement of terrorist or terrorist groups by effective border controls and controls on issuance of identity papers and travel documents.²⁷⁶ By the same resolution, the Council decided to establish a Committee of the Security Council to monitor implementation of the resolution, with the assistance of appropriate expertise. The Council called upon all States to report to the Committee, no later than 90 days from the date of adoption of the resolution and, thereafter, according to a timetable to be proposed by the Committee, on the steps they had taken to implement the resolution itself. Furthermore, the Council directed the Committee to delineate its tasks, submit a work programme within 30 days of the adoption of the resolution, and to consider the support it required, in consultation with the Secretary-General. Finally, the Council expressed its

²⁷² Resolution 1372 (2001), sixth preambular paragraph and para. 1.

²⁷³ Resolution 1367 (2001), paras. 1 and 2.

²⁷⁴ Resolution 1314 (2000), para. 15.

²⁷⁵ Resolution 1373 (2001), para. 1.

²⁷⁶ Resolution 1373 (2001), para. 2.

determination to “take all necessary steps” to ensure the full implementation of the resolution, in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter.²⁷⁷

Women and peace and security

By resolution 1325 (2000) of 31 October 2000, in connection with women and peace and security, the Council reaffirmed its readiness, whenever measures were adopted under Article 41, “to give consideration to their potential impact on the civilian population, bearing in mind the special needs of women and girls, in order to consider humanitarian exemptions”.²⁷⁸

By resolution 1379 (2001) of 20 November 2001, in connection with children and armed conflict, the Council undertook to consider, “as appropriate when imposing measures under Article 41, the economic and social impact of sanctions on children, with a view to providing appropriate humanitarian exemptions that take account of their specific needs and their vulnerability and to minimizing such impact”.²⁷⁹

B. Discussion relating to Article 41

The situation in Afghanistan

At its 4251st meeting, on 19 December 2000, the Council adopted resolution 1333 (2000), by which it took a series of mandatory measures against the Taliban. During the debate, several speakers cautioned that the Taliban continued to flout the will of the international community, as expressed by the Council in resolution 1267 (1999), by failing to hand over Osama bin Laden, and asked for additional measures to be imposed against the Taliban.²⁸⁰ By contrast, the representative of China emphasized that his country was not in favour of “easily resorting to sanctions or of their repeated use”. He further stated that sanctions had to be adopted with great caution and prudence, and were a “double-edged sword”, adversely impacting the humanitarian situation in Afghanistan. He expressed the belief that a new round of sanctions would “naturally have a negative impact on the Afghan peace

process,” and that a “unilateral arms embargo” could not achieve the objective of enhancing the peace process.²⁸¹ The representative of Canada noted that the resolution would send a “strong anti-terrorism message”, but drew attention to the necessity of monitoring the humanitarian situation in Afghanistan to ensure that the civilian population did not suffer “needlessly as a result of these new sanctions”. He remarked that the resolution could have been better targeted and more sensitive to humanitarian considerations, but welcomed the establishment of a committee of experts to monitor and report on the implementation and the humanitarian impact of the sanctions.²⁸² Likewise, the representative of the Netherlands insisted that the Council should continue to weigh the possible humanitarian and political impact these measures would have against the Council’s wider political objectives. He deemed unacceptable that “the Taliban should use the adoption of the current draft resolution as a pretext for blocking the delivery of humanitarian aid”.²⁸³

In regard to the humanitarian impact of measures imposed, the representative of Malaysia asserted that his country did not reject the use of sanctions, as long as they were “taken as a measure of last resort short of the use of force”, were targeted, had “minimal humanitarian impact on the population at large” and a “specific time-frame”. He held the belief that the sanctions imposed by the draft resolution would “exacerbate the sense of isolation and despair of the people of Afghanistan” and lead to the deterioration of the humanitarian situation in the Taliban-controlled areas in Afghanistan. He also noted that the periodic assessments regarding the humanitarian impact of the sanctions, to have been undertaken by the sanctions committee pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), had not been carried out. He expressed concern at the negative impact of the proposed measures on the peace process in Afghanistan. He warned that the imposition of measures against the Taliban would, in effect, interfere with the civil war in the country and that the one-sided arms embargo compromised the neutrality of the Council.²⁸⁴ A number of representatives expressed confidence that the targeted nature of the sanctions would avoid their having an adverse impact on the

²⁷⁷ Resolution 1373 (2001), paras. 6, 7 and 8.

²⁷⁸ Resolution 1325 (2000), para. 14.

²⁷⁹ Resolution 1379 (2001), para. 7.

²⁸⁰ S/PV.4251 and Corr.1, pp. 2-4 (Afghanistan); pp. 5-6 (the Netherlands); p. 6 (United Kingdom); pp. 6-7 (Ukraine); pp. 7-8 (United States); p. 9 (Canada); and pp. 9-11 (Russian Federation).

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

²⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

civilian population of Afghanistan.²⁸⁵ The representative of the Russian Federation further noted that the Council should not acquiesce to “blackmail” by responding to threats by the Taliban to expel humanitarian workers if the Council imposed the sanctions. He insisted that the one-sided nature of the arms embargo was “fully justified” since the Taliban had “always banked on using military means to resolve the Afghan problem” and offered their territory for the use and protection of terrorists. He underlined that the Taliban had on many occasions reneged on their commitments to begin negotiations, and that this “consistent policy” of the Taliban was what negatively impacted the peace process, and not the decisions of the Council.²⁸⁶ The representative of the United States affirmed that the policies of the Taliban had “aggravated the already abysmal economic and social conditions of the people of Afghanistan”.²⁸⁷

In regard to the time-bound nature of the measures imposed, the representative of France recalled that this was the third time during the year that the Council had mandated a time-bound sanctions regime and saluted the formation of a new Council doctrine that was conducive to “avoiding the perpetuation of sanctions for indefinite time periods”.²⁸⁸ The representative of Ukraine also noted that the resolution established time limits for the sanctions regime and deemed that, by adopting these measures, the Council was sending “a clear message to the Taliban regarding the termination of the sanctions regime”.²⁸⁹

At its 4325th meeting, on 5 June 2001, the Council discussed the report of the Committee of Experts on Afghanistan appointed pursuant to resolution 1333 (2000) regarding the monitoring of the arms embargo against the Taliban and the closure of terrorist training camps in the Taliban-held areas of Afghanistan. During the debate, several speakers pledged their support for the monitoring mechanism recommended in the committee’s report.²⁹⁰ The

representative of China pointed out that the establishment of a new sanctions monitoring mechanism would require the “close cooperation of States neighbouring Afghanistan” and the Council should, therefore, “carefully consider and respect the opinions of those neighbouring countries” before arriving at a decision.²⁹¹ The representative of Tunisia concurred and added that some of Afghanistan’s neighbours might need “concrete support” to strengthen and develop their monitoring mechanisms.²⁹² The representative of Mali maintained that the “goal of sanctions should not be to punish, but to modify behaviour”, and to attain that goal sanctions should be applied “rigorously”.²⁹³ The representative of Mauritius advised that the sanctions monitoring mechanism should not become a “mere reporting panel for further action by others”, but a “solid structure, with all financial and human resources to effectively deal with sanctions-busting cases”.²⁹⁴ The representative of Singapore cautioned that in creating the sanctions monitoring mechanism, the Security Council should not “unwittingly” institute measures that would impede the ability of humanitarian agencies to bring aid to the Afghan population.²⁹⁵ The representative of Uzbekistan added that the effectiveness of the monitoring mechanism would depend on the direct involvement and commitment of “all countries”.²⁹⁶ The representative of Pakistan expressed his Government’s general opposition to sanctions, “as a matter of principle” and called attention to the humanitarian consequences of sanctions in Afghanistan. He asked for sanctions to be lifted and the “wrong to be corrected”.²⁹⁷

The situation in Angola

At its 4283rd meeting, on 22 February 2001, the Council discussed the final report of the Monitoring Mechanism presented to the Council pursuant to resolution 1295 (2000), which established sanctions against UNITA. During the debate, several speakers

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-4 (Afghanistan); pp. 5-6 (the Netherlands); p. 6 (United Kingdom); p. 6 (France); pp. 7-8 (United States); and pp. 9-11 (Russian Federation).

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-11.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

²⁹⁰ S/PV.4325, p. 4 (Ukraine); pp. 6-7 (Russian Federation); pp. 7-8 (United States); pp. 9-10 (United Kingdom);

p. 10 (Ireland); pp. 10-11 (France); pp. 11-12 (Jamaica); p. 13 (Norway); p. 15 (Colombia); and pp. 15-18 (Afghanistan).

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

²⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

²⁹⁶ S.PV.4325 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

commended the positive effect of the sanctions regime in diminishing the procurement of arms by UNITA and its capacity to wage war.²⁹⁸ The representative of France noted that, despite this success, sanctions violations had occurred in Angola and called for the Council to find the “proper means” to put an end to the violations.²⁹⁹ Similarly, the representative of Ukraine declared that the Council should encourage States to take “strong action” with respect to sanctions violations.³⁰⁰ Moreover, the representatives of Mali and Mauritius asked for secondary sanctions to be imposed on States that violated the measures adopted against UNITA.³⁰¹ In response, the representative of Colombia asserted that “imposing sanctions on Governments that violate sanctions” would run the “risk of proliferating such measures, operating selectively and politicizing the sanctions regime”.³⁰² The representatives of Brazil and Mozambique remarked that the success of the sanctions against UNITA depended on the continued commitment of the international community in the implementation of sanctions.³⁰³ Similarly, the representative of Togo asserted that the sanctions regime would be implemented effectively only “through substantive dialogue” and “ongoing cooperation with all States”,³⁰⁴ while the representative of Bulgaria noted that the full implementation of sanctions could be achieved only “through a synergy of actions at the national, regional and global levels”.³⁰⁵ Furthermore, several speakers emphasized the need to institutionalize the monitoring of sanctions, so that the requisite expertise and methodology would be applied for the whole duration of the sanctions regimes.³⁰⁶ Several speakers concurred that the sanctions against UNITA should not represent an end in themselves, but create the necessary conditions for a final political solution to the Angolan

question.³⁰⁷ The representative of Sweden, speaking on behalf of the European Union and associated countries,³⁰⁸ expressed the European Union’s commitment to maintaining strong international pressure on UNITA and its leadership through the full implementation of the United Nations sanctions.³⁰⁹ Several representatives asked the Council to augment its sanctions against UNITA so as to compel it to return to the peace process as soon as possible.³¹⁰ By contrast, the representative of Bangladesh underlined that his Government encouraged “a process of peaceful resolution of disputes and of genuine national reconciliation”, alongside sanctions.³¹¹

At its 4418th meeting, on 15 November 2001, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser of the Secretary-General on the situation in Angola and its effects on Angolan civilians. During the debate, several speakers expressed their satisfaction with the positive impact of the sanctions imposed on UNITA.³¹² The representative of Brazil observed that, while the situation in Angola had improved, thanks primarily to sanctions, stability was still a goal to be achieved and asked for strict compliance with the United Nations sanctions.³¹³ The representative of Malawi, however, argued that the UNITA attacks against civilians demonstrated that the sanctions regime was ineffectual and insisted on an investigation of every possible loophole in the sanctions regime. He called upon the international community to support the Southern African Development Community (SADC) in implementing the sanctions regime against UNITA.³¹⁴ Similarly, several representatives called for the international community to play its role in securing peace in Angola, by fully complying with the sanctions against UNITA.³¹⁵ The representative of Belgium

²⁹⁸ S/PV.4283, p. 8 (Jamaica); p. 11 (Colombia); pp. 12-13 (China); and p. 13 (Mali).

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

³⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14 (Mali); and p. 19 (Mauritius).

³⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 11.

³⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 37 (Brazil); and p. 38 (Mozambique).

³⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (France); p. 8 (Jamaica); p. 10 (United Kingdom); p. 14 (Mali); p. 15 (Norway); p. 21 (Tunisia); p. 23 (Burkina Faso); p. 25 (Canada); p. 31 (Argentina); p. 36 (Brazil); p. 38 (Mozambique); and pp. 39-40 (Namibia).

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 27 (Swaziland); p. 28 (Portugal); and p. 36 (Brazil).

³⁰⁸ Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia; Cyprus, Malta and Turkey; and Iceland and Liechtenstein.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

³¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 12 (China); p. 13 (Mali); and p. 22 (Angola).

³¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

³¹² S/PV.4418, p. 5 (Angola); p. 6 (Ireland); p. 12 (Mauritius); p. 13 (Bangladesh); p. 15 (Mali); and p. 18 (Norway).

³¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

³¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

³¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 19 (Singapore); p. 20 (Jamaica); and p. 27 (Belgium).

insisted that sanctions were not a solution in themselves and that they should form part of a more comprehensive political framework.³¹⁶

With regard to the monitoring and strengthening of the measures imposed against UNITA, several speakers advocated the creation of a monitoring mechanism to increase the effectiveness of sanctions.³¹⁷ The representative of Mauritius, echoed by the representatives of Ukraine and Namibia, noted that sanctions should be not only “closely monitored, but also tightened”.³¹⁸ The representative of Cape Verde concluded that additional measures should be taken to put an end to criminal activities, and noted that such measures could be taken “only through effective monitoring mechanisms in the context of a review of the sanctions”.³¹⁹ The representative of Canada asked the Council to take “more resolute action” towards Member States that continued such violations by, for example, “imposing secondary sanctions”.³²⁰ The representative of Tunisia insisted that there could be “no military solution to the conflict” and that sanctions should be maintained until the peace process became irreversible.³²¹

At its 4517th meeting, on 23 April 2002, the Council was briefed on the situation in Angola by the Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser of the Secretary-General for Special Assignments in Africa who remarked that, while the suspension of the ban on travel by UNITA officials was in effect, it would be “premature” to talk about the lifting of other sanctions.³²² The representative of Angola attested that sanctions remained an effective policy instrument to ensure the full implementation of the Lusaka Protocol and to prevent any departure from “the spirit of peace growing in Angola”. He acknowledged that sanctions would continue to act as a catalyst for enduring peace and expressed his Government’s willingness to cooperate with the Security Council on the

³¹⁶ Ibid., p. 27.

³¹⁷ Ibid., p. 9 (France); p. 9 (Ukraine); p. 13 (Bangladesh); p. 16 (Colombia); and p. 17 (China).

³¹⁸ Ibid., p. 9 (Ukraine); p. 12 (Mauritius); and p. 24 (Namibia).

³¹⁹ Ibid., p. 22.

³²⁰ Ibid., p. 28.

³²¹ Ibid., p. 17.

³²² S/PV.4517, p. 4.

consideration of appropriate exemptions so as to facilitate the process of national reconciliation.³²³

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

At its 4437th meeting, on 14 December 2001, the Council considered the report of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Chair of the Panel conveyed the Panel’s recommendation to establish “a moratorium on the purchase, transit and import of high-value commodities” from regions of the Democratic Republic of the Congo where foreign troops were present. He expressed the view that this would end the exploitation of natural resources that was “linked to the continuation of the conflict”.³²⁴ During the ensuing debate, several speakers expressed support for such a moratorium. The representative of Ireland noted that such action might “have an impact on consumers and persuade them to pressurize the companies that purchase the commodities in question to seek alternative sources”.³²⁵ The representative of Jamaica expressed the belief that a moratorium should be “targeted not only at the countries and groups in the region, but also at the end users” to ensure that the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo benefited from the exploitation of their resources.³²⁶ The representative of Bangladesh stated that the moratorium should ideally also extend to cover financial transactions, arms transfers and military cooperation. He further noted that all parties concerned, including transit countries and the countries of destination of the Democratic Republic of the Congo’s illegally exploited resources, had a “moral obligation” to join the moratorium.³²⁷ The representative of Colombia stated that there was a need to “name and shame” those involved in the illegal exploitation of natural resources as well as the “international arms and munitions merchants” who were sustaining the fighting capacity of the armed groups committing atrocities against civilians of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.³²⁸ The

³²³ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

³²⁴ S/PV.4437, pp. 3-5.

³²⁵ Ibid., p. 23.

³²⁶ Ibid., pp. 23-25.

³²⁷ Ibid., pp. 25-26.

³²⁸ Ibid., pp. 34-35.

representative of Nigeria urged the Council to consider the imposition of sanctions on any country that violated the resolution on the exploitation of mineral resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.³²⁹ Several speakers noted the need for more in-depth study of the moratorium measure and for assessment of the possible impact it could have on the economic and humanitarian situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.³³⁰ The representative of Uganda advocated more caution, as the moratorium could have “the effect of sanctions against the small farmers and artisan miners” and pointed out that the moratorium would “cripple the capacity of missionary groups and other non-governmental organizations” who delivered humanitarian services.³³¹ The representative of the United States expressed doubts about the proposed moratorium. He noted that such a targeted moratorium on resources from specific areas would likely be unenforceable because of the difficulty of tracking those kinds of commodities. He further asserted that such a move would risk having a negative impact on the Congolese population.³³² The representative of Japan emphasized the need to protect the legitimate trade in primary commodities in order to support efforts towards peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.³³³

At its 4642nd meeting, on 5 November 2002, the Council held a debate on the final report of the Panel of Experts on the illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The representative of Belgium declared that the “establishment of a sanctions regime” was possible, but insisted that “the actions decided upon be part of a framework of a peace process and that they not affect it negatively”.³³⁴ The representative of the Russian Federation cautioned that the introduction of sanctions could give rise to “serious legal problems”, since it would be extremely difficult to prove that the plundering of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, posed “a threat

to international peace and security”.³³⁵ The representative of Zimbabwe remarked that the Panel of Experts distinguished between the companies and individuals to be sanctioned on the basis of where they were located and warned that this approach appeared “paternalistic”.³³⁶ The representative of Cameroon appealed to the countries of transit and destination of the natural wealth exploited illegally in the Democratic Republic of the Congo finally to take “adequate measures to control and even, if necessary, to interdict such activities”.³³⁷ The representative of Colombia pointed out that the nationality of an individual or business should not “be used to evade responsibility” for acts that the international community wished to sanction.³³⁸ The representative of Bulgaria expressed support for the Panel’s appeal to the Governments that harbored the entities involved in illegal exploitation to “shoulder their responsibility” by “making detailed inquiries” into the cases referred to in the report and take the necessary steps to stop such illegal practices.³³⁹ The representative of the United States noted that the “naming of those involved and the description of how they worked, in and of itself” was a “valuable tool”. He emphasized that the responsibility of Governments to respond to the Panel’s report did not lie solely with States in the region, but also with those outside of it.³⁴⁰ The representative of China stressed the need to differentiate between “illegal exploitation and day-to-day economic and trade exchanges” in order to avoid a negative impact on the economic development of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the livelihood of its people.³⁴¹

At its 4790th meeting, on 18 July 2003, the Council discussed the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in the aftermath of the installation of the Transitional Government of National Unity and the military operation undertaken by the Interim Emergency Multinational Force against the Union des patriotes congolais (UPC) on 11 July 2003 in Bunia. During the debate, several speakers called for the imposition of an arms embargo on all armed factions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, accompanied by the establishment of a monitoring

³²⁹ S/PV.4437 (Resumption 1), pp. 8-9.

³³⁰ S/PV.4437, pp. 10-14 (Uganda); pp. 20-21 (France); pp. 22-23 (Ireland); pp. 25-26 (Bangladesh); pp. 26-28 (Mauritius); pp. 30-31 (United States); pp. 32-33 (Singapore); pp. 34-35 (Colombia); and p. 36 (Mali).

³³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-14.

³³² *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.

³³³ S/PV.4437 (Resumption 1), pp. 13-14.

³³⁴ S/PV.4642, p. 14.

³³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

³³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-23.

³³⁷ S/PV.4642 (Resumption 1), pp. 9-11.

³³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-15.

³³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-18.

³⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

mechanism to ensure its implementation.³⁴² The representative of Germany also drew attention to the need to create an “efficient monitoring regime” so that the Council could “manifest its political will to impose punitive measures” on those who violated the embargo.³⁴³ The representative of Pakistan cautioned that the Council had to make the embargo “credible, effective and implementable” in order not to undermine the credibility of the Council. He stated that, in making the arms embargo more effective, the Council had to consider ways and means to track the illegal exploitation of resources to the sources of the funds as well as to the points where those resources and funds were converted into arms.³⁴⁴

The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia

By a letter dated 15 May 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council,³⁴⁵ the representative of Ethiopia transmitted his Government’s opinion that the Council had made a “mockery of justice” by contemplating punitive measures, such as an arms embargo against Ethiopia, since Ethiopia was the victim of aggression by Eritrea. He also urged the Council to be conscious of the “enormous implications” of its decision. By a subsequent letter dated 18 May 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council,³⁴⁶ the representative of Ethiopia complained that resolution 1298 (2000) was directed at his country, in spite of being “ostensibly aimed also at the aggressor country, Eritrea” and that the Council had committed a “grave mistake” by adopting the resolution.

By a letter dated 19 May 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council,³⁴⁷ the representative of Eritrea expressed his Government’s “utter surprise and disappointment” with the “clear imbalance” of the arms embargo imposed by resolution 1298 (2000). It argued that the resolution unjustly applied an arms

embargo on both Ethiopia, “the aggressor”, and Eritrea, “the victim”.

By a letter dated 9 January 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,³⁴⁸ the representative of Ethiopia reiterated his Government’s condemnation of the arms embargo imposed by resolution 1298 (2000). He further asserted that the arms embargo denied his country the “inherent right to defend itself”. He noted that by the Algiers Agreement of 12 December 2000, Eritrea and Ethiopia had in fact “gone beyond what was asked of them” by resolution 1298 (2000). He called on Security Council members to “shoulder their responsibilities by giving a boost to confidence in the region as a whole” and stressed that lifting the sanctions would be “an important symbolic gesture” to restore hope.

At its 4310th meeting, on 19 April 2001, the Council discussed the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia in the light of the creation of the temporary security zone, which marked the formal separation of the Ethiopian and Eritrean forces. During the debate, the representative of the Russian Federation remarked that the establishment of a temporary security zone was a “qualitatively new stage in the consolidation of the process of settling the conflict”. He therefore advocated an “early lifting of sanctions against both States” considering that the process of stabilization was “forward-moving”.³⁴⁹

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

At its 4336th meeting, on 26 June 2001, the Council discussed the effects of the sanctions imposed on Iraq and considered ways of improving the humanitarian situation in the country. The Council also debated a draft resolution presented by the United Kingdom on a new set of arrangements (“smart” sanctions against Iraq). The representative of the United Kingdom noted that the aim of his country as the sponsor of the draft resolution was to set in place measures to liberalize the flow of goods to Iraq while ensuring that military-related items were not exported to Iraq. He therefore insisted that the only route to the ending of sanctions lay through the confidence of the Council that Iraq had disarmed in accordance with the United Nations resolutions.³⁵⁰ That view was

³⁴² S/PV.4790, pp. 6-8 (Secretary-General and High Representative for the Common Foreign Policy and Security Policy of the European Union); pp. 8-9 (Germany); pp. 16-18 (United Kingdom); pp. 18-19 (Chile); pp. 23-25 (Pakistan); pp. 25-26 (Bulgaria); pp. 32-33 (Brazil); pp. 33-35 (Japan); and pp. 38-39 (Nepal).

³⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 23-25.

³⁴⁵ S/2000/430.

³⁴⁶ S/2000/448.

³⁴⁷ S/2000/464.

³⁴⁸ S/2001/23.

³⁴⁹ S/PV.4310, pp. 9-10.

³⁵⁰ S/PV.4336 and Corr.1, p. 4.

reinforced by a number of representatives who called for the lifting of sanctions but only after Iraq had fully complied with the requirements of the international community.³⁵¹ By contrast, the representative of Jordan asserted that the sanctions on Iraq did not achieve their purpose and had repercussions on the entire region. He requested the lifting of the sanctions imposed against Iraq which, in his view, would revive the “dialogue between Baghdad and the United Nations in order to settle all the outstanding issues” that emanated from Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait.³⁵² Similarly, the representative of Turkey asked for the sanctions to be lifted “altogether in the nearest possible future”.³⁵³ Sharing that view, the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya observed that the sanctions had become a “crime of genocide against the Iraqi people” and asked for their immediate removal.³⁵⁴ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic remarked that economic sanctions had proved “worthless” while having a harmful effect on the people and asked for their elimination.³⁵⁵ The Observer of the League of Arab States called for the lifting of sanctions against Iraq, but also insisted on the need to guarantee the security and stability of Kuwait.³⁵⁶ The representative of the Russian Federation cautioned that the perpetuation of sanctions could worsen the situation in the Gulf region and that the proposed resolution would have negative humanitarian and economic consequences in Iraq.³⁵⁷ By contrast, the representatives of the United States and Mali expressed the view that the proposed smart sanctions would ease the harmful effects of sanctions on civilians.³⁵⁸ A number of representatives emphasized that sanctions should not be an end in themselves, but a tool for the maintenance of peace and security and that, to achieve that goal, the cooperation of the Government of Iraq was essential.³⁵⁹ The representative of Singapore asked

for an increase in the effectiveness of sanctions to compel Iraq to comply, while at the same time making the sanctions more focused so that they would not impose “unduly onerous burdens” on the Iraqi people.³⁶⁰ The representative of Jamaica also spoke in favor of a sanctions regime that would be “focused, effectively targeted and of limited duration”.³⁶¹ Along the same lines, the representative of New Zealand called for sanctions “targeted for maximum effectiveness”.³⁶² Similarly, the representative of France expressed his Government’s disposition to ease the civilian sanctions as long as the Government of Iraq accepted the return of inspectors and the Council put in place a long-term monitoring mechanism.³⁶³ Finally, several speakers drew attention to the worsening humanitarian situation in Iraq and urged the Council to find ways to ease the effect of sanctions on the Iraqi people.³⁶⁴

At its 4625th meeting, on 16 October 2002, the Council continued its discussion on the sanctions regime imposed against Iraq. The representative of Iraq stressed that the measures imposed against his country constituted a “blatant violation of several provisions of the Charter”, but expressed his Government’s readiness to accept United Nations inspectors.³⁶⁵ The representative of South Africa asked the Council to make the lifting of sanctions conditional upon Iraq’s compliance with the relevant Security Council resolutions.³⁶⁶ The representative of Egypt also emphasized the need for Iraq “to implement scrupulously its obligations” and expressed his hope to see “progress on disarmament and the lifting of sanctions”.³⁶⁷ Iraq’s decision to allow the return of United Nations inspectors was commended by several speakers, who insisted that Iraq should comply with all its obligations before all sanctions against Iraq were lifted.³⁶⁸ Similarly, other representatives called on Iraq

³⁵¹ S/PV.4336 and Corr.1, p. 11 (China); p. 12 (Tunisia); p. 13 (Norway); p. 17 (Ukraine); p. 30 (Saudi Arabia); and p. 31 (Sweden); S/PV. 4336 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (India); p. 8 (Germany); p. 9 (Netherlands); p. 10 (Italy); and p. 14 (Spain).

³⁵² S/PV.4336 and Corr.1, pp. 28-29.

³⁵³ S/PV.4336 (Resumption 1), p. 4.

³⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

³⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

³⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

³⁵⁷ S/PV.4336 and Corr.1, p. 3.

³⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (United States); and p. 19 (Mali).

³⁵⁹ S/PV.4336 and Corr.1, p. 16 (Colombia); p. 17 (Ukraine); and p. 18 (Mauritius).

³⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

³⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

³⁶² S/PV.4336 (Resumption 1), p. 6.

³⁶³ S/PV.4336 and Corr.1, p. 7.

³⁶⁴ S/PV.4336 and Corr.1, p. 18 (Mauritius); p. 19 (Mali); and p. 32 (Malaysia); S/PV.4336 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Japan); p. 5 (Australia); and p. 7 (Bahrain).

³⁶⁵ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 7.

³⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

³⁶⁸ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Iran); p. 7 (League of Arab States); p. 19 (Argentina); p. 21 (Nigeria); and p. 24 (Sudan).

to adhere to its commitments under Security Council resolutions.³⁶⁹ The representative of Morocco insisted that military actions against Iraq should be avoided, and that instead sanctions should be used to persuade Iraq to comply with international law.³⁷⁰ The representative of Brazil underlined that the Council should “define positive incentives for full compliance” that would eventually lead to a gradual lifting of the sanctions regime.³⁷¹ Several speakers shared the view that Iraq’s cooperation with the inspectors should lay the foundation for lifting the sanctions and thus improve the humanitarian situation in Iraq.³⁷² The representatives of Belarus and Zimbabwe expressed support for an alteration of the sanctions regime against Iraq, to alleviate its humanitarian consequences.³⁷³ A number of speakers noted that the sanctions would have been lifted already had Iraq complied with its obligations.³⁷⁴ France insisted that the Council “must also demonstrate fairness by showing Iraq that war” was not inevitable if it “fully and scrupulously” fulfilled its obligations.³⁷⁵ The representative of Bulgaria also expressed his country’s commitment to a peaceful solution to the problem of disarming Iraq and for the lifting of sanctions.³⁷⁶ Several speakers expressed concern for the “humanitarian tragedy” suffered by the Iraqi people as a consequence of the sanctions.³⁷⁷ Also referring to the humanitarian consequences of sanctions against Iraq, a number of representatives called for their “early” or “immediate” removal to alleviate the suffering of the Iraqi people.³⁷⁸

At its 4683rd meeting, on 30 December 2002, the Council adopted resolution 1454 (2002) by which it

³⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (Ukraine); and p. 13 (Indonesia).

³⁷⁰ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 3.

³⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³⁷² S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 7 (Malaysia); p. 10 (Lebanon); p. 11 (India); p. 18 (Saudi Arabia); p. 20 (Organization of the Islamic Conference); and p. 22 (Cambodia).

³⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 18 (Belarus); and p. 24 (Zimbabwe).

³⁷⁴ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 25 (Senegal); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, p. 8 (United Kingdom); and p. 19 (Ireland).

³⁷⁵ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, p. 14.

³⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

³⁷⁷ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 7 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 18 (Singapore); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, p. 14 (Yemen); and p. 15 (Algeria).

³⁷⁸ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 19 (Pakistan); p. 20 (United Arab Emirates); and p. 23 (Tunisia).

introduced a number of adjustments to the way in which humanitarian deliveries to Iraq were carried out. The representative of the Russian Federation expressed his hope that as the relevant Security Council resolutions were implemented with the full cooperation of the Government of Iraq, a prospect would open for the “suspension and then the lifting of sanctions”.³⁷⁹ Similarly, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic asserted that the cooperation of Iraq with United Nations weapons inspectors “should inevitably lead to the lifting of the sanctions” and not to “the sanctions regime being complicated by the addition of further restrictions under the pretext that certain goods could be of dual use”.³⁸⁰

At its 4717th meeting, on 11 March 2003, the Council continued its debate on non-compliance by Iraq with relevant Security Council resolutions. The representative of Iraq reiterated his Government’s readiness to cooperate in a fruitful and constructive manner to determine that weapons of mass destruction no longer existed in Iraq and sanctions could be lifted.³⁸¹ The representative of Malaysia emphasized that the disarmament efforts in Iraq “should not be an end in themselves”, but that they should constitute a step towards the lifting of sanctions.³⁸² Similarly, several speakers expressed their hope for a peaceful solution to the situation in Iraq, so that sanctions against Iraq could be lifted.³⁸³

At its 4761st meeting, on 22 May 2003, the Council adopted resolution 1483 (2003) which lifted the economic sanctions on Iraq imposed by resolution 661 (1990). The representative of the United States saluted the removal of sanctions as a “momentous event for the people of Iraq”.³⁸⁴ Several speakers expressed the belief that the lifting of sanctions would give the Iraqi Government access to resources necessary to rebuild the economy and improve the humanitarian situation.³⁸⁵ The representatives of Guinea and Cameroon concurred that the situation in

³⁷⁹ S/PV.4683, p. 2.

³⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³⁸¹ S/PV.4717, p. 5.

³⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 7.

³⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 16 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); and p. 34 (Lebanon); S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Sudan); and p. 14 (Tunisia).

³⁸⁴ S/PV.4761, p. 2.

³⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (France); p. 5 (United Kingdom); p. 5 (Germany); p. 6 (Mexico); p. 8 (Russian Federation); p. 10 (Chile); and p. 11 (Pakistan).

Iraq no longer justified the maintenance of economic sanctions against it.³⁸⁶

At its 4872nd meeting, on 24 November 2003, the Council adopted resolution 1518 (2003) which established a Committee to continue to identify individuals and entities dealing with Iraq's funds or other financial assets. The representative of Germany declared that his Government's preference was for the mandate of the new Committee to cover "all remaining sanctions, for example, including the arms embargo".³⁸⁷ Similarly, the representative of France endorsed a broadening of the Committee's mandate, to "monitor compliance of States with the arms embargo against Iraq".³⁸⁸

The situation in Liberia

At its 4815th meeting, on 27 August 2003, the Council was briefed by the Executive Secretary of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) on the progress made in bringing to an end the civil war in Liberia and establishing the basis for a lasting peace. In his briefing, the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS stressed that in the light of the interim Government's denunciation of support for rebel groups in the region and moves towards national unity and peace, there was a need to review the sanctions regime imposed against Liberia. He noted that the sanctions would make it impossible for the interim Government to function, and thereby urged the Council to consider lifting the sanctions imposed against Liberia, except for the arms embargo.³⁸⁹

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

At its 4204th meeting, on 3 October 2000, the Council discussed the situation in the Middle East in the light of the clashes between Palestinian citizens and Israeli security forces. During the debate, the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya called for the Council to stop the "Israeli aggression against the Palestinian people". He noted that if "this matter concerned Iraq, Libya or the Sudan, even by way of mere allegations, the Council would not have taken all this time to adopt resolutions and to implement

sanctions". He called upon the Council to take the "necessary and effective measures" to provide full protection to the Palestinian civilians.³⁹⁰

At its 4506th meeting, on 3 April 2002, the Council debated the situation in the Middle East following a new military action taken by Israel in the Palestinian territories. The representative of Malaysia, conveying the position of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, called on the international community to take immediate action to stop the Israeli "aggression and illegitimate practices". It also requested the Council to take the necessary measures to provide international protection for the Palestinian people and to apply "deterrent sanctions against Israel".³⁹¹

At its 4510th meeting, on 8 April 2002, the Council discussed the situation in the Middle East in the aftermath of an escalation of the Israeli military campaign to reoccupy the city of Ramallah. During the debate, the representative of Mauritius noted that had any other country "challenged Security Council resolutions in such a manner", it would have been subjected to "all kinds of sanctions".³⁹² The representative of Malaysia asserted that the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories had deteriorated and echoed that the Council would have acted if a different country had defied it.³⁹³

The situation in Sierra Leone

At its 4168th meeting, on 5 July 2000, taking into consideration the role played by the illicit trade in diamonds in fuelling the conflict in Sierra Leone and the reports that such diamonds transited through neighbouring countries, the Council imposed an embargo against the import of all rough diamonds from Sierra Leone.³⁹⁴ During the debate preceding the adoption of the resolution, several speakers agreed that diamonds played an important role in fueling the conflict in Sierra Leone.³⁹⁵ The representative of the United Kingdom asserted that the measures imposed

³⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Guinea); and p. 9 (Cameroon).

³⁸⁷ S/PV.4872, p. 3.

³⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³⁸⁹ S/PV.4815, pp. 5-7.

³⁹⁰ S/PV.4204 (Resumption 2) and Corr.1, pp. 2-3.

³⁹¹ S/PV.4506 and Corr.1, p. 23.

³⁹² S/PV.4510, p. 10.

³⁹³ S/PV.4510 (Resumption 1), pp. 17-18.

³⁹⁴ Resolution 1306 (2000).

³⁹⁵ S/PV.4168, pp. 2-3 (Sierra Leone); pp. 3-4 (United Kingdom); pp. 4-5 (United States); p. 6 (Russian Federation); pp. 6-7 (Argentina); p. 7 (China); pp. 7-8 (Canada); and pp. 9-10 (France).

were a “robust and imaginative response” by the Security Council to the tragedy in Sierra Leone and would “shine a powerful light on an illicit trade which prefers to operate in the shadows”. He further noted that the draft resolution was “unusual in its direct appeal to the diamond trade” to address the problem.³⁹⁶ The representative of the United States indicated that the illicit trade in diamonds was closely linked to the illicit trade in small arms, and reminded all States of existing sanctions on arms shipments to the Revolutionary United Front. She indicated that the resolution was a necessary and critical step to assisting the Government of Sierra Leone in “re-establishing authority over its diamond-producing regions”.³⁹⁷ The representative of the Russian Federation observed that the measures were not “detrimental to the interests of legitimate participants in the international diamond market”.³⁹⁸ The representative of Canada expressed his Government’s hope that light would be shed on the link between the trade in diamonds and the supply of arms to rebel groups in Sierra Leone. He further stated that the Council would have to examine whether States, such as Liberia, had ceased their involvement in the illicit diamond trade and whether additional measures were required to enforce the arms embargo imposed against RUF.³⁹⁹ The representative of France argued that the measures would strengthen the existing arms embargo and agreed on the necessity of examining the links between the diamond and arms trades.⁴⁰⁰

With regard to the issue of the time-bound nature of sanctions, the representative of the United States expressed her concern “about the negative implications of putting in place time-limited sanctions”, stressing that Member States would have difficulties applying the sanctions if the measures were “turned off and on”.⁴⁰¹ The representative of the Netherlands concurred, suggesting periodic reviews of sanctions to relieve the unease of many members about the “phenomenon of sanctions that last much longer than originally intended”.⁴⁰² By contrast, several speakers conveyed their support for the use of time limits, as they would allow the Council to review the situation on the ground and thereby extend, modify or otherwise

adjust the measures.⁴⁰³ The representative of Argentina, however, noted that, in the light of Government of Sierra Leone support for the measures and the targeting of a rebel movement “notorious for its unusual cruelty against the civilian population”, a longer initial period for the sanctions would make the regime “more functional and effective”.⁴⁰⁴

At its 4264th meeting, on 25 January 2001, the Council considered the report of the Panel of Experts appointed pursuant to resolution 1306 (2000), paragraph 19, in relation to Sierra Leone, to investigate the violations of the measures imposed against Sierra Leone and the link between the trade in diamonds and arms. The representative of the United Kingdom stressed that his Government would look very seriously at any hint that citizens and companies of the United Kingdom might be involved in violating sanctions and would investigate fully where necessary. He urged other States to do the same and to ensure that the violation of United Nations sanctions was a criminal offence in their domestic legislation.⁴⁰⁵ Several speakers expressed their support for a monitoring mechanism that would review the implementation of sanctions and assess their unintended consequences.⁴⁰⁶ A number of representatives asserted that a new “diamond certification system” was required for a better monitoring of exports.⁴⁰⁷ By contrast, the representative of the Russian Federation emphasized that the process of resolving the problem of conflict diamonds in Sierra Leone and other conflict areas in Africa had to be focused primarily on “specific measures to break the linkage between the illicit traffic in rough diamonds and the financing of rebel movements” and should not involve “the interest of legal participants in the international diamond business”.⁴⁰⁸

As for the humanitarian impact of the sanctions regime, several speakers expressed the need to precisely target sanctions to prevent humanitarian

³⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 3-4 .

³⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 4.

³⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 6.

³⁹⁹ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid., pp. 9-10.

⁴⁰¹ Ibid., pp. 4-5.

⁴⁰² Ibid., pp. 8-9.

⁴⁰³ Ibid., p. 6 (Russian Federation); pp. 6-7 (Argentina); p. 7 (China); and pp. 9-10 (France).

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

⁴⁰⁵ S/PV.4264, p. 5.

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 6 (Jamaica); pp. 10-11 (Colombia); and p. 20 (Norway).

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid., pp. 4-6 (United Kingdom); p. 6 (Jamaica); p. 8 (France); p. 10 (Colombia); p. 11 (Tunisia); p. 14 (Ireland); p. 18 (Mauritius); p. 18 (Ukraine); and p. 21 (Norway).

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid., pp. 12-13.

consequences on the civilian population.⁴⁰⁹ In that connection, the representative of Sierra Leone emphasized that weapons bought from the sale of diamonds were being used to “maim and kill” thousands of people in Sierra Leone.⁴¹⁰

With reference to the involvement of Liberia in the conflict, several speakers noted that the country was prolonging the conflict in Sierra Leone through its support for RUF, and called for the imposition of measures on Liberia designed to apply pressure to modify such behavior.⁴¹¹ The representative of the United Kingdom added that such measures would cease as soon as Liberia stopped its financial and military support to RUF.⁴¹² The representative of the United States indicated that the measures were intended to bring an end to President Taylor’s ongoing support to RUF and his “continued engagement in illicit arms-for-diamonds trafficking”, and “to undermine the Government of Liberia’s ability to conduct war against its neighbours”, without causing hardship for the people of Liberia.⁴¹³ The representative of France recommended that the sanctions against Liberia be limited in time, subject to periodical review, “motivational”, and linked to precise criteria for their lifting. He emphasized that his country advocated an “incremental approach” to the implementation of sanctions so as to allow the “democratically elected Government of Liberia to shoulder its responsibilities”.⁴¹⁴ In response, the representative of Liberia maintained that his Government was the target of “grossly unsubstantiated allegations of diamond smuggling and gun running” with RUF, and that it was “neither connected nor a party to the illicit trade of Sierra Leonean diamonds”. He further noted that the possible imposition of a travel ban on Liberian officials and diplomats had “no basis in the Charter” and would deny Liberia the opportunity to “conduct its external relations as a sovereign Member of the United Nations”.⁴¹⁵

⁴⁰⁹ Ibid., pp. 6-7 (Jamaica); pp. 11-12 (Tunisia); p. 12 (China); and pp. 20-21 (Norway).

⁴¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 22-24.

⁴¹¹ Ibid., pp. 4-6 (United Kingdom); pp. 7-8 (France); pp. 13-15 (Ireland); pp. 15-17 (United States); and pp. 22-24 (Sierra Leone).

⁴¹² Ibid., pp. 4-6.

⁴¹³ Ibid., pp. 15-17.

⁴¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

⁴¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 24-29.

Letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991 from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America

By a letter dated 15 August 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁴¹⁶ the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya stated that his country had met its obligations pursuant to the relevant Council resolutions and requested that the measures imposed by resolutions 748 (1992) and 883 (1993) be lifted.

By a letter dated 15 August 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁴¹⁷ the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States noted that they were not opposed to the lifting of sanctions against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and that they expected the country to adhere fully to its commitments. A similar message was conveyed by a letter dated 12 September 2003 addressed to the Secretary-General from the representative of France.⁴¹⁸

At its 4820th meeting, on 9 and 12 September 2003, the Council adopted resolution 1506 (2003), by which it lifted the sanctions against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya imposed by resolutions 748 (1992) and 883 (1993) in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks against Pan Am flight 103 and Union de Transports Aeriens flight 772. During the subsequent debate, a number of speakers explained their vote in favour of the removal of sanctions based on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya’s fulfilment of the conditions previously imposed by the Council. They agreed it was a matter of justice for sanctions to be lifted once a country had complied with Security Council requirements.⁴¹⁹ The representative of the United States concurred that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had met its obligations and stated that his Government was not opposed to the “formal lifting” of sanctions. He cautioned, however, that the United States’ abstention should not be “misconstrued by Libya or by the world community as tacit United States acceptance” that the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had rehabilitated itself. Hence, he explained, the United States would keep in place the bilateral sanctions against the country.⁴²⁰ The

⁴¹⁶ S/2003/818.

⁴¹⁷ S/2003/819.

⁴¹⁸ S/2003/885.

⁴¹⁹ S/PV.4820 (Part II), p. 4 (Bulgaria); p. 5 (Russian Federation); p. 5 (Spain); and pp. 5-6 (United Kingdom).

⁴²⁰ Ibid., pp. 2-3.

representative of France declared that the lifting of sanctions constituted an important step in the process of reintegrating the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in the international community, but also encouraged the latter to make “the necessary gestures beyond the requirements for the lifting of sanctions”.⁴²¹ Similarly, the representative of Germany declared that his Government was “relieved” that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had fulfilled the demands of the Council, therefore enabling the definite lifting of sanctions. However, he emphasized that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had to take the further step of addressing the bombing of a Berlin discotheque in 1986.⁴²² The representative of Pakistan indicated that the people of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had “paid a high price with the sanctions imposed collectively on them”, noticing that sanctions always had “unintended consequences”.⁴²³ Similarly, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic recognized that the people of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had suffered for a long time because of the “unjust sanctions imposed against them”, and expressed his country’s belief that the Council should not impose sanctions that would “adversely impact the civilian population” and that would “expose children, women and men to suffering under collective sanctions” considered unacceptable under international law and the Charter.⁴²⁴

Security Council resolution 1054 (1996) of 26 April 1996

In a series of letters dated June 2000 addressed to the President,⁴²⁵ the representatives of the Sudan, Algeria, South Africa and Gabon expressed the support of their Governments for the removal of the sanctions against the Sudan, in the light of that country’s compliance with Council resolutions 1054 (1996) and 1070 (1996).

At its 4384th meeting, on 28 September 2001, the Council adopted resolution 1372 (2001), by which it lifted the sanctions against the Sudan imposed by paragraphs 3 and 4 of resolution 1054 (1996) and

paragraph 3 of resolution 1070 (1996). During the debate following the vote, several representatives indicated that the Sudan had met its obligations under Security Council resolutions and welcomed the removal of sanctions.⁴²⁶ The representative of the United Kingdom stated that the resolution sent out a clear signal that the Council stood ready to act once it had determined that a country had complied with the demands set out in a resolution.⁴²⁷ The representative of the United States welcomed the steps taken by the Sudan, but expressed concern for “the enormous suffering of the Sudanese people” and the civil war in the country. He stressed that in the light of those considerations, the United States had abstained from the vote.⁴²⁸ The representative of Ireland welcomed the steps taken by the Sudan, but cautioned that the sanctions were lifted because only “very specific requirements” had been met. He indicated that Ireland remained “deeply concerned” at the wider political, humanitarian and human rights situation in the Sudan.⁴²⁹

General issues relating to sanctions

At its 4128th meeting, on 17 April 2000, the Council discussed a number of general issues relating to sanctions regimes, including the following: (a) the general purpose of sanctions; (b) the criteria used for their imposition and termination; (c) the concept of targeted sanctions; (d) the humanitarian impact of sanctions; and (e) the monitoring of sanctions.

General purpose of sanctions. Many speakers emphasized that sanctions should be employed as an option for ensuring compliance only after all other peaceful options had been exhausted.⁴³⁰ The representative of Jamaica pointed out that sanctions were an alternative to the use of force, while the representative of New Zealand characterized sanctions as a “middle course” between “diplomatic censure and the use of force”.⁴³¹ The representatives of France and

⁴²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

⁴²² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁴²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁴²⁵ Letters dated 1 June 2000 from the representatives of the Sudan (S/2000/513); Algeria (S/2000/517); and South Africa (S/2000/521); and letter dated 2 June 2000 from the representative of Gabon (S/2000/533).

⁴²⁶ S/PV.4384, p. 2 (Russian Federation); p. 3 (United Kingdom); and p. 4 (the Sudan).

⁴²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁴²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁴²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁴³⁰ S/PV.4128, p. 5 (Bangladesh); pp. 9-11 (Ukraine); pp. 13-15 (Malaysia); pp. 18-20 (Tunisia); pp. 20-21 (Mali); pp. 23-24 (Russian Federation); pp. 28-30 (Pakistan); and pp. 38-39 (Cuba).

⁴³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-23 (Jamaica); and pp. 36-37 (New Zealand).

the Netherlands noted that sanctions were often an intermediate measure between peaceful measures and the use of force.⁴³² The representative of Canada stressed that sanctions were a “very potent means” of promoting peace and an “effective way to prevent or stop violence against civilians” and to “save human lives in the face of brutality and destruction”.⁴³³ By contrast, the representative of Pakistan stated that his country was opposed to sanctions as a “matter of principle”, preferring the adoption of means leading to a peaceful resolution of conflicts.⁴³⁴ The representative of Argentina understood sanctions to be “an important element of preventive action” that made it possible “to express the international community’s rejection of a given position or action” without the use of force.⁴³⁵ The representative of Australia acknowledged that while sanctions could be a “blunt instrument,” they remained a “necessary instrument and an integral part of the graduated set of responses” available to the Council.⁴³⁶ Several speakers noted that sanctions should not be an end in themselves but a means to an end,⁴³⁷ while others emphasized that sanctions should be combined with incentives in order to achieve compliance.⁴³⁸ The representative of Argentina warned that attention should be paid to the design of sanctions to make sure that their use was not viewed as a “half measure”, thus jeopardizing their effectiveness and the credibility of the United Nations.⁴³⁹

Criteria for the imposition and termination of sanctions. A number of speakers observed that sanctions should be imposed only when the Council has clearly established a threat to the peace or a breach of the peace.⁴⁴⁰ Other representatives stated that national interests should not influence the imposition of economic sanctions.⁴⁴¹ In that respect, the

representative of China cautioned that it was not appropriate to impose sanctions unilaterally in the absence of authorization by the Council.⁴⁴² The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya stated that the Council “had ignored threats to the peace and acts of aggression”, while at the same time imposing the “severest sanctions when there was no threat to international peace and security” in order to achieve the “specific political objectives of particular States, utterly unrelated to international peace and security”.⁴⁴³ The representative of Cuba agreed that the implementation of sanctions could not represent “an exclusive right of a select club of countries” or a “coercive instrument in the hands of a few Security Council members”.⁴⁴⁴ The representative of Iraq argued that the United States was able to impose an “extremist use of sanctions” due to the “absence of any checks or balances in the Charter of the United Nations” to limit the excessive use of sanctions.⁴⁴⁵ The representative of the Russian Federation expressed the view that sanctions should not be used to overthrow or change the “legitimate Government or existing political regime in the targeted country”,⁴⁴⁶ while the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya commented that the Council should not use sanctions to “force people to abandon their political choices or values, or to impose a particular pattern of behavior”.⁴⁴⁷ Moreover, several representatives insisted that sanctions should have a clearly defined purpose, and should comprise the objective criteria for their suspension or termination.⁴⁴⁸ The representative of the United States observed that once sanctions were imposed, the burden of proof for their suspension or termination resided in “the demonstrated behavior of the sanctioned entity”. He remarked that, just as sanctions “must never be lightly entered into, they should not be terminated due to a lack of resolve, a

⁴³² Ibid., pp. 7-9 (France); and pp. 17-18 (Netherlands).

⁴³³ Ibid., pp. 24-26.

⁴³⁴ Ibid., pp. 28-30.

⁴³⁵ Ibid., pp. 15-17.

⁴³⁶ Ibid., pp. 33-35.

⁴³⁷ Ibid., pp. 6-7 (United States); pp. 18-20 (Tunisia); and pp. 21-23 (Jamaica).

⁴³⁸ Ibid., pp. 7-9 (France); pp. 13-15 (Malaysia); pp. 15-17 (Argentina); pp. 18-20 (Tunisia); pp. 23-24 (Russian Federation); pp. 24-26 (Canada); and pp. 40-43 (Iraq).

⁴³⁹ Ibid., pp. 15-17.

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 7-9 (France); pp. 13-15 (Malaysia); pp. 23-24 (Russian Federation); pp. 30-31 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); and pp. 38-39 (Cuba).

⁴⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 20-21 (Mali); pp. 21-23 (Jamaica); pp. 28-30 (Pakistan); and pp. 30-31 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).

⁴⁴² Ibid., pp. 12-13.

⁴⁴³ Ibid., pp. 30-31.

⁴⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 38-39.

⁴⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 40-43.

⁴⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 23-24.

⁴⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 30-31.

⁴⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 5-6 (United Kingdom); pp. 6-7 (United States); pp. 11-12 (Namibia); pp. 13-15 (Malaysia); pp. 15-17 (Argentina); pp. 18-20 (Tunisia); pp. 20-21 (Mali); pp. 21-23 (Jamaica); pp. 23-24 (Russian Federation); pp. 28-30 (Pakistan); pp. 30-31 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); pp. 33-35 (Australia); pp. 35-36 (Bulgaria); pp. 36-37 (New Zealand); pp. 38-39 (Cuba); and pp. 40-43 (Iraq).

lack of will or a lack of patience”.⁴⁴⁹ The representative of the Russian Federation asserted that often “biased approaches” prevailed in the imposition, implementation, and removal of sanctions. He elaborated that “new criteria” were “artificially introduced by setting various additional trial periods and control periods, and complex mechanisms for monitoring and accountability”.⁴⁵⁰

Targeted sanctions. The majority of speakers shared the view that sanctions should be better targeted in relation to those responsible for the sanctioned behaviour to ensure a more effective compliance with the Council’s decisions and prevent harming civilians.⁴⁵¹ The representative of New Zealand observed that, “in the case of comprehensive trade sanctions imposed on authoritarian regimes in particular,” there was the unintended effect of “manipulation and profiteering by the elite” that would escape any adverse impact on themselves and exploit the situation to their own advantage. He further stated that, in light of such unintended consequences, “the trend away from general trade sanctions towards a more selective approach” needed to be accelerated by identifying a limited range of goods and services that would “target the interests of the regimes and elites identified as responsible for threats to peace and security”.⁴⁵² The representative of Portugal recommended that a more unified and precise terminology be used in sanctions resolutions to enhance harmonized national implementation.⁴⁵³ By contrast, the representative of Australia cautioned that targeted sanctions remained “untested” and might not be appropriate in all instances.⁴⁵⁴ The representative of the United Kingdom, while expressing his support for “smart” sanctions, commented that in the financial arena he suspected that the “fox” would be able “to stay ahead of the hounds”.⁴⁵⁵ The representative of Iraq held the belief that the “idea of replacing the

current sanctions regime against Iraq with a smart one” was “ill-intentioned” and was aimed at “entrenching the sanctions and rendering them an objective in of themselves”.⁴⁵⁶

Humanitarian impact of sanctions. The majority of representatives concurred about the possible humanitarian implications of sanctions and urged the Council to take them into account when imposing measures under Article 41 of the Charter.⁴⁵⁷ Several speakers also expressed concern at the impact sanctions had on third-parties such as States.⁴⁵⁸ The representative of Tunisia, echoed by the representative of Canada, commented that, as the implementation of sanctions was the “collective responsibility” of the international community, it was “entirely logical” that the costs of implementing sanctions had to be borne by the community as a whole and not just by a small number of States, such as the target State’s neighbors or economic partners.⁴⁵⁹ Several speakers contended that any assessment of the humanitarian or third-party impact of sanctions had to occur prior, during, as well as after their imposition.⁴⁶⁰ In contrast, the representative of the Netherlands explicitly stated that pre-assessment was not a viable option if sanctions were to remain an effective tool, and instead pointed to

⁴⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

⁴⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 23-24.

⁴⁵¹ Ibid., p. 5 (Bangladesh); pp. 7-9 (France); pp. 18-20 (Tunisia); pp. 20-21 (Mali); pp. 21-23 (Jamaica); pp. 24-26 (Canada); pp. 26-28 (Portugal); p. 28 (Germany); pp. 31-32 (Italy); pp. 32-33 (Sweden); pp. 35-36 (Bulgaria); pp. 36-37 (New Zealand); and p. 40 (Switzerland).

⁴⁵² Ibid., pp. 36-37.

⁴⁵³ Ibid., pp. 26-28.

⁴⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 33-35.

⁴⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 5-6.

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid., pp. 40-43.

⁴⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 5 (Bangladesh); pp. 5-6 (United Kingdom); pp. 6-7 (United States); pp. 7-9 (France); pp. 9-11 (Ukraine); pp. 11-12 (Namibia); pp. 12-13 (China); pp. 13-15 (Malaysia); pp. 15-17 (Argentina); pp. 17-18 (Netherlands); pp. 18-20 (Tunisia); pp. 20-21 (Mali); pp. 21-23 (Jamaica); pp. 23-24 (Russian Federation); pp. 24-26 (Canada); pp. 26-28 (Portugal); p. 28 (Germany); pp. 28-30 (Pakistan); pp. 31-32 (Italy); pp. 32-33 (Sweden); pp. 33-35 (Australia); pp. 35-36 (Bulgaria); pp. 36-37 (New Zealand); pp. 38-39 (Cuba); p. 40 (Switzerland); and pp. 40-43 (Iraq).

⁴⁵⁸ Ibid., pp. 7-9 (France); pp. 11-12 (Namibia); pp. 13-15 (Malaysia); pp. 21-23 (Jamaica); pp. 23-24 (Russian Federation); pp. 26-28 (Portugal); pp. 28-30 (Pakistan); pp. 30-31 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); pp. 32-33 (Sweden); pp. 33-35 (Australia); pp. 35-36 (Bulgaria); pp. 36-37 (New Zealand); pp. 43-45 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); and p. 45 (Turkey). For a more detailed discussion, see chapter XI, part VIII, sections B and C.

⁴⁵⁹ Ibid., pp. 18-20 (Tunisia); and pp. 24-26 (Canada).

⁴⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 11-12 (Namibia); pp. 12-13 (China); pp. 13-15 (Malaysia); pp. 18-20 (Tunisia); pp. 21-23 (Jamaica); pp. 24-26 (Canada); pp. 32-33 (Sweden); and pp. 38-39 (Cuba).

the need to monitor humanitarian and economic impacts of sanctions once they were in place.⁴⁶¹

Monitoring of sanctions. The majority of speakers agreed on the need to enhance capacities to implement and monitor sanctions at the national, regional and international levels.⁴⁶² The representative of France stated that the working methods of the sanctions committees had to be modified, as the rule of consensus had become a paralysing force. Furthermore, he advocated greater transparency in the conduct of business of the sanctions committees.⁴⁶³

At its 4394th meeting, on 22 October 2001, the Council discussed the results of the Interlaken and Bonn-Berlin processes on financial sanctions, arms embargoes and travel- and aviation-related sanctions. The Permanent Observer of Switzerland noted the important role played by sanctions in promoting international peace and security, but showed concern for the negative humanitarian impact of sanctions on civilians. He therefore voiced support for targeted sanctions.⁴⁶⁴ A similar position was held by the representative of Germany, who added that sanctions should not be a form of punishment, but should lead to compliance with the Charter of the United Nations.⁴⁶⁵ Several representatives indicated that the Council should focus on the implementation and monitoring of sanctions in order to improve their effectiveness.⁴⁶⁶ The Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs stressed that sanctions needed “continued refining to strengthen their effectiveness and to ease any possible negative impact” and advocated a “constructive dialogue on their implementation and monitoring”.⁴⁶⁷ Other speakers concurred that the focus should be on the national implementation and enforcement of

sanctions.⁴⁶⁸ The representative of Mali noted that sanctions had “rarely achieved their goals” and recommended a “continuous evaluation of their socio-economic impact”.⁴⁶⁹ The representatives of Chile and Tunisia declared that sanctions were not an end in themselves and should be part of an overall strategy for conflict settlement and prevention.⁴⁷⁰ The representative of the Russian Federation emphasized that the introduction of sanctions was “an extreme measure to be applied only where all other methods of bringing political impact to bear” had been exhausted. He also insisted that sanctions should be “carefully targeted”, “subject to regular review”, and contain “conditions for lifting them”.⁴⁷¹

At its 4713th meeting, on 25 February 2003, the Council discussed general issues relating to sanctions in connection with the final report of the Stockholm Process on the Implementation of Targeted Sanctions. The representative of Sweden declared that the goals of the Stockholm Process were to find ways to improve the efficiency of sanctions, while minimizing their unintended consequences, and to suggest ways to strengthen the capacity to implement targeted sanctions.⁴⁷² Several speakers drew attention to the importance of minimizing the unintended consequences sanctions had on the population of the targeted States and/or on neighbouring States.⁴⁷³ Other speakers concurred that targeted sanctions were more efficient at reaching specific actors while reducing the risk of collateral impact on innocent civilian populations.⁴⁷⁴ The representative of the United States insisted that sanctions still remained a “viable and very useful policy option” for use by the Security Council to modify State behaviour. He also stressed the importance of targeted measures as a way for the Council to avoid unnecessary negative impact on civilians and other States.⁴⁷⁵ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic remarked that targeted sanctions were more difficult to implement than collective

⁴⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

⁴⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 5 (Bangladesh); pp. 6-7 (United States); pp. 9-11 (Ukraine); pp. 11-12 (Namibia); pp. 13-15 (Malaysia); pp. 18-20 (Tunisia); pp. 21-23 (Jamaica); pp. 24-26 (Canada); pp. 26-28 (Portugal); pp. 28-30 (Pakistan); pp. 32-33 (Sweden); pp. 33-35 (Australia); pp. 35-36 (Bulgaria); and pp. 43-45 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia).

⁴⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.

⁴⁶⁴ S/PV.4394, p. 2.

⁴⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴⁶⁶ S/PV.4394, p. 6 (Sweden); p. 9 (France); and p. 10 (Ukraine); S/PV.4394 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 2 (Jamaica); p. 6 (Mauritius); p. 7 (Colombia); p. 8 (United States); and p. 9 (Singapore).

⁴⁶⁷ S/PV.4394, p. 6.

⁴⁶⁸ S/PV.4394 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 4 (United Kingdom); and p. 4 (Norway).

⁴⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁴⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Tunisia); and p. 11 (China).

⁴⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁴⁷² S/PV.4713, pp. 2-3.

⁴⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6 (Bulgaria); p. 7 (China); p. 8 (Guinea); p. 14 (Russian Federation); p. 15 (Pakistan); and p. 19 (Spain).

⁴⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (France); and p. 11 (Chile).

⁴⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

sanctions. He also emphasized the role played by the political will of Member States for the effective implementation of sanctions.⁴⁷⁶ Several representatives voiced support for the creation of a monitoring mechanism to counter sanctions evasions and to maintain an accurate assessment of sanctions.⁴⁷⁷ The representative of Mexico advocated improving the coordination among sanctions committees, as well as the “possibility of including in United Nations peacekeeping operation mandates the requirement of reporting violations of sanctions regimes”.⁴⁷⁸

The situation in Africa

At its 4577th meeting, on 18 July 2002, the Council discussed the effect of sanctions imposed on Sierra Leone and Liberia and sought ways to encourage regional peace in the Mano River region. The representative of Guinea cautioned that the international community should remain vigilant in monitoring political normalization and reconciliation in Liberia and the stability of the subregion and asked for sanctions to be lifted only once the Government of Liberia had discharged “all of its commitments under the relevant resolutions of the Security Council”.⁴⁷⁹ The representative of Mexico stressed that, for sanctions to be effective, it was essential for the population to perceive them as mechanisms “contributing to peace and security and not as acts of reprisal or of political reprimand”. He also observed that sanctions were not a guarantee that weapons would not enter Sierra Leone again and emphasized the importance of compliance by third parties with the sanctions.⁴⁸⁰ The representative of Colombia drew attention to the difficulties of dealing with armed groups and maintained that sanctions against them should be applied if necessary.⁴⁸¹ The representative of Mauritius remarked that the sanctions imposed on Liberia had been of “tremendous help” in bringing peace to Sierra Leone, but suggested that the Council should find ways of engaging constructively with Liberia rather than isolating it “any further”.⁴⁸² Similarly, the representatives of China and Ireland

reiterated the positive effect the sanctions against Liberia had had on the peace process in Sierra Leone.⁴⁸³ The representative of Norway expressed concern over the danger of the conflict in Liberia spilling over into neighbouring countries. He insisted that the sanctions on Liberia should be as effective as possible to prevent President Charles Taylor from continuing his destabilizing activities and to minimize the negative humanitarian impact.⁴⁸⁴

Children and armed conflict

At its 4176th meeting, on 26 July 2000, the Council discussed the role of the Security Council in protecting children in war-torn areas. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict called upon the Council to adopt a more active role in easing the impact of such sanctions on children, by using targeted sanctions against actors who flouted “international standards regarding the protection of children”.⁴⁸⁵ The representative of Bangladesh asserted that the Council had “a duty” to design sanctions regimes that did not affect the innocent.⁴⁸⁶ The representative of Malaysia expressed his Government’s concern about the “debilitating effects of sanctions on children” and voiced support for the “dispatching of assessment missions to targeted States” to minimize the unintended consequences on civilian populations, especially children.⁴⁸⁷ Similarly, the representative of Ukraine advocated the establishment of a permanent technical review mechanism that would monitor the impact of sanctions on civilians, in particular children.⁴⁸⁸ The representative of Tunisia supported the Secretary-General’s proposal for an assessment of the impact of sanctions on the civilian population before imposing the sanctions.⁴⁸⁹ The representative of France asked for an assessment of the consequences of sanctions before their implementation.⁴⁹⁰ The representative of Iraq expressed concern with the “indiscriminate and excessive application of sanctions by the Council” and concurred on the necessity of dispatching evaluation missions to assess the potential negative impact of

⁴⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 13

⁴⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (China); p. 12 (United Kingdom); and p. 20 (Germany).

⁴⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁴⁷⁹ S/PV.4577, p. 8.

⁴⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁴⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁴⁸² S/PV.4577 (Resumption 1), p. 8.

⁴⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 16 (China); and pp. 18-19 (Ireland).

⁴⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁴⁸⁵ S/PV.4176, p. 4.

⁴⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁴⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁴⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁴⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁴⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

sanctions.⁴⁹¹ The representative of Indonesia insisted that efforts should be made to relieve the suffering of children living under sanctions regimes by providing humanitarian exemptions so that children would not be denied access to basic necessities.⁴⁹²

At its 4422nd meeting, on 20 November 2001, the Council continued its discussion of possible measures to be taken to alleviate the plight of children affected by war. In his statement, the representative of the Republic of Korea remarked that, in the past years, there had been a surge in the number of armed conflicts and that innocent civilians had been increasingly targeted. He asked Member States to cooperate in imposing sanctions on individuals and groups involved in illegal trafficking of currency, arms and natural resources, which exacerbated armed conflict.⁴⁹³ The representatives of Iraq and Malaysia drew attention to the number of civilian victims resulting from the sanctions imposed on Iraq, and asked for the removal of those sanctions.⁴⁹⁴

Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of peace and security, particularly in Africa

At its 4288th meeting, on 7 March 2001, the Council discussed ways to increase the effectiveness of the Security Council in the maintenance of peace and security, especially in Africa. The representative of Sweden noted that the systematic and deliberate violations of sanctions continued to fuel some of the conflicts in Africa. He urged the Council to make the objectives of sanctions and the criteria for lifting them “clear”, to assess the possible humanitarian impacts of sanctions and to ensure that appropriate mechanisms for review were incorporated into sanctions regimes.⁴⁹⁵ The representative of Egypt shared the view that the Council should establish a specific time frame for the duration of the sanctions and specific mechanisms for their lifting.⁴⁹⁶ Along the same lines, the representative of Belarus advocated an improvement of the principles and mechanisms for the establishment of enforcement measures, in particular of economic sanctions.⁴⁹⁷ The

representative of Namibia agreed that the Council should take action against those who violated sanctions, but, at the same time, should ease or lift sanctions when the humanitarian situation demanded it.⁴⁹⁸

Protection of civilians in armed conflict

At its 4312th meeting, on 23 April 2001, the Council debated ways to improve the protection of civilians in armed conflict and lessen the effect of sanctions on civilians. The representative of Jamaica stressed the importance of a permanent technical review mechanism that would assess the unintended consequences of sanctions before they were imposed.⁴⁹⁹ The representative of China cautioned that protracted sanctions caused “enormous harm to civilians” and emphasized the need for action to curtail civilian suffering.⁵⁰⁰ The representative of Canada acknowledged that, despite certain setbacks, the Council had improved its “sanctions instrument”.⁵⁰¹ The representative of the Republic of Korea noted that targeted sanctions should be tailored to a specific regime and have clear goals. He also urged the Council to take into account the humanitarian implications of sanctions.⁵⁰² The representative of Switzerland shared the view that the Council should take better account of the humanitarian repercussions of sanctions regimes on civilian populations and promote targeted sanctions.⁵⁰³ The representative of Pakistan, however, stressed that there were “no smart sanctions, nor targeted sanctions, only unjust sanctions”.⁵⁰⁴ The representative of Sierra Leone drew attention to the role played by external actors in fostering conflict. He urged the Council to take action against those actors by using “the threat of the use of sanctions”.⁵⁰⁵ The representative of Iraq drew attention to the effects of sanctions on his country, stressing the “devastating impact of sanctions on children and infants”.⁵⁰⁶

At its 4877th meeting, on 9 December 2003, the Council continued its discussion on the means for

⁴⁹¹ S/PV.4176 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 14.

⁴⁹² Ibid., p. 26.

⁴⁹³ S/PV.4422 (Resumption 1), pp. 17-18.

⁴⁹⁴ Ibid., pp. 24-25 (Iraq); and p. 29 (Malaysia).

⁴⁹⁵ S/PV.4288, p. 6.

⁴⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 14.

⁴⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 24.

⁴⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 22.

⁴⁹⁹ S/PV.4312, p. 15.

⁵⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 18.

⁵⁰¹ S/PV.4312 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 4.

⁵⁰² Ibid., p. 9.

⁵⁰³ Ibid., p. 12.

⁵⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 23.

⁵⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 30.

⁵⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 32.

better protecting civilians in armed conflict. The representative of Chile maintained that “sanctions should be reserved for very specific areas, focused directly on those responsible and avoid negatively affecting the civilian population”.⁵⁰⁷ The representative of Germany insisted that sanctions should be imposed “with the consequences for civilians in mind”.⁵⁰⁸ Similarly, the representative of Canada welcomed the Council’s efforts to develop more-targeted sanctions regimes to minimize the potential humanitarian impact of sanctions on civilian populations.⁵⁰⁹

Small arms

At its 4355th meeting, on 2 August 2002, the Council discussed the impact of the illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons on conflict situations. In their statements, the representatives of Jamaica and Mauritius emphasized the role of targeted sanctions in limiting combatants’ access to resources and reducing the flow of arms to areas of conflict.⁵¹⁰ A number of speakers called for the establishment of a standing monitoring mechanism for sanctions that would more efficiently supervise compliance.⁵¹¹ The representative of Ukraine insisted that the Council should focus on ensuring the full implementation of its arms embargoes and other sanctions targeting illicit trade.⁵¹² That approach was supported by the representative of Brazil, who added that the Council should also provide “incentives” to all States to cooperate with the investigations of the sanctions committees.⁵¹³ The representative of Costa Rica asked the Council to investigate and find illicit supply routes for small arms and light weapons to various areas in conflict and impose appropriate sanctions on “the nations, entities or individuals involved in such activities”.⁵¹⁴

⁵⁰⁷ S/PV.4877, p. 12.

⁵⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

⁵⁰⁹ S/PV.4877 (Resumption 1), p. 13.

⁵¹⁰ S/PV.4355, p. 7 (Jamaica); and p. 18 (Mauritius).

⁵¹¹ S/PV.4355, p. 11 (France); p. 20 (Mali); and p. 23 (Singapore); S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 4 (Argentina); and p. 33 (Bulgaria).

⁵¹² S/PV.4355, p. 21.

⁵¹³ S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 7.

⁵¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month

At its 4466th meeting, on 31 January 2002, the Council discussed its activity for the current month. The representative of Colombia referred to resolution 1390 (2002) by which, in connection with the situation in Afghanistan, the Council had established the only sanctions regime that was “not linked to a specific territory or country” and instead had “global application”. He noted that its implementation would require new mechanisms and discussion of substantive topics “never before tackled in the Council”.⁵¹⁵ The representative of Singapore agreed that the resolution had global application while providing some “continuity” by retaining mechanisms such as the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities, the consolidated list issued by that Committee and the Monitoring Group established by resolution 1363 (2001).⁵¹⁶

At its 4748th meeting, on 30 April 2003, the Council discussed the role of the United Nations in post-conflict situations, especially with regard to Iraq. The Secretary-General noted that the Council would have to make difficult decisions in the near future, notably on the issue of sanctions. He also emphasized that the Council should play an important role in determining the role of the United Nations in the reconstruction of Iraq.⁵¹⁷ In that respect, the representative of the Russian Federation expressed his preference for the easing or suspension of “certain sanctions” in order to alleviate the humanitarian situation in the country.⁵¹⁸ The representative of Georgia cautioned that the Security Council’s handling of Iraq’s postwar reconstruction could serve as a “litmus test” of its commitment to peace and international security. He declared as unacceptable the attempts to “manipulate the technicalities of previously adopted resolutions” to prevent the Council from lifting the sanctions against Iraq.⁵¹⁹

⁵¹⁵ S/PV.4466, pp. 3-4.

⁵¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-14.

⁵¹⁷ S/PV.4748 and Corr.1, p. 4.

⁵¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁵¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

Part IV

Measures to maintain or restore international peace and security in accordance with Article 42 of the Charter

Article 42

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

Note

During the period under review, the Security Council did not explicitly invoke Article 42 in any of its decisions. However, the Council did adopt several resolutions by which it called on Member States to use “all necessary measures” to enforce its demands relating to the restoration of international peace and security and which may be of relevance to the Council’s interpretation and application of the principle in Article 42.

Section A presents eight case studies relating to the Council’s authorization of enforcement action under Chapter VII of the Charter, for the maintenance of peace and security: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Côte d’Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, East Timor, Iraq, Liberia and Sierra Leone. Section B covers highlights the salient issues that were raised in the Council’s deliberations in connection with the adoption of the relevant resolutions. Particular attention is also devoted to the discussion which arose in the Council in connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait and, specifically, on whether the Council should authorize the use of force against Iraq for its failure to comply with relevant Security Council resolutions.

A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 42

The situation in Afghanistan

By resolution 1386 (2001) of 20 December 2001, the Council authorized the establishment, for a period of 6 months, of the International Security Assistance

Force (ISAF) to assist the Afghan Interim Authority in the maintenance of security in Kabul and its surrounding areas.⁵²⁰ It also authorized the Member States participating in the Force to “take all necessary measures to fulfill its mandate”.⁵²¹ The mandate of the Force was extended several times by subsequent Council resolutions.⁵²²

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

By resolution 1305 (2000) of 21 June 2000, the Security Council authorized Member States, acting through or in cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), in accordance with resolution 1088 (1996), to fulfil the role determined in the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Dayton Agreement), under annex 1-A, by taking “all necessary measures” to fulfil its mandate.⁵²³ By the same resolution, the Council also authorized the relevant Member States to “take all necessary measures”, at the request of the Stabilization Force (SFOR), either in defence of the Force or to assist the Force in carrying out its mission, and recognized the right of the Force to “take all necessary measures” to defend itself from attack or threat of attack. The Council also authorized the relevant Member States to “take all necessary measures” to ensure compliance with the rules and procedures established by the Commander of SFOR, governing command and control of airspace over Bosnia and Herzegovina with respect to all civilian and military air traffic.⁵²⁴ The mandate of the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina was extended several times by subsequent Council resolutions.⁵²⁵

⁵²⁰ Resolution 1386 (2001), para. 1.

⁵²¹ Resolution 1386 (2001), para. 3.

⁵²² Resolutions 1413 (2002), paras. 1 and 2; 1444 (2002), paras. 1 and 2; and 1510 (2003), paras. 3 and 4.

⁵²³ Resolution 1305 (2000), paras. 10 and 11.

⁵²⁴ Resolution 1305 (2000), paras. 12 and 13.

⁵²⁵ Resolutions 1357 (2001), paras. 10, 11, 12, 13 and 19; 1418 (2002), para. 1; 1420 (2002), para. 1; 1421 (2002), para. 1; 1423 (2002), paras. 10, 11, 12, 13 and 19; and 1491 (2003), paras. 10, 11, 12 and 13.

The situation in Côte d'Ivoire

By resolution 1464 (2003) of 4 February 2003, recalling the decision taken by the Economic Community of West African States to promote a peaceful settlement of the conflict and deploy a peacekeeping force in Côte d'Ivoire, the Council authorized Member States participating in the forces of ECOWAS, together with the French forces supporting them, to "take the necessary steps to guarantee the security and freedom of movement of their personnel" and to ensure "the protection of civilians immediately threatened with physical violence within their zones of operation, using the means available to them".⁵²⁶ The Council subsequently renewed the authorization by resolution 1498 (2003) of 4 August 2003.⁵²⁷

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

By resolution 1291 (2000) of 24 February 2000, in connection with the expansion of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC),⁵²⁸ the Council decided that the Mission might "take the necessary action [...] to protect United Nations and co-located Joint Military Commission personnel, facilities, installations and equipment, ensure the security and freedom of movement of its personnel, and protect civilians under imminent threat of physical violence".⁵²⁹ By several subsequent resolutions, the Council extended the Mission's mandate.⁵³⁰

By resolution 1484 (2003) of 30 May 2003, the Council authorized the deployment of an Interim Emergency Multinational Force in Bunia in close coordination with MONUC, and authorized the Member States participating in the Multinational Force in Bunia "to take all necessary measures to fulfill its mandate".⁵³¹

By resolution 1493 (2003) of 28 July 2003, which authorized the increase of the Mission's military strength to 10,800 personnel, the Council authorized

⁵²⁶ Resolution 1464 (2003), para. 9.

⁵²⁷ Resolution 1498 (2003), para. 1.

⁵²⁸ Resolution 1291 (2000), para. 4.

⁵²⁹ *Ibid.*, para. 8.

⁵³⁰ Resolutions 1323 (2000), para. 1; 1332 (2000), para. 1; 1355 (2001), para. 29; 1417 (2002), para. 1; and 1489 (2003), para. 1.

⁵³¹ Resolution 1484 (2003), paras. 1 and 4.

the Mission to "take the necessary measures in the areas of deployment of its armed units, and as it deems it within its capabilities" (a) to protect United Nations personnel, facilities, installations and equipment; (b) to ensure the security and freedom of movement of its personnel, including in particular those engaged in missions of observation, verification or disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, reintegration or resettlement; (c) to protect civilians and humanitarian workers under imminent threat of physical violence; and (d) to contribute to the improvement of the security conditions in which humanitarian assistance is provided.⁵³² By the same resolution, the Council also authorized the Mission to "use all necessary means to fulfil its mandate in the Ituri district and, as it deems it within its capabilities, in North and South Kivu".⁵³³

The situation in Timor-Leste

By resolution 1410 (2002) of 17 May 2002, the Council decided to establish, as of 20 May 2002 and for an initial period of 12 months, the United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISET), with the following mandate: (a) to provide assistance to core administrative structures critical to the viability and political stability of East Timor; (b) to provide interim law enforcement and public security and to assist in the development of a new law enforcement agency in East Timor, the East Timor Police Service; and (c) to contribute to the maintenance of the external and internal security of East Timor.⁵³⁴ By the same resolution, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, the Council authorized the Mission "to take the necessary actions, for the duration of its mandate, to fulfil its mandate",⁵³⁵ and decided to review this issue and all other aspects of the mandate of the Mission after 12 months. By resolution 1480 (2003) of 19 May 2003, the Council extended the mandate of UNMISET until 20 May 2004.⁵³⁶

⁵³² Resolution 1493 (2003), para. 25.

⁵³³ Resolution 1493 (2003), para. 26.

⁵³⁴ Resolution 1410 (2002), paras. 1 and 2.

⁵³⁵ Resolution 1410 (2002), para. 6.

⁵³⁶ Resolution 1480 (2003), para. 1. The composition and the strength of the military and police components of the Mission were modified by resolution 1473 (2003) of 4 April 2003.

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

By resolution 1511 (2003) of 16 October 2003, the Council authorized a multinational force under unified command “to take all necessary measures to contribute to the maintenance of security and stability in Iraq”, including for the purpose of (a) ensuring the necessary conditions for the implementation of the timetable and programme for the drafting of a new constitution for Iraq and for the holding of democratic elections; and (b) contributing to the security of the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq, the Governing Council and other institutions of the Iraqi interim administration, and key humanitarian and economic infrastructure.⁵³⁷

The situation in Liberia

By resolution 1497 (2003) of 1 August 2003, the Council authorized Member States to establish a Multinational Force in Liberia (a) to support the implementation of the 17 June 2003 ceasefire agreement; (b) to help to establish and maintain security in the period after the departure of the President of Liberia and the installation of a successor authority; (c) to secure the environment for the delivery of humanitarian assistance; and (d) to prepare for the introduction of a longer-term United Nations stabilization force to relieve the Multinational Force.⁵³⁸ By the same resolution, the Council authorized Member States participating in the Multinational Force to “take all necessary measures to fulfill its mandate”.⁵³⁹

The situation in Sierra Leone

By resolution 1289 (2000) of 7 February 2000, the Council authorized the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) to “take the necessary action” to fulfil its mandate and ensure the security and freedom of movement of its personnel, as well as to afford protection to civilians under imminent threat of physical violence, within its capabilities and areas of deployment and taking into account the responsibilities of the Government of Sierra Leone.⁵⁴⁰

⁵³⁷ Resolution 1511 (2003), para. 13.

⁵³⁸ Resolution 1497 (2003), para. 1.

⁵³⁹ Resolution 1497 (2003), para. 5.

⁵⁴⁰ Resolution 1289 (2000), para. 10.

B. Discussion relating to Article 42

The situation in Afghanistan

At its 4414th meeting, on 13 November 2001, the Council discussed its role in setting Afghanistan on the path to a stable and lasting peace and in addressing the humanitarian needs of the Afghan people. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan emphasized that the establishment of a new Government could not be achieved in the absence of “genuine and lasting security”. He noted that the pervasive presence of non-Afghan armed and terrorist groups with no interest in a lasting peace would necessitate the introduction of a “robust security force, able to deter and, if possible, defeat challenges” to the Afghan Government’s authority. He presented three options to the Council: an all-Afghan security force, a multinational force and a United Nations peacekeeping force, stressing that the preferred option was an all-Afghan force, provided it could be fielded in a “speedy, robust and credible manner”.⁵⁴¹ The representative of Norway noted that the refusal by the Taliban regime to comply with Council resolutions “left no alternative but to use military force”, in accordance with the right of self-defence. He advised that the efforts to assist Afghanistan would only be effective if they were “well coordinated and part of a comprehensive political and economic strategy” supported by a “necessary security presence”.⁵⁴² The representative of China called on the United Nations to play a “leading role” and provide, together with the international community, the necessary political, technical and financial assistance to Afghanistan “on an urgent basis”. He announced his Government’s willingness to take into “serious consideration” any proposals or recommendations conducive to restoring the peace, stability and neutrality of Afghanistan.⁵⁴³ The representative of the United States argued that the international presence should be re-established “as soon as possible”.⁵⁴⁴ The representative of the Netherlands noted that a Security Council resolution had to enable “swift action to ensure as soon as possible some international, preferably United Nations, presence” in the towns that had just changed hands. He pointed out that “transitional military arrangements” would be essential

⁵⁴¹ S/PV.4414, p. 6.

⁵⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁵⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁵⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

to create a secure environment.⁵⁴⁵ The representative of Pakistan pointed out the significance of the interim administration's move to Kabul and called for the creation of a multinational force "with the coalition providing back-up support" to secure the peace and security of Kabul.⁵⁴⁶ The representative of Italy asserted that a "proper security framework" was an indispensable element for stability and also for the distribution of humanitarian assistance.⁵⁴⁷ The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran observed that the United Nations political and monitoring presence was one of the prerequisites for a successful transition, and that the presence of a United Nations military force was needed to ensure peace, order and security until the national army and police were in place.⁵⁴⁸ The representative of Germany argued that without military means it would not be possible to destroy the "hotbed of terror" in Afghanistan. He underlined the importance of clear political, economic and humanitarian objectives and urged the Council to provide the "mandate necessary to this end" through a Security Council resolution.⁵⁴⁹ The representative of Kazakhstan expressed the view that the Security Council should adopt comprehensive measures in the "political, military, humanitarian and human rights arena" along the lines of Mr. Brahimi's recommendations.⁵⁵⁰ The representative of Argentina maintained that the new Government of Afghanistan had to be helped to attain stability and security and that, in this respect, the "support of a security mechanism with an international component" might be necessary.⁵⁵¹ The representative of Chile reaffirmed that the United Nations had a central role in "creating effective cooperation mechanisms between countries in order to tackle international terrorism", a role that should be "intensified" when it became necessary to adopt measures aimed at "creating conditions for national stability in Afghanistan and, as a result, in the region".⁵⁵²

⁵⁴⁵ S/PV.4414 (Resumption 1), p. 4.

⁵⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

⁵⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁵⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁵⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

⁵⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁵⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁵⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 28.

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

At its 4092nd meeting, on 24 January 2000, the Council discussed ways to end to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo based on the principles laid out in the Lusaka Agreement. During the debate, the representative of Mozambique stated that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo could no longer afford further delays in the establishment of a full-fledged United Nations peacekeeping mission with an appropriate mandate under Chapter VII and with adequate numbers, taking into account the size of the country and the magnitude and complexity of the conflict.⁵⁵³ The representative of Zimbabwe indicated that the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo did not require "more talk of sending observers to their country, but the invoking of Chapter VII of the Charter and the urgent dispatch of peacekeepers to keep the peace".⁵⁵⁴ The representative of Uganda echoed that position, demanding that a neutral international peacekeeping force be deployed as an "interpositional force" in the Democratic Republic of the Congo under the auspices of the United Nations. He proposed that the mission be established under Chapter VII of the Charter to enable it to deal effectively with questions of disarmament, demobilization and the protection of civilians.⁵⁵⁵ The representative of Namibia called for the speedy deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping force in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, military observers and peacekeepers alike, under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.⁵⁵⁶ The representative of Canada expressed his Government's support for the "immediate creation of a robust United Nations mission" to assist in the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement, for which the mandate should include clear and unequivocal provision for the protection of civilians under Chapter VII of the Charter.⁵⁵⁷ The representative of Bangladesh concurred that a more robust mission with a Chapter VII mandate needed to be considered in due course for the implementation of the remaining provisions of the Lusaka Agreement.⁵⁵⁸

⁵⁵³ S/PV.4092. p. 11.

⁵⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁵⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁵⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁵⁵⁷ S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 11.

⁵⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

At its 4790th meeting, on 18 July 2003, the Council discussed the security situation in Bunia, following the installation of the Transitional Government of National Unity and a military operation undertaken by the Interim Emergency Multinational Force against the Union des patriotes congolais on 11 July 2003. During the debate, the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union expressed support for a “strengthened presence” of MONUC to be deployed in Bunia, with a “mandate under Chapter VII”.⁵⁵⁹ The representatives of Mexico and France noted that the Council had been preparing a draft to strengthen the mandate of MONUC, giving the mission a “robust mandate”.⁵⁶⁰ Similarly, several other speakers called for the Council to strengthen MONUC and grant it a robust mandate so that it could act effectively in emergency situations on the ground.⁵⁶¹ The representative of the Russian Federation shared the view of the Secretary-General on the need to adapt MONUC’s mandate to the realities in the country and conveyed his support for the adoption of a new resolution with “new tasks” for the United Nations peacekeeping operation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁵⁶² The representative of the United Kingdom stressed that a Chapter VII authorization for MONUC was “important” as it would help deter violence, but only if it was “credibly embodied on the ground”.⁵⁶³ The representative of Chile also advocated a “robust mandate under Chapter VII” for MONUC, which would be “essential to protect civilian populations and military personnel” subjected to “danger and threat”.⁵⁶⁴ The representative of China concurred, indicating that, as a result of the latest development, both the “mandate and size” of MONUC had to be adjusted. He therefore asserted his support for the draft resolution that would change MONUC’s mandate.⁵⁶⁵ The representative of Pakistan voiced support for an expansion of MONUC “to a ceiling of

10,800 troops, Chapter VII cover for Ituri and, if required, for the Kivu, and the presence of a brigade-size force in Ituri, with a clear, realistic and robust mandate”. He added that the expanded presence of MONUC should be accompanied by a “strong message” to the warring factions and those who backed them that further hostilities, which undermined the peace process, would “no longer be tolerated”. He concluded that, in that regard, his delegation supported the imposition of an arms embargo on all the warring parties.⁵⁶⁶ The representative of South Africa insisted that, in addition to strengthening the numbers and capabilities of the MONUC forces, the operation should be given a mandate under Chapter VII so that it could effectively carry out the tasks assigned to it.⁵⁶⁷ The representative of Japan acknowledged that, given the seriousness of the situation in the area of Bunia and in order to advance the Ituri pacification process, the MONUC contingent deployed in the region required a “sufficiently robust enforcement mandate”, and expressed his support for granting such a mandate to MONUC. Nevertheless, he asked States to exercise caution, as a strong enforcement mandate for activities, such as providing security under Chapter VII, under circumstances in which certain parties were not participating in the ceasefire agreement or peace accord, would risk changing the extant practices of peacekeeping operations and “plunging the troops into very complicated situations”, in which they might be required to “engage in combat as if they were parties to the conflict”. He concluded that the Council should not “easily” confer such “robust powers” to other peacekeeping operations and that such a mandate “should be given to peacekeepers only in exceptional cases” in which the urgency of the situation made it “absolutely necessary” and in which there were countries willing to contribute troops, as well as the clear prospect that the troops dispatched with such a mandate would contribute to the improvement of the situation.⁵⁶⁸ The representative of the Philippines pointed out that the formation of a Transitional Government in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was only a first step and that the security situation in the Ituri region remained “fragile”. Hence, he endorsed the Secretary-General’s proposal to strengthen MONUC and announced his delegation’s support for an early adoption of the draft resolution, under

⁵⁵⁹ S/PV.4790, p. 7.

⁵⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Mexico); and p. 11 (France).

⁵⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 12 (Guinea); pp. 20-21 (Cameroon); pp. 29-30 (South Africa); p. 31 (Bangladesh); and p. 33 (Brazil).

⁵⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁵⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁵⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 19. Along the same lines, at the 4784th meeting, on 7 July 2003, the representative of Chile endorsed strengthening the Mission’s presence with a mandate that enabled it to provide the necessary protection to the civilian population. See S/PV.4784, p. 15.

⁵⁶⁵ S/PV.4790, p. 22.

⁵⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁵⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30.

⁵⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

Chapter VII of the Charter.⁵⁶⁹ The representative of Nepal endorsed a quick, “fresh decision” by the Council to increase the Mission’s troop strength considerably and to adjust its mandate. He contended that only a “credible MONUC presence” could create confidence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which was critical “to stop hostilities in the Ituri region and elsewhere, to secure the Transitional Government on a firm footing in Kinshasa, and to implement an effective disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme”.⁵⁷⁰

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

At its 4625th meeting, on 16 October 2002, the Security Council held an open debate on the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, during which a number of speakers discussed the possibility of the use of force against Iraq. Several speakers welcomed the decision by Iraq to accept the return of United Nations inspectors on its territory and expressed the view that the Council should seize upon such positive developments by authorizing the immediate return of inspectors to Iraq, which would in turn open the way for the full implementation of all Council resolutions on Iraq.⁵⁷¹

A conspicuous number of speakers stressed that the use of force should be considered as a last resort. Only if it turned out that the inspectors had been prevented from doing their job, and when that had been communicated to the Council should the Council decide on a position to adopt in the face of such a situation.⁵⁷² The representative of Morocco reminded the Council that the “common defence system provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter” was designed in a way that made resorting to the use of force “the very last means available to the Security Council”, after all other means had been exhausted, and emphasized that avoiding the use of force was “central to both the role and the responsibilities of the United Nations,

especially of the Security Council”.⁵⁷³ The representative of Pakistan recalled that most of the resolutions relating to Iraq were adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter with an “explicit implication that enforcement action could be taken by the United Nations, as envisaged in Article 42 of the Charter, to secure compliance with its resolutions”. He underlined that any action involving the use of force should be considered only as a “last resort”, and that Article 42 should not provide the authority to one or more Member States “to resort to force unilaterally and on their own judgment, independently of the Security Council or without its explicit approval”.⁵⁷⁴ The representative of Liechtenstein stressed that ensuring full compliance with the Security Council decisions was indispensable to the Council’s credibility, and that the Council should do “everything possible, and be seen as doing everything possible, to ensure compliance with and implementation of its decisions without resorting to the use of force”.⁵⁷⁵

Similarly, other speakers made reference to the consequences that the use of force would cause. The representatives of Kuwait, Chile and Cambodia commented on the humanitarian impact of any military action against Iraq.⁵⁷⁶ The representative of Switzerland cautioned that the possible use of force should not be considered without account being taken of all the potential short and long-term consequences at the political, security, humanitarian and economic levels.⁵⁷⁷

Other delegations commented on the legitimacy of the use of force against Iraq. A number of speakers underlined that only the United Nations, and specifically the Security Council, could confer international legitimacy to any action against Iraq. The representative of South Africa noted that it would be inconsistent with the spirit and letter of the Charter if the Security Council were to authorize the use of military force against Iraq at a time when Iraq had indicated its willingness to abide by Council resolutions.⁵⁷⁸ The representative of Iraq called on

⁵⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 36-37.

⁵⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39.

⁵⁷¹ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 5 (South Africa); and p. 15 (Algeria).

⁵⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Kuwait); and p. 18 (Pakistan); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 12 (Chile); and p. 13 (Indonesia); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 2 (Morocco); p. 4 (Brazil); p. 13 (Djibouti); p. 14 (Liechtenstein); p. 16 (Angola); pp. 21-22 (Cambodia); and p. 27 (Nepal).

⁵⁷³ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), pp. 2-3.

⁵⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁵⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁵⁷⁶ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 11 (Kuwait); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 12 (Chile); and S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 21 (Cambodia).

⁵⁷⁷ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 5.

⁵⁷⁸ S/PV. 4625 and Corr.1, p. 5.

States to voice their objections to the “aggressive designs of the United States of America against Iraq” as silence “would be the beginning of the end of the collective security system” and would violate the principle of refraining from the use of force.⁵⁷⁹ The representative of Yemen pointed out that launching war solely on the basis of “reading one’s intentions” would open the door to exploding “hotbeds of tension and wars whose roots had been lying dormant”. He stressed that, in many cases, resorting to force illustrated a “shortcoming” more than it provided “evidence of the sensibility and rationality of the decision to use force”.⁵⁸⁰ The representative of Tunisia observed that advocating “an automatic recourse to force”, and “thus prejudging the outcome of inspections”, was unacceptable as it had not yet been established that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction. He underlined that an “ill-advised” act of force would undermine all the principles of the Charter, including the prohibition of the use of force.⁵⁸¹ The representative of India insisted that in contemplating the use of force, the question of legitimacy and the international rule of law were “important”, thus noting that, without an authorization of the Council “any support for a campaign would not be forthcoming”.⁵⁸²

Some speakers envisaged the possibility of the use or threat of use of force if Iraq did not fully comply with its obligations under Council resolutions. The representative of Mexico supported a two-stage action of the Council, the first of which would include the establishment of a revised system of inspections in Iraq. He further remarked that, if Iraq did not comply with the new resolution of the Council, the Council would have to determine, on the basis of the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) and International Atomic Energy Agency reports, whether the non-compliance constituted a threat to international peace and security and “to decide on the measures to be adopted, preferably unanimously, including the possible use of force”.⁵⁸³ The representative of the United States expressed his Government’s hope that the use of force would not become necessary and that the Iraqi regime would give up its weapons of mass destruction.

Otherwise, he cautioned, his country would lead a global coalition to disarm the Iraqi regime.⁵⁸⁴ The representative of Argentina conveyed his confidence that the use of force, as the last resort for the Council, could be avoided, but acknowledged that force, exercised in accordance with the norms of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the authorization of the Council, would become “the only option” once all negotiating mechanisms were exhausted.⁵⁸⁵ The representative of Cameroon asserted that Iraq had failed to comply with multiple Security Council resolutions and if that continued, the Council would have to take appropriate measures to ensure compliance with its decisions, in accordance with the provisions of Article 42.⁵⁸⁶ The representative of New Zealand asserted that if Iraq failed to comply with the inspection regime, the Council would need to make a “clear decision on further action”, and noted that use of force was “clearly not beyond the Council’s contemplation”.⁵⁸⁷

At its 4644th meeting, on 8 November 2002, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 1441 (2002) by which, acting under Chapter VII, it decided that Iraq’s failure to comply with the implementation of the resolution would constitute a further material breach of its obligations. During the debate, the Secretary-General stated that the newly adopted resolution clearly defined Iraq’s obligations to cooperate with the United Nations’ demands, and warned that in the event that Iraq’s defiance continued, the Council would have to face its responsibilities.⁵⁸⁸ The representative of the United States warned that, in “one way or another”, Iraq would be disarmed and stressed that the resolution contained no “hidden triggers” and no “automaticity” with respect to the use of force.⁵⁸⁹ Similarly, the representative of the United Kingdom noted that resolution 1441 (2002) contained no “automaticity”. Should Iraq commit a further breach of its disarmament obligations, the matter would return to the Council for discussion. In that regard he added that he would expect the Council to “then meet its responsibilities”. The disarmament of Iraq by peaceful means remained the preferred option of his delegation. But, if Iraq

⁵⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 9.

⁵⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 14.

⁵⁸¹ Ibid., pp. 23-24.

⁵⁸² S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 10.

⁵⁸³ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, p. 5.

⁵⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 12.

⁵⁸⁵ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 19.

⁵⁸⁶ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, p. 28.

⁵⁸⁷ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 18.

⁵⁸⁸ S/PV. 4644 and Corr.1, p. 2.

⁵⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 3.

chose to reject the final opportunity it had been given, his delegation, he “trusted”, together with other members of the Council, would ensure that the task of disarmament required by the resolutions was completed.⁵⁹⁰ Several representatives, including China, France and the Russian Federation, reiterated that resolution 1441 (2002) did not provide an automatic right to the use of force against Iraq in case of non-compliance.⁵⁹¹ The representative of Ireland noted carefully and welcomed the assurance given by the sponsors that their purpose was to achieve disarmament through inspections, and not to establish a basis for the use of military force. The use of force, he stressed, was, and should remain, a matter of last resort.⁵⁹² In that context, several speakers drew attention to the clearly defined two-stage process outlined in paragraphs 4, 11 and 12 of the resolution. They welcomed the reaffirmation, by those provisions, of the central role of the Council on the issue of Iraq.⁵⁹³ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic declared that his Government had voted in favour of the resolution owing to the assurances received from the representatives of the United States, United Kingdom, France and the Russian Federation that the resolution “would not be used as pretext” or as “a basis for any automatic strikes against Iraq”.⁵⁹⁴

At its 4707th meeting, on 14 February 2003, the Council heard a briefing by the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC on the progress of inspections in Iraq. During the ensuing debate, several representatives, including France and the Russian Federation, urged the Council to reserve the “use of force” for the moment when it became clear that all peaceful means had failed.⁵⁹⁵ The representative of France also added that the use of force was not justified “at this time” and that there was an alternative to war, namely “disarming Iraq through inspections”.⁵⁹⁶ The representative of Angola expressed the view that use of force at this stage would deprive the international community of valuable information that could be provided through

inspections. He therefore appealed to the Council to allow sufficient time for the inspectors to gather the necessary information to “make informed decisions at the appropriate time”.⁵⁹⁷ The representative of Germany warned that military action against Iraq would, in addition to the terrible humanitarian consequences, above all endanger the stability of a “tense and troubled region”. Consequently, he stressed that there should be “no automatism” leading the Council to the use of military force and that “all possible alternatives” needed to be “exhaustively explored”.⁵⁹⁸ By contrast, the representative of the United States expressed the view that the improvements of process, more inspectors and longer inspecting period, would not move the Council away from the central problem — that Iraq had failed to comply with resolution 1441 (2002) — and that the Council would have to consider in the very near future whether it had reached the point where it must face the issue “whether or not it is time to consider serious consequences of the kind intended by resolution 1441 (2002)”.⁵⁹⁹ The representative of Spain stated that if there was no change in the political attitude in Iraq, the Council would be obliged to “assume its responsibilities in the interest of peace and security of the world”, while the representative of the United Kingdom stated that the Council had reached that stage only by doing what the Charter required, which was to back a diplomatic process with a credible threat of force and also, if necessary, to be ready to use that threat of force.⁶⁰⁰

At its 4709th meeting, on 18 and 19 February 2003, the Council continued its discussion regarding Iraq’s compliance with resolution 1441 (2002). During the debate, a number of representatives reiterated their position that the use of force against Iraq should be considered only as a “last resort”, that the time to use military force had not yet arrived, given the progress of the inspections regime, and that therefore the use of force would not be justified at the present stage.⁶⁰¹ The representative of Malaysia recalled that the Council

⁵⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁵⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (France); p. 6 (Mexico); p. 7 (Ireland); p. 8 (Russian Federation); p. 9 (Bulgaria); p. 10 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 11 (Colombia); and p. 13 (China).

⁵⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁵⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Bulgaria); and p. 11 (Colombia).

⁵⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁵⁹⁵ S/PV.4707, p. 11 (France); p. 15 (Chile); p. 22 (Russian Federation); and p. 25 (Pakistan).

⁵⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁵⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁵⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁵⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-21.

⁶⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17 (Spain); and p. 18 (United Kingdom).

⁶⁰¹ S/PV.4709, p. 8 (Kuwait); p. 14 (Algeria); p. 16 (Bahrain); p. 25 (New Zealand); p. 30 (Greece, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 32 (Sudan); S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 6 (Switzerland); and p. 14 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).

had never authorized the use of force “on the basis of a potential threat of violence” and that all past authorizations had been in response to “actual invasions”.⁶⁰² The representative of South Africa stated that, since the inspections process was working and Iraq was showing signs of cooperating more proactively with the inspectors, no information provided thus far would seem to justify the Council abandoning the inspections process and immediately resorting to the threatened “serious consequences”. Recalling that there were no time limits stipulated for inspections in resolution 1441 (2002), he held the view that resorting to war without fully exhausting all other options represented an admission of failure by the Council in carrying out its mandate of maintaining international peace.⁶⁰³ Other delegations emphasized that the right to use force against Iraq could be authorized only by the Security Council and under the Charter of the United Nations.⁶⁰⁴ For instance, the representative of Nigeria characterized as “imperative” that every effort be made to avoid the use of force. He contended that if the use of force became “inescapable” for the enforcement of Council resolutions and for the Council’s credibility, such enforcement action should be the result of the collective will and decisions of the Council, under Article 42 of the Charter.⁶⁰⁵ While recognizing that force could be used only as a last resort, the representative of Iceland concluded his remarks by emphasizing that the Council had to face “its responsibility” in the eventuality that all other means proved inadequate.⁶⁰⁶

At its 4714th meeting, on 7 March 2003, the Council considered the quarterly report of UNMOVIC. A number of speakers shared the view that the inspectors’ reports demonstrated that progress had been achieved in implementing resolution 1441 (2002) and therefore saw no need for a new resolution, pointing instead to the importance of accelerated and strengthened inspections.⁶⁰⁷ While signaling that Iraq’s efforts to comply with resolution 1441 (2002) had been

insufficient, others also called for inspections to continue, although “not indefinitely”.⁶⁰⁸ The representative of France also underlined that the military agenda must not dictate the calendar of inspections, noting that he could not accept an ultimatum as long as inspectors were reporting cooperation, and would not allow a resolution to pass that authorized the automatic use of force.⁶⁰⁹ Similarly, the representative of China opposed a new resolution, “particularly one authorizing the use of force”,⁶¹⁰ while the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic questioned the rationale behind the necessity for “adopting a new resolution allowing the use of military force, as if war were the best and not the worst option” and expressed his hope that peace would prevail over the use of force.⁶¹¹ The representative of Iraq held that the United States and United Kingdom were unable to prove the existence of weapons of mass destruction in his country and aimed at advancing their “private agenda” in the region.⁶¹² In response, the representative of the United Kingdom observed that, since there had not been “active cooperation in the areas which matter” by Iraq, the only way disarmament could be achieved was by backing diplomacy with a credible threat of force. He recalled that “nothing” had ever been “automatic about the threat of force or the use of force”, indicating that the use of force was conditional rather than automatic.⁶¹³ The representative of the United States stressed that the “limited progress” noticed in Iraq’s behaviour was not the result of resolutions or inspectors, but of the “unified political will of the Council” and of the “willingness to use force”, if necessary, to ensure that the disarmament of Iraq was achieved.⁶¹⁴

At its 4717th meeting, on 11 March 2003, the Council continued to discuss the feasibility of a new resolution authorizing the use of force against Iraq. During the debate, a number of speakers voiced opposition to the prospect of an imminent military action against Iraq and underscored the need for the peaceful disarmament of Iraq. In their statements, many delegations expressed the view that inspections

⁶⁰² S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 10.

⁶⁰³ S/PV.4709, pp. 4-5.

⁶⁰⁴ S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 2 (Qatar); p. 13 (Nigeria); p. 15 (Ecuador); p. 26 (Norway); pp. 26-27 (Paraguay); and p. 34 (Belarus).

⁶⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁶⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁶⁰⁷ S/PV.4714, p. 9 (Germany); p. 11 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 17 (Russian Federation); p. 18 (France); and p. 21 (China).

⁶⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 29 (Cameroon); p. 28 (Angola); and p. 34 (Guinea).

⁶⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁶¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁶¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-12.

⁶¹² *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁶¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-27.

⁶¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-17.

were making concrete progress towards a genuine resolution of the question.⁶¹⁵ The representative of Malaysia, speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, expressed his commitment to the “fundamental principles of the non-use of force and of respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and security of all Member States of the United Nations”.⁶¹⁶ Emphasizing that the fundamental issue at stake was the peaceful disarmament of Iraq, the representative of South Africa pointed out that resolution 1441 (2002) was about disarming Iraq through inspections and “not a declaration of war”. He therefore added that the use of military force was not “the best way to bring about democracy or to improve human rights in any country”.⁶¹⁷ The representative of Algeria indicated that, since the inspections were beginning to bear fruit and Iraq was entering into a phase of “proactive” cooperation with the inspectors, everything should be done to avoid the use of force.⁶¹⁸ Similarly, recalling that the latest reports of UNMOVIC and IAEA indicated progress in the cooperation of Iraq, the representative of India stated that force should be resorted to only as “the very last, unavoidable option”, and as authorized by the Council.⁶¹⁹

By contrast, the representative of Canada expressed the view that an open-ended inspections process would relieve the pressure on Iraq to disarm, adding that there was no doubt that Iraq had begun to disarm only when it faced heavy outside pressure. At the same time, he maintained that military action without a Council mandate would risk undermining respect for international law and raise questions about the Security Council and its authority and efficacy. He therefore stated that a message of absolute clarity should be sent by the Council to Baghdad on what was required, namely the following: (a) that the leadership of Iraq should publicly direct all levels of the Government to take all necessary disarmament decisions; (b) that the Council should ask IAEA to bring forward the programme of work urgently, including the list of key remaining disarmament tasks; (c) that the Council should set a deadline of three

weeks for Iraq to demonstrate conclusively that it was implementing those tasks; and (d) that the Council should consider authorizing Member States eventually to use all necessary means to force compliance, unless it concluded that Iraq was complying.⁶²⁰

A number of speakers expressed the view that Iraqi cooperation with UNMOVIC and IAEA had not been immediate, unconditional and active, and that the United Nations inspectors had not received the information necessary to draw conclusions about Iraq’s possession of weapons of mass destruction.⁶²¹ At the same time, some delegations added that the inspections could not go on forever — their time limit must be short and precise, but achievable.⁶²² Several speakers maintained that Iraq had fallen short of what resolution 1441 (2002) required it to do, and had in fact only taken small and belated steps under pressure created by the threat of the use of force. The preceding speakers maintained that the best and perhaps last hope of achieving a peaceful solution was for the Council to send a clear message to Iraq through a new resolution, which set deadlines and included concrete demands that it must fully disarm.⁶²³ In appealing to Council members to support the draft, a number of speakers stated clearly that it was time that the Council faced its responsibilities, adding that the unity of the Council, particularly if force was required, needed to be maintained. For instance, the representative of El Salvador called upon the Council to “assume its lofty responsibilities and give effect to its decisions” under Chapter VII of the Charter.⁶²⁴ In the same way, the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia expressed the view that the Council had to act “in an even firmer manner” and that the inspection process in Iraq could not go on “indefinitely”. He remarked that political pressure and the real threat of the use of force had proven to be the “right

⁶¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8 (Malaysia); pp. 8-9 (South Africa); pp. 11-13 (Algeria); pp. 13-14 (Egypt); and pp. 14-16 (India).

⁶¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁶¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁶¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁶¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

⁶²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-21.

⁶²¹ S/PV.4717, pp. 22-23 (Turkey); pp. 23-24 (Norway); pp. 26-27 (Iceland); and pp. 27-28 (Singapore); S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Philippines); pp. 7-8 (Argentina); and p. 11 (Nicaragua).

⁶²² S/PV.4717, p. 23 (Norway); S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Greece, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 11 (Nicaragua).

⁶²³ S/PV.4717, p. 6 (Kuwait); S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Argentina); p. 10 (El Salvador); p. 17 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); and p. 23 (Colombia).

⁶²⁴ S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), p. 10.

mechanisms” and had yielded results.⁶²⁵ Similarly, the representative of Colombia affirmed that only the threat of the use of force and the unanimous adoption by the Council of resolution 1441 (2002) had made it possible for “certain headway to be made”, but stressed that the use of force should be used as “last resort”.⁶²⁶

At its 4721st meeting, on 19 March 2003, the Council met to discuss Iraq’s progress on complying with relevant Council resolutions. During the debate, several representatives, including those of Germany, France, the Russian Federation and China, expressed the belief that it was still possible to disarm Iraq peacefully, specifically by adhering to the deadlines outlined in the work programme of UNMOVIC, considering the progress made by the inspection regime lately.⁶²⁷ In particular, Germany, echoed by the Russian Federation, stated that, under the existing circumstances, the policy of military intervention had “no credibility”, as there was no basis in the Charter for “regime change by military means”.⁶²⁸ The representative of the Russian Federation underlined that no decision of the Council authorized the use of force against Iraq outside the Charter of the United Nations, nor did it authorize “the violent overthrow of the leadership of a sovereign State”.⁶²⁹ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic noted that the “attempts by some to blame the Security Council” for the failure to adopt a draft resolution authorizing military force against Iraq ignored the fact that the majority of the members of the Council rejected such a draft resolution, “thus rendering the use of the veto unnecessary by any country”.⁶³⁰ By contrast, while expressing regret that the Council had not been able to find an agreed way forward, the United Kingdom reiterated that it had been Iraq’s fundamental failure to disarm over a period of 12 years, despite pleas and pressure from the Council and the whole international community, which had led to the present situation. He also stressed that any action undertaken with regard to this matter would be in accordance with international law and based on relevant resolutions of the

Council.⁶³¹ Similarly, the representative of Spain avowed that the legitimate recourse to the use of force to disarm Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction was based on “the logical linking of resolutions 660 (1990), 678 (1990), 687 (1991) and 1441 (2002), adopted pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter”.⁶³²

At its 4726th meeting, on 26 March 2003, following the commencement of the United States-led military action against Iraq on 20 March 2003, the Council continued its discussion on the use of force against Iraq, with a particular focus on the legality of the military action undertaken. While a number of Member States maintained that the inspections should have been allowed to continue and that Iraq had indeed been actively cooperating with the inspectors,⁶³³ several others held that it was precisely because Iraq had failed to comply with Security Council resolutions that the coalition had been compelled to use force.⁶³⁴ During the debate, several representatives strongly objected to the use of force by coalition members, as a “unilateral” action which had failed to receive the authorization of the Council.⁶³⁵ Recalling the recent resolution adopted in Cairo at the Ministerial level by the League of Arab States, several speakers called the “Anglo-American aggression against Iraq” a flagrant violation of the Charter and of the principles of international law. Among others, the representative of Malaysia, speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, expressed his opposition to unilateral military actions or use of force, including those made without proper authorization from the Council. Pointing out that there was no authorization by the Council for the military action, he further underlined

⁶²⁵ Ibid., p. 17.

⁶²⁶ Ibid., pp. 22-23.

⁶²⁷ S/PV.4721, p. 5 (Germany); p. 5 (France); pp. 7-8 (Russian Federation); pp. 8-10 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 10 (Pakistan); p. 17 (Angola); and p. 18 (China).

⁶²⁸ Ibid., p. 4 (Germany); and p. 8 (Russian Federation).

⁶²⁹ Ibid., p. 8.

⁶³⁰ Ibid., p. 9.

⁶³¹ Ibid., pp. 19-20.

⁶³² Ibid., p. 15.

⁶³³ S/PV.4726, pp. 6-8 (Malaysia, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement); pp. 10-11 (Algeria); pp. 20-21 (South Africa); and pp. 21-23 (Cuba).

⁶³⁴ S/PV.4726, pp. 26-27 (Australia); pp. 25-27 (Singapore); p. 39 (Japan); pp. 39-40 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); pp. 41-42 (Latvia); pp. 42-43 (Nicaragua); and p. 45 (Albania); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 15 (Ethiopia); p. 29 (Spain); and p. 31 (Bulgaria).

⁶³⁵ S/PV.4726, pp. 8-7 (Malaysia, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement); pp. 8-9 (League of Arab States); p. 20 (South Africa); p. 22 (Cuba); pp. 31-32 (Viet Nam); pp. 33-34 (Islamic Republic of Iran); and p. 35 (Lebanon); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), pp. 26-28 (Russian Federation); p. 28 (China); and pp. 28-29 (France).

that the pre-emptive use of force threatened the foundation of international law.⁶³⁶ Similarly, a number of other speakers concurred that the military action was a violation of the Charter, calling it “unilateral action,” an “act of aggression” and a “unilateral attack”.⁶³⁷ The representative of the Russian Federation, echoed by the representative of Yemen, said that it was clear that the use of force against Iraq in an effort to change the political regime of a sovereign State ran counter to the fundamental principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations.⁶³⁸ Other speakers stressed that the “pre-emptive” use of force threatened the foundation of international law.⁶³⁹

By contrast, other Member States argued that failure to have taken action against the Iraqi regime would have been tantamount to tolerating breaches of the law and persistent disregard of the obligations to the United Nations.⁶⁴⁰ The actions of the coalition were, rather, in accordance with international law, they noted, pointing out that resolutions 678 (1990), 687 (1991) and 1441 (2002) provided authority for the use of force to disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction and to restore international peace and security to the region. They stressed that failure to take action to disarm effectively the Iraqi regime would be a serious political and military mistake and would lead to the further undermining of the authority of the United Nations. The representative of the United States, joined by the representative of the United Kingdom, underscored that the coalition, comprising more than 48 countries, was acting to compel Iraq’s compliance with Council resolutions “because the risk of inaction was too great to tolerate”.⁶⁴¹

⁶³⁶ S/PV.4726, p. 8.

⁶³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 19 (Indonesia); pp. 21-22 (Cuba); p. 28 (Brazil); p. 32 (Viet Nam); and p. 9 (United Republic of Tanzania).

⁶³⁸ S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), pp. 26-28.

⁶³⁹ S/PV.4726, p. 8 (Malaysia, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement); p. 13 (Yemen); and p. 32 (Viet Nam).

⁶⁴⁰ S/PV.4726, pp. 14-16 (Kuwait); pp. 24-25 (Poland); p. 27 (Australia); pp. 38-39 (Japan); pp. 39-40 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); pp. 42-43 (Nicaragua); and pp. 47-48 (Mongolia); S/PV. 4726 (Resumption 1), pp. 22-24 (United Kingdom); and pp. 25-26 (United States).

⁶⁴¹ S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), pp. 22-24 (United Kingdom); and pp. 25-26 (United States).

The situation in Sierra Leone

At its 4099th meeting, on 7 February 2000, the Council adopted resolution 1289 (2000) by which it decided to extend the presence on the ground of the military component of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone and to revise its mandate. During the debate preceding the adoption of the resolution, the representative of Sierra Leone welcomed “wholeheartedly” the fact that the revised mandate and the additional responsibilities of UNAMSIL were “fully backed by Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations”.⁶⁴² The representative of the United States acknowledged the need to expand the Mission’s mandate and welcomed the draft resolution that would grant United Nations troops “Chapter VII authority in the discharge of their mandate to take the necessary action to ensure the security and freedom of their personnel”.⁶⁴³ By contrast, the representative of the United Kingdom stressed that, while UNAMSIL was not a Chapter VII peace enforcement operation, his Government recognized in formulating the mandate for the force, that the task would require “a robust and serious stance against possible threats”.⁶⁴⁴

At its 4139th meeting, on 11 May 2000, the Council discussed the situation in Sierra Leone in the context of the abduction of several hundred United Nations peacekeepers in various parts of Sierra Leone. During the debate, many representatives called for a review of the mandate of UNAMSIL, with some of them expressing a preference for a Chapter VII operation.⁶⁴⁵ The representative of Algeria pointed out that the crisis at hand showed “very clearly” that the mandate and resources available to UNAMSIL were not adequate and appealed to the Council to review urgently the Mission’s mandate and then adopt a new resolution placing UNAMSIL action “within the context of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, making it a peace-enforcement mission”.⁶⁴⁶ The representative of Canada called for the Council to recommit itself to establishing a strong and credible

⁶⁴² S/PV.4099, p. 3.

⁶⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁶⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁶⁴⁵ S/PV.4139 and Corr.1 and Corr.2, pp. 4-5 (Algeria, on behalf of the Organization of African Unity); pp. 5-6 (Mali); pp. 8-9 (Canada); pp. 9-10 (Malaysia); pp. 12-13 (Bangladesh); pp. 13-14 (Namibia); pp. 16-17 (Jamaica); pp. 17-18 (Ukraine); and pp. 19-20 (Tunisia).

⁶⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

force in the face of “appalling provocation” on the part of the Revolutionary Unified Party (RUF). He pointed out that the Council should be prepared to revisit the UNAMSIL mandate “in the light of the fundamental changes in the situation on the ground” and to re-examine, on a regular basis, the Mission’s requirements in personnel and capabilities.⁶⁴⁷ The representative of Malaysia expressed the view that the question of the adequacy of the limited Chapter VII mandate given to UNAMSIL should be “promptly examined in the light of the hard realities on the ground and in the context of the changed environment from that originally envisaged”. He reminded the Council that his country had supported a limited Chapter VII mandate because there was “an agreement on the table and because the cooperation of the parties was assured to be forthcoming”. He stated that the reality was different and the response should be recalibrated appropriately.⁶⁴⁸ The representative of Bangladesh highlighted the need for a “much more robust mandate for a long-term solution of the problem in Sierra Leone” and, to make it effective, advocated a “full Chapter VII mandate for UNAMSIL”.⁶⁴⁹ Similarly, the representative of China spoke in favour of the Council adopting “appropriate measures” with respect to the situation in Sierra Leone, including a review of the mandate of UNAMSIL and the adoption of measures to ensure that its mandate was fully implemented. He asked the Secretariat to formulate recommendations in that regard, as soon as possible, for consideration by the Council.⁶⁵⁰

By contrast, other delegations were of the view that the current mandate was sufficient to deal with the situation, as it contained elements of Chapter VII, and that UNAMSIL should be reinforced only in terms of strength and resources.⁶⁵¹ The representative of the United Kingdom expressed the view that the UNAMSIL mandate was “sufficient” for it to carry out its tasks, as it contained elements that allowed for the “use of force in self-defence and, where possible, in defence of the civilian population”. The immediate objective, therefore, was to reinforce UNAMSIL and

“get it up to strength”. He asserted that, as the situation evolved, the decision on the mandate of the Mission would depend on the tasks expected from UNAMSIL. In addition, he agreed with the Secretary-General’s point that changing the Mission’s mandate would not “of itself change it into an effective peace enforcement mission” and stressed that “moving to peace enforcement would be a radical change of approach” which required careful thought.⁶⁵² The representative of the Russian Federation observed that the UNAMSIL mandate under resolution 1289 (2000) allowed sufficiently strong measures to be taken to ensure the safety of international personnel and of the Government of Sierra Leone. He underlined that of “key importance” was “the effective exercise by the military contingent of its mandate”. If fully deployed, he added, UNAMSIL would be able to stabilize the situation.⁶⁵³ Conveying the position of the European Union and associated countries,⁶⁵⁴ the representative of Portugal noted that UNAMSIL had authority, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to use force to ensure the security and freedom of movement of its personnel and to protect civilians, where possible. He therefore called on all States to provide UNAMSIL with the “means deemed necessary for the accomplishment of its mandate”.⁶⁵⁵ The representative of India affirmed that UNAMSIL needed to be “consolidated” as it was unable to implement many of the tasks given to it. He emphasized that, with the new “professional and well-equipped reinforcements,” UNAMSIL should concentrate on measures that would make it impossible for power “to be seized by force”. He further indicated that UNAMSIL already had a Chapter VII mandate to provide security at key locations and Government buildings and to use force in self-defence, and noted that, if all units in UNAMSIL acted “with discipline and courage” in accordance with their current mandate, they would be able to serve the United Nations and the people of Sierra Leone well.⁶⁵⁶ The representative of Jordan held the belief that a reconsideration of the UNAMSIL mandate might lead to “an absence of agreement between the troop contributors”, which would weaken the United Nations position in Sierra Leone. He endorsed the stance taken by India that the mandate should remain unchanged, under Chapter VII

⁶⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 8.

⁶⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 10.

⁶⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 13.

⁶⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 20.

⁶⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 6-8 (United Kingdom); pp. 16-17 (Russian Federation); p. 22 (Portugal on behalf of the European Union); pp. 23-25 (India); p. 27 (Pakistan); and p. 28 (Jordan).

⁶⁵² Ibid., p. 7.

⁶⁵³ Ibid., p. 16.

⁶⁵⁴ Slovakia, Hungary, Czech Republic and Poland.

⁶⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 22.

⁶⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 24.

of the Charter, until the situation in Sierra Leone stabilized.⁶⁵⁷ Similarly, the representative of Pakistan observed that while an adequate mandate had been given to the Mission, the peacekeepers were not adequately equipped to act in line with the mandate. There had to be a balance and linkage between the mandate, composition of forces and operational posture adopted in the field. He stressed that the Council could not allow the peace process in Sierra Leone to fail, “despite invoking Chapter VII elements in the mandate of the Security Council”. He contended that there could not be “different types of Chapter VII missions in different regions” and that, if “Chapter VII missions in other regions” had successfully helped to establish peace, it had to be the case in Sierra Leone as well.⁶⁵⁸ Other speakers expressed their willingness to consider a revision of the UNAMSIL mandate, without however explicitly supporting it.⁶⁵⁹ The representative of Argentina indicated that it might be helpful to review the question of the mandate, and that his country would not oppose “any change in the mandate if it were necessary”. He nevertheless expressed the view that the UNAMSIL mandate was “sufficiently strong” to serve

in the extant circumstances, being able to take all necessary measures to guarantee the security and freedom of movement of its personnel and to protect civilians under imminent threat of physical violence.⁶⁶⁰ While indicating his Government’s willingness to think about reviewing the mandate of UNAMSIL, the representative of France indicated that there should be “true cohesiveness” between the mandate of a force and the size, training and equipment of the contingents responsible for implementation, and opined that this was not “sufficiently” the case for UNAMSIL.⁶⁶¹ The representative of Ukraine voiced support for the “substantial strengthening” and reinforcement of UNAMSIL.⁶⁶² The representative of Japan remarked that it was for the Council to decide between two options: expanding the mandate of the Mission to include the task of peace enforcement by incorporating the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) into the United Nations mission; or entrusting peace enforcement to ECOMOG itself. He suggested that what was “most important” was for the Council to respond promptly, before the situation deteriorated further.⁶⁶³

⁶⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 28.

⁶⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 27.

⁶⁵⁹ Ibid., pp. 14-16 (Argentina); pp. 18-19 (France); and p. 25 (Japan).

⁶⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 15-16.

⁶⁶¹ Ibid., p. 19.

⁶⁶² Ibid., p. 18.

⁶⁶³ Ibid., p. 25.

Part V

Decisions and deliberations having relevance to Articles 43 to 47 of the Charter

Article 43

1. *All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.*

2. *Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.*

3. *The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.*

Article 44

When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a Member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfilment of the obligations assumed under Article 43, invite that Member, if the Member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the

Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces.

Article 45

In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, Members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in Article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 46

Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 47

1. There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament.

2. The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any Member of the United Nations not permanently represented on the Committee shall be invited by the Committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities requires the participation of that Member in its work.

3. The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. Questions relating to the command of such forces shall be worked out subsequently.

4. The Military Staff Committee, with the authorization of the Security Council and after consultation with appropriate regional agencies, may establish regional sub-committees.

Note

During the period under review, the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole paid considerable attention to enhancing peacekeeping efforts and to improving consultations with troop-contributing countries. One major impetus was the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (the Brahimi report), which was released by the Secretary-General on 21 August 2000.⁶⁶⁴ This report took a critical look at past peacekeeping efforts and strove to clarify what United Nations peacekeeping was trying to accomplish and how it might be doing so. Its focus included preventive action, peacebuilding, peacekeeping strategy and concrete operational issues. Among other things, it aimed to improve the rapid deployment of forces and strengthen the surge capacity for planning, preparing and deploying missions. The report also stressed the importance of improved consultations with troop-contributing countries.

On 3 October 2000, the Council established the Security Council Working Group on the Brahimi Report to undertake a full examination of those recommendations in the report which fell within the purview of the Council, in particular peacekeeping operations. On the basis of a draft recommendation by the Working Group, the Council adopted resolution 1327 (2000) of 13 November 2000 in which, inter alia, it underlined the importance of an improved system of consultations among the troop-contributing countries, the Secretary-General and the Security Council, and agreed to strengthen significantly the existing system of consultations.⁶⁶⁵ By a statement of the President dated 31 January 2001,⁶⁶⁶ Council members gave further consideration to the issue and, by resolution 1353 (2001) of 13 June 2001, the Council specified the format, procedures and documentation of meetings with the troop-contributing countries. During the period under review, the Council held three meetings on the item entitled "Strengthening cooperation with

⁶⁶⁴ S/2000/809. On 7 March 2000, the Secretary-General convened a high-level Panel to undertake a thorough review of the United Nations peace and security activities, and to present a clear set of specific, concrete and practical recommendations to assist the United Nations in conducting such activities better in the future. The Chairman of the Panel was Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi.

⁶⁶⁵ Resolution 1327 (2000), annex I.

⁶⁶⁶ S/PRST/2001/3.

troop-contributing countries”,⁶⁶⁷ and held 54 private meetings with troop-contributing countries, pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001).

During the period under review, the Council did not explicitly refer to Articles 43 and 44 of the Charter in any of its decisions. The Council, however, adopted decisions by which it called upon States to enforce demands related to the maintenance of peace and security, and which are therefore of relevance to the interpretation of Articles 43 and 44.⁶⁶⁸ During the same period, the Council did not adopt any resolutions referring to Article 45 of the Charter, nor was there any constitutional discussion regarding the application and interpretation of this Article. By two resolutions, in accordance with the principles enshrined in Articles 46 and 47, the Council undertook to consider, inter alia, the possibility of using the Military Staff Committee as one of the means of enhancing the United Nations peacekeeping capacity.⁶⁶⁹

The following overview is divided into six sections. Section A contains decisions of the Council by which it imposed measure based on the principles of Article 43, and section B attempts to draw out the salient issues raised in the Council’s deliberations relevant to Article 43. Section C provides an overview of the Council’s decisions that may be interpreted as having reference to the principles contained in Article 44, while part D outlines the relevant discussion in that connection which took place in the Council’s deliberations. Section E outlines the Council’s decisions relating to the Military Staff Committee (Articles 46-47 of the Charter), and is followed by section F which attempts to identify the salient issues raised in the Council’s deliberations relevant to Articles 46 to 47.

A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 43

The situation in Afghanistan

By resolution 1386 (2001) of 20 December 2001, the Council established the International Security

⁶⁶⁷ S/PV.4257 and Resumption 1, S/PV.4270 and S/PV.4326.

⁶⁶⁸ See chapter V for additional details on arrangements concerning peacekeeping missions and other measures used by subsidiary organs of the Council to give effect to its decisions.

⁶⁶⁹ Resolution 1327 (2000), annex IV; and resolution 1353 (2001), annex I.C.

Assistance Force for six months and called upon Member States to contribute personnel, equipment and other resources to it. It also encouraged neighbouring States and other Member States to provide to ISAF such necessary assistance as might be requested, including the provision of overflight clearances and transit.⁶⁷⁰ Subsequent resolutions extending the Mission’s mandate made similar requests for contributions.⁶⁷¹

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

By resolution 1305 (2000) of 21 June 2000, the Council authorized the Member States, acting through or in cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), to continue the multinational Stabilization Force established in accordance with its resolution 1088 (1996) for a further planned period of 12 months under unified command and control. The resolution invited all States, in particular those in the region, to continue to provide appropriate support and facilities, including transit facilities, for the Member States participating in SFOR. It also requested the Member States, acting through or in cooperation with NATO, to continue to report to the Council, through the appropriate channels and at least at monthly intervals.⁶⁷²

The situation in Côte d’Ivoire

By resolution 1464 (2003) of 4 February 2003, the Council authorized Member States participating in the Economic Community of West African States forces, in accordance with Chapter VIII, together with the French forces supporting them, to take the necessary steps to guarantee the security and freedom of movement of their personnel and to ensure the protection of civilians immediately threatened with physical violence within their zones of operation, using the means available to them, for a period of six months.

The resolution also called upon all States neighbouring Côte d’Ivoire to support the peace process by preventing any action that might undermine

⁶⁷⁰ Resolution 1386 (2001), paras. 1, 2 and 7.

⁶⁷¹ Resolutions 1413 (2002), para. 3; and 1444 (2002), para. 3. By resolution 1510 (2003), the Council strengthened the mandate of ISAF but did not make a renewed call for contributions.

⁶⁷² Resolution 1305 (2000), paras. 10, 16 and 18.

the security and territorial integrity of Côte d'Ivoire, particularly the movement of armed groups and mercenaries across their borders and illicit trafficking and proliferation of arms in the region, including small arms and light weapons.⁶⁷³

By resolution 1498 (2003) of 4 August 2003, the Council extended the Mission's mandate and requested ECOWAS, through the command of its force, and France to report to the Council periodically, through the Secretary-General, on all aspects of the implementation of their respective mandates.⁶⁷⁴

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

By resolution 1291 (2000) of 24 February 2000, the Council decided that the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo would establish, under the overall authority of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, a joint structure with the Joint Military Commission that would ensure close coordination during the period of deployment of MONUC.⁶⁷⁵

By resolution 1332 (2000) of 14 December 2000, the Council endorsed the proposal made by the Secretary-General to deploy, as soon as he considered that conditions would allow it and in accordance with the relevant provisions of resolution 1291 (2000), additional military observers, to monitor and verify the parties' implementation of the ceasefire and disengagement plans adopted in Maputo and Lusaka. It also expressed its readiness to support the Secretary-General, as soon as he considered that conditions would allow it, in the deployment of infantry units in support of the military observers in Kisangani and Mbandaka.⁶⁷⁶

By resolution 1355 (2001) of 15 June 2001, the Council updated the concept of operations put forward by the Secretary-General in his report of 8 June 2001, requested the Secretary-General to deploy military observers in locations where early withdrawal was implemented, with a view to monitoring the process, and reiterated the authorization contained in resolution 1291 (2000) for up to 5,537 military personnel for MONUC, including observers as deemed necessary by

the Secretary-General. It also stressed the need for the co-location of the Joint Military Commission with MONUC in Kinshasa and reaffirmed that it was ready to support the Secretary-General, if and when he deemed it necessary and when conditions allowed it, to further deploy military personnel in the border areas in the east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC).⁶⁷⁷

By resolution 1417 (2002) of 14 June 2002, the Council extended the mandate of MONUC until 30 June 2003 and called upon Member States to contribute personnel to enable the Mission to reach its authorized strength of 5,537, including observers, within the time frame outlined in its concept of operation. It also took note of the recommendation by the Secretary-General for a troop ceiling increase and expressed its intention to consider authorizing it as soon as further progress had been achieved.⁶⁷⁸

By resolution 1493 (2003) of 28 July 2003, the Council extended and expanded the mandate of MONUC until 30 July 2004.⁶⁷⁹ It authorized an increase in the military strength of the Mission to 10,800 personnel. By the same resolution, the Council also encouraged MONUC, in coordination with other United Nations agencies, donors and non-governmental organizations, to provide assistance for the reform of the security forces, the re-establishment of a State based on the rule of law and the preparation and holding of elections, and welcomed the efforts of the Member States to support the transition and national reconciliation.⁶⁸⁰

The situation in Timor-Leste

By resolution 1410 (2002) of 17 May 2002, the Council established the United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor, authorizing the Mission to take the necessary actions to fulfil its mandate which consisted of the following elements: (a) to provide assistance to core administrative structures critical to the viability and political stability of East Timor; (b) to provide interim law enforcement and public security and to assist in the development of a new law enforcement agency in East Timor, the East Timor

⁶⁷³ Resolution 1464 (2003), paras. 9 and 11.

⁶⁷⁴ Resolution 1498 (2003), paras. 1 and 2.

⁶⁷⁵ Resolution 1291 (2000), para. 6.

⁶⁷⁶ Resolution 1332 (2000), paras. 4 and 8.

⁶⁷⁷ Resolution 1355 (2001), paras. 31, 33, 38 and 39.

⁶⁷⁸ Resolution 1417 (2002), paras. 1, 2 and 3.

⁶⁷⁹ Resolution 1493 (2003), paras. 2, 6, 7, 17, 19, 25, 26 and 27.

⁶⁸⁰ Resolution 1493 (2003), paras. 3 and 5.

Police Service; and (c) to contribute to the maintenance of the external and internal security of East Timor.⁶⁸¹

By the same resolution, the Council also decided that the Mission was to be headed by a Special Representative of the Secretary-General and should consist of the following: (a) a civilian component comprising an office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General with focal points for gender and HIV/AIDS, a civilian support group of up to 100 personnel filling core functions, a serious crimes unit and a human rights unit; (b) a civilian police component initially comprised of 1,250 officers; and (c) a military component with an initial strength of up to 5,000 troops, including 120 military observers. The Council also urged Member States, international agencies and organizations to provide support “as requested by the Secretary-General”, in particular in support of the full establishment of the East Timor Police Service and East Timor Defence Force.⁶⁸²

By resolution 1473 (2003) of 4 April 2003, the Council decided that the composition and strength of the police component of UNMISSET and the schedule for its downsizing should be adjusted in line with paragraphs 33 and 35 of the special report of the Secretary-General dated 3 March 2003,⁶⁸³ and should include the following specific measures: (a) inclusion of an internationally formed unit for one year; (b) provision of additional training capacity in key areas specified in the special report of the Secretary-General; (c) greater emphasis on human rights and rule of law elements; (d) retention of a greater monitoring and advisory presence in districts where policing authority had been handed over to the Timor-Leste Police Force; (e) follow-up to the recommendations outlined in the report of the Joint Assessment Mission on policing of November 2002; and (f) adjustment of planning for the gradual transfer of policing authority to the Timor-Leste Police Force.⁶⁸⁴ The Council further decided that the schedule for the downsizing of the military component of UNMISSET for the period up until December 2003 should be adjusted in line with the letter of 28 March 2003 from the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations addressed to the members of the Security Council; and, accordingly, that two battalions be retained within regions adjoining

⁶⁸¹ Resolution 1410 (2002), para. 2.

⁶⁸² Resolution 1410 (2002), paras. 3, 6 and 9.

⁶⁸³ S/2003/243.

⁶⁸⁴ Resolution 1473 (2003), para. 1.

the Tactical Coordination Line during that period, together with associated force elements, including mobility; and that the number of military peacekeepers should be reduced to 1,750 more gradually than was foreseen in resolution 1410 (2002). Finally, the Council requested the Secretary-General to provide for approval by the Security Council, by 20 May 2003, a detailed military strategy for the revised schedule for the downsizing of the military component of UNMISSET, and also to keep the Council closely and regularly informed of developments on the ground and on the implementation of the revised military and police strategies.⁶⁸⁵

By resolution 1480 (2003) of 19 May 2003, the Council took note of the military strategy outlined by the Secretary-General in his report dated 21 April 2003,⁶⁸⁶ and decided to extend the mandate of UNMISSET until 20 May 2004.⁶⁸⁷

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

By resolution 1511 (2003) of 16 October 2003, the Council authorized a multinational force under a unified command to take all necessary measures to contribute to the maintenance of security and stability in Iraq. In that connection, the Council urged Member States to contribute assistance, including military forces, to the multinational force and requested that the United States, on behalf of the multinational force, report to the Council on the efforts and progress of this force, as appropriate, and not less than every six months.⁶⁸⁸

The situation in Sierra Leone

By resolution 1289 (2000) of 7 February 2000, the Council decided that the military component of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone would be expanded to a maximum of 11,100 military personnel, subject to periodic review in the light of conditions on the ground and the progress made in the peace process. It stressed the importance of a smooth transition between the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group and UNAMSIL and urged all

⁶⁸⁵ Resolution 1473 (2003), paras. 2, 3 and 4.

⁶⁸⁶ S/2003/449.

⁶⁸⁷ Resolution 1480 (2003), para. 1.

⁶⁸⁸ Resolution 1511 (2003), paras. 14 and 25.

those concerned to consult over the timing of troop movements and withdrawals.⁶⁸⁹

By resolution 1299 (2000) of 19 May 2000, the Council decided that the military component of UNAMSIL would be expanded to a maximum of 13,000 military personnel. It also expressed its appreciation to all States that, to expedite the rapid reinforcement of UNAMSIL, had accelerated the deployment of their troops to UNAMSIL, made available additional personnel, and offered logistical, technical and other forms of military assistance, and called upon all those in a position to do so to provide further support.⁶⁹⁰

By resolution 1313 (2000) of 4 August 2000, the mandate of UNAMSIL was extended with the stated intention of strengthening its structure, capability and resources. Towards that end, the Council considered that the military component of UNAMSIL should be reinforced through accelerated troop rotations, as appropriate, and with further aviation and maritime assets, a strengthened force reserve, upgraded communications and specialist combat and logistic support assets. The Council stressed that the successful achievement of the objectives of the Mission would depend on the provision of fully equipped, complete units to UNAMSIL, with the required capabilities, effective command and control structure and capacity, a single chain of command, adequate resources and the commitment to implement the mandate of the Mission in full as authorized by the Council.⁶⁹¹

By resolution 1334 (2000) of 22 December 2000, the Council strongly urged all States in a position to do so seriously to consider contributing peacekeeping forces for Sierra Leone, and expressed its appreciation to those States who had already made such offers. It also expressed its intention, following consultations with troop-contributing countries, to respond promptly to any additional specific recommendations made by the Secretary-General in the next period on the force, strength and tasks of UNAMSIL.⁶⁹²

By resolution 1346 (2001) of 30 March 2001, the Council further extended the mandate of UNAMSIL and decided to increase its military component as recommended by the Secretary-General in his

report.⁶⁹³ It also expressed its appreciation to those Member States who had provided additional troops and support elements to UNAMSIL, and those who had made commitments to do so. The Council encouraged the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to seek, if necessary, further properly trained and equipped forces to strengthen the military components of UNAMSIL to enable the Mission to implement fully its revised concept of operations, and requested the Secretary-General to inform the Council upon receipt of firm commitments to that end.⁶⁹⁴

By four subsequent resolutions, the Council further extended the mandate of UNAMSIL and expressed its appreciation to those Member States who had provided troops and support elements to UNAMSIL, and to those who had made commitments to do so.⁶⁹⁵ In one of the resolutions it also urged Member States able to do so to provide qualified civilian police trainers and advisers, and resources, to help the Sierra Leone Police fulfil its size and capacity targets.⁶⁹⁶

Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa

By resolution 1318 (2000) of 7 September 2000, the Council underlined the importance of enhancing the United Nations capacity for rapid deployment of peacekeeping operations and urged Member States to provide sufficient and timely resources. The Council also welcomed the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations and decided to consider the recommendations which fell within its area of responsibility expeditiously.⁶⁹⁷

Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security

By resolution 1327 (2000), the Security Council resolved, inter alia, to give peacekeeping operations clear, credible and achievable mandates. It also

⁶⁸⁹ Resolution 1289 (2000), paras. 9 and 14.

⁶⁹⁰ Resolution 1299 (2000), paras. 1 and 2.

⁶⁹¹ Resolution 1313 (2000), paras. 1, 3, 4 and 6.

⁶⁹² Resolution 1334 (2000), paras. 4, 5 and 6.

⁶⁹³ S/2001/228.

⁶⁹⁴ Resolution 1346 (2001), paras. 1, 2 and 4.

⁶⁹⁵ Resolutions 1370 (2001), paras. 1 and 2; 1400 (2002), paras. 1 and 2; 1436 (2002), paras. 1 and 2; and 1470 (2003), paras. 1 and 2.

⁶⁹⁶ Resolution 1470 (2003), para. 10.

⁶⁹⁷ Resolution 1318 (2000), annexes III and IV.

recognized that the problem of the commitment gap with regard to personnel and equipment for peacekeeping operations required the assumption by all Member States of the shared responsibility to support United Nations peacekeeping.⁶⁹⁸

B. Discussion relating to Article 43

The situation in Sierra Leone

At its 4139th meeting, on 11 May 2000, the Council met to discuss the deterioration of the situation in Sierra Leone, including the detention of several hundred United Nations peacekeepers in various parts of the country. During the debate several tributes were paid to troop-contributing countries, and a discussion took place on whether the peacekeeping force had been sufficiently mandated and equipped. The representative of Algeria, while advocating a review of the UNAMSIL mandate within the context of Chapter VII of the Charter, informed the Council of the willingness of certain members of ECOWAS, as stated at the Abuja summit of 9 May 2000, to make the necessary troops available to the United Nations to strengthen its Mission in Sierra Leone. He further appealed to countries with the necessary resources to offer an appropriate logistic and financial contribution to UNAMSIL so that it could best discharge its revised mandate.⁶⁹⁹ The representative of the United Kingdom reported that his country had taken a number of “important steps” to support UNAMSIL, in particular by deploying the British Spearhead Battalion to Freetown securing the Lungi airport, thus freeing up UNAMSIL troops to concentrate on their wider tasks. He also pointed out that, at United Nations request, a United Kingdom military advisory team was also sent to Freetown to help the United Nations assess what technical support was needed to strengthen UNAMSIL. He stated that the Council should be ready to do anything necessary to assist in the reinforcement of UNAMSIL and that the United Kingdom would continue to offer technical and logistical support to help strengthen the Mission. He welcomed the willingness of the ECOWAS leaders, following their summit meeting in Abuja on 9 May, to consider, in the event of any new involvement of regional forces in Sierra Leone, the practical modalities of such

involvement and, in that connection, warned that new troops should be “blue-hatted, properly equipped for the job they have to do, under a single United Nations chain of command and with the same rules of engagement”.⁷⁰⁰ The representative of Canada, recognizing the importance of a peacekeeping effort that was “truly multilateral and under the United Nations flag”, encouraged Member States to work towards the creation of a “strong, united and cohesive force” that should take the form of “an expanded UNAMSIL and should respect the fundamental military principle of unity of command”. He added that his country would offer an airlift for rapid deployment of troops from India and Bangladesh and that Canada was considering increasing its assistance to UNAMSIL troops, which were without sufficient equipment.⁷⁰¹ Similarly, the representative of the United States stated that his country would “assist the deployment of additional troops for UNAMSIL”.⁷⁰² In his statement, the representative of Malaysia expressed the view that, among the immediate priorities for UNAMSIL, the Mission should strengthen its presence by regrouping in larger numbers to enable the force to better defend itself in case of rebel attack. He believed that the time had come for the Council to consider the “possible next steps”, including as a priority the dispatch of a rapid reaction force to Sierra Leone for the purpose of stabilizing the situation and putting the political process “back on track”. Although supporting the idea that ECOMOG should play a pivotal role in helping the international community to restore order in the country, he stated that, under the present circumstances, all countries deploying troops in Sierra Leone should come under “the United Nations banner and under one command structure”, with adequate resources.⁷⁰³ The representative of Bangladesh stressed the need to bolster UNAMSIL by bringing it up to its mandated strength at the earliest date, by deploying “additional numbers on the ground”. In that regard, he informed the Council that the battalion his country promised to the Mission would be ready for airlifting along with all its equipment by 20 May 2000. He maintained that the Council should look into the possibility of mobilizing more troops, and stated his appreciation for the ECOWAS countries that expressed their intention of providing extra forces to bring stability to Sierra

⁶⁹⁸ Resolution 1327 (2000), annex I.

⁶⁹⁹ S/PV.4139 and Corr.1 and Corr.2, p. 5.

⁷⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

⁷⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁷⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁷⁰³ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

Leone. He cautioned, however, that the entire military presence on the ground should be under an integrated United Nations command with “one mandate provided by the Security Council”.⁷⁰⁴ Similarly, the representative of Namibia advocated that UNAMSIL be strengthened, and welcomed the decision of ECOWAS to put ECOMOG troops immediately at the disposal of UNAMSIL and their integration into the Mission. He added that many troop-contributing countries did not have the equipment that would make “a Chapter VII mandate meaningful” and thus appealed to those in a position to do so to contribute equipment to UNAMSIL. He further stated that the Council should not “abdicate” its responsibility in Sierra Leone and “pass it to ECOMOG”, unless ECOMOG could be provided with financial and logistical support.⁷⁰⁵ The representative of Argentina emphasized the need to speed up the transportation of the battalions that had been pledged in order to provide the required number of troops and the equipment required to deal with the current situation. He supported the Secretary-General’s request to increase the number of troops to 11,100, as quickly as possible.⁷⁰⁶ Similarly, the representative of the Russian Federation attached paramount importance to the speedy increase of UNAMSIL to 11,100 soldiers and officers. He specified that his country was at that time addressing with the United Nations the practical issues of providing an airlift to Sierra Leone for additional units for UNAMSIL and of sending a number of Russian military helicopters to Sierra Leone.⁷⁰⁷ In his statement, the representative of Jamaica commended the countries which had pledged rapidly to increase the troop strength of the Mission, endorsed the integration of ECOMOG troops into UNAMSIL, and called upon the international community to commit the necessary funding and the logistical expertise as required.⁷⁰⁸ Echoing the previous speaker, the representative of Ukraine supported a substantial reinforcement of UNAMSIL by increasing its “combat capabilities” and by ensuring that the Mission was properly equipped and performing its functions under the United Nations chain of command. He confirmed his country’s availability to support the reinforced Mission and, in that regard, he recalled that Ukraine was already involved in

providing airlift support for the needs of UNAMSIL.⁷⁰⁹ The representative of France voiced his support for any proposal of the Secretary-General to reinforce UNAMSIL “with Blue Helmets” and stated that France stood ready to think about reviewing the mandate of the force to take into account the unilateral breaking of the Lomé Agreement by the Revolutionary United Front.⁷¹⁰ Supporting the strengthening of UNAMSIL through ECOWAS troops, the representative of Tunisia held the view that, for effective implementation, sufficient equipment and appropriate financial and logistical support should be given to the peacekeeping force under UNAMSIL command.⁷¹¹ Speaking on behalf of the European Union and associated countries,⁷¹² the representative of Portugal encouraged all States in a position to do so to assist and provide the means deemed necessary for the accomplishment of the Mission’s mandate. He echoed the words of the Secretary-General by inviting the Council to “back words with deeds, and mandates with resources needed to make them work”.⁷¹³ The representative of India informed the Council that his country was sending a second battalion urgently, together with other reinforcements, to bolster the Mission’s strength. He emphasized that, in the current crisis, it would be essential to preserve the unity of command of UNAMSIL, which should function as “a cohesive force”, and warned that undermining the leadership of UNAMSIL was “fraught with dangerous consequences for the Mission as a whole and for the troops under its command”.⁷¹⁴ The representative of Pakistan stated that, in carrying out their mandate, peacekeepers in Sierra Leone were mandated to take the necessary action to ensure the security and freedom of UNAMSIL personnel and, within their capabilities and areas of deployment, to afford protection to civilians under imminent threat of physical violence. According to the speaker, while an adequate mandate was given to the Mission to address such situations as hostage-taking, the peacekeepers deployed on the ground were not adequately equipped to act in accordance with the mandate. He therefore requested the Secretariat to assess what went wrong in the planning and deployment of peacekeepers in Sierra Leone, including

⁷⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 13.

⁷⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 14.

⁷⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 14.

⁷⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 16.

⁷⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 17.

⁷⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 18.

⁷¹⁰ Ibid., p. 18.

⁷¹¹ Ibid., pp. 19-20.

⁷¹² Slovakia, Hungary, Czech Republic and Poland.

⁷¹³ Ibid., p. 22.

⁷¹⁴ Ibid., p. 24.

the configuration of the force, to ensure that in the future the security component of a peacekeeping mission would serve as an asset rather than become a liability. He concluded by remarking that his country wished to see a practical concept of operation and configuration of force capable of supporting the implementation of the mandate of the Mission, such that its success did not depend only on the declared intentions of the parties involved in the conflict.⁷¹⁵ The representative of Jordan reported that his country was in the process of reinforcing UNAMSIL by committing two extra companies drawn from the country's special forces, as well as another battalion within a few days. He thus appealed to the Council not to consider "new initiatives" during the process of deployment of the Jordanian troops.⁷¹⁶

Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security

At its 4220th meeting, on 13 November 2000, the Council considered the report of the Security Council Working Group on the Brahimi Report,⁷¹⁷ which included a draft resolution containing decisions and recommendations to strengthen United Nations peacekeeping operations. The draft resolution was subsequently adopted unanimously, without change, as resolution 1327 (2000). A key point in resolution 1327 (2000), as noted by many representatives in their statements following the voting, was the Council's resolve to give peacekeeping operations clear, credible and achievable mandates.⁷¹⁸ Several representatives noted the importance of rapid deployment and admitted that there was a gap between Council mandates and the commitments by Member States to make them achievable.⁷¹⁹ The representative of Bangladesh explicitly referred to Article 43 and stated that his country had proposed the inclusion of a paragraph in the draft resolution which would have addressed the

commitment gap. He proposed that "the Council recognize that the contribution of troops by Member States possessing the greatest capacity and means, particularly permanent members of the Security Council, is critically important for bridging the commitment gap, facilitating rapid deployment and further increasing the operational effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping operations". His delegation therefore suggested that each of the permanent members agree to provide at least 5 per cent, or another agreed percentage, of the troops for each United Nations peacekeeping operation.⁷²⁰ However, the proposal was not included in the resolution adopted.

Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries

At its 4257th meeting, on 16 January 2001, the Council held an open debate on the item entitled "Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries". In his statement, the representative of Zambia noted that, whenever the use of peacekeeping forces was contemplated, the Security Council should adhere to the provisions of Article 43 and Article 44 of the Charter.⁷²¹ Similarly, the representative of Mali stated that his country "would like us to be able to invoke Articles 43 and 44 whenever useful and whenever possible".⁷²²

C. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 44

Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa

By resolution 1318 (2000) of 7 September 2000, the Council affirmed its determination to strengthen United Nations peacekeeping operations by, among other things, strengthening consultations with troop-contributing countries when deciding on such operations.⁷²³

⁷¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁷¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁷¹⁷ S/2000/1084.

⁷¹⁸ S/PV.4220, p. 3 (Jamaica); p. 5 (United States and Bangladesh); p. 9 (Canada); p. 9 (Russian Federation); p. 10 (Argentina); p. 11 (United Kingdom); p. 13 (Tunisia); p. 14 (Ukraine); p. 16 (Mali); and p. 16 (Netherlands). See also resolution 1327 (2000), annex I, first paragraph.

⁷¹⁹ S/PV.4220, p. 5 (United States); p. 6 (Bangladesh); p. 9 (Canada); p. 15 (Ukraine); and p. 16 (Mali).

⁷²⁰ S/PV.4220, p. 6.

⁷²¹ S/PV.4257, p. 25.

⁷²² *Ibid.*, p. 21. For a more detailed summary of the debate, see section D, "Discussion relating to Article 44".

⁷²³ Resolution 1318 (2000), annex III.

Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security

By resolution 1327 (2000) of 13 November 2000, the Security Council (a) encouraged the Secretary-General to begin his consultations with potential troop contributors well in advance of the establishment of peacekeeping operations, and requested him to report on his consultations during the consideration of new mandates; (b) underlined the importance of an improved system of consultations among the troop-contributing countries, the Secretary-General and the Council, to foster a common understanding of the situation on the ground, of the mandate of the mission and of its implementation; (c) agreed, in that regard, to strengthen significantly the existing system of consultations through the holding of private meetings with troop-contributing countries, including at their request and without prejudice to the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, in particular when the Secretary-General had identified potential troop-contributing countries for a new or ongoing peacekeeping operation, during the implementation phase of an operation, when considering a change in, or renewal or completion of a peacekeeping mandate, or when a rapid deterioration in the situation on the ground threatened the safety and security of United Nations peacekeepers; and (d) welcomed the proposals of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations for improving the capacity of the United Nations to deploy military, civilian police and other personnel rapidly, including through the United Nations standby-arrangements system, and urged the Secretary-General to consult current and potential troop-contributing countries on how best to achieve this important objective.⁷²⁴

Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries

Following an open debate on strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries at the 4257th meeting, on 16 January 2001,⁷²⁵ the Council made two related decisions under the item during the period under review.

⁷²⁴ Resolution 1327 (2000), annexes I, II and IV.

⁷²⁵ For a detailed summary of the debate, see section D, "Discussion relating to Article 44".

By a statement of the President dated 31 January 2001,⁷²⁶ the Council decided to establish a Working Group of the Whole on United Nations peacekeeping operations. While not replacing the private meetings with the troop-contributing countries, the Working Group was to address both generic peacekeeping issues relevant to the responsibilities of the Council and technical aspects of individual peacekeeping operations without prejudice to the competence of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations. As a first step, the Working Group was given the task of undertaking an in-depth consideration of, inter alia, all the proposals made in the course of the Council's 4257th meeting, including ways to improve the three-way relationship between the Council, the troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat.

At its 4326th meeting, on 13 June 2001, the Council resumed its consideration of the item entitled "Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries", and had before it the first report of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations.⁷²⁷ On the basis of a draft resolution contained in the report, the Council adopted resolution 1353 (2001) of 13 June 2001 which, inter alia, stressed the need to improve the relationship between the Security Council, the troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat to foster a spirit of partnership, cooperation, confidence and mutual trust. It also encouraged Member States to take steps to bridge the commitment gap with regard to personnel and equipment for specific United Nations peacekeeping operations.⁷²⁸ Annex II of the resolution laid out the format, procedures and documentation of meetings with the troop-contributing countries.

D. Discussion relating to Article 44

The situation in Sierra Leone

At its 4139th meeting, on 11 May 2000, the Council discussed, inter alia, a possible revision of the mandate for UNAMSIL. With respect to a review of the mandate and an increase of troops on the ground, the representative of India stated that he expected that troop contributors would be "associated in the

⁷²⁶ S/PRST/2001/3.

⁷²⁷ S/2001/546.

⁷²⁸ Resolution 1353 (2001), eighth preambular paragraph and annex I.A, second paragraph.

Council's decision-making process, in the spirit of Article 44 of the Charter".⁷²⁹

Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries

At its 4257th meeting, on 16 January 2001, the Council held an open debate on the item entitled "Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries", during which 37 speakers, including representatives of 21 troop-contributing countries and the Deputy Secretary-General, addressed the Council.⁷³⁰

The representative of Egypt stated that measures to strengthen the relationship between the troop-contributing countries and the Security Council should lead to the participation by those countries in the Council's decision-making process "at all stages of the establishment, deployment and withdrawal of a peacekeeping operation", especially when the use of force was involved, "as provided for clearly in Article 44 of the Charter of the United Nations".⁷³¹ Similarly, the representative of Zambia noted that, whenever the use of peacekeeping forces was contemplated, the Security Council should adhere to the provisions of Article 43 and Article 44 of the Charter.⁷³² The representative of New Zealand affirmed that the question of strengthening cooperation with troop contributors should be approached from the perspective that the Charter guarantees, under Article 44, those troop contributors who are not members of the Council the right to be heard by the Council, "at the very least". Echoing previous speakers, he noted that the Charter included provisions contemplating the invitation of troop contributors to participate in the decisions of the Council concerning the employment of their contingents. He therefore maintained that those provisions should be considered as a "starting point in considering the possible establishment of new

mechanisms and the procedural issues that flow therefrom". He concluded by affirming that Article 44 should be given "due weight in United Nations peacekeeping in the twenty-first century".⁷³³ The representative of Malaysia emphasized the need to establish a formalized mechanism of consultations between the Council and troop-contributing countries in order "to give effect to Article 44 of the Charter". In this connection, he added that meetings with troop-contributing countries could be made "more interactive and useful and less ritualistic if they were convened well ahead of the renewal of a peacekeeping operation, not just before, as is often the case".⁷³⁴ The representative of Bangladesh asserted that, as a policy issue, his country strongly favoured the involvement of troop-contributing countries in the decisions of the Council in accordance with the provisions of Article 44 of the Charter of the United Nations.⁷³⁵ Similarly, the representative of Mali stated that it should be possible "to invoke Articles 43 and 44 whenever useful and whenever possible".⁷³⁶

During the debate, several representatives referred to a proposal contained in the Brahimi report but not included in resolution 1327 (2000) that suggested the institutionalization of consultations with the troop-contributing countries through the establishment of ad hoc subsidiary organs of the Council, as provided for in Article 29.⁷³⁷ The representative of India, in referring to that proposal, expressed disappointment that this "attempt to arrive at an appropriate mechanism of mutually advantageous communication between troop contributors and the Council" was seen as "root canal work by the Council, particularly when this is an obligation on the Council and not an indulgence by it". Maintaining that the Council, when the use of force was being authorized, should implement Articles 43 and 44 of the Charter, he further specified that Article 44 stipulated that troop-contributing countries should "participate in the Council's decisions, not just be consulted".⁷³⁸ The representative of the Republic of Korea noted that what mattered was not the number of times troop-contributing countries were briefed or allowed to speak

⁷²⁹ S/PV.4139 and Corr.1 and Corr.2, p. 24.

⁷³⁰ Prior to the 4257th meeting, by a letter dated 8 January 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/21), the representative of Singapore announced his country's intention, during its Presidency, to hold an open debate on strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries. The letter also contained two papers on the subject, providing background information to the issue as well as suggesting some specific questions that could be addressed by the participants in the open debate.

⁷³¹ S/PV.4257, p. 24.

⁷³² *Ibid.*, p. 25.

⁷³³ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁷³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁷³⁵ S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

⁷³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁷³⁷ S/2000/809, para. 61.

⁷³⁸ S/PV.4257, pp. 8 and 11.

in the Council, but the degree to which they could substantially contribute to the decision-making process of peacekeeping operations.⁷³⁹ Similarly, the representative of Canada pointed out that the main issue was not a proper communication or consultation process with troop-contributing countries, even though improvements were possible, but that of better “cooperation and participation”.⁷⁴⁰ The representative of Argentina stated that, notwithstanding the fact that the Council had exclusive decision-making power, the Council’s decisions directly affected troop contributors, “since the risks of the operations fell mainly on their shoulders”.⁷⁴¹ The representative of Nigeria felt the need for better coordination and consultation between troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat. That, in his view, was the best way to forge trust and understanding among the various stakeholders and to ensure the success of the various United Nations peacekeeping operations. He added that, while the Council was responsible for issuing mandates and the Secretariat for logistics and administration through the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, it was the troop-contributing countries that actually translated Security Council mandates into action. He therefore deemed it important that the three entities continue to consult among themselves for the eventual success of any operation at hand.⁷⁴²

E. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Articles 46 and 47

Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security

By resolution 1327 (2000) of 13 November 2000, the Security Council undertook “to consider the possibility of using the Military Staff Committee as one of the means of enhancing the United Nations peacekeeping capacity”.⁷⁴³

⁷³⁹ Ibid., p. 13.

⁷⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 22.

⁷⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 19 and 20.

⁷⁴² Ibid., p. 31.

⁷⁴³ Resolution 1327 (2000), annex IV.

Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries

By resolution 1353 (2001) of 13 June 2001, the Council undertook “to consider the possibility of using the Military Staff Committee as one of the means of enhancing United Nations peacekeeping operations”.⁷⁴⁴

F. Discussion relating to Articles 46 and 47

Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security

At the Council’s 4220th meeting, on 13 November 2000, the Russian Federation commented that, following the resolution on the Brahimi report,⁷⁴⁵ the Council had entered the equally important stage of implementing agreed decisions. He believed that the approach of using the Military Staff Committee as one of the means of enhancing the United Nations peacekeeping capacity would maintain balance in the distribution of responsibilities between Member States and the United Nations Secretariat.⁷⁴⁶

Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa

At the 4288th meeting, on 7 March 2001, the representative of the Russian Federation recalled that, in resolution 1327 (2000), a decision was made to consider the question of how best to utilize the Military Staff Committee. He commented that there was a need not to leave all of it on paper or simply within the sphere of conversation, but to see what in fact could really be done.⁷⁴⁷

No exit without strategy

At the Council’s 4223rd meeting, on 15 November 2000, the representative of the Russian Federation noted that, for peacekeeping operations to conclude successfully, the United Nations rapid deployment capacity should be developed, the effectiveness of the planning enhanced, and the technical and financial

⁷⁴⁴ Resolution 1353, annex I.C.

⁷⁴⁵ S/2000/809.

⁷⁴⁶ S/PV.4220, p. 9.

⁷⁴⁷ S/PV.4288 (Resumption 1), p. 15.

resources of operations ensured. In that connection, he added that it was important to strengthen relevant Secretariat units, including the possibility of making full use of the capacity of the Military Staff Committee as “an important source of military expertise both for preparing for the possible deployment of an operation and for wrapping one up”.⁷⁴⁸

Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries

At the Council’s 4257th meeting, on 16 January 2001, the representative of India, in advancing his views on the relationship between the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries, reminded the Council that Article 47(2) of the Charter stipulated that the Military Staff Committee could include officers from any Member State, when the efficient discharge of the Committee’s responsibilities required the participation of that Member in its work. He further invited the Council to revive the Military Staff Committee and use it as a forum for consultations with troop-contributing countries on purely military aspects.⁷⁴⁹ In response, the representative of the Russian Federation stated that his delegation would regard India’s proposal on making more use of the Military Staff Committee in line with resolution 1327 (2000).⁷⁵⁰ The representative of Columbia also voiced his support for reviving the Military Staff Committee, with a broadened mandate that would reflect the

⁷⁴⁸ S/PV.4223, p. 15.

⁷⁴⁹ S/PV.4257, p. 11.

⁷⁵⁰ S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1), p. 13.

concerns voiced by other delegations, while the representative of Mauritius concurred with India’s statement.⁷⁵¹

Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council

At its 4343rd meeting, on 29 June 2001, the Council held a wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council during the month of June 2001. During the debate, the representative of the Russian Federation, recalling the need to follow up implementation of the Council’s decisions, stated that the Military Staff Committee, as a mechanism which should be useful for the Council’s work on peacekeeping, had been underutilized. He further recalled that the Council, in resolutions 1327 (2000) and 1353 (2001), had already emphasized the need to study the means to make more active use of the Military Staff Committee in order to strengthen United Nations peacekeeping operations. He concluded by stating that his delegation expected the Military Staff Committee “to respond to the Council’s resolutions”.⁷⁵² By a letter dated 6 July 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁷⁵³ the representative of the Russian Federation enclosed a position paper containing proposals to enhance the activities of the Military Staff Committee in the context of strengthening United Nations peacekeeping potential.

⁷⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19 (Colombia); and p. 21 (Mauritius).

⁷⁵² S/PV.4343 and Corr.1, p. 6.

⁷⁵³ S/2001/671.

Part VI

Obligations of Member States under Article 48 of the Charter

Article 48

- 1. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.*
- 2. Such decisions shall be carried out by the Members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members.*

Note

In accordance with Article 48, action required to carry out the Council’s decisions “shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine”, both “directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies”. During the period under review, no decisions were adopted by the Council referring expressly to Article 48. In a number of instances, however, the Council adopted decisions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter that

underlined the mandatory nature of those measures imposed and contained provisions that might be construed as implicit references to the principle enshrined in Article 48.⁷⁵⁴ In the absence of express references to the Article, it is not always possible to ascribe to the Council with any certainty decisions concerning that particular Article.

The following Council decisions may, nevertheless, help to shed light on the Council's interpretation and application of Article 48. Section A provides an overview of action required to carry out the Council's decisions adopted in accordance with the provisions of Article 41 of the Charter, while section B focuses on the action required to carry out Council's decisions imposing measures which involved the use of armed force in accordance with the provisions of Article 42 of the Charter.

During the period under consideration, the interpretation and application of Article 48 did not give rise to any significant constitutional discussion in the Council's deliberations.

A. Obligations arising pursuant to Security Council decisions adopted under Article 41

In decisions imposing measures not involving the use of armed force under Article 41 of the Charter, the Security Council consistently called upon "all States" to comply with relevant prohibitions.⁷⁵⁵ In some instances, the Council addressed its calls to comply with relevant prohibitions to "States" in general⁷⁵⁶ or "all Member States".⁷⁵⁷

⁷⁵⁴ In connection with Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea and Ethiopia, Iraq, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Somalia.

⁷⁵⁵ Resolutions 1298 (2000), paras. 6 and 8; 1306 (2000), para. 9; 1343 (2001), paras. 4, 5, 6, 7 and 21; 1356 (2001), para. 1; 1519 (2003), para. 1; 1295 (2000), para. 15; 1343 (2001), paras. 5, 6, 7 and 21; 1408 (2002), para. 18; 1478 (2003), paras. 17, 27 and 28; 1521 (2003), paras. 2, 4, 6 and 10; 1333 (2000), paras. 4, 5, 8, 10 and 11; 1363 (2001), para. 8; 1373 (2001), para. 3; 1390 (2002), para. 8; and 1455 (2003), para. 5.

⁷⁵⁶ Resolutions 1306 (2000), para. 17; and 1333 (2000), para. 18.

⁷⁵⁷ Resolution 1390 (2002), para. 4.

In connection with the measures imposed against Liberia and Sierra Leone, the Council expressly included "all States in the region"⁷⁵⁸ and "all States in West Africa"⁷⁵⁹ among the addressees of its decisions.⁷⁶⁰ In one instance, in connection with the mandatory measures imposed against the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Council explicitly decided that "all States, including the Democratic Republic of the Congo" were to take the necessary measures to comply with the relevant provisions of the resolution.⁷⁶¹ Similarly, in connection with measures imposed against Iraq, the Council urged "all States, and in particular the Government of Iraq", to provide their full cooperation in the effective implementation of the provisions of the resolution.⁷⁶²

In connection with the measures imposed against Angola, the Council called upon "relevant States" to take measures to ensure that members of the diamond industry abided by the measures contained in the relevant resolutions.⁷⁶³ The Council also urged "all States, including those geographically close to Angola" to take immediate steps to ensure criminal prosecution of nationals or other individuals operating on their territory who violate the measures imposed by the Council against the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA).⁷⁶⁴

When imposing measures against Afghanistan, Ethiopia and Eritrea, and Sierra Leone, the Council in each case expressly stated in its decisions that States were to act strictly in accordance with the provisions of the resolution, "notwithstanding the existence of any rights or obligations conferred or imposed by any international agreement or any contract entered into or any licence or permit granted before the date of the respective resolution".⁷⁶⁵

⁷⁵⁸ Resolutions 1343 (2001), para. 4; 1408 (2002), para. 4; and 1478 (2003), para. 9.

⁷⁵⁹ Resolution 1521 (2003), para. 3.

⁷⁶⁰ In connection with the situation in Liberia, the Council also requested "all States, in particular arms exporting countries" to exercise the highest degree of responsibility in small arms and light weapons transactions to prevent illegal diversion and re-export. See resolution 1408 (2002), para. 19.

⁷⁶¹ Resolution 1493 (2003), para. 20.

⁷⁶² Resolution 1302 (2000), para. 15.

⁷⁶³ Resolution 1295 (2000), para. 19.

⁷⁶⁴ Resolution 1295 (2000), para. 27.

⁷⁶⁵ In connection with the measures imposed against Afghanistan, see resolution 1333 (2000), para. 17. In

In addition, when imposing sanctions against Afghanistan, Eritrea and Ethiopia, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Somalia, the Council required “all States”,⁷⁶⁶ or more generally “States”,⁷⁶⁷ to report on their compliance with relevant prohibitions, and provided that implementation reports received from States were to be examined by committees specifically mandated to monitor the implementation of sanctions, and to consider any information concerning violations of relevant State obligations. To ensure full compliance with relevant prohibitions, in connection with the situation in Sierra Leone and the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia, the Council, by the same decisions, also requested “all States, relevant United Nations bodies and, as appropriate, other organizations and interested parties” to report to the Committee information on possible violations of the measures imposed by the Council.⁷⁶⁸ In one instance, when imposing measures against Somalia, the Council called on “the neighbouring States” to report to the Committee quarterly on their efforts to implement the arms embargo.⁷⁶⁹

By a number of decisions, while setting reporting obligations on the compliance with relevant prohibitions, the Council also addressed its calls to “all States” to cooperate with the relevant Panels of Experts and sanctions committees.⁷⁷⁰ In other instances, the

connection with the measures imposed against Eritrea and Ethiopia, see resolution 1298 (2000), para. 9. In connection with the measures imposed against Sierra Leone, see resolutions 1306 (2000), para. 9, and 1343 (2001), para. 22.

⁷⁶⁶ In connection with the situation in Afghanistan, see resolutions 1333 (2000), para. 20; 1390 (2002), para. 6; and 1455 (2003), para. 6. In connection with the situation in Sierra Leone, see resolutions 1306 (2000), para. 8, and 1343 (2001), para. 18. In connection with the situation in Somalia, see resolution 1407 (2002), para. 8.

⁷⁶⁷ In connection with the situation in Angola, see resolution 1295 (2000), para. 27. In connection with the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia, see resolution 1298 (2000), para. 11.

⁷⁶⁸ In connection with the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia, see resolution 1298 (2000), para. 12. In connection with the situation in Sierra Leone, see resolution 1306 (2000), paras. 16 and 18.

⁷⁶⁹ Resolution 1519 (2003), para. 8.

⁷⁷⁰ In connection with the situation in Afghanistan, see resolution 1333 (2000), para. 19. In connection with the situation in Angola, see resolutions 1295 (2000), paras. 4 and 26; and 1439 (2002), para. 7. In connection with the situation in Liberia, see resolution 1408 (2002), para. 15.

Council explicitly called upon “all States, relevant United Nations bodies and, as appropriate, other organizations and interested parties” to cooperate fully with the Committee and the Panel of Experts.⁷⁷¹ With regard to the measures imposed against Somalia, the Council called upon “all States, in particular those in the region” to provide the relevant Committee with all available information on violations of the arms embargo and also requested “all States and the Transitional National Government and local authorities in Somalia” to cooperate fully with the Panel of Experts in its quest for information.⁷⁷² By a subsequent resolution, the Council called upon “all States in the region and regional organizations, in particular the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the African Union, and the League of Arab States (LAS)”, to establish focal points to enhance cooperation with the Monitoring Group and to facilitate information exchange.⁷⁷³ By the same resolution, the Council requested that “the neighbouring States” report to the Committee quarterly on their efforts to implement the arms embargo.⁷⁷⁴

In its resolutions concerning, respectively, the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda, the Council decided that “all States” should cooperate fully with the Tribunals and their organs in accordance with resolutions 827 (1993) and 955 (1994) and the Statutes of the Tribunals.⁷⁷⁵ Furthermore, by resolution 1503 (2003), the Council set the “completion strategies” for the two Tribunals and called on “the international community” to assist national jurisdictions, in improving their capacity to prosecute cases transferred

In connection with the situation in Sierra Leone, see resolution 1306 (2000), para. 21.

⁷⁷¹ In connection with the situation in Liberia, see resolutions 1408 (2002), para. 21, and 1478 (2003), para. 33. By resolution 1478 (2003), the Council also called on “all member States of the Economic Community of West African States” to cooperate fully with the Panel of Experts in the identification of aircraft and vessels suspected of being used in violation of the arms embargo (para. 30). In connection with the situation in Afghanistan, see resolutions 1363 (2001), para. 7; 1390 (2002), para. 7; and 1455 (2003), para. 7.

⁷⁷² Resolutions 1407 (2002), paras. 4 and 9; and 1425 (2002), para. 7.

⁷⁷³ Resolution 1519 (2003), para. 5.

⁷⁷⁴ Resolution 1519 (2003), para. 8.

⁷⁷⁵ Resolutions 1329 (2000), para. 5; and 1431 (2000), para. 3.

from the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda. By the same resolution, the Council also called on “all States, especially Serbia and Montenegro, Croatia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina, and on the Republika Srpska within Bosnia and Herzegovina” to intensify cooperation with and render all necessary assistance to the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Similarly, the Council called on “all States, especially Rwanda, Kenya, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the Republic of the Congo” to intensify cooperation with and render all necessary assistance to the International Tribunal for Rwanda. Finally, by the same resolution, the Council called on “all States” to cooperate with the International Criminal Police Organization (ICPO-Interpol) in apprehending and transferring persons indicted by the Tribunals.⁷⁷⁶

B. Obligations arising pursuant to Security Council decisions adopted under Article 42

While the above-mentioned decisions adopted under Article 41 were formulated to ensure universal compliance and create binding obligations for all or some States, decisions in accordance with the provisions of Article 42 of the Charter, imposing measures involving the use of armed force, frequently took the form of authorizations or calls on States willing and in a position to take such action.

In a number of decisions providing for the use of “all necessary measures”⁷⁷⁷ to enforce previous resolutions, the Council addressed such authorizations to “Member States” in general,⁷⁷⁸ or more specifically

⁷⁷⁶ Resolution 1503 (2003), paras. 1-4.

⁷⁷⁷ The phrase “all necessary measures” was used by the Security Council in connection with the situation in Afghanistan (resolution 1386 (2001), para. 3); the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina (resolution 1305 (2000), para. 11); and the situation in Liberia (resolution 1497 (2003), para. 5). In connection with the situation in Côte d’Ivoire, reference was made to “the necessary steps” (resolution 1464 (2003), para. 9). In connection with the situation in Sierra Leone, the Council authorized UNAMSIL to “take the necessary action” to fulfil its mandate (resolution 1289 (2000), para. 10).

⁷⁷⁸ In connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, see resolution 1511 (2003). In connection with the situation in Liberia, see resolution 1497 (2003).

to “Member States participating”⁷⁷⁹ and “Member States acting”.⁷⁸⁰

By resolution 1386 (2001) of 20 December 2001, authorizing the establishment of the International Security Assistance Force to assist the interim authority of Afghanistan in the maintenance of security in Kabul and its surrounding areas, the Council called upon Member States to contribute personnel, equipment and other resources to the Force, authorized the Member States participating in the Force to take all necessary measures to fulfil its mandate, and called on them to assist the Afghan Interim Authority in the “establishment and training of new Afghan security and armed forces”.⁷⁸¹

By resolution 1497 (2003) of 1 August 2003, in connection with the situation in Liberia, the Council authorized “Member States” to establish a Multinational Force to “support the implementation of the 17 June 2003 ceasefire agreement”. By the terms of the resolution, the Council authorized the Member States participating in the Multinational Force, to take “all necessary measures” to fulfil its mandate. The Council also demanded that “all States in the region” refrain from any action that could contribute to instability in Liberia or on the borders between Liberia, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Côte d’Ivoire.⁷⁸²

By resolution 1484 (2003) of 30 May 2003, authorizing the deployment of an Interim Emergency Multinational Force in Bunia in close coordination with MONUC, the Council authorized the “Member States participating in the Multinational Force in Bunia” to take all necessary measures to fulfil its mandate, and called upon “Member States” to contribute personnel, equipment and other necessary financial and logistic resources to the Multinational Force.⁷⁸³

By resolution 1511 (2003) of 16 October 2003, the Council authorized a multinational force under unified command “to take all necessary measures” to

⁷⁷⁹ In connection with the situation in Afghanistan, see resolution 1386 (2001). In connection with the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, see resolution 1484 (2003).

⁷⁸⁰ In connection with the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, see resolution 1305 (2000).

⁷⁸¹ Resolution 1386 (2001), paras. 2, 3 and 10.

⁷⁸² Resolution 1497 (2003), paras. 1, 5 and 9.

⁷⁸³ Resolution 1484 (2003), paras. 3 and 4.

contribute to the maintenance of security and stability in Iraq, and urged Member States to contribute assistance under that United Nations mandate, including military forces, to the multinational force.⁷⁸⁴

Some of the decisions authorizing the use of all necessary measures, in accordance with Article 42 of the Charter, expressly envisaged possible action through regional agencies or arrangements. By resolution 1305 (2000), adopted in connection with the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Council authorized “Member States acting” through or in cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to fulfil the role determined in the Dayton Agreement. It further authorized “Member States” to take all necessary measures, at the request of the Stabilization Force, either in defence of SFOR or to

assist the force in carrying out its mission. By the same resolution the Council also invited “all States, in particular those in the region” to continue to provide appropriate support and facilities, including transit facilities, for the above-mentioned Member States.⁷⁸⁵ In one instance, related to the situation in Côte d’Ivoire, the Council authorized “Member States participating in the ECOWAS forces deployed in accordance with Chapter VIII together with the French forces supporting them” to take the necessary steps to guarantee the security and freedom of movement of their personnel and to ensure, without prejudice to the responsibilities of the Government of National Reconciliation, the protection of civilians immediately threatened with physical violence within their zones of operation.⁷⁸⁶

⁷⁸⁴ Resolution 1511 (2003), para. 14.

⁷⁸⁵ Resolution 1305 (2000), paras. 10, 12 and 16.

⁷⁸⁶ Resolution 1464 (2003), para. 9.

Part VII

Obligations of Member States under Article 49 of the Charter

Article 49

The Members of the United Nations shall join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.

Note

During the period under review, the obligation of States to join in affording mutual assistance assumed specific relevance in connection with decisions under Chapter VII of the Charter by which the Security Council authorized or called on Member States to take measures to enforce the Council’s resolutions, even though those decisions contained no explicit references to Article 49. In the absence of explicit references to the Article, it is not always possible to ascribe to the Council with any certainty decisions concerning that particular Article. The Council decisions presented in sections A and B may, however, help to shed light on the Council’s interpretation and application of Article 49. Section A provides an overview of the Council’s decisions calling upon Member States to provide mutual assistance in carrying out the decisions adopted in accordance with the provisions of Article 41 of the Charter, while section B focuses on the

Council’s decisions making similar calls in connection with the implementation of measures which involved the use of armed force in accordance with the provisions of Article 42 of the Charter.

During the period under consideration, the interpretation and application of Article 49 did not give rise to any significant constitutional discussion in the Council’s deliberations.

A. Calls for mutual assistance in the implementation of decisions adopted under Article 41

In its decisions imposing measures not involving the use of armed force, in accordance with the provisions of Article 41 of the Charter, the Security Council, in a number of instances, requested Member States in a position to do so to offer assistance to concerned States in the implementation of those measures. Such requests were made by the decisions outlined below.

The situation in Liberia

By resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001, the Council decided that all States were to take the

necessary measures to prevent the direct or indirect import of all rough diamonds from Liberia. In that connection, it also urged all diamond exporting countries in West Africa to establish certificate-of-origin regimes for the trade in rough diamonds and called upon “States, relevant international organizations and other bodies in a position to do so to offer assistance” to the concerned Governments.⁷⁸⁷

The situation in Sierra Leone

By resolution 1306 (2000) of 5 July 2000, in connection with its request to all States to take the necessary measures to prohibit the import of all rough diamonds from Liberia, the Council requested “States, relevant international organizations and other bodies in a position to do so to offer assistance” to the Government of Sierra Leone to facilitate the full implementation of an effective certificate-of-origin regime for rough diamonds.⁷⁸⁸ By a subsequent resolution,⁷⁸⁹ the Council reiterated its call upon “States, relevant international organizations and other bodies in a position to do so to offer assistance” to the Government of Liberia and other diamond-exporting countries in West Africa with their certificate-of-origin regimes.

By resolution 1478 (2003) of 6 May 2006, calling upon States of the subregion to strengthen the measures they had taken to combat the spread of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities, the Council urged “States in a position to do so to provide assistance to the Economic Community of West African States”.⁷⁹⁰

By resolution 1521 (2003) of 22 December 2003, in connection with its request to the National Transitional Government of Liberia to take urgent steps to establish an effective certificate-of-origin regime for trade in rough diamonds from Liberia, the Council called upon “States, relevant international organizations and others in a position to do so to offer assistance” to the National Transitional Government of Liberia in achieving the aforementioned objective.⁷⁹¹

⁷⁸⁷ Resolution 1343 (2001), para. 16.

⁷⁸⁸ Resolution 1306 (2000), para. 6.

⁷⁸⁹ Resolution 1408 (2002), para. 9.

⁷⁹⁰ Resolution 1478 (2003), para. 22.

⁷⁹¹ Resolution 1521 (2003), para. 15.

The situation in Somalia

By a statement of the President dated 31 October 2001,⁷⁹² the Council emphasized the necessity for efforts against international terrorism in accordance with resolution 1373 (2001), and welcomed the intention of the Transitional National Government of Somalia to take steps in that regard. By the same statement, the Council urged the international community, including through the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism, to “provide assistance” to Somalia for the implementation of the aforementioned resolution.

B. Calls for mutual assistance in the implementation of decisions adopted under Article 42

In its decisions imposing measures involving the use of armed force, while calling upon States willing and in a position to take relevant enforcement action, the Security Council regularly requested “all States” to provide appropriate support and assistance to those States. Such requests were made by the decisions outlined below.

The situation in Afghanistan

By resolution 1386 (2001) of 20 December 2001, authorizing the International Security Assistance Force to take “all necessary means” to assist the Afghan Interim Authority in the maintenance of security in Kabul and its surrounding areas, the Council called upon Member States to “contribute personnel, equipment and other resources to the Force”, and invited those Member States to inform the leadership of the Force and the Secretary-General. The Council further encouraged neighbouring States and other Member States to provide to the Force such necessary assistance as might be requested, including overflight clearances and transit.⁷⁹³ By subsequent resolutions extending the mandate of ISAF, the Council called upon Member States to “contribute personnel, equipment and other resources to the Force, and to

⁷⁹² S/PRST/2001/30.

⁷⁹³ Resolution 1386 (2001), paras. 2 and 7.

make contributions to the Trust Fund established pursuant to resolution 1386 (2001)".⁷⁹⁴

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

By resolution 1305 (2000) of 21 June 2000, the Council paid tribute to those Member States that participated in the multinational Stabilization Force established in accordance with resolution 1088 (1996), and welcomed their willingness to assist the parties to the Peace Agreement by continuing to deploy a multinational Stabilization Force. By the same resolution, the Council also invited "all States, in particular those in the region to continue to provide appropriate support and facilities, including transit facilities, for the Member States participating in the Stabilization Force".⁷⁹⁵

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

By resolution 1484 (2003) of 30 May 2003, the Council, authorizing the deployment of an Interim Emergency Multinational Force in Bunia in close coordination with the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, called upon all Member States and "in particular those in the Great Lakes region" to provide all necessary support to facilitate the swift deployment in Bunia of the Multinational Force.⁷⁹⁶

The situation in Liberia

By resolution 1497 (2003) of 1 August 2003,

⁷⁹⁴ Resolutions 1413 (2001), para. 3, and 1444 (2002), para. 3.

⁷⁹⁵ Resolution 1305 (2000), paras. 8 and 16.

⁷⁹⁶ Resolution 1484 (2003), para. 8.

establishing a Multinational Force in Liberia, the Council called upon Member States to "contribute personnel, equipment and other resources to the Multinational Force", and stressed that the expenses of the Multinational Force would be borne by the participating Member States and other voluntary contributions. By the same resolution, it also called upon all Liberian parties and Member States to "cooperate fully" with the Multinational Force in the execution of its mandate and to respect the security and freedom of movement of the Multinational Force, as well as to ensure the safe and unimpeded access of international humanitarian personnel to populations in need in Liberia.⁷⁹⁷

The situation in Sierra Leone

By a statement of the President dated 4 May 2000,⁷⁹⁸ in connection with the situation in Sierra Leone, the Council expressed its full support for the continued efforts of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone in the fulfilment of its mandate, and called upon all States in a position to do so to "assist the Mission" in that regard. By resolution 1299 (2000) of 19 May 2000, the Council members expressed their appreciation to all States which, in order to expedite the rapid reinforcement of the Mission, had accelerated the deployment of their troops to the Mission, made available additional personnel and offered logistical, technical and other forms of military assistance, and called upon "all those in a position to do so to provide further support".⁷⁹⁹

⁷⁹⁷ Resolution 1497 (2003), paras. 6 and 11.

⁷⁹⁸ S/PRST/2000/14.

⁷⁹⁹ Resolution 1299 (2000), para. 2.

Part VIII

Special economic problems of the nature described in Article 50 of the Charter

Article 50

If preventive or enforcement measures against any state are taken by the Security Council, any other state, whether a Member of the United Nations or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of those

measures shall have the right to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems.

Note

During the period under review, the Security Council paid close attention to the issue of sanctions

and their unintended negative impact on civilian populations and third States. With a view to minimizing those effects, the Council, through a note by the President, decided to establish an Informal Working Group to develop general recommendations on how to improve the effectiveness of sanction regimes and limit their unintended negative effects.⁸⁰⁰ The Council also held three meetings on the item entitled “General issues relating to sanctions” and, while considering other agenda items, also made decisions and discussed topics related to Article 50.

Section A of this part examines decisions of the Council relevant to Article 50, while section B highlights the salient issues raised in the Council’s deliberations regarding the interpretation and application of the Article. Finally, section C briefly presents material relating to the Council’s subsidiary bodies in connection with Article 50, as included in the reports of those bodies to the Council and in the reports of the Secretary-General on the “Implementation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations related to assistance to third States affected by the application of sanctions”.⁸⁰¹

A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 50

The situation in Angola

By resolution 1295 (2000) of 18 April 2000, having noted the conclusions and recommendations of the Panel of Experts established by the Security Council pursuant to resolution 1237 (1999) of 7 May 1999, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish a monitoring mechanism composed of up to five experts, for a period of six months, to collect additional relevant information and investigate relevant leads relating to any allegations of violations of the measures contained in resolutions 864 (1993), 1127 (1997) and 1173 (1998) concerning the situation in Angola, “including through visits to relevant countries”, and to report periodically to the relevant Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993), including by providing a written report by 18 October 2000, with a view to “improving the implementation of the measures imposed against

⁸⁰⁰ S/2000/319.

⁸⁰¹ See, for the period under consideration: A/55/295, A/56/303, A/57/165, A/58/346 and A/59/334.

UNITA”.⁸⁰² The Council further requested the Secretary-General, acting in consultation with the Committee, to appoint experts to serve on the monitoring mechanism. Following consultations with the Committee, on 11 July 2000, the Secretary-General appointed five experts to serve on the monitoring mechanism.⁸⁰³

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

By resolution 1483 (2003) of 22 May 2003, the Council decided to terminate, with certain exceptions, all prohibitions related to trade with Iraq and the provision of financial or economic resources to Iraq, as established by resolution 661 (1990) and subsequent relevant resolutions. By the same resolution, the Council also decided to impose new targeted financial sanctions.⁸⁰⁴ By resolution 1518 (2003) of 24 November 2003, the Council established a Committee to administer the new measures imposed by resolution 1483 (2003). In his report on the implementation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations related to assistance to third States affected by the application of sanctions, the Secretary-General observed that, as a result of the modifications made to the measures imposed on Iraq since May 2003, all of the Council’s existing sanctions regimes “were now targeted in nature and, the unintended consequences for civilian populations and third States were minimized”.⁸⁰⁵

The situation in Liberia

By resolution 1478 (2003) of 6 May 2003, the Council decided to consider how best to minimize any humanitarian or socio-economic impact of the measures imposed by paragraph 17 of its resolution, and requested the Secretary-General and the Panel of Experts to submit a report in that regard.⁸⁰⁶ Pursuant to the request, the Secretary-General submitted a report dated 5 August 2003 by which he provided observations and recommendations on the possible humanitarian and socio-economic impacts of the timber sanctions imposed against Liberia.⁸⁰⁷ By a letter dated 7 August 2003 addressed to the President of the

⁸⁰² Resolution 1295 (2000), para. 3.

⁸⁰³ A/55/295, p. 4.

⁸⁰⁴ Resolution 1483 (2003), paras. 10 and 23.

⁸⁰⁵ A/59/334, para. 10.

⁸⁰⁶ Resolution 1478 (2003), paras. 18 and 19.

⁸⁰⁷ S/2003/793.

Council,⁸⁰⁸ the Acting Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) transmitted to the members of the Council the report of the Panel of Experts which, inter alia, included observations and recommendations concerning the possible humanitarian and socio-economic impact of the timber sanctions imposed on Liberia.

By resolution 1521 (2003) of 22 December 2003, the Security Council requested the Panel of Experts on Liberia to report with observations and recommendations including, inter alia, how to minimize any humanitarian and socio-economic impact of timber sanctions against Liberia.⁸⁰⁹

The situation in Sierra Leone

By resolution 1306 (2000) of 5 July 2000, the Security Council requested the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) to hold an exploratory hearing in New York to assess the role of diamonds in the Sierra Leone conflict and the link between trade in Sierra Leone diamonds and trade in arms and related materiel in violation of resolution 1171 (1998), “involving representatives of interested States and regional organizations”, the diamond industry and other relevant experts.⁸¹⁰ The exploratory hearing was held on 31 July and 1 August 2000.⁸¹¹

General issues relating to sanctions

Establishment of an informal working group

In a note by the President dated 17 April 2000,⁸¹² the members of the Council decided to establish an informal working group to develop general recommendations on how to improve the effectiveness of United Nations sanctions. The working group was given the task of, among other things, examining the unintended impact of sanctions on third States and of assisting Member States in implementing sanctions. It was to report its findings to the Council by 30 November 2000, but the working group was unable to reach a consensus on all of the recommendations. By two subsequent notes by the President dated 15 January 2002 and 18 December 2003, respectively, the Council agreed to extend the mandate of the working group

until 31 December 2004.⁸¹³ The working group’s proposed outcome document thus remained under consideration, with a focus on those issues for which there was no provisional agreement.

B. Discussion relating to Article 50

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

At the 4336th meeting, on 28 June 2001, the representative of India observed that the sanctions on Iraq had caused acute economic and financial hardship to other countries, including India. He complained that the request by India for relief under Article 50 was still pending with the sanctions committee.⁸¹⁴

Similarly, by a letter dated 24 June 2002 addressed to the President of the Council,⁸¹⁵ the representative of Tunisia submitted a matter relating to the requirements of Article 50 concerning the losses incurred by his country as a result of the consequences of the embargo imposed on Iraq by the Council since 1990. He therefore requested the Council to take note “once more” of the very serious impact of the sanctions and the challenges which the Tunisian national economy continued to face since the imposition of the embargo regime on Iraq. In that connection, he insisted on the necessity for the Council to understand Tunisia’s “urgent and vital need to maintain its national interests in cooperation with Iraq on the basis of Article 50 of the Charter of the United Nations”.⁸¹⁶

By a similar letter dated 17 July 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁸¹⁷ the representative of Malaysia brought to the attention of the Council that many countries, including Malaysia, had suffered “enormous economic losses” as a result of the implementation of the Council’s sanctions against Iraq. To address those problems in accordance with the provisions of Article 50 of the Charter, the representative asked the Council to enable Malaysia to benefit from the provisions of Article 50 in the context of its economic and trade relations with Iraq, and thus to alleviate the negative consequences the country had suffered as a result of more than a decade of sanctions imposed against Iraq.

⁸⁰⁸ S/2003/779.

⁸⁰⁹ Resolution 1521 (2003), para. 22.

⁸¹⁰ Resolution 1306 (2000), para. 12.

⁸¹¹ See A/55/295, para. 9.

⁸¹² S/2000/319.

⁸¹³ S/2002/70 and S/2003/1185, respectively.

⁸¹⁴ S/PV.4336 (Resumption 1), p. 5.

⁸¹⁵ S/2002/698.

⁸¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁸¹⁷ S/2001/703.

General issues relating to sanctions

The Council held three meetings on the item entitled “General issues relating to sanctions”, with much discussion focusing on issues relating to Article 50.⁸¹⁸ No decisions arose from those meetings, although progress was reported in the design and implementation of sanctions regimes.

At the 4128th meeting, on 17 April 2000, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs asserted that it was essential for the United Nations system to develop a coordinated and integrated approach to minimize unintended consequences on civilian populations and third States. To that end, he recommended that the Council consider authorizing the Secretariat to dispatch assessment missions to targeted States and neighbouring countries either before sanctions were imposed or shortly thereafter. He also proposed that the Council consider including in its resolutions provisions to address the impact of sanctions on non-targeted States. He suggested that “practical assistance arising from Article 50” be addressed through special arrangements with individual neighbouring States and through donors’ conferences to identify possible forms of financial assistance and support for non-targeted States.⁸¹⁹ The representative of France stated that third States and targeted States were often not invited to speak before sanctions committees. He added that measures had been planned to that end, but had not been applied.⁸²⁰ The representative of Namibia noted that, while he believed that parties should be heard by the Council under the terms of Article 50, solutions needed to include the provision of special assistance to compensate for economic losses and adverse social impact.⁸²¹ The representative of Tunisia agreed that, notwithstanding Article 50, there was still no effective mechanism to compensate for losses suffered by third countries.⁸²² Several representatives noted the negative effects that their countries had suffered as a result of sanctions placed against another country,⁸²³ while others affirmed that the Council had to do more to

minimize negative consequences for third States.⁸²⁴ The President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of Canada, suggested that donor-country conferences addressing the needs of particular Member States adversely affected by sanctions might be a measure to address concerns related to Article 50.⁸²⁵ The representative of Malaysia stated that sanctions affected third countries since they often imposed extremely high economic costs on the major economic partners of targeted States. Emphasizing that this aspect was well recognized in Article 50 of the Charter, but very rarely invoked or seriously addressed, he regretted that assistance to disadvantaged States had been ad hoc and inadequate and, while some provisions for third-party compensation had been made, no such aid had been forthcoming in the case of the African sanctions regimes. Where little or no assistance was available, he asserted, the affected States may have had no choice but to continue surreptitiously with their traditional economic relationships to avoid economic hardship. On occasion, they had done so openly, as was clearly the case with respect to the sanctions regime on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, when the Organization of African Unity decided in 1998 to cease complying with the United Nations sanctions directed against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.⁸²⁶ The representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia stated that the implementation of Article 50 of the Charter had enormous political, economic, social and humanitarian importance for many Member States. His country regretted the non-implementation of Article 50 but was pleased by the decision to establish, on a temporary basis, an informal working group of the Council to develop general recommendations on how to improve the effectiveness of United Nations sanctions. He hoped that those recommendations would not neglect Article 50 of the Charter.⁸²⁷ The representative of Bulgaria similarly recognized the importance of the proper implementation of Article 50 and, in that connection, of the informal working group.⁸²⁸

By a letter dated 17 April 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁸²⁹ transmitting the statement that he had not been able to deliver in person

⁸¹⁸ S/PV.4128, S/PV.4394 and S/PV.4713.

⁸¹⁹ S/PV.4128, pp. 2-4.

⁸²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁸²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁸²² *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁸²³ *Ibid.*, p. 29 (Pakistan); p. 35 (Bulgaria); p. 44 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); and p. 45 (Turkey).

⁸²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 23 (Russian Federation); p. 32 (Sweden); and p. 44 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia).

⁸²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

⁸²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

⁸²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

⁸²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.

⁸²⁹ S/2000/324.

at the 4128th meeting, the representative of Egypt drew the attention of the Council to the “collateral” and “large-scale damage” caused by sanctions to the interests of third States and their population, as it had been the case for his country. He invited the Council to consider establishing “more permanent mechanisms and measures” for the holding of the consultations provided for in Article 50 with third States that found or might find themselves confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of enforcement measures imposed by the Council. He further noted that, in order to “implement Article 50 of the Charter in full”, the conclusions arrived at by the ad hoc expert group, convened in June 1998 in accordance with General Assembly resolution 52/162 to develop a methodology for assessing the consequences incurred by third States, constituted “an important step towards the practical implementation of the provisions of Articles 49 and 50 of the Charter”.⁸³⁰

At the 4394th meeting, on 22 and 25 October 2001, discussions on general issues relating to sanctions continued, with many representatives again emphasizing the need to minimize sanctions’ negative effects on third States.⁸³¹ In their statements, two speakers explicitly invoked Article 50 and the need to improve its implementation.⁸³² Pointing to improvements in sanctions regimes, the representative of Jamaica observed that there had been a shift by the Council in its approach to the design of sanctions. She stated that recent sanctions on Eritrea and Ethiopia, Liberia, Sierra Leone and the Taliban regime of Afghanistan had all been targeted and that, in designing those sanctions, the Council had borrowed extensively from the preliminary work and reports of the Bonn-Berlin and Interlaken processes, as well as from the work of its own working group on general issues of sanctions.⁸³³

⁸³⁰ Ibid., pp. 2-3.

⁸³¹ S/PV.4394, p. 2 (Switzerland); pp. 4-5 (Germany); and p. 8 (France); S/PV.4394 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 8 (Mali); and pp. 10-11 (China).

⁸³² S/PV.4394, p. 6 (Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs); S/PV.4394 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 10 (Tunisia).

⁸³³ S/PV.4394 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 2. The report from the Bonn-Berlin process, under the leadership of Germany, was titled “Design and implementation of arms embargoes and travel and aviation-related sanctions”. The report issuing from the Interlaken process, under the leadership of Switzerland, was

At the 4713th meeting, on 25 February 2003, the State Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Sweden presented to the Council the results of the Stockholm Process on the Implementation of Targeted Sanctions.⁸³⁴ He recognized that, while the use of sanctions had increased, concern had been growing over the negative effects of economic sanctions on vulnerable populations and societies in general, with the collateral effects of sanctions on third States being highlighted.⁸³⁵ In his statement, the representative of Bulgaria informed the Council that, as an active participant in both the preparatory discussion and in the final meeting, held in Stockholm in November 2002, Bulgaria shared and supported the conclusions, guidelines and recommendations laid down in the final text of the report. He added that the inclusion of a special section dedicated to unintended consequences of sanctions implementation for third States and to the need for direct or indirect compensation for damages caused to them was backed by the experience of Bulgaria as a State severely affected by the sanctions imposed on the former Yugoslavia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Iraq. He concluded that, although the practical implementation of the provisions of Article 50 had been extensively discussed in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly, in the Security Council and during the Stockholm Process, there were still aspects to be clarified and work on these issues should continue.⁸³⁶

Briefing by Mr. Carl Bildt, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans

At the Council’s 4164th meeting, on 23 June 2000, the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia suggested that if the Security Council would like to “shoulder fully its responsibility under the Charter”, it should address the implementation of Article 50 of the Charter.⁸³⁷

entitled “Targeted financial sanctions: A manual for design and implementation”.

⁸³⁴ The Stockholm Process on the Implementation of Targeted Sanctions dealt with ways to increase the efficiency of sanctions by reforming and improving their implementation, while minimizing unintentional negative consequences.

⁸³⁵ S/PV.4713, pp. 2-3.

⁸³⁶ Ibid., pp. 5-6.

⁸³⁷ S/PV.4164 (Resumption 1), p. 8.

Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa

At the Council's 4288th meeting, on 7 March 2001, the representative of Egypt emphasized the hope that the Council would consistently adhere to the provisions of Article 50 and would apply it without discrimination or politicization.⁸³⁸ At the same meeting, the representative of Tunisia indicated that reforms in the area of sanctions had to take into account the adverse impact of sanctions and the provisions of the Charter, in particular those of Article 50.⁸³⁹

C. Instances arising in Security Council subsidiary bodies

Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait

At its 4673rd meeting, on 18 December 2002, the Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait. In his statement, the Chairman reported that the Committee was devoting a great deal of time to discussing reported violations of sanctions, as well as to humanitarian exemptions under resolution 661 and application of Article 50 of the Charter and, in that regard, drew attention to the various reports submitted to the Council by the Committee.⁸⁴⁰

The Chairman reported that in its deliberations concerning issues related to Article 50, the Committee had granted permission for Member States that were not members of the Committee to address it at formal meetings concerning their special economic problems falling under Article 50.⁸⁴¹

At its 215th meeting, on 19 March 2001, the Committee discussed how to proceed with the communications from Belarus and India concerning the application of Article 50 of the Charter. In that connection, at its 223rd meeting, on 10 September 2001, the Committee was briefed by the Secretariat on

the history of the application of Article 50 and the past practice of the Committee. At its 224th meeting, on 9 October 2001, in response to letters from Belarus and India, the Committee agreed to send letters, with attached questions on matters for which clarifications were sought, inviting the representatives of Belarus and India to present their cases to the Committee. At its 227th meeting, on 3 December 2001, the Additional Secretary of the Ministry of External Relations of India addressed the Committee regarding special economic problems arising from the carrying out of preventive or enforcement measures imposed by the Council and stated that his country estimated to have lost \$25 billion to \$30 billion as a result of United Nations sanctions against Iraq. He suggested that India be compensated through an India-Iraq "wheat for oil" programme, given India's surplus production of wheat.⁸⁴² By a letter from the Chairman dated 28 February 2002, the Committee informed India that it had considered the matter at several formal and informal meetings but had been unable to reach a consensus, although it would continue to study the matter. India replied in a letter dated 26 March 2002, stating its disappointment that no consensus had been reached and requesting an expeditious and positive decision on the matter.⁸⁴³

In a letter dated 24 June 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁸⁴⁴ the representative of Tunisia brought to the attention of the Council the impact of the Iraqi sanctions regime on the Tunisian economy during the past 11 years, totalling \$7 billion as at May 2002. The members of the Council agreed to refer the letter to the Committee for its consideration.⁸⁴⁵ On 31 July 2002, at its 236th meeting, the Committee agreed to have the Chairman approach the representative of Tunisia to hear what kind of response, if any, he was expecting from the Committee.⁸⁴⁶

⁸⁴² S/2002/647, paras. 52 and 53.

⁸⁴³ For details, see A/57/165, para. 6.

⁸⁴⁴ S/2002/698.

⁸⁴⁵ See A/57/165, para. 7.

⁸⁴⁶ S/2003/300, para. 67.

⁸³⁸ S/PV.4288, p. 14.

⁸³⁹ *Ibid.*, (Resumption 1), p. 18.

⁸⁴⁰ S/PV.4673, p. 3.

⁸⁴¹ *Ibid.*

Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities

On 15 December 2003, several Member States attended an informal meeting of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities. They addressed alleged inaccuracies contained in the second report completed by the Monitoring Group established pursuant to Security Council resolution 1363 (2001)

and mandated by the Council to monitor the implementation of the measures imposed against Al-Qaida and the Taliban.⁸⁴⁷ Although the measures imposed against Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities were targeted in nature and were not in themselves cited as causing special economic problems, one of the States appearing before the Committee argued that the allegations levelled against it by the Monitoring Group might result in decreased tourism, thus causing an adverse effect upon its economy.⁸⁴⁸

⁸⁴⁷ S/2003/1070 and Corr.1, annex.

⁸⁴⁸ A/59/334, para. 8.

Part IX
Right of self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter

Article 51

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Note

During the period under review, the Security Council reaffirmed the principle set out in Article 51 in four decisions relating to “threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts” and “small arms”, respectively. Those cases are presented in section A.

During the same period, in the course of the deliberations in the Council, a variety of issues occasioned pertinent arguments relating to the interpretation of the principle of self-defence. Specifically, the Council debated the application and interpretation of Article 51 in connection with the following items: (a) the situation in Afghanistan; (b) the situation concerning the Democratic Republic

of the Congo; (c) the situation between Iraq and Kuwait; (d) the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question; (e) letters dated 5 October 2003 from, respectively, the permanent representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon addressed to the President of the Security Council; (f) small arms; (g) threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts; (h) the role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes; and (i) the role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts. The arguments advanced during the Council’s deliberations in connection with those situations are presented in section B.

Those cases will be followed by a brief overview in section C of instances in which the right of self-defence was invoked in official correspondence, but which did not give rise to any constitutional discussion relevant to Article 51.

A. Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 51

Small arms

By two statements of the President dated 4 September 2001 and 31 October 2002, respectively,⁸⁴⁹ in connection with the Council’s consideration of the destabilizing role played by the accumulation and uncontrolled spread of small arms

and light weapons in many regions of the world, the Council members reaffirmed “the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and, subject to the Charter, the right of each State to import, produce and retain small arms and light weapons for its self-defence and security needs”.⁸⁵⁰

Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts

By resolution 1368 (2001) of 12 September 2001, the Council condemned the terrorist attacks which took place on 11 September 2001 and called on States to work together to bring to justice the perpetrators, organizers, and sponsors of the attacks, and to redouble their efforts to prevent and suppress terrorist acts. The Council also expressed its readiness to take all necessary steps to respond to the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 and to combat all forms of terrorism, in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations. By the same resolution, the Council recognized “the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence in accordance with the Charter”.⁸⁵¹

By resolution 1373 (2001) of 28 September 2001, the Security Council decided that all States were to prevent and suppress the financing of terrorist acts and called on States to work together urgently to achieve these goals. The Council asserted that such acts constituted a threat to international peace and security and expressed its deep concern about the increase of acts of terrorism in various regions of the world. In that connection, the Council reaffirmed “the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence as recognized by the Charter”.⁸⁵²

B. Discussion relating to Article 51

The situation in Afghanistan

By a letter dated 7 October 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁸⁵³ the representative of

the United States announced that, acting in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, his Government, together with other States, would initiate actions “in the exercise of its inherent right of individual and collective self-defence following the armed attacks that were carried out against the United States on 11 September 2001”.⁸⁵⁴ He reported that the United States armed forces had initiated actions against Al-Qaida terrorist training camps and military installations of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan.

Through a series of letters addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁸⁵⁵ the representatives of the United Kingdom, Canada, France, Australia, Germany, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Poland reported that, in accordance with “the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence”, their respective Governments had undertaken actions involving the participation of military forces within the international efforts to combat the terrorist network responsible for the attacks against targets in the United States. By two letters addressed to the Secretary-General dated 8 and 17 October 2001, respectively,⁸⁵⁶ the representative of Belgium conveyed the European Union’s solidarity with the United States and its support for the actions taken by the latter “in self-defence”.

At its 4414th meeting, on 13 November 2001, the Council held an open debate on the situation in Afghanistan, mainly focusing on the country’s future political transition. During the debate, a number of speakers made reference to the actions taken by the United States armed forces in Afghanistan initiated on 7 October 2001. The representative of Norway emphasized the necessity of breaking the cycle of war and misrule in Afghanistan and argued that the Taliban regime in Afghanistan had ignored binding Security Council resolutions demanding it to stop harbouring and supporting terrorists. He therefore concluded that there was “no alternative but to use military force — in accordance with the right of self-defence”.⁸⁵⁷ The representative of Egypt recalled that military operations were pursued in Afghanistan in connection with the Council’s commitment to “the inherent right

⁸⁴⁹ S/PRST/2001/21 and S/PRST/2002/30.

⁸⁵⁰ S/PRST/2001/21, fourth paragraph., and S/PRST/2002/30, third para.

⁸⁵¹ Resolution 1368 (2001), third preambular paragraph, and paras. 1, 3 and 5.

⁸⁵² Resolution 1373 (2001), fourth preambular paragraph.

⁸⁵³ S/2001/946.

⁸⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁸⁵⁵ S/2001/947, S/2001/1005, S/2001/1103, S/2001/1104, S/2001/1127, S/2001/1171, S/2001/1193 and S/2002/275.

⁸⁵⁶ S/2001/967 and S/2001/980.

⁸⁵⁷ S/PV.4414, p. 13.

of individual or collective self-defence” as expressed in resolution 1368 (2001) of 12 September 2001.⁸⁵⁸ By contrast, the representative of Malaysia cautioned that although the use of military force was “a legitimate course of action as an act of self-defence”, it was not “the only course of action, the most effective or politically wise”, given the consequences of the military action on the Afghan people.⁸⁵⁹

By a letter dated 16 November 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁸⁶⁰ the representative of Chile transmitted the statement on international terrorism issued by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Rio Group on the subject of international terrorism at their meeting on 14 November 2001. The statement reaffirmed the strong support by the Rio Group for the action taken to combat terrorism, “in exercise of the right of self-defence, in the framework of the Charter of the United Nations”, following the “appalling attacks in New York and Washington, D.C.”.⁸⁶¹

By a letter dated 20 November 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁸⁶² the representative of Belgium presented the conclusions of the General Affairs Council of the European Union on Afghanistan. The General Affairs Council welcomed the recent developments on the ground which contributed to achieving the objectives of the international coalition against terrorism, and confirmed its unreserved support for the coalition’s action “undertaken in self-defence and in conformity with Security Council resolution 1368 (2001) of 12 September 2001”.

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

At its 4092nd meeting, on 24 January 2000, the Council debated the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the necessity of implementing the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. The representative of Argentina acknowledged that the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo could not be analysed or effectively resolved without consideration of other key principles of international law, such as respect for the territorial integrity and political independence of the Democratic Republic of

the Congo, non-interference in its internal affairs, the withdrawal of all foreign forces that were on its territory without its explicit consent, the inalienable right to individual or collective self-defence and the illegality of the acquisition of territory by force”.⁸⁶³

At the 4273rd meeting, on 7 February 2001, the representative of the United States pointed out that the human rights situation in areas under Rwandan occupation or under the control of the Congolese Rally for Democracy (Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie) was deeply troubling. He noted that Rwanda’s claims to the right of self-defence were “badly undercut by the numerous Congolese civilian victims”.⁸⁶⁴

At its 4317th meeting, on 3 May 2001, the Council discussed the illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. During the debate, the representative of Zimbabwe stated that the military intervention by Angola, Namibia and Zimbabwe came as a result of the appeal by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He explained that the Democratic Republic of the Congo’s request to the Southern African Development Community was in line with Article 51 of the Charter regarding the right of a State to ask for military assistance when its security, sovereignty and territorial integrity were threatened.⁸⁶⁵

At the Council’s 4437th meeting, on 14 December 2001, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo emphasized that no army of a SADC member country would have been brought into his country without the consent of the Government. He insisted that the Congolese Government viewed the condemnation of an initiative that enabled it to defend its national sovereignty as amounting to “depriving a State of its basic right under Article 51” of the Charter “to resort to individual or collective self-defence to preserve its sovereignty and territorial integrity”.⁸⁶⁶ Similarly, the representative of Zimbabwe pointed out that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo had invited the SADC countries to come to its assistance in fending off aggression against its territory in exercise of its right to

⁸⁵⁸ S/PV.4414 (Resumption 1), p. 22.

⁸⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁸⁶⁰ S/2001/1091.

⁸⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁸⁶² S/2001/1101.

⁸⁶³ S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 20.

⁸⁶⁴ S/PV.4273, p. 5.

⁸⁶⁵ S/PV.4317 (Resumption 1), p. 22.

⁸⁶⁶ S/PV.4437, p. 7.

self-defence as enshrined in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.⁸⁶⁷

By a letter dated 18 July 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁸⁶⁸ the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo commented on the situation in Kisangani, following the refusal by Rwanda and its allies to demilitarize the city. He stressed that the reported abuses in the occupied territories could not be blamed on the Government, as such clashes were initiated by the Congolese resistance. He invoked peoples' right to resist foreign occupation and domination and characterized the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo as a "case of self-defence by the Congolese in the face of aggression".⁸⁶⁹

By a letter dated 25 February 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁸⁷⁰ the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo warned that troops of the Rwandan Patriotic Army had flagrantly violated the ceasefire by attacking troops based in Muliro, in the vicinity of Lake Tanganyika. In response, faced with a "situation of self-defence", the Forces armées congolaises had put up fierce resistance to the attackers, and had succeeded in driving the enemy troops beyond Kamamba. By a subsequent letter dated 28 February 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁸⁷¹ the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo reiterated that the Congolese armed forces had acted in self-defence when resisting Rwandan armed forces and had pushed them back beyond Kamamba.

By another letter dated 18 March 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁸⁷² the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo underlined his Government's duty to safeguard the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, "as authorized by the Charter of the United Nations, above all Article 51" against attacks from Rwanda and the Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie (RCD)-Goma.⁸⁷³

By a letter dated 15 April 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁸⁷⁴ the representative of Rwanda reported that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo had "allied itself with the planners and perpetrators of the Rwandan genocide". He asked the members of the Council to re-examine the circumstances which had led Rwanda "to intervene militarily in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in exercise of the inherent right of self-defence, pursuant to Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations".⁸⁷⁵

At the Council's 4634th meeting, on 24 October 2002, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo reaffirmed his Government's conviction that it was within its legitimate rights to take all necessary measures to respond to the Rwandese armed aggression "in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter, including seeking assistance from the States members of the Southern Africa Development Community by invoking their natural right to collective and individual self-defence".⁸⁷⁶

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

In a series of letters addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council between 2000 and 2001,⁸⁷⁷ the representative of Iraq,

⁸⁷⁴ S/2002/420.

⁸⁷⁵ At the 4532nd meeting, on 14 May 2002, in connection with the situation in the Great Lakes region, the representative of Rwanda stated that his country had intervened militarily in the Democratic Republic of the Congo "by virtue of its natural right of legitimate defence under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations" (S/PV.4532, p. 13).

⁸⁷⁶ S/PV.4634, p. 8.

⁸⁷⁷ S/2000/12, S/2000/45, S/2000/58, S/2000/85, S/2000/104, S/2000/134, S/2000/159, S/2000/191, S/2000/259, S/2000/291, S/2000/308, S/2000/341, S/2000/383, S/2000/439, S/2000/471, S/2000/507, S/2000/540, S/2000/571, S/2000/614, S/2000/628, S/2000/652, S/2000/694, S/2000/776, S/2000/735, S/2000/754, S/2000/774, S/2000/775, S/2000/795, S/2000/802, S/2000/820, S/2000/826, S/2000/848, S/2000/849, S/2000/850, S/2000/851, S/2000/895, S/2000/924, S/2000/968, S/2000/997, S/2000/1012, S/2000/1069, S/2000/1128, S/2000/1155, S/2000/1165, S/2000/1208, S/2000/1229, S/2000/1248, S/2001/37, S/2001/79, S/2001/116, S/2001/122, S/2001/141, S/2001/161, S/2001/168, S/2001/227, S/2001/248, S/2001/297, S/2001/316, S/2001/369, S/2001/484, S/2001/536, S/2001/620, S/2001/638, S/2001/650 and S/2001/692.

⁸⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁸⁶⁸ S/2001/709.

⁸⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁸⁷⁰ S/2002/198.

⁸⁷¹ S/2002/217.

⁸⁷² S/2002/286.

⁸⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

denouncing the violations of Iraq's airspace by United States and United Kingdom aircraft based in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Turkey, informed the Council that the Iraqi air forces, "acting in self-defence", had engaged the aircraft and had driven them off.

At its 4152nd meeting, on 8 June 2000, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 1302 (2000), by which it reaffirmed the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq and renewed the oil-for-food programme intended to alleviate the humanitarian impact of the sanctions imposed on Iraq. Responding to assertions made by the representative of the Russian Federation that the United States and United Kingdom aircraft had targeted civilian sites and the economic infrastructure in Iraq, the representative of the United States stated that the limited military operations of the United States aircraft were carried out "in self-defence" against military targets that threatened them and that they did not impact the overall humanitarian situation.⁸⁷⁸

By a letter dated 17 February 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁸⁷⁹ the representative of Iraq pointed out that the right of self-defence could not justify the military actions initiated by the United States against Iraq, which could be qualified as "a unilateral use of armed force against the sovereignty of an independent State". In a subsequent letter dated 20 February 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁸⁸⁰ the representative of Iraq reaffirmed his country's "legitimate and inherent right of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter and its inherent right under international law to compensation for the damage, in both human and material terms", that was caused by military acts against its territory undertaken by the United States and the United Kingdom.⁸⁸¹ By the same letter, the representative of Iraq urged the Council to put an end to the aggression and to ensure that the aggressors would be made responsible. In identical letters dated 16 August 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council,⁸⁸² the representative of Iraq replied to allegations by the United States that its military attacks were a response to provocation on the part of Iraqi air defence personnel. He cautioned that such a view

would mean that Iraq would be denied the right to self-defence affirmed by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.⁸⁸³

At its 4531st meeting, on 14 May 2002, the Council debated a number of proposals by the Syrian Arab Republic with a view to amending the draft resolution before the Council extending the provisions of the oil-for-food programme.⁸⁸⁴ In that connection, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic affirmed that the proposals were intended to ensure that Iraq was not denied "its natural right to acquire means for self-defence, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter, provided they did not include weapons of mass destruction".⁸⁸⁵

By a letter dated 28 May 2002 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁸⁸⁶ the representative of Iraq reaffirmed that the Iraqi army and people would continue "to exercise the right to legitimate self-defence" against the attacks by the United States and urged the international community "to endeavour to halt this aggression and bring its perpetrators to account".⁸⁸⁷ By a subsequent letter dated 11 June 2002 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁸⁸⁸ the representative of Iraq declared that the United States had violated resolutions 255 (1968) and 984 (1995) by threatening to use nuclear weapons against States that did not have nuclear weapons. He made reference to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 8 July 1996⁸⁸⁹ that held as unlawful the threat or use of force by means of nuclear weapons that was contrary to Article 2 (4) of the Charter and that failed to meet all the requirements of Article 51.⁸⁹⁰ By a subsequent letter dated 15 August 2002 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁸⁹¹ the representative of Iraq reported on the effects of the United States-led military action against Iraq and requested the Council to recognize Iraq's right to defend itself under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, and to reconsider

⁸⁷⁸ S/PV.4152, p. 5.

⁸⁷⁹ S/2001/146.

⁸⁸⁰ S/2001/152.

⁸⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁸⁸² S/2001/805.

⁸⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁸⁸⁴ S/2002/532. At the 4531st meeting, on 14 May 2002, the draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted as resolution 1409 (2002).

⁸⁸⁵ S/PV.4531, p. 2.

⁸⁸⁶ S/2002/589.

⁸⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁸⁸⁸ S/2002/659.

⁸⁸⁹ A/51/218.

⁸⁹⁰ S/2002/659, p. 2.

⁸⁹¹ S/2002/939.

its decisions that prevented Iraq from exercising its right of self-defence.

At its 4625th meeting, on 16 October 2002, the Council debated the question of Iraq's compliance with the norms of international law and relevant Security Council resolutions. The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran noted that the concept of "pre-emptive strike" distorted the "conventional understanding of the right of self-defence as clearly enshrined in customary international law and codified in the United Nations Charter".⁸⁹² The representative of Cuba concurred that the collective security system should be based on cooperation and not on doctrines that "constitute a violation of the spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations and that distort the inherent right of legitimate self-defence, as recognized by Article 51 of the Charter".⁸⁹³ During the course of the debate, several speakers made reference to the Secretary-General's address to the General Assembly on 12 September 2002 in which he emphasized that, while Article 51 of the Charter provided States with the right of self-defence, if attacked, when it came to addressing the broader threats to international peace and security, there was no substitute for the unique legitimacy provided by the United Nations.⁸⁹⁴

At the 4644th meeting on 8 November 2002, the representative of the United States, welcoming the adoption of resolution 1441 (2002), and affirming that the resolution did not contain any "hidden triggers" or "automaticity", noted that, "in one way or another", Iraq should be disarmed. He added that if the Council failed to act decisively in the event of further Iraqi violations, the resolution would "not constrain any Member State from acting to defend itself against the threat posed by Iraq or to enforce relevant United Nations resolutions and protect world peace and security".⁸⁹⁵

At its 4709th meeting, on 18 February 2003, the Council discussed the issue of disarmament in connection with Iraq. The representative of Cuba remarked that the doctrine of pre-emptive attack advocated the right to use, or threaten to use, force and to take unilateral military action against other States, in

advance and in the face of indeterminate and vague threats. He asserted that this interpretation was a violation of the spirit and the letter of the Charter of the United Nations and turned "the inherent right of legitimate self-defence into a blank cheque".⁸⁹⁶ The representative of the Gambia argued that the position taken by African Governments on the issue was clear and fully consistent with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Article 51 permitted the use of force only if an armed attack occurred and, even then, only until the Council had taken "measures necessary to maintain international peace and security".⁸⁹⁷ Meanwhile, the representative of Zimbabwe reminded the Council that a Member State could engage in individual and collective measures of self-defence even without the United Nations but, as shown by the Iraq case, Security Council authority had "assisted United States policy by adding the teeth of economic sanctions, extending a broad political umbrella and authorizing on-site monitoring on foreign-State territory".⁸⁹⁸

At its 4717th meeting, on 11 March 2003, the Council continued its deliberations on Iraq's compliance with Council resolutions and, specifically, on the alleged possession by Iraq of weapons of mass destruction. The representative of Cuba emphasized that, in the absence of evidence from inspections by the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission and the International Atomic Energy Agency, a war against Iraq would be "unjust and totally unnecessary". Consequently, he concluded that Iraq did not pose a credible threat or risk to the national security of the United States and war against Iraq could not be seen as "an act of self-defence".⁸⁹⁹ In the continuation of the debate, the representative of the Sudan highlighted that the conventional view in international law was that the Charter prohibited war except in the case of self-defence, pursuant to Article 51 and to Chapter VII on the basis of Security Council resolutions".⁹⁰⁰

By a letter dated 16 March 2003 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁹⁰¹ the representative of Iraq declared that in view of the escalation of threats of

⁸⁹² S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

⁸⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁸⁹⁴ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 10 (India); and p. 12 (Viet Nam).

⁸⁹⁵ S/PV.4644 and Corr.1, p. 3.

⁸⁹⁶ S/PV.4709, p. 11.

⁸⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁸⁹⁸ S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 33.

⁸⁹⁹ S/PV.4717, p. 26.

⁹⁰⁰ S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), p. 3.

⁹⁰¹ S/2003/327.

aggression against Iraq and the increased massing of United States and British military in Kuwait, Iraq would take the necessary steps to exercise its legitimate right of self-defence, pursuant to Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, to protect the area of the port and city of Umm Qasr, the lives and property of Iraqi citizens and public property.

In the aftermath of the United States-led military action against Iraq initiated on 20 March 2003, by a letter dated 24 March 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁰² the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations transmitted a resolution adopted by the League that condemned the United States-led military action against Iraq, in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter.

At its 4726th meeting, on 26 March 2003, the Council convened in response to letters dated 24 March 2003 from the representatives of Iraq and Malaysia addressed to the President of the Council,⁹⁰³ and discussed, *inter alia*, the issue of the use of force in connection with the right of self-defence. The representative of Yemen stressed that using force against others for reasons other than self-defence and without a Council mandate constituted a flagrant violation of the principles of international law and the Charter.⁹⁰⁴ The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran held that the unilateral war against Iraq did not meet any standard of international legitimacy and that it was not waged in self-defence against any prior armed attack nor could Iraq be considered an imminent threat against the national security of “belligerent Powers”.⁹⁰⁵ Along the same lines, the representative of Lebanon cautioned that the invocation of the right to self-defence was an invalid argument, “since Article 51 of the Charter recognizes the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence only if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations”,⁹⁰⁶ a condition not met in the case of Iraq. Finally, the representative of Iraq reiterated his country’s commitment to the Geneva Conventions and the provisions of international humanitarian law, which his country would not disobey except in “self-defence

of its people, its dignity, sovereignty and independence”.⁹⁰⁷

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

At its 4506th meeting, on 3 April 2002, the Council debated the situation in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem. During the discussion, the representative of South Africa stressed that Israel’s decision “to destroy Palestinian infrastructure, to humiliate and humble Palestinian civilians and to threaten the life of the legitimate, elected and internationally recognized leader of the Palestinian people” could not be justified “as acts of counter-terrorism or even self-defence”.⁹⁰⁸ The representative of Saudi Arabia concurred that Israel’s “state terrorism” was “not being undertaken in self-defence or as a means of protecting its citizens”, but as a means of protecting its occupation and of consecrating its usurpation of Palestinian territory.⁹⁰⁹ Referring to the humanitarian situation in the occupied territories, the representative of Singapore acknowledged Israel’s right to “exercise self-defence” but emphasized that, under international law, Israel must allow immediate medical access to the occupied areas by international humanitarian agencies such as the International Committee of the Red Cross.⁹¹⁰ The representative of Cuba asserted that the “right of self-defence” could not justify the illegal occupation of territories or the forced exile of Palestinians from their land of birth.⁹¹¹ The representative of Iraq warned that Israel and the United States sought to transform the right of self-defence into a political means to justify acts of aggression.⁹¹² Similarly, the representative of the Sudan qualified as unacceptable Israel’s justification for its actions as aiming to combat terrorism or providing self-defence.⁹¹³ That point of view was reinforced by the representative of Qatar, who insisted that the “Israeli onslaught” could not be categorized as self-defence.⁹¹⁴ However, the representative of Canada expressed his Government’s recognition for “Israel’s right to exist within secure and

⁹⁰² S/2003/365.

⁹⁰³ S/2003/362 and S/2003/363, respectively.

⁹⁰⁴ S/PV.4726, p. 13.

⁹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

⁹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁹⁰⁷ S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 36.

⁹⁰⁸ S/PV.4506 and Corr.1, p. 16.

⁹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁹¹¹ S/PV.4506 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 2.

⁹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

recognized borders and its right to self-defence against terrorist acts". Nonetheless, he recalled that the continuing Israeli incursions into Palestinian towns and cities fed the spiral of violence.⁹¹⁵ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic insisted that Israel was misleading the world by claiming to commit its acts of aggression under "the guise of self-defence".⁹¹⁶ The representative of Mexico endorsed that view, declaring that his country was contesting Israel's invocation of the right to self-defence to explain its military incursions into Palestinian cities and the siege and kidnapping of the President of the Palestinian National Authority. He declared that, on the contrary, Israel was "not acting in accordance with the principles of legitimate self-defence recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations".⁹¹⁷ The Secretary-General cautioned that the Israeli actions since the adoption of Security Council resolution 1402 (2002) did not help to stabilize the situation in the region and emphasized that Israel could not use the right to self-defence as a "blank cheque".⁹¹⁸ He added that there was an urgent need to comply with all provisions of international law, particularly those that ban indiscriminate and disproportionate use of force as well as the humiliating treatment of the civilian population.⁹¹⁹

At the 4510th meeting, on 8 April 2002, speakers echoed the Secretary-General's position that Israel's right to self-defence was not a "blank cheque" and did not entitle it not to comply with the principles of international law.⁹²⁰ The representative of the United Arab Emirates called for the international community to distinguish between "the terrorism pursued by the Israeli Government and the legitimate right of the Palestinian people to self-defence and to resist occupation" until their territories had been liberated and an independent State had been established in independent Palestine.⁹²¹

⁹¹⁵ Ibid, p. 24.

⁹¹⁶ Ibid, p. 27.

⁹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 37.

⁹¹⁸ S/PV.4506 (Resumption 2), p. 5.

⁹¹⁹ Similarly, at the 4525th meeting, on 3 May 2002, the representative of Mauritius recognized Israel's right to protect its people from terrorist attacks, but stressed that Israel should be aware that self-defence was not a "blank cheque" (S/PV.4525 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 28).

⁹²⁰ S/PV.4510, p. 21 (South Africa); and p. 23 (Kuwait).

⁹²¹ S/PV.4510 (Resumption 1), p. 22.

At the 4515th meeting, on 18 April 2002, the representative of Brazil made reference to the Secretary-General's comment regarding the right of self-defence not constituting a "blank cheque" for aggression when stressing that Israel must allow full freedom of movement for humanitarian agencies in the Palestinian territories.⁹²² In reference to the humanitarian crisis in the occupied territories, the representative of India also contended that the right of self-defence could not be used as justification for the crisis.⁹²³ In response, the representative of Israel declared that the "Israeli actions in Jenin and elsewhere were undertaken reluctantly and in self-defence against an unrelenting campaign of violence and terrorism incited, supported and financed by the Palestinian Authority". He added that those actions were taken only after the Palestinian Authority was given ample opportunity to fulfill its commitment and after Israel had exercised restraint in the face of a wave of suicide-bombing massacres.⁹²⁴

At its 4588th meeting, on 24 July 2002, the Council met to discuss the escalation of military acts carried out by Israel in the Palestinian territory, and specifically the attack in the area of Yarmuk in the northern Gaza Strip. The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic reminded the Council that this was not the first time Israel had committed "massacre against the Palestinian people". He noted that Israel was pursuing "a systematic policy of destruction in a show of senseless force", for the sole purpose of preventing the Palestinian people from exercising their right to self-determination. He further added that Israeli actions perpetrated against the "defenceless Palestinian people" could not be regarded as acts of self-defence since Israel's nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction would be satisfactory for its defence, should it decide to withdraw to the lines it held prior to 4 June 1967.⁹²⁵ Other speakers agreed that the international community should not consider the recent Israeli aggression to be an act of self-defence.⁹²⁶ The President of the Council, speaking in his capacity as the representative of the United Kingdom, emphasized that, according to the norms of international law, actions taken by Israel in self-defence "must be

⁹²² S/PV.4515, p. 21.

⁹²³ Ibid., p. 26.

⁹²⁴ S/PV.4515 (Resumption 1), p. 21.

⁹²⁵ S/PV.4588, pp.13-14.

⁹²⁶ Ibid., p.21 (Egypt); and p. 28 (Iraq).

proportionate” and that Israel must avoid civilian casualties and avoid damaging civilian property and infrastructure.⁹²⁷

At its 4722nd meeting, on 19 March 2003, the Council was briefed on the situation in the Middle East by the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General. In his statement, he emphasized the obligation of Israel under international law to minimize the harm to innocent civilians but stressed that, like every other State, Israel had a “right to self-defence” which should be “exercised with caution, using reasonable means”.⁹²⁸ Similarly, at the 4741st meeting, on 16 April 2003, the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs recognized Israel’s right to self-defence, but cautioned that it should be exercised within the boundaries of international law.⁹²⁹ At the 4846th meeting, on 21 October 2003, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs reiterated that while “Israel’s right to defend itself against terrorist attacks” was recognized, the right of self-defence was neither unconditional nor unlimited and should be exercised in proportionate terms and in keeping with Israel’s obligations under international law.⁹³⁰

At its 4841st meeting, on 14 October 2003, the Council discussed the recent Israeli actions in the Rafah area. During the debate, the representative of France recognized “Israel’s inalienable right to security, its right to self-defence and its right to combat terrorist attacks”, but insisted that the struggle against terrorism could not justify everything and had to be

carried out with respect for the law.⁹³¹ A similar point was made by the representative of Italy, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries⁹³², and by the representative of Norway.⁹³³ By contrast, the representative of Saudi Arabia argued that the international community viewed as terrorists those who resisted occupation, while the “unjust occupier and oppressor” who had usurped all the rights of others was “allowed to enjoy the right of self-defence to further its colonialism and entrench its occupation”.⁹³⁴ In response, the representative of Israel questioned whether “the energy of the Security Council should be expended debating security measures adopted in self-defence, or addressing the terrorism that made such measures necessary”.⁹³⁵

Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/939)

Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/943)

At its 4836th meeting, on 5 October 2003, the Council discussed two letters dated 5 October 2003 from the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon, respectively.⁹³⁶ By the two letters, the aforementioned representatives requested the Council to convene an emergency meeting to consider Israel’s military action targeting a site situated inside the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic. During the debate, the representative of Israel insisted that Israel’s response to the suicide bombings against a terrorist training facility in the Syrian Arab Republic was “a clear act of self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter”.⁹³⁷ A series of speakers, however, contended that Israel’s actions did not qualify as an

⁹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁹²⁸ S/PV.4722, p. 3. At the 4757th meeting, on 19 May 2003, the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General highlighted “Israel’s right to self-defence in the face of repeated terrorist attacks”. He maintained, however, that the United Nations must “repeat the call on the Israeli authorities to abandon the use of excessive force in densely populated areas and to protect the safety of civilians and preserve their property in keeping with Israel’s obligations under international humanitarian law” (S/PV.4757, p. 3).

⁹²⁹ S/PV.4741 and Corr.1, p. 2. At the 4773rd meeting, on 13 June 2003, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs reaffirmed Israel’s “right to self-defence in the face of repeated terrorist attacks”, but cautioned that it was “incumbent upon Israel to pursue its security and self-defence in a manner that minimizes the suffering of Palestinian civilians” (S/PV.4773, p. 4).

⁹³⁰ S/PV.4846, p. 3.

⁹³¹ S/PV.4841, p. 18.

⁹³² Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia; Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey; and Iceland and Liechtenstein.

⁹³³ *Ibid.*, p. 42 (Italy, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 43 (Norway).

⁹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

⁹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁹³⁶ S/2003/939 and S/2003/943.

⁹³⁷ S/PV.4836 and Corr.1, p. 7.

exercise of the right to self-defence.⁹³⁸ The Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations reaffirmed its support of the Syrian Arab Republic and any measures that it might adopt in “self-defence against such aggression”.⁹³⁹ Similar views were expressed by other representatives in their statements.⁹⁴⁰ The representative of Egypt referred to the similarities between the present situation and that of 30 years ago when Egypt and the Syrian Arab Republic took military action against Israel to regain Egyptian territory in the Sinai which at the time was occupied by Israel. He asserted that Egypt’s actions at that point in time were in conformity with the right of self-defence and had taken place on Egyptian territory.⁹⁴¹

Small arms

At its 4355th meeting, on 2 August 2001, the Council discussed the consequences of the illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons, especially in conflict situations. The representative of the Russian Federation spoke in favor of a responsible policy in the supply of weapons to the international market, while expressing his support for the right to acquire weapons legally based on “the provisions of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter on the legitimate right of States to self-defence”.⁹⁴² The representative of Tunisia concurred that any action designed to cope with the problems of small arms and light weapons must take into account “the legitimate right of self-defence of States, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter, and the right of peoples to self-determination”.⁹⁴³ Several speakers endorsed the necessity of finding a solution for the problem of small arms that would respect States’ and peoples’ right to self-defence in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter.⁹⁴⁴

At its 4623rd meeting, on 11 October 2002, the Council debated the Secretary-General’s report on small arms.⁹⁴⁵ Several speakers reminded the Council

of the importance of respecting the right to self-defence when considering a solution to the problem of small arms and emphasized that States should have the right to acquire and produce small arms for self-defence and national security.⁹⁴⁶

At its 4720th meeting, on 18 March 2003, the Council discussed the proliferation of small arms and light weapons and the phenomenon of mercenaries in view of their negative effects on West Africa. In that connection, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic confirmed the need to respect international law and the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular respect for national sovereignty, non-interference in the internal affairs of Members States and the right to individual or collective self-defence as stipulated by Article 51 of the Charter.⁹⁴⁷

Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts

At its 4413th meeting, on 12 November 2001, the Council discussed the threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts in the context of the attacks of 11 September 2001 against the United States. The representative of France argued that the armed response by the United States against Osama bin Laden, the Al-Qaida network and the Taliban system that supported them, was taken “in exercise of its right of self-defence” and therefore expressed “solidarity with that action”.⁹⁴⁸ The representative of Norway concurred that resolution 1368 (2001) made it clear that the attacks on 11 September 2001 against the United States constituted a threat to international peace and security, and thus “triggered the right to self-defence”. He added that the pursuit of terrorists and their backers in Afghanistan was being carried out in the exercise of that right, and that his Government fully supported the action by the United States⁹⁴⁹

At the Council’s 4512th meeting, on 15 April 2002, in relation to the terrorist acts of 11 September 2001, the representative of Mexico noted that the fight against terrorism should conform to the provisions of

⁹³⁸ Ibid., p. 8 (Pakistan); p. 17 (Morocco); and p. 18 (Jordan).

⁹³⁹ Ibid., p. 14.

⁹⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 23 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); and p. 24 (the Sudan).

⁹⁴¹ Ibid., p. 18.

⁹⁴² S/PV.4355, p. 13.

⁹⁴³ Ibid., p. 16.

⁹⁴⁴ S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 15 (Venezuela); p. 17 (Sudan); and p. 19 (Egypt).

⁹⁴⁵ S/2002/1053.

⁹⁴⁶ S/PV.4623, pp. 14-15 (Syrian Arab Republic); S/PV.4623 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Egypt); p. 9 (Philippines); p. 15 (Israel); and p. 37 (Pakistan).

⁹⁴⁷ S/PV.4720 (Resumption 1), p. 15.

⁹⁴⁸ S/PV.4413, p. 7.

⁹⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 10.

the Charter and of international law and that the use of force “must be governed by a valid interpretation of the legitimate right of self-defence and must in all circumstances conform to the principle of proportionality”.⁹⁵⁰ The representative of Israel reiterated the provisions of resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1368 (2001), which recognized that terrorism constituted a threat to international peace and security and that States had “an inherent right to individual and collective self-defence against it”.⁹⁵¹

At its 4618th meeting, on 4 October 2002, the Council continued its debate on ways to combat terrorism internationally. In that context, the representative of Egypt cautioned that terrorism should not be confused with “the legitimate right to self-defence against foreign occupation”.⁹⁵²

The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes

At its 4753rd meeting, on 13 May 2003, the Council discussed the role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes. In his statement, the representative of India maintained that no State could permit aggression against its own territory. He added that nothing in the Charter could “impair the inherent right of each Member State to take all necessary measures for its self-defence” if there were an armed attack against it.⁹⁵³ Referring to the conflict in Nagorny-Karabakh, and responding to the representative of Azerbaijan who stated that “one fifth” of his country’s territory remained “under Armenian occupation”,⁹⁵⁴ the representative of Armenia argued that the conflict was not the result of armed aggression, as Azerbaijan tried to present it, “but the forced resort to self-defence of the Karabakh population”.⁹⁵⁵

Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts

At its 4174th meeting, on 20 July 2000, the Council discussed the role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts. In that connection, the representative of Pakistan declared that the concept

of preventive disarmament needed further “discussion and elaboration, because such a concept would militate against the inherent right to self-defence sanctified by the Charter of the United Nations”.⁹⁵⁶

Wrap-up discussion of the work of the Security Council for the current month

At its 4445th meeting, on 21 December 2001, the Council held a wrap-up discussion of the work of the Security Council during the year 2001. Referring to Afghanistan as a successful case, the representative of Singapore noticed that after 11 September 2001, the “decisive intervention of the United States-led military coalition, exercising the right of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter, paved the way for a new Afghanistan to emerge” in which the humanitarian situation of the Afghan people had improved.⁹⁵⁷

C. Invocation of the right of self-defence in other instances

Communication concerning relations between Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo

By a letter dated 11 May 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁵⁸ the representative of Burundi reported that the Burundian rebellion in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the threat it posed to Burundian trade on Lake Tanganyika, led Burundi to deploy a military self-defence operation covering the part of the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo along Lake Tanganyika. He noted that the purpose of the Burundian military operation was “strictly confined to self-defence”, and that Burundi had never had “political, territorial or economic designs on the Democratic Republic of the Congo”.⁹⁵⁹

Communications concerning the situation in Côte d’Ivoire

By a letter dated 28 April 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁶⁰ the representative of Côte d’Ivoire informed the Council of the progress

⁹⁵⁰ S/PV.4512, p. 14.

⁹⁵¹ S/PV.4512 (Resumption 1), p. 12.

⁹⁵² S/PV.4618 (Resumption 1), p. 17.

⁹⁵³ S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 7.

⁹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁹⁵⁶ S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 5.

⁹⁵⁷ S/PV.4445, p. 17.

⁹⁵⁸ S/2001/472.

⁹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁹⁶⁰ S/2003/510.

made in the implementation of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement. He decried the international community's condemnation of the Government of Côte d'Ivoire when it exercised "its right to self-defence, as provided for in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations",⁹⁶¹ in response to the atrocities and violations of the Agreement.

Communications concerning the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia

By a letter dated 7 April 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁶² the representative of Ethiopia presented the state of affairs of the conflict between Eritrea and Ethiopia. He described the "liberation" of Badme by the Ethiopian forces in February 1999 as an "exercise of Ethiopia's right of legitimate self-defence under international law enshrined in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations".⁹⁶³

In response, the representative of Eritrea, by a letter dated 12 May 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁶⁴ called upon the Council to support the right of Eritrea to self-defence "in the wake of the war of aggression" carried out by Ethiopia.

By a letter dated 2 June 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁶⁵ the representative of Ethiopia asserted that his Government had exercised its right of self-defence, and that they had verified that its territories had been cleared of invading forces.

In response, the representative of Eritrea, by a letter dated 9 June 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁶⁶ argued that Ethiopia's offensive deep inside sovereign Eritrean territory was a flagrant act of invasion. He observed that while Eritrea had the right to self-defence, it could not engage in military activities in an area where it had redeployed "voluntarily from deep into its own sovereign territory".⁹⁶⁷

⁹⁶¹ Ibid., p. 2.

⁹⁶² S/2000/296.

⁹⁶³ Ibid., p. 2.

⁹⁶⁴ S/2000/420.

⁹⁶⁵ S/2000/523.

⁹⁶⁶ S/2000/554.

⁹⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 2.

Communications concerning relations between Georgia and the Russian Federation

By a letter dated 11 September 2002 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁹⁶⁸ the representative of the Russian Federation cautioned Georgia to establish a security zone in the area of the Georgia-Russian Federation border and respect Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) of 28 September 2001. If Georgia failed to comply, and did not put an end to "the bandit sorties and attacks on adjoining areas in the Russian Federation", the Russian Federation would reserve the right to act in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.⁹⁶⁹

By a letter dated 13 September 2002 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁹⁷⁰ the representative of Georgia expressed his Government's distress regarding the Russian Federation's threat to use force against Georgia. He conveyed his Government's willingness to cooperate in fighting global terrorism and qualified as unacceptable the Russian Federation's interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter⁹⁷¹ in a manner that would justify its aggressive intentions.

By identical letters dated 15 September 2002 addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council,⁹⁷² the representative of Georgia reiterated the "unaptness" of Article 51 of the Charter to explain the Russian Federation's actions towards Georgia, considering that Georgia did not attack the Russian Federation.

Communications concerning relations between India and Pakistan

By a letter dated 23 January 2000 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁹⁷³ the representative of Pakistan reported that, on 22 January 2000, Indian forces had crossed the border and attacked a Pakistani post between the two channels of the Tawi River. In response, he declared that the Pakistani forces "fought gallantly in self-defence and succeeded in repelling the Indian attack". He also announced that the Pakistan Armed Forces would "exercise their right of self-

⁹⁶⁸ S/2002/1012.

⁹⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 3.

⁹⁷⁰ S/2002/1035.

⁹⁷¹ Ibid., p. 2.

⁹⁷² S/2002/1033.

⁹⁷³ S/2000/48.

defence with their well-known sense of commitment and determination".⁹⁷⁴

By a letter dated 22 May 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁷⁵ the representative of Pakistan announced his Government's readiness to join the international coalition against terrorism. He added that Pakistan would nevertheless be ready to meet resolutely any aggression by India, in the exercise of its inherent right to self-defence, against the territory of Pakistan or the territories in Kashmir.

Communications concerning relations between Iran and Iraq

By a letter dated 15 February 2000 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁹⁷⁶ the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran reported that terrorist groups from the Iraqi territory were operating along the Iranian border. He noted that Iran reserved its legitimate right to self-defence and would respond to such hostile acts if they continued.

In a series of letters addressed to the Secretary-General,⁹⁷⁷ the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran reported that members of the terrorist Mojahedin Khalq Organization, authorized by the Government of Iraq to be based on Iraqi soil, engaged in acts of sabotage against Iran. He stated that Iran considered intolerable the continuation of such hostile acts and reserved its right to legitimate self-defence and removal of any threats.

By a letter dated 18 April 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁷⁸ the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran informed the Council that in response to the acts of terrorism committed by members of the terrorist Mojahedin Khalq Organization based in Iraq, the armed forces of Iran, in accordance with Article 51, took a "limited and proportionate defensive measure" against a number of that entity's bases in Iraq. If the Government of Iraq were "to take appropriate measures" to put an end to the use of Iraqi territory for cross-border attacks and terrorist operations against Iran, it would render

unnecessary the measures taken in accordance with Article 51 by the Government of Iran.⁹⁷⁹

Communications concerning relations between Iraq and Saudi-Arabia

By identical letters dated 29 May 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council,⁹⁸⁰ the representative of Saudi Arabia reported that, on 23 May 2001, an Iraqi patrol crossed the Saudi-Iraqi international boundary. In response, members of the Saudi Frontier Force "were forced to respond to the fire in self-defence, and in the exchange between the Force and the members of the Iraqi patrol a number of Saudi soldiers were wounded".⁹⁸¹

Communications concerning the situation in Liberia

By a letter dated 11 May 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁹⁸² the representative of Liberia indicated that the arms embargo imposed against Liberia had impaired the country's capacity adequately to exercise its right of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter and announced that his Government reserved the right to defend itself in that connection.

By a letter dated 4 June 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁸³ the representative of Liberia informed the Council of the armed attacks against Liberia from the territory of Guinea. He reasserted his Government's right to self-defence in the wake of armed aggression.

In a subsequent letter dated 6 September 2001 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁸⁴ the representative of Liberia asked the Council "to grant a limited waiver of the arms embargo imposed by resolution 1343 (2001) to permit the importation of essential military supplies under United Nations monitoring to be used for the sole purpose of self-defence". He argued that Liberia had an inherent right to self-defence and a "constitutional responsibility to provide for the protection of its sovereign territory, and the life and property of its citizens".

⁹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁹⁷⁵ S/2002/571.

⁹⁷⁶ S/2000/128.

⁹⁷⁷ S/2000/216, S/2000/271, S/2000/912, S/2000/1036 and S/2001/271.

⁹⁷⁸ S/2001/381.

⁹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁹⁸⁰ S/2001/547.

⁹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁹⁸² S/2001/474.

⁹⁸³ S/2001/562.

⁹⁸⁴ S/2001/851.

By a letter dated 31 October 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General,⁹⁸⁵ the representative of Liberia reiterated that the Liberian nation had been under attack from dissidents in Lofa County, in northern Liberia, since April 1999. He declared that the Government of Liberia, acting under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, would utilize “every available means to defend its sovereignty, protect its territorial integrity and preserve its people”.⁹⁸⁶

At the 4405th meeting, on 5 November 2001, the representative of Liberia asked the Council to remove any constraints imposed on Liberia so that the country could defend its territory and sovereignty, “as is the inherent right of every Member of this Organization under its constitution and Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations”.⁹⁸⁷

By a letter dated 20 March 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁸⁸ the representative of Liberia informed the Council that Liberia had “taken measures to provide for its legitimate self-defence in the wake of persistent armed attacks against its territory”. He further assured the Council that these measures were without prejudice to Security Council resolution 1343 (2001), and that his Government would continue to comply with the demands outlined in resolution 1343 (2001).

Communications concerning violations of the Lusaka Agreement

By a letter dated 8 November 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁸⁹ the

⁹⁸⁵ S/2001/1035.

⁹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁹⁸⁷ S/PV.4405, p. 27.

⁹⁸⁸ S/2002/310.

⁹⁸⁹ S/2000/1076.

representative of Zimbabwe dismissed the Rwandan allegations of repeated violations of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement by Southern African Development Community allied forces. He urged the Security Council to “see through Rwanda’s subterfuge. The so-called right to self-defence is nothing more than an excuse by Rwanda to launch an offensive”.⁹⁹⁰

Communications concerning relations between the Sudan and Eritrea

By a letter dated 7 October 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁹¹ the representative of the Sudan drew attention to the Eritrean attacks on eight Sudanese locations along the Sudanese boundary with Eritrea. He noted that, at a time when Eritrea’s aggression against his country continued, the Sudan affirmed “its natural and legal right to defend its territory, its citizens and its installations, in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations”⁹⁹² to repel the aggression.

Communication concerning relations between Uganda and Rwanda

By a letter dated 15 June 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁹³ the representative of Uganda reported repeated violations of the ceasefire in Kisangani by the Rwandan Patriotic Army which had forced the Ugandan People’s Defence Forces to “take self-defence measures, including the securing of Tshopo Bridge and establishment of a defence at Sotexki junction”.⁹⁹⁴

⁹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁹⁹¹ S/2002/1117.

⁹⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁹⁹³ S/2000/596.

⁹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

Chapter XII

Consideration of the provisions of other Articles of the Charter

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introductory note	1021
Part I. Consideration of the purposes and principles of the United Nations (Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter)	1022
A. Article 1, paragraph 2	1022
B. Article 2, paragraph 4	1026
C. Article 2, paragraph 5	1038
D. Article 2, paragraph 6	1041
E. Article 2, paragraph 7	1041
Part II. Consideration of the functions and powers of the Security Council (Articles 24 and 25 of the Charter)	1044
A. Article 24	1044
B. Article 25	1054
Part III. Consideration of the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter	1057
Note	1057
A. General considerations of the provisions of Chapter VIII	1059
B. Encouragement or calls by the Security Council for action by regional arrangements in the pacific settlement of disputes	1066
C. Calls by the Security Council for involvement of regional arrangements in the implementation of Chapter VII measures	1073
D. Consideration or authorization by the Security Council of enforcement action by regional arrangements	1075
E. Consultation, briefing and reporting by regional arrangements	1077
Part IV. Consideration of the miscellaneous provisions of the Charter	1078
Note	1078

Introductory note

Chapter XII covers the consideration by the Security Council of Articles of the Charter not dealt with in the preceding chapters. It consists of four parts: part I covers material pertaining to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, namely Articles 1 (2), 2 (4), 2 (5), 2 (6) and 2 (7). In part II, Articles 24 and 25 are considered in relation to the functions and powers of the Security Council. Part III deals with the practice of the Security Council in connection with the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter, Articles 52 to 54, concerning regional arrangements. Part IV considers miscellaneous provisions of the Charter, including material relating to Article 103.

Part I

Consideration of the purposes and principles of the United Nations (Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter)

A. Article 1, paragraph 2

Article 1, paragraph 2

[The Purposes of the United Nations are:]

To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace.

Note

During the period under review, there was one explicit reference to Article 1 (2) of the Charter in a resolution in connection with the situation in Western Sahara: by resolution 1359 (2001) of 29 June 2001, the Council reaffirmed the provisions contained in Article 1 (2) of the Charter.¹ There were also implicit references to the principle enshrined in Article 1 (2) in a number of resolutions and presidential statements.²

Article 1 (2) was explicitly invoked twice in the deliberations of the Council, without giving rise to a constitutional discussion. In the first instance, at the 4841st meeting, on 14 October 2003, concerning the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, the Article was invoked by the Permanent

Observer of Palestine in connection with the construction of a “separation wall” by Israel.³ In the second instance, at the 4625th meeting, on 16 October 2002 concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the representative of Iraq argued that the United Nations sanctions against his country were “a violation of Article 1, paragraph 2 of the Charter, which deals with respect for the principle of equality among peoples — their equal rights and their right to self-determination”, since no sanctions should be imposed that would “cause international disagreements that are incompatible with the legal rights of the State or that prejudice the people’s right to self-determination”.⁴

The principle of self-determination was frequently invoked without giving rise to a constitutional discussion in the consideration of the agenda items entitled “The situation in East Timor”,⁵ “The situation in Western Sahara”,⁶ “The situation in the Middle East”,⁷ and “Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)”.⁸ While there were also other references to the principle of self-determination, they were often incidental and too numerous to be listed here. The Council also called for, welcomed, or otherwise expressed support for the holding of elections in a number of cases, including those relating to Bosnia and Herzegovina,⁹ Central African Republic,¹⁰ Côte d’Ivoire,¹¹ East Timor,¹² Guinea-Bissau,¹³ Haiti,¹⁴ Liberia,¹⁵ Sierra Leone,¹⁶ Somalia,¹⁷

¹ Resolution 1359 (2001), third preambular paragraph.

² In connection with the situation in Western Sahara, see resolutions 1292 (2000), fifth preambular paragraph; 1301 (2000), fifth preambular paragraph; 1309 (2000), fourth preambular paragraph; 1324 (2000), fourth preambular paragraph; 1342 (2001), fourth preambular paragraph; 1349 (2001), fourth preambular paragraph; 1359 (2001), sixth and eighth preambular paragraphs; 1429 (2002), sixth preambular paragraph and para. 1; and 1495 (2003), para. 1. In connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, see resolution 1483 (2003), fifth preambular paragraph. In connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, see resolution 1291 (2000), second and third preambular paragraphs. In connection with the situation in East Timor, see resolutions 1366 (2001), fourth preambular paragraph; 1392 (2002), second and fifth preambular paragraphs; and 1410 (2002), second, third and sixth preambular paragraphs; S/PRST/2002/13, first paragraph; and S/PRST/2001/32, third, fifth and sixth paragraphs.

³ S/PV.4841, p. 5 (Palestine).

⁴ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p.7.

⁵ See, for example, S/PV.4537, pp. 3, 8, 10, 17, 18, 22, 26, 31 and 33.

⁶ See, for example, S/PV.4149, pp. 2, 3 and 5.

⁷ See, for example, S/PV.4231, p. 4, 6, 14 and 25 or S/PV.4478 pp. 9, 25, 26, 29 and 35.

⁸ See, for example, S/PV.4403, pp. 8 and 22.

⁹ See, for example, S/PRST/2001/11.

¹⁰ See, for example, S/PRST/2000/5.

¹¹ See, for example, S/PRST/2003/20.

¹² See, for example, resolutions 1338 (2001), fifth preambular paragraph; S/PRST/2000/26; and S/PRST/2000/39.

¹³ See, for example, S/PRST/2000/11 and S/PRST/2000/37.

¹⁴ See, for example, S/PRST/2000/8.

Tajikistan¹⁸ and Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.¹⁹

The cases that follow reflect instances in which the Council dealt with questions relating to the principle enshrined in Article 1 (2), in connection with the situation in East Timor (case 1); Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999) (case 2); and the situation between Iraq and Kuwait (case 3).

Case 1

The situation in East Timor

On 20 May 2002, the Security Council convened the 4537th meeting, on the occasion of the independence of East Timor. At that meeting, several speakers congratulated the people of East Timor for their efforts to attain independence by democratic means, including by exercising their right to self-determination.²⁰ The Deputy Secretary-General noted the courageous contribution made in 1999 by Indonesia and Portugal in the signing of the 5 May Agreement,²¹ allowing the people of East Timor to express their will for self-determination.²² The representative of Portugal congratulated East Timor which had “exerted the right of self-determination and affirmed its independence”.²³ The representative of Indonesia commemorated the milestone event of the “birth of East Timor as a fully-fledged sovereign and independent nation”.²⁴ Several

speakers noted the role played by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and that the General Assembly, through its adoption of resolution 56/282, had removed East Timor from the list of non-self-governing territories.²⁵

At the same meeting, in a statement by the President, the Council welcomed the attainment of independence by East Timor, which marked the “culmination of a process of self-determination” and transition that had begun in May 1999, and looked forward to the day when East Timor would join as a State Member of the United Nations. The Council also affirmed its commitment to the sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and national unity of East Timor within its internationally recognized boundaries.²⁶

Following its consideration of the application of East Timor for admission to the United Nations²⁷ at the 4542nd meeting on 23 May 2002, the Council adopted resolution 1414 (2002), by which it recommended to the General Assembly that East Timor be admitted to membership of the United Nations.²⁸

Case 2

Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)

As part of the political process designed to determine the future status of Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999),²⁹ the Secretary-General, in his report of 22 April 2002, noted the need for a political roadmap for both the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), whose duties included facilitating such a process, and for the provisional institutions of self-government in Kosovo. He informed the Council that he had asked his Special Representative to develop benchmarks against which progress in the critical areas of the rule of law, functioning of democratic institutions, the economy,

¹⁵ See resolutions 1408 (2002), seventh preambular paragraph and 1509 (2003), para. 3 (f).

¹⁶ See resolutions 1346 (2001), fourth preambular paragraph; 1370 (2001), fifth preambular paragraph; 1389 (2002), fifth preambular paragraph; 1400 (2002), eighth preambular paragraph; and 1436 (2002), third preambular paragraph.

¹⁷ See, for example, S/PRST/2001/1.

¹⁸ See, for example, S/PRST/2000/17.

¹⁹ See, for example, S/PRST/2001/8 and S/PRST/2001/34.

²⁰ S/PV.4537, pp. 10-11 (Costa Rica, on behalf of the Rio Group); p. 13 (Philippines); pp. 14-15 (Brazil); pp. 16-17 (Venezuela); pp. 18-19 (Jamaica, on behalf of the Caribbean Community); pp. 22-23 (Syrian Arab Republic); pp. 23-24 (Russian Federation); pp. 25-26 (Guinea); pp. 30-31 (Mexico); and pp. 31-32 (Colombia).

²¹ Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Portuguese Republic on the question of East Timor (S/1999/513, annex I).

²² S/PV.4537., pp. 2-3.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Spain); p. 14 (Cuba); p. 17 (Venezuela); and p. 27 (Bulgaria).

²⁶ S/PRST/2002/13, first and ninth paragraphs.

²⁷ S/2002/558.

²⁸ For details, see chapter VII.

²⁹ Resolution 1244 (1999), para. 11 (e).

freedom of movement, the return of internally displaced persons and refugees and contributions to regional stability could be measured.³⁰ In his report of 9 October 2002, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the benchmarks process was being publicized in Kosovo under the slogan of “Standards before Status”.³¹

By a presidential statement dated 6 February 2003, the Council reiterated its full support for the Standards before Status policy, which postulated targets in the eight key areas: functioning of the democratic institutions, the rule of law, freedom of movement, the return of refugees and internally displaced persons, economy, property rights, dialogue with Belgrade, and the Kosovo Protection Corps. The Council welcomed the presentation of a detailed plan for its implementation that would provide the appropriate baseline against which progress could be measured and stated that the fulfilment of those targets was “essential to commencing a political process designed to determine Kosovo’s future, in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999)”.³²

At the 4742nd meeting, on 23 April 2003, most speakers reiterated their support for the Standards before Status approach to the situation in Kosovo reflected in resolution 1244 (1999).³³ The representative of the United Kingdom condemned unilateral statements on Kosovo’s final status from either side and agreed that there was considerable work to be done to fulfil the benchmarks. He also underlined the need for democratic governance to take hold in Kosovo before there could be a settlement of Kosovo’s status.³⁴ The representative of China expressed concern that, according to the report of the Secretary-General,³⁵ from time to time comments were made regarding the status of Kosovo. He reiterated the belief that Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) remained the international community’s policy basis with respect to the question of Kosovo.³⁶ The representative of

Pakistan, while supporting the full implementation of resolution 1244 (1999), noted that it considered the Standards before Status approach to be unique and applicable only in the case of Kosovo and expressed the view that the resolution of the status question should be the primary focus of the work of the Council in “all but the most exceptional cases”.³⁷ The representative of Albania reiterated the position that the processes underway in Kosovo were paving the way for the final status of Kosovo, which should “reflect and respect the right and will of all the people there to determine their future”.³⁸

By a presidential statement dated 12 December 2003, the Council expressed support for the prospect of a comprehensive review of the progress of the Provisional Institutions of Self-Government in meeting the standards. The Council stressed that further advancement towards a process to determine the future status of Kosovo in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999) would depend on the positive outcome of that comprehensive review.³⁹

Case 3 The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

At the 4726th meeting, on 26 March 2003, which was convened following the commencement of the military action against Iraq, the Secretary-General regretted that the intense efforts to achieve a peaceful solution, through the Security Council, had not succeeded and that the earlier inability of the Council to agree on a collective course of action placed an even greater burden on the Council. In that context, he emphasized that the Council should consider two guiding principles which should underpin all the efforts by the Council and its future decisions on Iraq: respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Iraq and respect for the right of the Iraqi people to determine their own political future and control their own natural resources.⁴⁰ During the debate, a number of speakers reiterated the importance of the two principles in finding a solution to the situation in Iraq.⁴¹

³⁰ S/2002/436, para. 54.

³¹ S/2002/1126, para. 2.

³² S/PRST/2003/1.

³³ S/PV.4742, p. 5 (Chile); pp. 7-8 (Germany); pp. 9-10 (Bulgaria); pp. 10-11 (Russian Federation); pp. 11-12 (France); pp. 14-15 (United States); pp. 15-16 (Angola); and pp. 20-21 (Greece, on behalf of the European Union).

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

³⁵ S/2003/421, para. 44.

³⁶ S/PV.4742, p. 10.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7. This position was reiterated in subsequent meetings (see S/PV.4770, p. 13; S/PV.4853, p. 7; and S/PV.4886, p. 13).

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-23.

³⁹ S/PRST/2003/26, fifth paragraph.

⁴⁰ S/PV.4726, pp. 3-4.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); pp. 20-21

By resolution 1472 (2003) of 28 March 2003, the Council, *inter alia*, reaffirmed the respect for the right of the Iraqi people “to determine their own political future and to control their own natural resources”.⁴²

By resolution 1483 (2003) of 22 May 2003, the Council stressed the right of the Iraqi people freely to determine their own political future and control their own natural resources, expressed resolve that the day when Iraqis governed themselves had to come quickly, and encouraged efforts by the people of Iraq to form a representative government based on the rule of law that afforded equal rights and justice to all Iraqi citizens without regard to ethnicity, religion, or gender.⁴³ By the same resolution, the Council also noted the letter of 8 May 2003 from the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom to the President⁴⁴ and recognized the specific authorities, responsibilities and obligations under applicable international law of those States as occupying Powers under unified command (the “Authority”). The Council called upon the Authority, consistent with the Charter and other relevant international law, to promote the welfare of the Iraqi people through the effective administration of the territory, including in particular working towards the restoration of conditions of security and stability and the creation of conditions in which the Iraqi people could freely determine their own political future.⁴⁵

At the 4808th meeting, on 14 August 2003, the Council adopted resolution 1500 (2003), by which it welcomed the establishment of the broadly representative Governing Council of Iraq on 13 July 2003, as an important step towards the formation by the people of Iraq of an internationally recognized, representative government that would exercise the sovereignty of Iraq.⁴⁶ Following the vote, a number of speakers welcomed the establishment of the Governing Council as a first step towards a sovereign, stable and

democratic Iraq.⁴⁷ The representative of the United States maintained that in its expression of support for the Governing Council of Iraq, the resolution hastened the day when the people of Iraq would be in full command of their own affairs.⁴⁸ The representative of Pakistan wished that the resolution had contained the reaffirmation of other principles, including the right of the Iraqi people to choose their own political destiny and form of government and to exercise their right of self-determination.⁴⁹ The representative of Mexico held that, while his delegation associated itself with the consensus on welcoming the establishment of the interim Governing Council as a first logical step towards establishing a genuinely representative government that exercised the sovereignty of the Iraqi people, such welcome did not constitute legal recognition or endorsement, because the Governing Council was still under the authority of the occupying Powers.⁵⁰ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, which had abstained in the voting, stressed that the formation of the interim Governing Council of Iraq would gain credibility only from the fact that it was paving the way for the formation of a national government that represented the full spectrum of Iraqi society and was capable of fulfilling the aspirations of the Iraqi people. Therefore, only the Iraqi people could lend legitimacy to the Governing Council. He expressed the hope that the Council would work to, *inter alia*, establish an elected national government that enjoyed the support of the Iraqi people and was recognized by the international community.⁵¹

At the 4844th meeting, on 16 October 2003, the Council adopted resolution 1511 (2003), by which it reaffirmed the right of the Iraqi people freely to determine their own political future and control their own natural resources, and reiterated its resolve that the day when Iraqis govern themselves must come quickly. By the same resolution, the Council also underscored the temporary nature of the exercise by the Coalition Provisional Authority of the specific responsibilities, authorities and obligations under applicable international law recognized and set forth in resolution 1483 (2003), which would cease when an

(South Africa); pp. 23-24 (India); pp. 24-25 (Poland); and pp. 40-41 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), pp. 26-27 (Russian Federation); pp. 28-29 (France); pp. 29-30 (Spain); pp. 30-31 (Chile); pp. 31-32 (Bulgaria); and pp. 33-34 (Germany).

⁴² Resolution 1472 (2003), seventh preambular paragraph.

⁴³ Resolution 1483 (2003), fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs.

⁴⁴ S/2003/538.

⁴⁵ Resolution 1483 (2003), thirteenth preambular paragraph and para. 4.

⁴⁶ Resolution 1500 (2003), para. 1.

⁴⁷ S/PV.4808, p. 4 (Spain); pp. 4-5 (Germany); pp. 5-6 (Russian Federation); and p. 6 (China).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

internationally recognized, representative government established by the people of Iraq was sworn in and assumed the responsibilities of the Authority.⁵²

Following the vote, the representative of the Russian Federation stated that it was essential that international efforts be united in the search for a long-term and stable political settlement that would enable the Iraqi people to take the leadership of their country into their own hands through a legitimately elected government. Regarding resolution 1511 (2003), he noted that the functions of the multinational force were subordinate to the tasks of promoting the restoration of the sovereignty of Iraq,⁵³ and as soon as that happened, the mandate of the multinational force would expire. If the legitimately elected government of Iraq requested some form of assistance to maintain security, then the Council would consider such a request.⁵⁴ The representative of Germany stated that his delegation would have wished for clearer guidelines with regard to timing of the transfer of sovereignty to the Iraqis, because only in that way could it be made clear that the current political status of Iraq was a temporary one. The representative of France also maintained that it would have been desirable for a clear text to set nearer and stricter deadlines for the transfer of responsibilities and the political transition. In particular, his country remained convinced that the sovereign assumption by the Iraqis of their own destiny was a necessary starting point to allow for the reconstruction and stabilization of Iraq; to marginalize those in Iraq who had chosen violence; and to mobilize the international community on behalf of Iraq.⁵⁵ The representative of Pakistan commented that the resolution would have gained considerably in clarity and credibility if it had clearly stipulated the principles which should guide the political transition in Iraq: respect for political independence, unity and territorial integrity of Iraq; the right of the Iraqi people to choose their own political destiny and form of Government; permanent sovereignty and control over their natural resources;

⁵² Resolution 1511 (2003), second preambular paragraph.

⁵³ By para. 13 of resolution 1511 (2003), the Council authorized a multinational force under unified command to take all necessary measures to contribute to the maintenance of security and stability in Iraq.

⁵⁴ S/PV.4844, pp. 2-3.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

and non-intervention and non-interference in their internal affairs.⁵⁶

At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom noted that, while resolution 1511 (2003) was clear about giving control of Iraq to its people as quickly as possible, it did not prescribe to the Iraqis artificial schedules for the transfer of power. Instead it put the people of Iraq in the driving seat through the Iraqi interim administration and reaffirmed the temporary nature of the Coalition's powers.⁵⁷ The representative of the United States maintained that resolution 1511 (2003) confirmed Iraqi leadership in establishing a political horizon for the transfer of power and made clear that the interim Iraqi leadership embodied Iraqi sovereignty during the transition. He stressed that the Coalition would not waver from its stated objectives of transferring governing responsibilities and authorities to the people of Iraq as soon as practicable.⁵⁸

B. Article 2, paragraph 4

Article 2, paragraph 4

All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.

Note

The practice of the Security Council touching upon the provisions of Article 2 (4), as illustrated by its decisions and deliberations, is captured below. In addition, there were a few communications containing explicit references to Article 2 (4) during the reporting period.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

⁵⁹ See, for example, letter dated 5 October 2000 from the representative of Yugoslavia addressed to the President (S/2000/961); letters dated 14 February 2001, 12 April 2001 and 29 May 2001 from the representative of Cyprus addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/136, S/2001/395 and S/2001/541); letters dated 11 June 2002, 20 December 2002 and 9 March 2003 from the representative of Iraq addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2002/659, S/2002/1400 and S/2003/296); identical

Decisions of the Security Council relating to Article 2 (4)

During the reporting period, the Council adopted no decisions which included an explicit reference to Article 2 (4). However, a number of decisions adopted by the Council contained references which might be considered to have a bearing on the principle enshrined in Article 2 (4). In dealing with a number of situations, the Council called upon the parties to refrain from any actions involving acts of violence and to exercise restraint,⁶⁰ called for parties to cease hostilities,⁶¹ and

letters dated 11 June 2002 from the representative of Mali addressed to the Secretary-General and the President (S/2002/657); and letter dated 24 March 2003 from the representative of the League of Arab States addressed to the President (S/2003/365).

⁶⁰ In connection with the situation in Georgia, see S/PRST/2000/32. In connection with Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999), see S/PRST/2000/35 and S/PRST/2001/8. In connection with the situation in Burundi, see resolution 1375 (2001), para. 2 and S/PRST/2003/30. In connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, see resolutions 1399 (2002), para. 9; and 1493 (2003), para. 8. In connection with the situation in the Middle East, see resolutions 1337 (2001), para. 8; 1365 (2001), para. 9; 1391 (2002), para. 9; 1428 (2002), para. 9; 1461 (2003), para. 8; and 1496 (2003), para. 7; and S/PRST/2000/3. In connection with the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia, see resolution 1430 (2002), para. 6. In connection with the situation in Somalia, see S/PRST/2001/30 and S/PRST/2003/2. In connection with the situation in Liberia, see resolution 1478 (2003), para. 9.

⁶¹ In connection with the situation in Burundi, see resolutions 1286 (2000), para. 3; and 1375 (2001), para. 3; S/PRST/2000/29; S/PRST/2001/17; S/PRST/2001/26; S/PRST/2001/33; S/PRST/2001/35; and S/PRST/2002/40. In connection with Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999), see S/PRST/2000/40. In connection with the letter dated 4 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, see S/PRST/2001/7. In connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, see resolutions 1468 (2003), para. 8; and 1484 (2003), para. 5; S/PRST/2002/27; and S/PRST/2003/6. In connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, see resolutions 1322 (2000), para. 4; 1397 (2002), para. 1; 1402 (2002), para. 2; and 1435 (2002), para. 1.

deplored and condemned violations of ceasefire agreements, and demanded respect for the ceasefire agreements.⁶² Furthermore, the Council, in its decisions, reaffirmed the principle of non-threat or non-use of force in international relations, reiterated its position against interference by States in internal affairs of others and condemned hostile action across the border of a Member State, as elaborated below.

Affirmation of the principle of non-threat or non-use of force

By a number of its decisions, the Council reaffirmed the principle of non-threat or non-use of force in international relations enshrined in Article 2 (4).

On the occasion of the Security Council meeting at the level of heads of State and Government, held on 7 September 2000 in the course of the Millennium Summit,⁶³ by resolution 1318 (2000), the Council adopted the declaration on ensuring an effective role for the Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa, in which it reaffirmed the importance of adhering to the principles of non-threat or non-use of force in international relations in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations, and the peaceful settlement of international disputes.⁶⁴

In connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, by a series of resolutions,⁶⁵ the Council reaffirmed the obligation of

⁶² In connection with the situation in Georgia, see resolutions 1339 (2001), para. 10; 1364 (2001), para. 15; 1393 (2002), para. 8; 1427 (2002), para. 8; 1462 (2003), para. 10; and 1494 (2003), para. 19. In connection with the situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, see S/PRST/2001/20. In connection with the situation in Burundi, see S/PRST/2003/4. In connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, see resolutions 1304 (2000), para. 3; 1332 (2000), fifth preambular paragraph; and 1493 (2003), para. 14; and S/PRST/2001/15. In connection with the situation in Liberia, see resolutions 1497 (2003), para. 12; and 1509 (2003), para. 4; and S/PRST/2003/14.

⁶³ S/PV.4194.

⁶⁴ Resolution 1318 (2000), annex, section I, second paragraph.

⁶⁵ Resolutions 1291 (2000), second preambular paragraph; 1304 (2000), third preambular paragraph; 1332 (2000), third preambular paragraph.; 1341 (2001), third preambular paragraph; 1355 (2001), third preambular

all States to “refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations”.

In connection with the situation in the Middle East, by a presidential statement,⁶⁶ the Council reaffirmed its commitment to the full sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries and, in that context, it asserted that all States should refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.”

Reiteration of the principle of non-interference by States in internal affairs of others

In some cases, the Council reiterated its position against interference by States in the internal affairs of other States. For example, in connection with the situation in Afghanistan, by a presidential statement of 7 April 2000,⁶⁷ the Council reiterated that “outside interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, including the involvement of foreign combatants and military personnel and the supply of weapons and other materials used in the conflict, should cease immediately.” It also called upon all States to take resolute measures to prohibit their military personnel from planning and participating in combat operations in Afghanistan, and immediately to withdraw their personnel and to assure that the supply of ammunition and other war-making materials was halted. The Council also expressed its deep concern at the continuing involvement in the fighting in Afghanistan, on the side of the Taliban forces, of thousands of non-Afghan nationals. By a presidential statement of 17 June 2003,⁶⁸ the Council expressed the belief that constructive and mutually supportive bilateral and regional relations between Afghanistan and all States, and in particular its neighbours, “based on the principles of mutual respect and non-interference in

paragraph; 1376 (2001), second preambular paragraph; 1417 (2002), third preambular paragraph; 1445 (2002), third preambular paragraph; and 1493 (2003), third preambular paragraph.

⁶⁶ S/PRST/2000/3.

⁶⁷ S/PRST/2000/12.

⁶⁸ S/PRST/2003/7.

each others affairs,” were important for stability in Afghanistan.

Furthermore, in connection with the situation in Somalia, the Council, in a series of its decisions,⁶⁹ reiterated its insistence that all States, in particular those of the region, should “not interfere in the internal affairs of Somalia” and that such interference could jeopardize the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and unity of that State.

In addition, in connection with the situation in Côte d’Ivoire, by a presidential statement of 20 December 2002, the Council stressed the need to respect the sovereignty, political unity and territorial integrity of that country and called upon all States in the region to “refrain from any interference in Côte d’Ivoire”.⁷⁰ Furthermore, by resolution 1464 (2003) of 4 February 2003, the Council called upon all States neighbouring Côte d’Ivoire to support the peace process by preventing “any action that might undermine the security and territorial integrity” of that country.⁷¹ The appeal was renewed in a subsequent resolution.⁷²

Condemnation of hostile action across the border of a Member State

In several situations under consideration, the Council called for cessation of involvement by foreign Governments in the conflicts and demanded the withdrawal of foreign forces from the territories of others. For example, in connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Council, by its decisions, repeatedly called for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁷³ By resolution 1304 (2000) of 16 June 2000, the Council reiterated its

⁶⁹ Resolutions 1425 (2002), third preambular paragraph; 1474 (2003), fourth preambular paragraph; and 1519 (2003), third preambular paragraph; S/PRST/2001/1; S/PRST/2001/30; S/PRST/2002/8; and S/PRST/2002/35.

⁷⁰ S/PRST/2002/42.

⁷¹ Resolution 1464 (2003), para. 11.

⁷² Resolution 1479 (2003), para. 13.

⁷³ Resolutions 1291 (2000), sixth preambular paragraph; 1304 (2000), para. 4; 1332 (2000), para. 10; 1341 (2001), para. 2; 1355 (2001), para. 3; 1376 (2001), para. 2; 1417 (2002), para. 11; 1445 (2002), para. 2; and 1468 (2003), paras. 11-12; S/PRST/2000/2; S/PRST/2001/29; and S/PRST/2002/5. In connection with ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, see S/PRST/2000/28.

unreserved condemnation of the fighting between Ugandan and Rwandan forces in Kisangani “in violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo”; demanded that Ugandan and Rwandan forces as well as forces of the Congolese armed opposition and other armed groups immediately and completely withdraw from Kisangani; and further demanded that Uganda and Rwanda, which had “violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo,” withdraw all their forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo without further delay.⁷⁴

In other instances, the Council demanded cessation of military action and further use of force and called for withdrawal of troops. In connection with the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia, the Council, in its resolutions, reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Eritrea and Ethiopia, demanded that both parties cease immediately all military action and refrain from the further use of force.⁷⁵

In connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, the Council, by resolution 1402 (2002) of 30 March 2002, called for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Palestinian cities, including Ramallah,⁷⁶ and by resolution 1435 (2002) of 24 September 2002, it demanded the expeditious withdrawal of the Israeli occupying forces from Palestinian cities towards the return to the positions held prior to September 2000.⁷⁷

Furthermore, on a number of occasions, the Council condemned incursions by States into other States, demanded that States, in particular, the neighbouring States, end military and financial support for armed groups and parties engaged in conflict, or insisted that the territory of a State should not be used to undermine stability in the area in question.

In connection with the situation in Somalia, the Council insisted, in its decisions, that the territory of Somalia should not be used to undermine stability in the subregion.⁷⁸

In connection with the situation in Sierra Leone, by resolution 1470 (2003) of 28 March 2003, the Council noted with concern the instability on the border between Sierra Leone and Liberia, and demanded that the armed forces of Liberia and any armed groups “refrain from illegal incursions into the territory of Sierra Leone”.⁷⁹

In connection with the situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone, the Council, by a presidential statement of 21 December 2000, condemned the incursion into Guinea by rebel groups coming from Liberia and Sierra Leone. The Council reaffirmed its commitment to the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of Guinea, expressed its serious concern over reports that “external military support” was being provided to those rebel groups, and called upon “all States, particularly Liberia, to refrain from providing any such military support and from any act that might contribute to further destabilization of the situation on the borders between Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone.” The Council further called upon all States in the region to prevent armed individuals from using their national territory to prepare and commit attacks in neighbouring countries.⁸⁰

In connection with the situation in Liberia, by resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001, the Council demanded that the Government of Liberia immediately cease its support for the Revolutionary United Front in Sierra Leone and for other armed rebel groups in the region.⁸¹ Furthermore, in a number of resolutions, the Council demanded that all States in the region cease military support for armed groups in neighbouring countries and take action to prevent armed individuals and groups from using their territory to prepare and commit attacks on neighbouring countries, and refrain from any action that might contribute to further destabilization of the situation in the region.⁸²

In connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, by resolution 1468 (2003) of 30 March 2003, the Council demanded that all Governments in the Great Lakes region immediately

⁷⁴ Resolution 1304 (2000), paras. 2, 3 and 4.

⁷⁵ Resolutions 1297 (2000), third preambular paragraph and para. 2; and 1298 (2000), fifth preambular paragraph and para. 2.

⁷⁶ Resolution 1402 (2002), para. 1.

⁷⁷ Resolution 1435 (2002), para. 3.

⁷⁸ S/PRST/2001/1 and S/PRST/2001/30.

⁷⁹ Resolution 1470 (2003), para. 14.

⁸⁰ S/PRST/2000/41.

⁸¹ Resolution 1343 (2001), para. 2.

⁸² *Ibid.*, para. 4; resolutions 1408 (2002), para. 4; 1478 (2003), para. 9; 1497 (2003), para. 9; 1509 (2003), para. 13; and 1521 (2003), para. 3.

cease military and financial support to all parties engaged in armed conflict in the Ituri region.⁸³ That demand was extended to all States in resolution 1493 (2003) of 28 July 2003, by which the Council demanded that “all States, in particular those in the region, including the Democratic Republic of the Congo” ensure that no direct or indirect assistance, especially military or financial assistance, was given to the movements and armed groups present in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁸⁴

Deliberations of the Security Council relating to Article 2 (4)

During the period under review, there were instances in the deliberations of the Council in which explicit references were made to Article 2 (4).⁸⁵

Three cases included below depict the debates and decisions relevant to the principle enshrined in Article 2 (4), in connection with (a) the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo (case 4); (b) the situation between Iraq and Kuwait (case 5); and (c) the letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, and the letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (case 6).

⁸³ Resolution 1468 (2003), para. 11.

⁸⁴ Resolution 1493 (2003), para. 18.

⁸⁵ See, for example, in connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, S/PV.4092, p. 12 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); in connection with the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia, S/PV.4227, p. 8 (Argentina); in connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, S/PV.4726, p. 5 (Iraq); in connection with the role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes, S/PV.4753, p. 10 (Mexico); in connection with the letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/939) and the letter dated 5 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/943), S/PV.4836, p. 17 (Morocco) and p. 18 (Jordan); and in connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, S/PV.4841, p. 5 (Palestine).

Case 4 The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

At the 4092nd meeting, on 24 January 2000, the Secretary-General, in his briefing, stressed as a top priority the need for an understanding of the limits of the use of force.⁸⁶ The President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo expressed his hope that the Council would be able to achieve agreement to “end the occupation” of a part of his country’s national territory by the “occupying armies of Rwanda, Uganda and Burundi,” in conformity with resolution 1234 (1999). He further recalled that Article 2 (3) and (4) of the Charter required Members to settle their international disputes by peaceful means and called on them to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.⁸⁷

The President of Zimbabwe noted that the meeting was devoted to the preservation of the territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as enshrined in Chapter I, Article 2, of the Charter. He added that the Southern African Development Community (SADC) allied forces had no territorial or other hidden agendas in that country and stressed that SADC was there, at the invitation of the sovereign Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to uphold one of the most fundamental principles of the Charter, namely, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and non-interference in the domestic affairs of a sovereign country.⁸⁸ Similarly, the representative of Namibia emphasized that his country was in the Democratic Republic of the Congo at the express invitation of that Government and in response to the request by a SADC member State. While reiterating the adherence of Namibia to the Ceasefire Agreement signed at Lusaka on 10 July 1999, he pointed out that there was the problem of interference by some of the other interlocutors who were not being too helpful because they seemed to have their own hidden agendas and pursued an outcome that was a blatant violation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political

⁸⁶ S/PV.4092, p. 5.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

independence and unity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁸⁹

The President of Uganda, for his part, argued that his country and the other neighbouring countries of the Democratic Republic of the Congo had legitimate security concerns, which had been recognized by the region and by the international community in the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. He also asked for the Council to be cognizant of the terrorist role played by the Sudan, sometimes using the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, with or without cooperation from Kinshasa, to destabilize the neighbouring countries. The issue, according to him, was not the territorial integrity of the Congo, as his country supported the territorial integrity of all the countries in Africa. He expected all foreign troops to withdraw in accordance with a timetable to be worked out according to the Ceasefire Agreement, by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU), under the supervision of the United Nations interpositional force.⁹⁰ After touching on the genocide in Rwanda and arguing its linkage to the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the President of Rwanda declared his country's commitment to the principles of the Ceasefire Agreement, stating that Rwanda had faithfully respected the ceasefire. Furthermore, he added that fundamental to them was article II of the Agreement, which addressed the security of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and its neighbouring countries.⁹¹ A few speakers acknowledged that the lasting solution to the conflict would require taking into account the legitimate security concerns of neighbouring States.⁹²

In his statement, the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity underscored the attachment of OAU to the principles enshrined in its Charter, of respect for the sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of its member States and the peaceful settlement of disputes. Since those same principles had been under serious threat in the Democratic Republic of the Congo owing to the internal and external dimensions of that conflict, OAU, in tandem with the region and other partners, had

worked assiduously to bring an end to the conflict.⁹³ The Facilitator of the Inter-Congolese Dialogue, echoing the views expressed by the Secretary-General of OAU concerning the inviolability of the national sovereignty and territory integrity of the country in question, explained that the origins of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo reflected the internal political, economic and social problems within the country itself, as well as an external dimension relating to the security concerns of that country and of the neighbouring countries.⁹⁴

A number of speakers stressed, inter alia, the importance of respect for the territorial integrity, political independence and national sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and other States in the region and the need for orderly withdrawal of all foreign forces.⁹⁵ In addition, the representative of Argentina argued that consideration of other key principles of international law was needed, including non-interference in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the inalienable right to individual or collective self-defence, the illegality of the acquisition of territory by force and the inviolability of boundaries.⁹⁶ The representative of the Russian Federation observed that, owing to the complex nature of the conflict in question, any settlement would also be complex, which would need to ensure security and the inviolability of the borders of all the States in the region and strengthen cooperation between those States on the basis of the principles of "non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States and the non-use of force, in accordance with the Charter".⁹⁷

At the same meeting, the Council issued a presidential statement by which it reaffirmed the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including over its natural resources, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of OAU and in that regard, reiterated its call for the immediate cessation of hostilities and the orderly

⁸⁹ Ibid., pp. 29-30.

⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 19-22.

⁹¹ Ibid., pp. 21-22.

⁹² S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 20 (Argentina); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), p. 2 (Netherlands); and p. 8 (Malaysia).

⁹³ S/PV.4092, p. 24.

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 27.

⁹⁵ S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Mali); p. 11 (Canada); p. 17 (Bangladesh); and p. 18 (Tunisia); S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), p. 3 (China); p. 5 (Jamaica); and p. 8 (Malaysia).

⁹⁶ S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 20.

⁹⁷ S/PV.4092 (Resumption 2), p. 9.

withdrawal of all foreign forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in accordance with the Ceasefire Agreement.⁹⁸

At the 4104th meeting, on 24 February 2000, prior to the adoption of resolution 1291 (2000), the representative of Ukraine remarked that his Government attached particular significance to the fact that the draft resolution⁹⁹ was accompanied by the explicit reaffirmation of the purposes and principles of the Charter, and the emphasis on the obligation of all States to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Organization.¹⁰⁰ By resolution 1291 (2000), the Council reaffirmed the above-mentioned principles and reiterated its call for the orderly withdrawal of all foreign forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in accordance with the Ceasefire Agreement.¹⁰¹

By resolution 1304 (2000) of 16 June 2000, the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, reiterated its unreserved condemnation of the fighting between Ugandan and Rwandan forces in Kisangani in violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, demanded that those forces and those allied to them desist from further fighting, and further demanded that Ugandan and Rwandan forces as well as forces of the Congolese armed opposition and other armed groups immediately and completely withdraw from Kisangani. The Council also demanded the following: (a) that Uganda and Rwanda, which had violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, withdraw all their forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo without further delay, in conformity with the timetable of the Ceasefire Agreement and the Kampala Disengagement Plan; (b) that each phase of withdrawal completed by Ugandan and Rwandan forces be reciprocated by the other parties, in conformity with the same timetable; and (c) that all other foreign military presence and activity, direct and indirect, in the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo be brought to an end, in conformity with the provisions of the Ceasefire

Agreement. The Council demanded, in that context, that all parties abstain from any offensive action during the process of disengagement and withdrawal of foreign forces.¹⁰²

By resolution 1332 (2000) of 14 December 2000, the Council called for the withdrawal of Ugandan and Rwandan forces, and all other foreign forces, from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in compliance with resolution 1304 (2000) and the Ceasefire Agreement, and urged the forces to take urgent steps to accelerate that withdrawal.¹⁰³

At the 4271st meeting, on 2 February 2001, the Secretary-General, recalling the provisions of resolution 1304 (2000), looked forward to the early withdrawal of all foreign forces, as provided by the Ceasefire Agreement.¹⁰⁴ The President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo invited the authorities in Rwanda, Uganda and Burundi to return to a better sense of good-neighbourliness, with a view to achieving a peaceful settlement of differences. He further underscored the commitment of his country to relaunch the Ceasefire Agreement so that it would, among others, preserve the fundamental attributes of his country, including independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity, which the Council had continuously reconfirmed. He also appealed to the international community to support the Congolese people as they moved towards the dialogue of peace which must be among them “without any interference”.¹⁰⁵

A number of speakers considered it imperative for foreign forces to withdraw in order to establish peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.¹⁰⁶ The representative of the United States held that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo had a right, under the Charter, to demand that uninvited foreign forces depart its territory. At the same time, he maintained that the Governments of Rwanda and Uganda had a right, under the Charter, to demand that the Congolese territory not be used as a launching pad for attacks against their countries. He further argued

⁹⁸ S/PRST/2000/2.

⁹⁹ S/2000/143.

¹⁰⁰ S/PV.4104, p. 2.

¹⁰¹ Resolution 1291 (2000), second, third and sixth preambular paras.

¹⁰² Resolution 1304 (2000), eighteenth preambular paragraph and paras. 2-5.

¹⁰³ Resolution 1332 (2000), para. 10.

¹⁰⁴ S/PV.4271, p. 3.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (France); p. 15 (Columbia); p. 16 (Mauritius); p. 17 (Ukraine); p. 18 (Norway); p. 20 (Russian Federation); and p. 21 (Singapore).

that just as the international community was justified in calling for the withdrawal of Rwandan and Ugandan forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, so too must they call on all the Lusaka signatories to abandon support for former members of the Rwandese Armed Forces (ex-FAR) and Interahamwe.¹⁰⁷

The President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in responding to various statements made in the meeting, added that the final objective of democratization would come about only if the forces that had “invaded” his country were one way or the other forced to get out of it so that the country regained its national territorial integrity. He highlighted that his country was “under foreign occupation” which must end as soon as possible.¹⁰⁸

By a letter dated 13 July 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo expressed his concern over the “openly proclaimed desire” of Rwanda and the Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie (RCD-Goma) to “create a secessionist State” in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo, which was in violation of the principle of the charter of OAU regarding the inviolability of the borders that had emerged from decolonization, and of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as of the relevant provisions of all the resolutions by which the Council reaffirmed the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of his country and all the States in the region.¹⁰⁹ In response, the representative of Rwanda, in a letter dated 19 July 2001 addressed to the President, rejected the claim made by the Democratic Republic of the Congo, by, *inter alia*, recalling the issue of nationality in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which, according to him, affected neighbouring countries such as Rwanda.¹¹⁰

At the 4348th meeting, on 24 July 2001, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo commented that all the leaders of the region had been able to confirm their willingness to withdraw from the territory of his country in accordance with resolution 1304 (2000). However, while certain parties were indeed withdrawing some of their contingents,

others showed reluctance to do so, combining withdrawal with rotation and redeployment and expressing their willingness to maintain troops in the border towns that happened to be rich in natural resources. With respect to the security concerns raised by certain parties and in particular by Rwanda, the representative maintained that those concerns represented yet another pretext aimed at maintaining the Rwandan occupation of his country. Recalling that from 1997 to 1998 his country had benefited from technical military assistance with Rwanda, with a view to helping to reorganize the Congolese armed forces, he pointed out that throughout that entire period, no one had mentioned any security concerns nor any relating to activities of former members of the Rwandese Armed Forces or Interahamwe. He argued that it had taken months for Rwanda to recognize the extent of its intervention, and that Rwanda then used as a justification the need to defend those Congolese whose nationality had been supposedly questioned and who had been reportedly persecuted by the Congolese authority. Referring to the 4273rd meeting,¹¹¹ the representative argued that the President of Rwanda did not answer convincingly the questions addressed to him “concerning the presence of forces of aggression on the Congolese territory, the permeability of common borders and the need to build a free, secure and democratic Rwandan society based on human rights, equality and respect for diversity”. He stressed that his country had no hidden agenda in Rwanda and that his country, which bore “no responsibility for the Rwandan genocide of 1994”, would not tolerate its territory being used as a base for the launching of operations aimed at destabilizing neighbouring countries with which it wished to be on good terms. Furthermore, he argued that the security guarantees in the Great Lakes region should not come at the expense of the sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo nor interfere with its territorial integrity.¹¹²

By a presidential statement dated 24 July 2001,¹¹³ the Council reiterated its demand that all parties accelerate the finalization and the implementation of comprehensive plans for the orderly withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the disarmament,

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹⁰⁹ S/2001/694, p. 1.

¹¹⁰ S/2001/716.

¹¹¹ S/PV.4273, under the agenda item entitled “The situation in the Great Lakes region”.

¹¹² S/PV.4348, pp. 29-30.

¹¹³ S/PRST/2001/19, seventh and ninth paragraphs.

demobilization, reintegration, repatriation and resettlement of all armed groups referred to in chapter 9.1 of annex A to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. Concerning the Inter-Congolese Dialogue, the Council emphasized the importance of an open, representative and inclusive dialogue, free from outside interference, leading to a consensus settlement.

By resolution 1376 (2001) of 9 November 2001, the Council reaffirmed the obligation of all States to refrain from the use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any State or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations, and reaffirmed also the political independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including over its natural resources. It further welcomed the withdrawal of some foreign forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including the full Namibian contingent, as a positive step towards the full withdrawal of all foreign forces, and requested all States that had not yet done so to begin to implement, without delay, their full withdrawal in accordance with resolution 1304 (2000) of 16 June 2000.¹¹⁴

By resolution 1417 (2002) of 14 June 2002, the Council, reaffirming the obligation of all States to refrain from the use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any State or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations, welcomed the commitments made by the President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, during the Security Council mission to the Great Lakes, not to support the armed groups referred to in the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, and urged the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo urgently to take all necessary steps to ensure that its territory was not used to support those armed groups.¹¹⁵

At the 4596th meeting, on 8 August 2002, held following the signing of the Peace Agreement between the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Republic of Rwanda on the Withdrawal of the Rwandan Troops from the Territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Dismantling of the ex-FAR and Interahamwe Forces in

the Democratic Republic of the Congo, signed in Pretoria on 30 July 2002,¹¹⁶ the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo thanked the Council for having convened a meeting to welcome the “recent and very significant advances made to put an end to the war of aggression” that had been waged against his country for more than four years. He affirmed that the Pretoria Agreement fell within the framework of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and was in conformity with the provisions of relevant resolutions calling for the orderly withdrawal of all foreign troops. The representative stated that among the countries that had come to the assistance of his country in “defending its national sovereignty and its territorial integrity”, Namibia had totally withdrawn and Angola and Zimbabwe had repatriated a large number of their contingents. On the other hand, withdrawal movements of the uninvited forces had been observed only on the part of Uganda and Burundi. Rwanda had considerably increased its forces and remained the only country engaged in large-scale military operations on Congolese soil, he added. He asserted that the Pretoria Agreement was “the most serious opportunity for peace” since the beginning of war on 2 August 1998 and provided a response to security concerns expressed by Rwanda, although it was his country that had been experiencing total insecurity for four years. He believed that the Pretoria Agreement also envisaged the restoration of the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of his country, which had been gravely imperiled by the Rwandan presence, and embodied the ingredients for a return to normality for the Great Lakes region. The representative maintained that it was urgent that his country conclude with the Governments of Uganda and Burundi agreements similar to the Pretoria Agreement.¹¹⁷

The representative of Rwanda also praised the signing of the Pretoria Agreement which he considered was an “unprecedented” step towards the resolution of the conflict. He observed that for a long time the Council had urged Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of the Congo to work together to resolve the root causes of the conflict, that is, to find how to dissuade the ex-FAR and Interahamwe forces from carrying out attacks on Rwanda from bases in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In his opinion, the disarmament, demobilization and repatriation of the

¹¹⁴ Resolution 1376 (2001), second preambular paragraph and para. 2.

¹¹⁵ Resolution 1417 (2002), third preambular paragraph and para. 10.

¹¹⁶ S/2002/914, annex.

¹¹⁷ S/PV.4596, pp. 4-7.

armed forces in the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement was not effectively implemented, and therefore, the security threat to affected countries, principally Rwanda, had not been reduced. What the Pretoria Agreement brought to the process was a solemn commitment by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to track, assemble and disarm former members of the Rwandese Armed Forces and Interahamwe forces. He stated that his country had undertaken to withdraw its troops from the Democratic Republic of the Congo as soon as the above-mentioned process got under way and was judged to be irreversible. The representative further stated that Rwanda fully recognized the problems caused by the presence and activities of their nationals in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and welcomed the decision of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to negotiate the Pretoria Agreement.¹¹⁸

By a presidential statement of 15 August 2002,¹¹⁹ the Council welcomed the Peace Agreement between the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda and the Programme of Implementation of the Peace Agreement between the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Republic of Rwanda on the Withdrawal of the Rwandan Troops from the Territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Dismantling of the ex-Rwandese Armed Forces and Interahamwe Forces in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, signed in Pretoria on 30 July 2002. The Council also welcomed the commitment of the Government of Rwanda, under the Pretoria Agreement, regarding the withdrawal of its troops from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and took note of the submission by Rwanda of its initial troop withdrawal plan to the "Third Party".

By a presidential statement of 18 October 2002,¹²⁰ the Council welcomed the progress on withdrawal of foreign forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and stressed that the withdrawals must be completed. The Council called upon all parties to the conflict to cease hostilities immediately and without preconditions, and called upon the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and all Governments in the region to exert their influence on all the parties to that effect and to refrain from any action which would further exacerbate

the situation or undermine the peace process. The Council further stressed that no Government, military force or organization or individual should provide military or other supplies or any other form of support to any of the groups involved in the fighting in the east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in Burundi.

By resolution 1445 (2002) of 4 December 2002, the Council welcomed the signature of the Luanda Agreement on 6 September 2002 by the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda,¹²¹ The Council also welcomed the decision taken by all foreign parties to withdraw fully their troops from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as well as progress in the implementation of those processes, including the withdrawals by Angola, Rwanda, Uganda and Zimbabwe. The Council noted the commitment of Uganda under the Luanda Agreement to complete the withdrawal of its forces no later than 15 December 2002, welcomed the positive interaction between the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda since the signing of the Agreement, and called upon both parties to work, together and with the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), towards conditions that would allow the Agreement to be implemented in full. The Council reiterated that no Government, military force or organization or individual should provide military or any other form of support to any of the groups involved in the fighting in the east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in particular in Ituri. The Council encouraged the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and, respectively, Rwanda and Uganda to take steps to normalize their relations and to cooperate to ensure mutual security along their borders, as provided for in the Pretoria Agreement and the Luanda Agreement, and also encouraged the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Burundi to take similar steps.¹²²

By a presidential statement of 16 May 2003,¹²³ the Council called upon all parties in the region to end

¹¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 8-9.

¹¹⁹ S/PRST/2002/24.

¹²⁰ S/PRST/2002/27.

¹²¹ Treaty on the withdrawal of Ugandan troops from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, cooperation and normalization of relations between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Republic of Uganda (S/2003/213, annex).

¹²² Resolution 1445 (2002), paras. 1, 2, 16, 17 and 20.

¹²³ S/PRST/2003/6.

all support to armed groups and to refrain from any action that might compromise the restoration of peace in Ituri, in particular the work of the Ituri interim administration, and reaffirmed its strong commitment to the sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo over all its territory.

By resolution 1484 (2003) of 30 May 2003, the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, demanded that all Congolese parties and all States in the Great Lakes region refrain from any military activity or from any activity that could further destabilize the situation in Ituri, and in that regard demanded also the cessation of all support, in particular weapons and any other military materiel, to the armed groups and militias, and demanded further that all Congolese parties and all States in the region actively prevent the supply of such support.¹²⁴

Case 5 The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

The Security Council convened the 4726th meeting, on 26 March 2003, in connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, in response to letters dated 24 March 2003 from the representatives of Iraq and Malaysia addressed to the President of the Council.¹²⁵ The letter from the representative of Iraq, in particular, requested the convening of an urgent meeting with a view to “halting American-British aggression and the immediate withdrawal of the invading forces outside the international boundaries” of Iraq, reconfirming the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of Iraq and preventing all States from interfering in its internal affairs.¹²⁶

At the meeting, the representative of Iraq argued that his country was subject to the American-British full-scale military aggression since 20 March 2003, which constituted a violation of international law and the Charter, in particular Article 2 (4) and (7). He emphasized that the Council had not authorized the use of force by those two States and that resolution 1441 (2002) did not allow the use of force.¹²⁷ The latter argument was supported by the Libyan Arab

Jamahiriya.¹²⁸ Similarly, pointing out that there was no authorization by the Council of the military action, the representative of Malaysia underlined that the pre-emptive use of force threatened the foundation of international law.¹²⁹ The representative of Yemen stressed that using force against others for reasons other than self-defence and without a Council mandate constituted a flagrant violation of the principles of international law and the Charter.¹³⁰ The representatives of Yemen and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya further regarded the declared policy to change the Iraqi regimens “an act of aggression” carried out against a sovereign, independent State that was a State Member of the Organization, and as interference in the domestic affairs of Iraq.¹³¹ A number of other speakers concurred that the military action was a violation of the Charter, calling it a “unilateral action,” “act of aggression” and “unilateral attack.”¹³² Furthermore, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran held that the unilateral war against Iraq did not meet any standard of international legitimacy and that it was not waged in self-defence against any prior armed attack nor could Iraq be considered an imminent threat against the national security of the “belligerent Powers”.¹³³

According to the representatives of Argentina and Morocco, the use of force should be the last resort, once all peaceful means had been exhausted, and the use of force should be authorized by the Security Council.¹³⁴ The representative of Venezuela maintained that the Council must categorically reject the use of force, and therefore it should direct its efforts toward achieving an immediate ceasefire and ending the use of force.¹³⁵

In contrast, the representative of Poland regretted that Iraq had not abided by the provisions of resolution 1441 (2002) and held that the resolution contained “a warning of grave consequences in case of non-compliance, based on Chapter VII” of the Charter.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹³¹ S/PV.4726, p. 13 (Yemen); and p. 16 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 19 (Indonesia); pp. 21-22 (Cuba); p. 28 (Brazil); p. 32 (Viet Nam); and S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (United Republic of Tanzania).

¹³³ S/PV.4726, p. 33.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 37 (Argentina); and p. 44 (Morocco).

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

¹²⁴ Resolution 1484 (2003), ninth preambular paragraph and para. 7.

¹²⁵ S/2003/362 and S/2003/363, respectively.

¹²⁶ S/2003/362.

¹²⁷ S/PV.4726, pp. 4-5.

He continued that the use of force remained the only option when the peaceful means for the resolution of the Iraqi crisis had been exhausted as Council decisions, particularly those relating to weapons of mass destruction, were not abided by and the Iraqi regime constituted a threat to international peace and security.¹³⁶ The representative of Australia noted that existing Security Council resolutions, including resolutions 678 (1990), 687 (1991) and 1441 (2002), provided authority for the use of force to disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction and to restore international peace and security to the region.¹³⁷ The representative of the United Kingdom stressed that the action of his country with its coalition partners, to uphold United Nations resolutions, was both legitimate and multilateral and that the use of force was authorized in the circumstances under resolutions 678 (1990), 687 (1991) and 1441 (2002).¹³⁸ The representative of the United States underscored that the actions the coalition forces were undertaking were an appropriate response, legitimate and not unilateral, arguing that resolution 1441 (2002) explicitly found Iraq in continuing material breach and in view of additional material breaches by Iraq, the basis for the existing ceasefire had been removed and the use of force was authorized under resolution 678 (1990).¹³⁹

Case 6

**Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the
Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab
Republic to the United Nations addressed to the
President of the Security Council (S/2003/939)**

**Letter dated 5 October 2003 from the
Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the
United Nations addressed to the President of the
Security Council (S/2003/943)**

On 5 October 2003, the Security Council convened the 4836th meeting in response to the request contained in a letter dated 5 October 2003 from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Council.¹⁴⁰ By that letter, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic requested a meeting to consider the “violations of Syrian and

Lebanese airspace committed on that date by the Israeli air force and the missile attack carried out by the latter on the same day against a civilian site situated inside Syrian territory”.

At the meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic condemned the “unwarranted aggression” in flagrant violation of the Charter and of the Agreement on Disengagement between Israeli and Syrian forces, signed at Geneva in May 1974.¹⁴¹ The representative of Lebanon argued that excessive violations by Israel of his country’s air space and of the Blue Line arrangements sponsored by the United Nations in southern Lebanon led to an act of aggression against a Member State. He further argued that the Charter and the norms of international law “warn[ed]” against any act of aggression by any Member State against another irrespective of the reason and also held that a State should first resort to the Council to argue its case.¹⁴²

However, the representative of Israel argued that its “measured defensive response to the horrific suicide bombings against a terrorist training facility” in the Syrian Arab Republic was a clear act of self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter. He underscored that those actions came after Israel had exercised tremendous restraint despite countless acts of terrorism that had claimed hundreds of innocent lives, for which the Syrian Arab Republic was responsible, and after his country and the international community had repeatedly called on the Syrian Arab Republic to end its support of terrorism and comply with international law. He further argued that like any State faced with a critical and prolonged threat, Israel needed to exercise its inherent right and obligation to defend its citizens.¹⁴³ The representative of the United States called on all sides to avoid heightening the tension in the Middle East and to think carefully about the consequences of their actions. He added that it was in the interest of the Syrian Arab Republic and in the broader interests of Middle East peace that the Syrian Arab Republic stop harbouring and supporting the groups that perpetrated terrorist acts such as the one that had occurred in Haifa.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁶ Ibid., pp. 24-25.

¹³⁷ Ibid., p. 27.

¹³⁸ S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 23.

¹³⁹ Ibid., pp. 25-26.

¹⁴⁰ S/2003/939.

¹⁴¹ S/PV.4836 and Corr.1, p. 3.

¹⁴² Ibid., pp. 15-16.

¹⁴³ Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 13-14.

A number of speakers condemned the air attack by Israel against the Syrian Arab Republic as a violation of the norms of international law and the Charter and/or called on parties to exercise restraint and restore the political process;¹⁴⁵ some strongly opposed the attack, calling it an act of aggression against a Member State and echoing the argument made by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.¹⁴⁶

The representative of Pakistan observed that the Charter prescribed strict rules for the use of force by Member States, which was envisaged in only two circumstances: the first was in exercise of the right of self-defence against a direct act of aggression or use of force and the second was the collective use of force under Article 42 of the Charter, with the explicit authorization of the Council. He continued to argue that the attack by Israel against the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic had not met those strict requirements set out in the Charter and considered it an arbitrary attack in violation of the Charter and the relevant Council resolutions concerning the Middle East.¹⁴⁷ The representative of Morocco expressed the view that the Syrian Arab Republic had been a victim of Israeli recourse to the use of force, in violation of the Charter: Article 2 (4) called on all Member States to refrain from the use of force against the territorial integrity or the political independence of any State. He contended that the Israeli attack had been a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Syrian Arab Republic, and that it could not be the object of the sole legal justification envisaged in the Charter, legitimate self-defence.¹⁴⁸ The representative of Jordan made it clear that no party could act outside the jurisdiction of Article 2 (4) of the Charter, which prohibited the use of force except in two cases. The first case was the use of force under Article 51 of the Charter, which reflected the principle of self-defence. However, the exercise of that right on the part of any State was conditioned on a prior armed attack against it. The second case was authorization by the Council of the use of force under Chapter VII of the Charter.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 9 (Spain); p. 9 (United Kingdom); p. 10 (Russian Federation); p. 10 (Germany); p. 11 (Bulgaria); p. 11 (Chile); and p. 11 (Mexico).

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 14 (League of Arab States); pp. 16-17 (Algeria); p. 19 (Palestine); pp. 21-22 (Islamic Republic of Iran); pp. 22-23 (Bahrain); p. 23 (Yemen); and p. 24 (Qatar).

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 17.

Neither case applied in the case of the aerial attack by Israel against the Syrian Arab Republic, he argued.¹⁴⁹

C. Article 2, paragraph 5

Article 2, paragraph 5

All Members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

Note

During the period under review, there were no explicit references to Article 2 (5) in the decisions or deliberations of the Security Council. However, in the report of the Panel on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations, Article 2 (5) was explicitly cited in the context of conflict prevention. As one of its key recommendations on preventive action, The Panel supported the Secretary-General's more frequent use of fact-finding missions to the areas of tensions, and stressed obligations of Member States, under Article 2 (5) of the Charter, to give "every assistance" to such activities of the United Nations.¹⁵⁰

In addition, the Council adopted several resolutions and issued a number of presidential statements which might have an implicit bearing on the principle enshrined in Article 2 (5). The following examples including calls for assistance relating to the good offices of the Secretary-General; measures imposed within the framework of Article 41 of the Charter; peacekeeping operations; enforcement actions of regional arrangements authorized by the Council; and multinational forces authorized by the Council, can be considered representative of the practice of the Council during the period under review concerning the principle enshrined in Article 2 (5).

Assistance relating to the good offices of the Secretary-General

With regard to the good offices of the Secretary-General and his representatives, for example, by a presidential statement of 26 January 2000, in connection with the situation concerning the

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 18.

¹⁵⁰ S/2000/809, para. 34.

Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Council urged all parties to provide the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Democratic Republic of the Congo with “the assistance and cooperation” he would require to carry out his functions.¹⁵¹

Assistance relating to measures imposed within the framework of Article 41 of the Charter

During the period under review, implicit references to Article 2 (5) were frequently made in decisions of the Security Council in connection with the measures imposed by the Council under Chapter VII of the Charter. In a number of cases, the Council called on States to take action or otherwise strengthen their efforts in support of sanctions or other measures that had been imposed by the Council. In addition, in some cases, the Council explicitly requested Member States to cooperate with the relevant Committees and the monitoring and expert bodies established to oversee the implementation of the sanctions measures and with inspection bodies.

For instance, with regard to the situation in Liberia, by resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001, the Council called on all States to take the appropriate measures to ensure that individuals and companies in their jurisdiction acted in conformity with United Nations embargoes, in particular those established by resolutions 1171 (1998) and 1306 (2000), and to take the necessary judicial and administrative action to end any illegal activities by those individuals and companies.¹⁵²

In connection with the situation in Angola, by resolution 1295 (2000) of 18 April 2000, the Council requested the Secretary General to establish a monitoring mechanism, and called on all States to cooperate fully with it in the discharge of its mandate.¹⁵³ Furthermore, in a presidential statement dated 15 November 2001,¹⁵⁴ the Council called on Member States to comply fully with the implementation of the sanctions regime against the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA) and to cooperate fully with the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution

864 (1993) and the monitoring mechanism on sanctions against UNITA.

In connection with the situation in Somalia, by resolution 1407 (2002) of 3 May 2002, the Council called on “all States, the Transitional National Government and local authorities in Somalia” to cooperate fully with the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 751 (1992) and the Team of Experts to be established by the same resolution in their quests for information in accordance with the resolution. It also requested all States to report to the Committee on measures they had in place to ensure the full implementation of the arms embargo and called upon all States, particularly those in the region, to provide the Committee with all available information on violations of the embargo.¹⁵⁵ In addition, by resolution 1519 (2003) of 16 December 2003, the Council called on all States in the region to cooperate with the Monitoring Group set up by that resolution, by establishing the focal points to enhance its cooperation and to facilitate information exchange.¹⁵⁶

In connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, by resolution 1302 (2000) of 8 June 2000 and subsequent resolutions, while extending the oil-for-food programme established by resolution 986 (1995), the Council appealed to all States to continue to facilitate the transit of humanitarian supplies to Iraq authorized by the Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990), and to take all other appropriate measures to ensure that urgently needed humanitarian supplies reached the Iraqi people as rapidly as possible. The Council further urged all States, specifically the Government of Iraq, to provide their full cooperation in the “effective implementation” of the relevant resolution.¹⁵⁷

Furthermore, also with regard to the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, by resolution 1441(2002) of 8 November 2002, recalling that the effective operation of the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) established pursuant to resolution 1284 (1999) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) was

¹⁵¹ S/PRST/2000/2.

¹⁵² Resolution 1343 (2001), para. 21.

¹⁵³ Resolution 1295 (2000), paras. 3 and 4.

¹⁵⁴ S/PRST/2001/36.

¹⁵⁵ Resolution 1407 (2002), paras. 4, 8 and 9.

¹⁵⁶ Resolution 1519 (2003), para. 5.

¹⁵⁷ Resolutions 1302 (2000), para. 16; 1330 (2000), paras. 16 and 21; 1360 (2001), paras. 10 and 13; and 1454 (2002), para. 4.

essential for the implementation of resolution 687 (1991) and other relevant resolutions, the Council requested all Member States “to give their full support” to UNMOVIC and IAEA “in the discharge of their mandates”.¹⁵⁸

Assistance relating to peacekeeping operations

In a number of decisions of the Council, Member States were requested to provide assistance to peacekeeping operations, including the provision of troops and material support.¹⁵⁹ For example, in connection with the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia, by resolution 1312 (2000) of 31 July 2000, the Council called upon the parties to provide the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) “with access, assistance, support and protection required for the performance of its duties”.¹⁶⁰

Assistance relating to enforcement actions by regional arrangements authorized by the Security Council

In some cases, the Security Council called upon Member States to assist enforcement actions taken by the regional arrangements which were authorized by the Security Council. For instance, in connection with the situation in Côte d’Ivoire, by a presidential statement of 25 July 2003,¹⁶¹ the Council called upon Member States to provide logistic and financial support to the Economic Community of West African States Mission in Côte d’Ivoire, authorized under Chapter VII of the Charter by resolution 1464 (2003) of 4 February 2003, so that it could continue to fulfill its mandate.

Assistance relating to multinational forces authorized by the Security Council

On occasion, the Security Council called for assistance to be provided to the multinational forces it had authorized. For example, in connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, by resolution 1501 (2003) of 26 August 2003,

¹⁵⁸ Resolution 1441 (2002), twelfth preambular paragraph and para. 10.

¹⁵⁹ For the provisions in resolutions adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter requesting Member States to provide assistance to peacekeeping operations, see chapter XI, part V, section A.

¹⁶⁰ Resolution 1312 (2000), para. 3.

¹⁶¹ S/PRST/2003/11.

the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, authorized the States members of the Interim Emergency Multinational Force that had been authorized by resolution 1484 (2003) to provide assistance to the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo deployed in and the immediate surroundings of Bunia, if requested and if exceptional circumstances demanded it.¹⁶²

In other instances, the Council, by its resolutions,¹⁶³ requested full cooperation of Member States with the multinational forces. For instance, in connection with the situation in Afghanistan, by resolution 1386 (2001) of 20 December 2001, the Council encouraged neighbouring States and other Member States to “provide to the International Security Assistance Force such necessary assistance” as might be requested, “including overflight clearances and transit”.¹⁶⁴

Other activities of the United Nations

During the period under review, the Council called upon Member States to support the efforts by the United Nations in the areas of counter-terrorism, conflict resolution and humanitarian assistance.

For example, in connection with threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts, by resolution 1373 (2001) of 28 September 2001, the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, decided that all States should “refrain from providing any form of support,” active or passive, to entities or persons involved in terrorist acts, including by suppressing recruitment of members of terrorist groups and eliminating the supply of weapons to terrorists.¹⁶⁵

In respect of humanitarian assistance, the Council, in connection with the situation between Iraq

¹⁶² Resolution 1501 (2003), para. 2.

¹⁶³ In connection with the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, see resolutions 1305 (2000), para. 16; 1357 (2001), para. 16; 1423 (2002), para. 16; and 1491 (2003), para. 16. In connection with the situation in Afghanistan, see resolution 1386 (2001), para. 7. In connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, see resolution 1484 (2003), para. 8. In connection with the situation in Liberia, see resolution 1497 (2003), para. 11. In connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, see resolution 1511 (2003), para. 14.

¹⁶⁴ Resolution 1386 (2001), para. 7. See also chapter XI, part VI, section B.

¹⁶⁵ Resolution 1373 (2001), para. 2 (a).

and Kuwait, by resolution 1483 (2003) of 22 May 2003, called upon “all Member States in a position to do so to respond immediately to the humanitarian appeals by the United Nations and other international organizations for Iraq”.¹⁶⁶

D. Article 2, paragraph 6

Article 2, paragraph 6

The Organization shall ensure that states which are not Members of the United Nations act in accordance with these Principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Note

During the period under review, there was no explicit reference to Article 2 (6) in the decisions of the Security Council. Furthermore, no decisions included a reference to “States not Members of the United Nations” that might be described as an implicit reference to the principle enshrined in Article 2 (6). The Security Council in its decisions tended to refer to “all States” or simply to “States” when it made calls for States to take specific actions.¹⁶⁷ There were no explicit references to Article 2 (6) during the Council’s deliberations, nor did any constitutional discussion arise in connection with that Article.

E. Article 2, paragraph 7

Article 2, paragraph 7

Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII.

¹⁶⁶ Resolution 1483 (2003), para. 2.

¹⁶⁷ For references to “all States” or “States” contained in the decisions of the Council adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter, see chapter XI, part VI entitled “Obligations of Member States under Article 48 of the Charter”.

Note

During the period under review, there was no explicit reference to Article 2 (7) contained in the decisions adopted by the Council.

Article 2 (7) was explicitly referred to in several communications¹⁶⁸ during the reporting period. In addition, in a letter dated 16 September 2002¹⁶⁹ from the Secretary-General addressed to the President, transmitting a letter of the same date from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq addressed to the Secretary-General, the Minister drew attention to the decision of his Government to allow the return of the United Nations weapons inspectors to Iraq without conditions, and reiterated the importance of the commitment of all States Members of the Council and the United Nations to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Iraq, as stipulated in the relevant Council resolutions and “in Article 2 of the Charter”.

During the deliberations of the Security Council, the principle enshrined in Article 2 (7), while not always invoked explicitly, was touched upon frequently, as illustrated by the cases presented below. The first two cases deal with the thematic debates on the humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council (case 7) and on the protection of civilians in armed conflict (case 8). Case 9 captures the relevant deliberations of the Council in two meetings held in connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait: one meeting was held following the decision by the Government of Iraq to allow the return of the United Nations weapons inspectors to Iraq without conditions, contained in the letter dated 16 September 2002 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, addressed to the Secretary General,¹⁷⁰ and the other following the military action against Iraq by the United States, the United Kingdom and their allies which commenced on 20 March 2003.

¹⁶⁸ See, for example, the letter dated 5 October 2000 from the representative of Yugoslavia addressed to the President (S/2000/961); the letter dated 26 May 2001 from the representative of Iraq addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/532); and the letter dated 20 December 2002 from the representative of Iraq addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2002/1400).

¹⁶⁹ S/2002/1034.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

Case 7

Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council

At the 4109th meeting, on 9 March 2000, the Council held a thematic debate on the agenda item entitled “Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council.” In the course of the debate, speakers engaged in discussing the role and responsibility of the Security Council in dealing with humanitarian crises and providing humanitarian assistance. In particular, the representative of France argued that humanitarian crises could reach such degrees of seriousness that the response could only be a political one and, in certain circumstances, one that would also require the use of force to end large-scale violations of human rights and international humanitarian law, as those violations in themselves threatened international peace and security, and therefore fully justified the use of such action, in accordance with the Charter. He continued that such was the case in Kosovo and that under those circumstances the Council could not but exercise the responsibilities assigned to it under the Charter.¹⁷¹

While acknowledging that humanitarian activities were necessary in armed conflicts as a basic and undisputed duty of the international community, and in particular, of the Security Council, the representative of Tunisia underscored that the conduct of such humanitarian assistance “must of necessity strictly comply with the principles of sovereignty of States, their political independence, their territorial integrity and non-interference in their internal affairs”, as stipulated by the Charter of the United Nations and the international conventions in force.¹⁷²

The representative of Pakistan pointed out that the prospects of preventive action must be studied within the five fundamental parameters, one of which was respect for the principle of State sovereignty and non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, although that principle could not be extended to situations where people under colonial rule, foreign occupation or alien domination were struggling for their inalienable right to self-determination.¹⁷³ The representative of India, explicitly referring to Article 2 (7), argued that it was the

¹⁷¹ S/PV.4109, p. 7.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

¹⁷³ S/PV.4109 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

sovereign right of a State to determine whether it needed humanitarian assistance. According to him, if the State chose not to seek assistance, coercion or use of force by the Council or any other body would violate that Article.¹⁷⁴

Case 8

Protection of civilians in armed conflict

At the 4130th meeting, on 19 April 2000, the Council held a thematic debate on the protection of civilians in armed conflict. Various speakers referred to the need to observe the purposes and principles of the United Nations, in particular, respect for the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of States and non-interference in their internal affairs.¹⁷⁵

The representative of China held that the Government of a country in armed conflict tended to decide on the measures necessary to protect civilians in accordance with the nature and characteristics of the conflict and the circumstances of civilians in the area of conflict, and, in that regard, the positions of sovereign States should be respected by the Security Council, as action taken without the understanding and cooperation of the countries involved might lead those countries to resist. He also pointed out that any attempts to politicize humanitarian concerns, wantonly interfere in other countries’ internal affairs or worse yet, overturn a legitimate Government under the pretext of protecting civilians, ran counter to the purposes and principles of the Charter.¹⁷⁶ The representative of Tunisia also believed it essential, when dealing with the protection of civilians in armed conflict, to respect the principles of the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of States and non-interference in their internal affairs, as well as to secure the consent and cooperation of the parties, in particular the Governments of the countries concerned.¹⁷⁷

In a similar vein, the representative of Egypt expressed the belief that the provision of humanitarian assistance to civilians in time of war, under the

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹⁷⁵ S/PV.4130 and Corr.1, p. 14 (China); p. 17 (Tunisia); and p. 22 (Ukraine); S/PV.4130 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 12 (Egypt); and p. 14 (Bahrain).

¹⁷⁶ S/PV.4130 and Corr.1, p. 14.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

auspices of the United Nations or the International Committee of the Red Cross, should be conducted with the consent of or at the request of the countries concerned and that the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of States should be respected. He further insisted that humanitarian assistance must not be used as a cover for action in support of the political interests of any particular State or group of States.¹⁷⁸

At the same meeting, the Council adopted resolution 1296 (2000), in which the Council reaffirmed its commitment to the purposes of the Charter as set out in Article 1, paragraphs 1 to 4, and to the principles of the Charter as set out in Article 2, paragraphs 1 to 7, including its commitment to the principles of the political independence, sovereign equality and territorial integrity of all States, and respect for the sovereignty of all States.¹⁷⁹

Case 9 **The situation between Iraq and Kuwait**

At the 4625th meeting, on 16 October 2002, in connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, speakers touched upon the principle enshrined in Article 2 (7), in conjunction with the discussion on the sanctions regime against Iraq and on the role of the Council in resolving the situation.

Throughout the deliberations, a number of speakers reaffirmed their respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Iraq.¹⁸⁰ The representative of the United Arab Emirates drew attention to the provisions of relevant Council resolutions calling for respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq and non-interference in its internal affairs.¹⁸¹

In his intervention, the representative of Iraq maintained that the sanctions regime was in violation of numerous Articles of the Charter, including Article 2 (7), which did not “allow the United Nations to intervene” in matters that were “essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State”.¹⁸²

The representative of Malaysia argued that the focus in the Council should be on promoting United Nations diplomacy to resolve the problem through effective inspections and weapons destruction, not on “legitimizing war against Iraq to effect regime change”. He held that removing the Head of State or Government of a sovereign State was “illegal and against the Charter”.¹⁸³ A similar argument was also made by the representative of Viet Nam.¹⁸⁴

At the 4726th meeting, held on 26 March 2003 in response to the request contained in letters dated 24 March 2003 from the representatives of Iraq and Malaysia addressed to the President of the Council,¹⁸⁵ the Secretary-General stressed that respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Iraq should be a guiding principle in the future decisions by the Council on Iraq.¹⁸⁶ The representative of Iraq emphasized that the full-scale Anglo-Saxon military invasion and the aggressive war against his country constituted a blatant material breach of international law and the Charter, particularly Articles 2 (4) and 2 (7).¹⁸⁷ The representative of Pakistan underlined the principles prescribed in the Charter, including the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in internal affairs of a State, in containing the conflict and restoring the rule of law in Iraq.¹⁸⁸

¹⁷⁸ S/PV.4130 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, pp. 12-13.

¹⁷⁹ Resolution 1296 (2000), sixth preambular paragraph.

¹⁸⁰ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 16 (Egypt); p. 19 (Pakistan); and pp. 23-24 (Tunisia); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 23 (Cuba); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 3 (Morocco); p. 11 (India); p. 13 (Djibouti); p. 21 (Organization of the Islamic Conference); and p. 26 (Nepal); and S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr.1, p. 10 (China).

¹⁸¹ S/PV.4625 and Corr.1, p. 20.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁸³ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 7.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹⁸⁵ S/2003/362 and S/2003/363, respectively.

¹⁸⁶ S/PV.4726, p. 4.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹⁸⁸ S/PV.4726 (Resumption 1), p. 22.

Part II

Consideration of the functions and powers of the Security Council (Articles 24 and 25 of the Charter)

A. Article 24

Article 24

1. *In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.*

2. *In discharging these duties the Security Council shall act in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations. The specific powers granted to the Security Council for the discharge of these duties are laid down in Chapters VI, VII, VIII, and XII.*

3. *The Security Council shall submit annual and, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly for its consideration.*

Note

During the period under review, none of the decisions adopted by the Council contained an explicit reference to Article 24 of the Charter.¹⁸⁹ However, Article 24, the provision by which the Members of the United Nations conferred on the Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, was implicitly referred to in a number of resolutions and presidential statements, mostly in the context of the agenda items dealing with thematic and cross-cutting issues. By such decisions, the Council reaffirmed, reiterated, recalled or bore in mind its “primary responsibility” under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁹ Article 24 (3), in connection with the annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly, is dealt with in chapter VI, part I, section E.

¹⁹⁰ For example, in connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, see resolutions 1291 (3000), second preambular paragraph; 1304 (2000), second preambular paragraph; 1341 (2001), ninth preambular paragraph; and 1355 (2001), ninth preambular paragraph. In connection with ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance

of international peace and security, particularly in Africa, see resolution 1318 (2000), annex, section I, third paragraph. In connection with the protection of civilians in armed conflict, see resolution 1296 (2000), fifth preambular paragraph, and S/PRST/2002/6. In connection with children and armed conflict, see resolutions 1314 (2000), fourth preambular paragraph; and 1379 (2001), fourth preambular paragraph. In connection with women and peace and security, see resolution 1325 (2000), third preambular paragraph. In connection with strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries, see resolution 1353 (2001), fifth preambular paragraph. In connection with the responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations, see resolution 1308 (2000), fifteenth preambular paragraph, and S/PRST/2001/16. In connection with the role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts, see resolution 1366 (2001), sixth preambular paragraph, and S/PRST/2000/25. In connection with the protection of United Nations personnel, associated personnel and humanitarian personnel in conflict zones, see resolution 1502 (2003), first preambular paragraph. In connection with promoting peace and security: humanitarian assistance to refugees in Africa, see S/PRST/2000/1. In connection with maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council, see S/PRST/2000/7. In connection with the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peacebuilding, see S/PRST/2000/10. In connection with peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach, see S/PRST/2001/5. In connection with small arms, see S/PRST/2001/21. In connection with the situation in Africa, see S/PRST/2002/2.

¹⁹¹ For instance, in connection with the situation in Africa, see S/PV.4087 (Resumption 1), p. 20 (South Africa); S/PV.4460, p. 33 (South Africa); and S/PV.4538 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (South Africa). In connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, see S/PV.4092 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (South Africa); and S/PV.4143 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Zimbabwe). In connection with general issues relating to sanctions, see S/PV.4128, p. 43 (Iraq). In connection with strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries, S/PV.4257, p. 12 (India); and S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1), p. 13 (Ireland). In connection with ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the

references to Article 24 were also found in several communications of the Council.¹⁹²

maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa, see S/PV.4288, p. 12 (Egypt). In connection with role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts, see S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p.18 (Nigeria). In connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, see S/PV.4336 (Resumption 1), p. 14 (Canada); and p. 18 (Iraq); S/PV.4625 and Corr. 1, p. 3 (Deputy Secretary-General); p. 7 (Iraq); p. 21 (Jordan); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 2 (Morocco); and p. 22 (Jamaica); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3), p. 16 (Singapore); p. 20 (Ireland); and p. 25 (Bulgaria); S/PV.4709, p. 8 (Kuwait); and p. 16 (Jordan); and S/PV.4726, p. 32 (Jamaica). In connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, see S/PV.4357 (Resumption 1) and Corr. 1, p. 13 (Bahrain); S/PV.4506 (Resumption 1) and Corr. 1, p. 18 (United Republic of Tanzania); and S/PV.4515 (Resumption 1), p. 14 (Singapore). In connection with the situation in East Timor, see S/PV.4403, p. 15 (Singapore). In connection with the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, see S/PV.4568, p. 15 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 16 (Jordan); and p. 19 (Mongolia); and S/PV.4568 (Resumption 1), and Corr. 1 p. 2 (Fiji). In connection with small arms, see S/PV.4623 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Egypt). In connection with wrap-up discussions on the work of the Security Council for the current month, see S/PV.4677, p. 9 (Singapore). In connection with the role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes, see S/PV.4753, p. 27 (Cameroon). In connection with United Nations peacekeeping, S/PV.4772, p. 10 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 17 (Nigeria); and p. 21 (Pakistan). In connection with justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role, see S/PV.4835, p. 35 (Bahrain).

¹⁹² In connection with the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia, see the letter dated 7 April 2000 from the representative of Ethiopia to the President of the Council (S/2000/296, p. 4). In connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, see identical letters dated 22 January 2001, 4 November 2002, 2 December 2002, 31 December 2002 and 27 January 2003 from the representative of Iraq to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Council (S/2001/68, p. 8; S/2002/1222, p. 3; S/2002/1316, p. 3; S/2002/1439, p. 3; and S/2003/108, p. 4). In connection with peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach, see the letter dated 25 January 2001 from the representative of Tunisia to the Secretary-General (S/2001/82, p. 5). In connection with the letters dated 20 and 23 December 1991, from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, see the letter dated 14 February 2001 from the representative of Mali to the President of the Council (S/2001/140,

In order to illustrate the interpretation and application of Article 24 by the Council, a number of cases were drawn from deliberations in which Council members engaged in discussing the role and responsibilities of the Council.

Cases 10 to 16 relate to thematic debates in which Member States touched upon the question of the mandate of the Security Council vis-à-vis other United Nations bodies in accordance with the Charter.

Case 17 reviews discussions in connection with the agenda items entitled “The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina” and “United Nations peacekeeping”. In which the Council dealt with the issue of exemption from prosecution in cases involving personnel from States not Parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. Finally, relevant debates are set out concerning the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question (case 18), and the situation between Iraq and Kuwait (case 19).

Case 10 Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council

At the outset of the 4109th meeting, on 9 March 2000, the President reaffirmed that the Charter of the United Nations conferred upon the Security Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and stressed that the Council, in discharging such functions, needed a broad, more proactive approach. Furthermore, he expressed the view that the Council had a responsibility to address humanitarian issues relating to situations of conflict and take appropriate action.¹⁹³

At the same meeting, the representative of Canada pointed out that while advocating for the implementation of a comprehensive approach to conflict prevention, the Council must be prepared to respond quickly to situations in which populations were in grave need, by supporting their access to

p. 2). In connection with threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts, see the letter dated 22 December 2003 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism to the President of the Council, transmitting the third report from Angola submitted pursuant to para. 6 of resolution 1373 (2001) (S/2003/1210, p. 4).

¹⁹³ S/PV.4109, p. 2.

protection and assistance and by identifying political solutions to resolve the underlying causes of humanitarian crises. He argued that given that humanitarian actions did not respond to the causes of conflict but to the needs of victims, humanitarian efforts should be matched by corresponding actions enabling political actors, and in particular the Council, to address and resolve conflict.¹⁹⁴ The representative of France stated that the Council had the primary responsibility to deal with situations in which violations of international humanitarian law and human rights threatened international peace and security, as in East Timor. Therefore, the Council also had the responsibility for continuing to deal with humanitarian situations in all aspects of its activities, as in the case of Iraq. The representative further stressed that although relieving civilian suffering was the task of United Nations agencies and humanitarian organizations, it should not absolve the Council of its responsibilities for dealing with crises.¹⁹⁵ The representative of Tunisia argued that the Security Council should shoulder its responsibility in the field of humanitarian activities as the duty of the international community.¹⁹⁶

The representative of China was of the view that the Security Council, in fulfilling its primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security, and in reviewing situations of armed conflict, should also pay attention to humanitarian issues caused by conflicts and especially take into consideration factors such as humanitarian assistance, in order to help eliminate or alleviate humanitarian crises, while respecting the sovereignty of a recipient State.¹⁹⁷ The representative of the Russian Federation considered that, while not equating the functions of the Council with those of humanitarian organizations, the Council must lend active political support to the activities of those organizations which in general must be backed up by the authority of the Council.¹⁹⁸ Others also considered it essential that the Council, in dealing with specific situations, ensure the protection of civilians and consider humanitarian aspects of conflicts.¹⁹⁹

In that context, many speakers emphasized the importance of strengthening the coordination mechanisms in humanitarian activities among the relevant bodies of the United Nations system and others.²⁰⁰ At the same time, several speakers stressed the need to respect the mandate of all organs of the United Nations in accordance with the Charter.²⁰¹ For example, the representative of Egypt warned that the delicate balance established in the Charter between the responsibilities and functions of the primary bodies of the United Nations should be maintained, so that each could fulfil its respective tasks without encroaching upon the responsibilities of the other. He urged the Council, in fulfilling its tasks, to act in compliance with all the provisions of the Charter and in conformity with the specific role and responsibility assigned to it, in order to address all threats to international peace and security.²⁰² The representative of Colombia expressed concern that if the Council assumed the role, outside the scope of the Charter, of directing the response of the entire United Nations system to humanitarian emergencies, it would be unable properly to fulfil its mission of preserving international peace and security. He contended that the matter of humanitarian emergencies should be addressed by the General Assembly where the “proper guidance” to the humanitarian action could be given by all Member States.²⁰³ The representative of Brazil considered that the role of the Council was to add to the work of the other bodies of the United Nations, including the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, without trying to replace them.²⁰⁴

At the same meeting, the representative of India pointed out that the Council was a creature of the Charter, in which Article 24 conferred on the Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. In that regard, he argued that nowhere did the Charter speak of humanitarian action or its aspects. The representative maintained that the membership of the United Nations, on behalf of which the Council acted in accordance with Article 24, agreed

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Jamaica); p. 10 (Malaysia); p. 11 (Mali); and p. 17 (Ukraine); S/PV.4109 (Resumption 1), p. 15 (Bulgaria); and p. 17 (Brazil).

²⁰⁰ S/PV.4109, p. 5 (Canada); p. 9 (Jamaica); p. 12 (Mali); p. 13 (Tunisia); p. 14 (Namibia); p. 15 (Russian Federation); and p. 17 (Netherlands); S/PV.4109 (Resumption 1), p. 16 (Bulgaria); and p. 17 (Brazil).

²⁰¹ S/PV.4109, p. 19 (Argentina); and p. 21 (Egypt); S/PV.4109 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Pakistan).

²⁰² S/PV.4109, pp. 20-21.

²⁰³ S/PV.4109 (Resumption 1), pp. 7-8.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

on the one hand that peacekeeping, another activity not mentioned in the Charter, was set up as a practical instrument. On the other hand, there was no agreement on the humanitarian aspect, and whether the Council should have a role in it.²⁰⁵

By a presidential statement dated 9 March 2000,²⁰⁶ the Council, recalling its primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security, recognized the importance of the humanitarian dimension to the maintenance of international peace and security and to its consideration of humanitarian issues relating to the protection of all civilians and other non-combatants in situations of armed conflict. It also recognized that humanitarian crises could be both causes and consequences of conflicts and that they could affect the Council's efforts to prevent and end conflicts and to deal with other threats to international peace and security. By the same presidential statement, the Council also underlined the importance of effective coordination among relevant United Nations organs and agencies as well as other organizations and actors in the field in situations of ongoing conflict and peacebuilding, and expressed its willingness to consider ways to improve such coordination.

Case 11

The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations

By resolution 1308 (2000) of 17 July 2000, the Council emphasized the important role of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in addressing HIV/AIDS, and stressed the need for coordinated efforts of all relevant United Nations organizations to address the HIV/AIDS pandemic in line with their respective mandates and to assist, wherever possible, in global efforts against it. By the same resolution, the Council also stressed that the HIV/AIDS pandemic, if unchecked, might pose a risk to stability and security.²⁰⁷

At the 4259th meeting, on 19 January 2001, recalling that his delegation had introduced the issue of

HIV/AIDS for the first time into the agenda of the Council in January 2000,²⁰⁸ the representative of the United States pointed out that there had been debates about whether the Council, "the highest international body legitimizing international involvement across borders" should address the matter at all. While acknowledging that others considered it appropriate that the issue be left entirely to the Economic and Social Council, he maintained that the earlier debate on the topic had been worth it, because the continued work by the Council would save lives.²⁰⁹ In that connection, some speakers recalled resolution 1308 (2000) and argued that HIV/AIDS was a threat to international peace and security, and therefore the Council had a role to play.²¹⁰

The representative of Costa Rica, however, while registering his concern in relation to the risk that peacekeepers might contract or spread HIV/AIDS, stressed that under the Charter, it was up to the General Assembly to study and coordinate efforts to combat the epidemic and for the Economic and Social Council to assess, and deal with, the social and developmental effects of the disease. He held that the competence of the Council in that area was severely limited.²¹¹

Case 12

Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach

At the 4272nd meeting, on 5 February 2001, several speakers acknowledged that peacebuilding was a multidimensional task, which required partnership and better coordination of the Security Council with other organs such as the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council as well as with other agencies responsible for peacebuilding.²¹²

²⁰⁸ At the 4087th meeting, on 10 January 2000, the Council discussed the agenda item entitled "The situation in Africa: the impact of AIDS on peace and security in Africa".

²⁰⁹ S/PV.4259, pp. 9-10.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 20 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4259 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Ireland); p. 7 (Canada); and p. 8 (Sweden, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries).

²¹¹ S/PV.4259 (Resumption 1), p. 10.

²¹² S/PV.4272, p. 6 (France); pp. 9-10 (United States); p. 10 (United Kingdom); p. 15 (Colombia); p. 17 (China); and p. 25 (Bangladesh); S/PV.4272 (Resumption 1); p. 4 (Algeria); p. 11 (Egypt); p. 25 (Argentina); p. 26 (Malaysia); and pp. 33-34 (Tunisia).

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

²⁰⁶ S/PRST/2000/7.

²⁰⁷ Resolution 1308 (2000), third, fourth and eleventh preambular paragraphs.

The representative of the United States pointed out that, while directing multiple United Nations agencies involved in peacebuilding was not the responsibility of the Council, the Council had in the past agreed that certain peacebuilding measures, such as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration activities and the rebuilding of local police forces, fell within its purview.²¹³ The representative of Colombia expressed the view that the Council should be considered as only one of the actors and sometimes “the least relevant one” among those involved in peacebuilding.²¹⁴ For his part, underscoring the importance of the main bodies of the Organization carrying out their work within their mandates in conformity with the Charter, the representative of Egypt held that the issue of peacebuilding fell within the competence of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, and therefore urged the Council to give more attention to emerging or ongoing conflicts and to focus on peacebuilding in a controlled manner as it related to post-conflict situations, so the Council was not diverted “from its main function of maintaining international peace and security”. While recognizing the Council’s role in peacebuilding, he also expressed concern about the overlap in the functions of the main bodies of the United Nations.²¹⁵ A similar concern was expressed by the representative of India, who held that most of what post-conflict peacebuilding involved lay “outside the mandate of the Council” and “within the purview of the General Assembly”.²¹⁶

By a presidential statement dated 20 February 2001,²¹⁷ the Council reaffirmed its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and reiterated the value of including, as appropriate, peacebuilding elements in the mandates of peacekeeping operations. The Council further reiterated its willingness to consider ways to improve its cooperation with other United Nations bodies and organs directly by peacebuilding, in particular with the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, which had a primary role in that field.

²¹³ S/PV.4272, p. 9.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

²¹⁵ S/PV.4272 (Resumption 1), pp. 10-11.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

²¹⁷ S/PRST/2001/5.

Case 13

Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflict

At the 4334th meeting, on 21 June 2001, many speakers expressed general support for greater interaction between the Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in dealing with the issue of conflict prevention. They also discussed the distribution of competencies established by the Charter among those principle organs of the United Nations. Some, in that context, stressed that the Council did have a key but not exclusive role to play in the area of conflict prevention.²¹⁸ For example, the representative of Iraq stressed that the Charter, in particular Articles 10, 11 and 14, entrusted the General Assembly with a role in the maintenance of international peace and security and in the prevention and settlement of conflicts. Nonetheless, the Security Council had expanded its mandate, and thereby exceeded the terms of reference of the General Assembly, which had led to a diminished role and competence of the General Assembly.²¹⁹ The representative of Nigeria argued that although Article 24 of the Charter bestowed on the Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, a successful conflict prevention strategy required the cooperation of all United Nations actors.²²⁰

By a presidential statement dated 20 July 2000, bearing in mind its primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Council reaffirmed its role in taking appropriate steps aimed at the prevention of armed conflicts. In addition, the Council, stressing the importance of effective post-conflict peacebuilding strategies in preventing the re-emergence of conflicts, recognized the need for close cooperation among bodies of the United Nations system in the area of post-conflict peacebuilding and expressed its

²¹⁸ S/PV.4334, p. 9 (United Kingdom); p. 12 (Tunisia); p. 13 (Russian Federation); p. 19 (Norway); p. 20 (Ukraine); and p. 27 (Canada); S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Sweden, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); p. 5 (Republic of Korea); pp. 5-7 (Argentina); p. 8 (Costa Rica); p. 13 (Egypt); p. 14 (Mexico); p. 16 (Brazil); p. 21 (Iraq); p. 25 (Belarus); and p. 26 (Nepal).

²¹⁹ S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 21.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

willingness to consider ways to improve such cooperation. The Council further affirmed that a reformed, strengthened and effective United Nations remained central to the maintenance of peace and security, of which prevention was a key component.²²¹ By resolution 1366 (2001) of 30 August 2001, the Council expressed its determination to pursue the objective of prevention of armed conflict “as an integral part of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security”.²²²

Case 14 Small arms

At the 4355th meeting, convened on 2 August 2001, following the conclusion of the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, held in New York from 9 to 20 July 2001, many speakers recognized that the Security Council had an important contribution to make with respect to the issue of small arms, indicating that certain provisions of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects adopted at the conclusion of the Conference²²³ were relevant to the role of the Council. At the same time, the representative of the United States cautioned the Council against seeking a more elaborate role beyond its competence.²²⁴ As to the relationship with the General Assembly, the representative of Brazil emphasized that with respect to small arms, the Council should avoid creating a process parallel to that of the Conference; that its role related, *inter alia*, to conflict prevention, arms embargoes and the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants.²²⁵ Stressing that the Programme of Action was adopted through a process initiated by the General Assembly, the representative of South Africa suggested that involvement of the Council on the issue of small arms should be “confined to specific areas related to the Council’s agenda”.²²⁶ Furthermore, the representative of the Sudan, speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, pointed out that the role of the Council must be a “supporting one in respect of the

efforts undertaken by the General Assembly”.²²⁷ The representative of Pakistan maintained that the Council could contribute to the question of small arms, by focusing on the areas that were directly within its competence and jurisdiction, which meant that it fulfilled its Charter obligations towards the pacific settlement of disputes and the prevention of armed conflicts.²²⁸

At the same meeting, speakers encouraged coordination between the Security Council and other organs of the Organization, particularly the General Assembly and the specialized agencies, to promote a coherent system-wide approach to small arms.²²⁹

By a presidential statement dated 31 August 2001,²³⁰ the Council noted with grave concern that the destabilizing accumulation and uncontrolled spread of small arms and light weapons in many regions of the world, among other things, increased the intensity and duration of armed conflicts, undermined the sustainability of peace agreements and compromised the effectiveness of the Council in discharging its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Welcoming the adoption of the Programme of Action, the Council recognized its responsibility in assisting in its implementation.

By a statement by the President dated 31 October 2002,²³¹ the Council recognized its responsibility to examine ways in which it could further contribute to dealing with the question of illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in situations under its consideration.

Case 15 Protection of civilians in armed conflict

At the 4492nd meeting, on 15 March 2002, the Council heard supportive opinions on the role of the Security Council in the protection of civilians in armed conflict. The representative of France, pointing out that the majority of the victims of conflict had shifted from soldiers to civilians, reaffirmed the primary responsibility of the Council for the maintenance of

²²¹ S/PRST/2000/25.

²²² Resolution 1366 (2001), para. 1.

²²³ A/CONF.192/15, para. 24.

²²⁴ S/PV.4355, p. 5.

²²⁵ S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 7.

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 22-24.

²²⁹ S/PV.4355, p. 7 (Jamaica); p. 10 (Bangladesh); p. 14 (China); p. 23 (Singapore); and p. 27 (Peru); S/PV.4355 (Resumption 1) and Corr. 1; p. 7 (Brazil).

²³⁰ S/PRST/2001/21.

²³¹ S/PRST/2002/30.

peace and security, and asserted that the ongoing debate was entirely justified.²³² The representative of the United States expressed the view that it had always considered the protection of civilians to be at the heart of the task of the United Nations and of the Security Council in dealing with conflicts.²³³ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic maintained that the Council had decided to focus on the question of protection of civilians as an early warning element of the maintenance of international peace and security. He stated that the Council had a special responsibility to encourage Member States to fulfil their obligations with respect to the protection of civilians and that ways must be found to improve cooperation among the Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, each according to its mandate.²³⁴ Noting that resolutions 1265 (1999) and 1296 (2000) had established a solid base for the work of the Council in the area of protection of civilians, the representative of the Russian Federation was of the view that it was “only normal” for the Council to devote its attention to the issue.²³⁵

By a presidential statement dated 15 March 2002,²³⁶ the Council reaffirmed its concern at the hardships borne by civilians during armed conflict and recognized the consequent impact this had on durable peace, reconciliation and development, bearing in mind its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and underlining the importance of taking measures aimed at conflict prevention and resolution.

By subsequent presidential statements dated 20 December 2002 and 15 December 2003,²³⁷ the Council reaffirmed the need to keep the protection of civilians in armed conflict as an important item on the agenda of the Council.

²³² S/PV.4492, p. 6.

²³³ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

²³⁶ S/PRST/2002/6.

²³⁷ S/PRST/2002/41 and S/PRST/2003/27, respectively.

Case 16

The situation in Africa

Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa

At the 4538th meeting, on 22 May 2002, following a briefing by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa, the representative of Cuba observed that many measures necessary for eliminating the causes of conflict in Africa and consolidating peace and sustainable development were “clearly beyond the mandate of the Security Council” and corresponded to the work of such organs as the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. Therefore, one of the functions of the Working Group should be to consider carefully the activities undertaken by the Council in Africa as the Council might not be the appropriate organ to undertake them. He further argued that his delegation’s concerns stemmed not only from the conceptual perspective but also from a concern over the suffering of the countries where the Council assumed functions that were beyond its competence, and for which it was not duly prepared. He emphasized that the work of the Working Group should “complement and not substitute” for the efforts of other organs to address problems in Africa, and should avoid duplications. He also hoped that it would contribute to improved coordination and communication among the General Assembly, the Council and the Economic and Social Council.²³⁸ The representative of India contended that post-conflict peacebuilding did not fall within the purview of the Council, but lay with other bodies and organs of the Organization. He contended that as and when those bodies required the involvement and the cooperation of the Security Council, they would invite it.²³⁹

Case 17

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

United Nations peacekeeping

In a letter dated 3 July 2002 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Canada requested the Council to convene a meeting on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, stressing that at issue was not just an extension of the United Nations

²³⁸ S/PV.4538, pp. 23-24.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH), but the “potentially irreversible” decision of the Council which could negatively affect, inter alia, the integrity of treaty negotiations and the “credibility of the Council”.²⁴⁰ In response to that request, the Council convened the 4568th meeting, on 10 July 2002, in connection with the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

At the meeting, the representative of Canada raised concerns over the discussion that had been taking place in the Council regarding exemptions for peacekeepers from prosecution by the International Criminal Court. He maintained that the Council had not been empowered to rewrite treaties. He further argued that the draft resolutions being circulated²⁴¹ contained elements that “exceed[ed] the Council’s mandate” and that passage of them would “undermine the credibility of the Council”.²⁴² Similarly, the representatives of New Zealand and South Africa stated that the authority and the role of the Council entrusted to it by the Charter would be open to question, if the Council attempted to change the negotiated terms of a treaty without the approval of its States parties.²⁴³ Other speakers also expressed concern over the legitimacy of the proposal which, in their opinion, exceeded the competency of the Council.²⁴⁴

Specifically referring to Article 24 of the Charter, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran expressed regret that the one-sided approach adopted by a permanent member of the Council was, inter alia, putting in jeopardy the future of United Nations peacekeeping. He further argued that such an approach ran counter to the spirit and letter of the Charter, especially Article 24, which maintained that the Council acted “on behalf of the general membership”.²⁴⁵ The representative of Jordan was of the view that it was almost inconceivable, given the obligations conferred upon it by Article 24, that the

Council could ponder putting at risk the lives of potentially millions of people and existing peacekeeping operations because of differences in opinions on the International Criminal Court.²⁴⁶ Explicitly citing Article 24 of the Charter, the representative of Mongolia recalled that Member States viewed the Council as the main United Nations body that was called upon, not only to strengthen international peace and security, but also to safeguard State sovereignty and independence in the case of threats or a crisis.²⁴⁷

The representative of Fiji explicitly referred to Article 24 (1), stating that the functions and powers of the Council, including those set out in Chapter VII, did not include amending treaties and that doing so would violate established principles of international treaty law.²⁴⁸

However, the representative of the United States argued that the proposal by his delegation, in which article 16 of the Rome Statute was used, was consistent with both the Statute and the primary responsibility of the Council for maintaining international peace and security.²⁴⁹

By resolution 1422 (2002) of 12 July 2002, under the agenda item entitled “United Nations peacekeeping”, the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, requested the International Criminal Court to suspend for 12 months, starting 1 July 2002, the investigation or prosecution cases involving personnel from States not Parties to the Rome Statute of the Court, and expressed the intention to renew that request under the same conditions each 1 July for further twelve-month periods for as long as it might be necessary.²⁵⁰

At the 4772nd meeting, on 12 June 2003, in connection with United Nations peacekeeping, some speakers, without explicitly invoking Article 24, contested the proposed renewal of the provisions of resolution 1422 (2002). The representative of Canada indicated his concern about the legitimacy of the action recommended by the Council and stated that under the Charter, Member States had entrusted “certain powers under certain conditions” to the Council in order to

²⁴⁰ S/2002/723.

²⁴¹ Not issued as documents of the Council.

²⁴² S/PV.4568, p. 3.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6 (New Zealand) and p. 6 (South Africa).

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 14 (Costa Rica, on behalf of the Rio Group); p. 15 (Islamic Republic of Iran); pp. 26-27 (Mexico); and p. 30 (Venezuela); S/PV.4568 (Resumption 1) and Corr. 1, p. 13 (Argentina); pp. 13-14 (Cuba); and p. 16 (United Kingdom).

²⁴⁵ S/PV.4568, p. 15.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

²⁴⁸ S/PV.4568 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 2.

²⁴⁹ S/PV.4568, p. 10.

²⁵⁰ Resolution 1422 (2002), paras. 1-2.

maintain international peace and security. The representative further indicated his dismay that the Council, in purporting to act in the name of Member States, would take action in the absence of any apparent threat to international peace and security which was the precondition for action under Chapter VII of the Charter.²⁵¹ The representative of New Zealand also expressed concern that the intention of the Council to renew resolution 1422 (2002) on an annual basis was inconsistent with both the terms and the purpose of the provision. As such, it touched directly on the obligations assumed by States parties under the Rome Statute, without their consent. He further stated that such an approach stretched the legitimate limits of the role and responsibility entrusted to the Council under the Charter.²⁵² The representative of Jordan expressed the belief that the Council should not be rewriting treaties previously negotiated by all States comprising the entire international community.²⁵³

The representative of Liechtenstein stated that resolution 1422 (2002) was more damaging to the Council itself than to the International Criminal Court, and that many of the comments offered the previous year made it clear that the resolution effectively raised questions about the credibility of the action by the Council. He drew attention to the fact that at a time when the relevance of the Council and the Organization as a whole was openly questioned by many critics, the Council would do itself a disservice by renewing automatically or indefinitely the provisions of resolution 1422 (2002).²⁵⁴ The representative of South Africa also questioned the renewal of resolution 1422 (2002) and urged the Council to use its authority wisely and in the interest of humankind as a whole, and not allow itself to jeopardize the Court or frustrate the ends of international criminal justice.²⁵⁵

At the same meeting, there were a number of explicit references to Article 24. The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran expressed regret that a unilateral approach by one member of the Council had created an untenable and unsound situation in the Council and undoubtedly, such an approach ran counter

to the spirit and letter of the Charter, especially Article 24, which maintained that the Council acted on behalf of the membership of the United Nations.²⁵⁶ The representative of Nigeria also reaffirmed that Member States had collectively conferred on the Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, under Article 24.²⁵⁷ While supporting the draft resolution,²⁵⁸ the representative of Pakistan stated that his Government strongly adhered to the position that the Council, despite its wide authority and responsibilities, was not empowered to unilaterally amend or abrogate international treaties and agreements freely entered into by sovereign States. He further reaffirmed that the powers of the Security Council were constrained under paragraph 2 of Article 24 of the Charter, which obliged it to discharge its duties in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.²⁵⁹ At the meeting, the draft resolution was adopted as resolution 1487 (2003) by which the Council extended for a twelve-month period the provisions of resolution 1422 (2002).

Case 18 **The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question**

At the 4231st meeting, on 22 November 2000, convened in connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, the representative of Palestine affirmed that, to put an end to the situation, the responsibility of the Council was consistent and clear in accordance with the Charter. He noted that first, concrete measures needed to be taken to end the Israeli campaign against the Palestinian people and secondly, the Council must provide the necessary international protection for Palestinian civilians under Israeli occupation.²⁶⁰ For his part, the representative of Israel held the belief that as the organ with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Council was duty-bound to encourage the parties to return to the path of bilateral negotiation and compromise. He further urged the Council to call upon the Palestinians to adhere to the commitments they had undertaken to renew

²⁵¹ S/PV.4772, p. 5.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

²⁵⁸ S/2003/630.

²⁵⁹ S/PV.4722, p. 21.

²⁶⁰ S/PV.4231 and Corr. 1, pp. 3-4.

security cooperation with Israel and to call for an end to the violence and to return to the negotiating table. The representative of Israel assured the Council that, if the Palestinians were to take those actions, the bloodshed would end immediately.²⁶¹

Several speakers called upon the Council to fulfil its obligations under the Charter and to act without delay to stop the violence. The representative of Malaysia emphasized that the Council, with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, must live up to its obligations and that its credibility was at stake.²⁶² The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya stated that if the Council was to express the will of the international community and to maintain international peace and security, it should be just and shoulder its responsibilities under the Charter and its own resolutions.²⁶³ A similar call was made by the representative of Egypt.²⁶⁴

In subsequent meetings on the agenda item, also expressed the opinion speakers that the Council should assume the responsibility vested in it by the Charter, by explicitly citing Article 24.²⁶⁵

Case 19 **The situation between Iraq and Kuwait**

At the 4336th meeting, held on 28 June 2001 in response to the request contained in a letter dated 15 June 2001 from the representative of the Russian Federation addressed to the President,²⁶⁶ the Council considered, *inter alia*, the effects of the sanctions imposed on Iraq and ways of improving the humanitarian situation in that country. At the meeting, the representative of Canada, referring to a draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom to modify the oil-for-food programme,²⁶⁷ recalled that Article 24 of the Charter specified that members of the Council were to “act on behalf of the entire United Nations membership”. Therefore, he appealed to all members

of the Council to act corporately in the common interest by supporting the draft resolution, since that was “their duty under the Charter” and “our expectation of them as our representatives”.²⁶⁸

At the 4625th meeting, on 16 October 2002, following the decision of the Government of Iraq to resume weapons inspections in Iraq, the Deputy Secretary-General stated that non-compliance by Iraq with Security Council resolutions posed a challenge to the Organization and in particular to the Council. She further reaffirmed that in Article 24 of the Charter, Member States had conferred on the Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and that it was essential that the Council should face up to its grave responsibility.²⁶⁹

At the same meeting, the representative of Jordan called on all Member States to work towards achieving a solution through peaceful means in order to avoid making the situation in the Middle East even more critical, which, in his opinion, compelled the Council to assume its responsibilities as provided for in the Charter, including paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 24.²⁷⁰

The representative of Morocco expressed the view that resolutions of the Council should be respected, as the Council adopted them “on behalf of” Member States, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations and in line with the provisions of Article 24 of the Charter.²⁷¹ Explicitly citing Article 24, the representative of Jamaica also reaffirmed that the Council was entrusted with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security on behalf of the membership of the Organization, and that in discharging its responsibilities, the Council should act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. As such, he argued that the Council was accountable to the wider membership, especially in discussing a matter of great importance for the world.²⁷²

At the same meeting, the representative of Iraq held that the embargo imposed against his country was a blatant violation of several provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, such as Article 24, which called

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

²⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

²⁶⁵ See S/PV.4357 (Resumption 1) and Corr. 1, p. 13 (Bahrain); S/PV.4506 (Resumption 1) and Corr. 1, p. 18 (United Republic of Tanzania); and S/PV.4515 (Resumption 1), pp. 14-15 (Singapore).

²⁶⁶ S/2001/597.

²⁶⁷ Not issued as a document of the Council.

²⁶⁸ S/PV.4336 (Resumption 1), p. 14.

²⁶⁹ S/PV.4625 and Corr. 1, p. 3.

²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

²⁷¹ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 2.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 22.

for the Council to work in keeping with the purposes and principles of the Charter.²⁷³

Following the commencement of the military action against Iraq by the United States and its allies, at the 4726th meeting, on 26 March 2003, the Secretary-General urged Member States to reunite to uphold the principles of the Charter. This was essential for the Council to recover its rightful role, entrusted to it by the Charter, as the body with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.²⁷⁴

The representative of Iraq argued that, while consideration of humanitarian questions was important, the Council should pay attention first to the cessation of “the war of aggression”, not the humanitarian aspects. He continued that the focus on the latter was an attempt to distract the Council from its main role in the maintenance of international peace and security.²⁷⁵ Similarly, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran held that the international community expected the Council to live up to its obligations and call for an immediate ceasefire and the withdrawal of foreign troops from Iraq.²⁷⁶

The representative of Malaysia, speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, expressed disappointment at the failed attempts to avert the war in Iraq and called on the Council to pronounce itself on the issue of the ongoing military action against Iraq. He called on the Council to use its power and authority as mandated by the Charter, “to revert to the multilateral process” to resolve the current issue. He further pointed out that “as the custodian of international peace and security”, the Council had a “special and heightened” responsibility to ensure that the international world order was based on the principles of justice and international law.²⁷⁷ The representative of the League of Arab States called upon the Council to shoulder its obligations as the organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. He urged the Council to put an end to the war and initiate an immediate withdrawal of the “invading forces”, which was the responsibility of the Council. The credibility of the Council, he said,

²⁷³ Ibid., p. 7.

²⁷⁴ S/PV.4726, p. 4.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 6.

²⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 34.

²⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 6-8.

depended upon that.²⁷⁸ The representative of Jamaica, referring explicitly to Article 24, also reminded the Council of its responsibility.²⁷⁹

B. Article 25

Article 25

The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.

Note

During the period under review, the Council did not adopt any decisions that explicitly invoked Article 25 of the Charter. In the deliberations of the Council, however, there were several occasions²⁸⁰ on which explicit references to Article 25 of the Charter were made.

On one such occasion, a speaker noted the relationship between Articles 24 and 25. At the 4568th meeting, on 10 July 2002, the representative of Mongolia noted that Article 24 of the Charter conferred on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and that Member States viewed the Council as the main United Nations body that was called upon, not only to strengthen international peace and security, but also to

²⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 9.

²⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 32.

²⁸⁰ In connection with children and armed conflict, see S/PV.4176 (Resumption 1), p. 16 (Iraq). In connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, see S/PV.4625 and Corr. 1, p. 18 (Pakistan); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (League of Arab States); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr. 1, p. 7 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 16 (Singapore); p. 23 (Colombia); p. 27 (Mauritius); and p. 29 (Palestine); S/PV.4709 (Resumption 1) and Corr. 1, p. 27 (Iceland); and S/PV.4717 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (El Salvador). In connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, see S/PV.4506 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Kuwait); p. 10 (Iraq); p. 30 (Singapore); and p. 37 (Mexico); S/PV.4510, p. 3 (Palestine); and S/PV.4525, p. 13 (Canada). In connection with the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, see S/PV.4568, p. 19 (Mongolia). In connection with the role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes, see S/PV.4753, p. 26 (Cameroon). In connection with justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role, see S/PV.4835, p. 9 (Japan).

safeguard their sovereignty and independence in case of threats or crisis. He stated that it was because of that trust and faith that Member States agreed, in Article 25 of the Charter, to accept and carry out the decisions of the Council.²⁸¹

The principle enshrined in Article 25 was referred to, without being invoked explicitly, in a large number of resolutions and presidential statements. In particular, the binding nature of the decisions of the Council, within the context of Article 25, was reaffirmed in a resolution in connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, by which the Council requested the Secretary-General immediately to notify Iraq of the resolution, which was binding on Iraq.²⁸² In addition, by a presidential statement of 20 July 2000, in connection with the role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts, the Council recalled “the obligation of all Member States to accept and carry out” its decisions, including those for the prevention of armed conflicts.²⁸³

In other instances, the Council demanded that Member States comply with relevant resolutions, reminding them that non-compliance was in a violation of the Charter. For example, in connection with the situation in Somalia, by resolution 1474 (2003) of 8 April 2003, noting with regret that the arms embargo on Somalia had been continuously violated since its imposition in 1992, the Council stressed the obligation of “all States and other actors” to comply with resolution 733 (1992) and reaffirmed that non-compliance constituted “a violation of the provisions of the Charter”.²⁸⁴ Similar provisions were included in resolution 1519 (2003) of 16 December 2003.²⁸⁵

In a draft resolution that was not adopted during the period under review, the Council, recalling “the obligation of Members of the United Nations to accept and carry out decisions of the Security Council”, would have condemned the failure of implementation of its

resolutions and demanded the immediate implementation of a resolution.²⁸⁶

During the period under review, there were a few instances in which Article 25 was explicitly cited in communications.²⁸⁷

In one case, during the deliberations of the Council concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, an aspect of the application of Article 25 was touched upon, namely the binding nature of the decisions of the Council (case 20).

Case 20 **The situation between Iraq and Kuwait**

At the 4625th meeting, on 16 and 17 October 2002, many speakers urged Iraq to implement relevant Security Council resolutions. The representative of Pakistan, explicitly citing Article 25 of the Charter, opined that the Article imposed a “clear-cut” obligation on Member States to implement the decisions of the Security Council without conditions.²⁸⁸

However, several speakers expressed concern about “discrimination” or “double standards” of the Council in seeking the implementation of its decisions in connection with the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, compared to those, in particular, in connection with the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question.²⁸⁹ The representative of South Africa argued that the Council should ensure consistency in the way it acted to enforce its decisions and to avoid subjectivity and vagueness in its

²⁸¹ S/PV.4568, p. 19.

²⁸² Resolution 1441 (2002), para. 9.

²⁸³ S/PRST/2000/25.

²⁸⁴ Resolution 1474 (2003), second preambular paragraph and para. 1.

²⁸⁵ Resolution 1519 (2003), fourth preambular paragraph and para. 1.

²⁸⁶ S/2002/363.

²⁸⁷ See the letters dated 2 January 2002 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/2, p. 12 and S/2002/10, p. 6); identical letters dated 26 September 2002 from the representative of Palestine addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Council (S/2002/1083, p. 2); and the letter dated 3 June 2003 from the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2003/619, p. 43).

²⁸⁸ S/PV.4625 and Corr. 1, p. 18.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 17 (Egypt); and p. 24 (Tunisia); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (League of Arab States); and p. 24 (Sudan); S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2); p. 8 (Malaysia); pp. 9-10 (Lebanon); p. 17 (Palestine); pp. 18-19 (Saudi Arabia); p. 20 (Organization of the Islamic Conference); p. 24 (Zimbabwe); and p. 25 (Qatar); and S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr. 1, p. 7 (Syrian Arab Republic).

resolutions. He further underlined that, the Council, by clearly defining the objectives of its decisions and setting clear benchmarks for compliance, could facilitate efforts by Member States to fully comply with their obligations.²⁹⁰ Similarly, the representative of Algeria, in referring to resolution 1435 (2002), expressed the view that the Council must be consistent and fair and ensure compliance with its resolutions in every instance.²⁹¹ The representative of Jordan stated that the implementation of Security Council resolutions was an obligation of all States, without exception, including resolutions on the Middle East, whether they were adopted with regard to Iraq or to the occupied Palestinian territories.²⁹² The representative of Malaysia argued that what was required of Iraq, with respect to compliance with Council decisions, must also be required of others, particularly Israel, which had ignored many of them with impunity.²⁹³ The representative of Saudi Arabia stressed that Council resolutions, under whatever Chapter of the Charter they might be adopted, were binding, particularly since they addressed issues of international peace and security.²⁹⁴

The representative of Israel, for his part, contended that there was indeed a double standard directed against Israel, which could explain the failure to see any distinction between “binding resolutions, adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter — resolutions that set out specific actions to be taken by Iraq, independent of the actions of any other party — and interdependent recommendations or statements of the principle, adopted under Chapter VI”, that were designed to move all the parties forward in the Middle East. He continued by affirming that unlike resolutions concerning Iraq, the resolutions of the Council on the

Israeli-Palestinian conflict did not envision Israeli action without reciprocal commitment and implementation by other parties to the dispute, and that they could not be compared to resolutions adopted under Chapter VII which addressed the threat posed by the aggressive intentions of one regime to both the region and the world.²⁹⁵

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, however, rejected the view expressed by the representative of Israel as “distortion” of the Charter and affirmed that Article 25 called on all States to implement Council resolutions and that all Council resolutions were binding and must be implemented, and therefore, all resolutions were binding on all Members.²⁹⁶ The representative of Singapore, echoed by the representative of Mauritius, explicitly cited Article 25 and held that irrespective of whether they were adopted under Chapter VI or Chapter VII of the Charter, all Council resolutions must be complied with and no Council resolution on any issue could be cast aside without consequences. The representative of Singapore continued by stating that, to maintain its credibility and authority, the Council must vigorously pursue the implementation of all its resolutions, whether they were on Iraq, the Middle East, the Balkans or Africa.²⁹⁷ The representative of Palestine renounced the statement by the representative of Israel indicating that there was a difference in the nature of the resolutions adopted pursuant to Chapter VII and those pursuant to Chapter VI of the Charter. He declared that, while recognizing the existence of an enforcement mechanism pursuant to Chapter VII, to attempt to give the impression that some resolutions were binding and others were not was “legally false”, and maintained that Article 25 was clear and all Council resolutions were binding.²⁹⁸

²⁹⁰ S/PV.4625 and Corr. 1, p. 6.

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

²⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 21.

²⁹³ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 2), p. 8.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

²⁹⁵ S/PV.4625 (Resumption 3) and Corr. 1, pp. 2-3.

²⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 16 (Singapore); and p. 27 (Mauritius).

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.

Part III

Consideration of the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter

Article 52

1. *Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.*

2. *The Members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.*

3. *The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.*

4. *This Article in no way impairs the application of Articles 34 and 35.*

Article 53

1. *The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council, with the exception of measures against any enemy state, as defined in paragraph 2 of this Article, provided for pursuant to Article 107 or in regional arrangements directed against renewal of aggressive policy on the part of any such state, until such time as the Organization may, on request of the Governments concerned, be charged with the responsibility for preventing further aggression by such a state.*

2. *The term enemy state as used in paragraph 1 of this Article applies to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of the present Charter.*

Article 54

The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Note

During the period under review, the Security Council further broadened its cooperation and coordination with regional arrangements or agencies in the maintenance of international peace and security, as provided for in Chapter VIII of the Charter.²⁹⁹ The more active involvement of regional organizations in the maintenance of peace and security provided for a wider range of options for the Council as to the nature and modalities of cooperation with those regional arrangements, which differed in mandate, structure, capacity and experience in peace-related activities.

Underscoring its expanding cooperation with regional organizations, in April 2003, the Security Council held its first thematic debate, with participation of several regional organizations,³⁰⁰ on the agenda item entitled “The Security Council and regional organizations: facing the new challenges to international peace and security”.³⁰¹

²⁹⁹ Chapter VIII of the Charter refers to “regional arrangements and agencies”. The *Repertoire* follows the practice of the Council in its use of these terms as synonymous with “regional organizations”.

³⁰⁰ Participating regional organizations included the Organization of American States (OAS), the League of Arab States (LAS), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the African Union, the European Union and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). For additional information regarding participation of representatives of regional organizations in meetings of the Council, see chapter III, annex II.

³⁰¹ In parallel, the Secretary-General continued a high-level meeting process with the heads of regional organizations with a view to strengthening mutual cooperation between regional organizations and the United Nations, particularly, in the context of Chapter VIII of the

The resolutions and presidential statements adopted by the Council during the period under consideration revealed an increased recognition of regional organizations and of their growing or potential role in international peace and security. Most of the activities of regional organizations praised or endorsed by the Council concerned efforts at the peaceful settlement of disputes. In other instances, regional organizations were called upon to assist in the monitoring and implementation of mandatory measures imposed by the Council under Chapter VII of the Charter. Furthermore, in three instances, the Council authorized the use of force by regional organizations to support the respective peacekeeping operations in the performance of their mandates.

While all instances of cooperation with regional arrangements could be considered to fall within the framework of Chapter VIII of the Charter, the Council, on occasion, invoked Chapter VIII or the relevant Articles therein in its decisions.³⁰² A number of explicit references to Chapter VIII as well as to Articles 52, 53 and 54 of the Charter were also made in

Charter, on issues related to peace and security. By a presidential statement dated 20 February 2001 (S/PRST/2001/5), the Council welcomed the convening of the fourth high-level meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations and its results as conveyed by the Secretary-General in his letter of 12 February 2001 (S/2001/138). Upon the conclusion of the fifth high-level meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations in July 2003, by identical letters dated 22 October 2003 addressed to the President of the Security Council and the President of the General Assembly (S/2003/1022-A/58/444), the Secretary-General transmitted the conclusions of the meeting. Subsequently, reference was made to the outcome of the fifth high-level meeting during the deliberations of the Council.

³⁰² In connection with the item entitled "Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa", see resolution 1318 (2000), annex, section VII, first paragraph. In connection with the item entitled "The situation in Côte d'Ivoire", see resolution 1464 (2003), para. 9. In connection with the item entitled "The situation in Liberia", see resolution 1497 (2003), fifth preambular paragraph. In connection with the item entitled "Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts", see S/PRST/2000/25. In connection with the item entitled "The situation in Africa", see S/PRST/2002/2.

the course of the deliberations of the Council, particularly during the debates on thematic issues.³⁰³

In addition, explicit references to Article 52 were made in two communications,³⁰⁴ and an explicit

³⁰³ In connection with the item entitled "Protection of civilians in armed conflict", see S/PV.4660, p. 28 (Russian Federation). In connection with the item entitled "Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security", see S/PV.4630 (Resumption 1), p. 29. In connection with the item entitled "Protection of United Nations personnel, associated personnel and humanitarian personnel in conflict zones", see S/PV.4100, p. 11 (Russian Federation). In connection with the item entitled "High-level meeting of the Security Council: combating terrorism", see S/PV.4688, p. 14 (Mexico). In connection with the item entitled "Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month", see S/PV.4818, p. 4 (Cameroon) and p. 9 (Russian Federation); and S/PV.4445, p. 4 (Tunisia). In connection with the item entitled "Justice and the rule of law: the United Nations role", see S/PV.4835, p. 24 (Australia). In connection with the item entitled "Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council", see S/PV.4109 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Pakistan); and p. 13 (India). In connection with the item entitled "No exit without strategy", see S/PV.4223 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Thailand). In connection with the item entitled "Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts", see S/PV.4334, p. 18 (Norway) and S/PV.4334 (Resumption 1), p. 20 (South Africa). In connection with the item entitled "Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/434)", see S/PV.4439, p. 19 (Tunisia).

³⁰⁴ By a letter dated 5 April 2000 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of Djibouti, as President of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) at the time, emphasized that IGAD was the main forum for peace efforts in the Sudan. While recognizing the primary responsibility of the Council for the maintenance of peace and security and its involvement in the pacific settlement of conflicts, he held that taking up the question of peace in the Sudan in the Council might have a negative impact on the peace process currently under way under the auspices of IGAD. He expressed hope that the Council, in accordance with Article 52 of the Charter, would do its utmost to "give a chance to the laudable efforts undertaken by IGAD for the resolution of the conflict in the Sudan" (S/2000/288). Additionally, by a letter dated 31 July 2000 addressed to the President of the Council, Mr. Jovanovic of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia

reference to Article 53 was made in another communication.³⁰⁵ Explicit references to Article 54 were made occasionally by regional organizations in communications informing the Council of activities undertaken or contemplated by them for the maintenance of international peace and security.³⁰⁶

The practice of the Council under Chapter VIII of the Charter is set out below in five sections. Section A captures the relevant debates and decisions of the Council on general and thematic issues that touch upon the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter. Section B illustrates various ways in which the Council, in dealing with specific situations under its consideration, encouraged and supported efforts by regional organizations in the peaceful settlement of disputes. Section C sets out cases in which regional organizations were involved in the implementation of Chapter VII measures. Section D depicts four cases in which the Council considered or authorized enforcement action by regional organizations. The final section, section E, captures the modalities and mechanisms of communication, consultation and

argued that the sanctions imposed since 1998 against his country by the European Union were not in line with Article 52 of the Charter and had never been referred to the Council. Considering that the sanctions by the European Union were not based on international law and were contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter, the Council was called upon to consider the lack of legal basis of the continued impositions of the sanctions, to declare them illegal and to propose that they be urgently lifted (S/2000/753).

³⁰⁵ See the letter dated 14 February 2001 from the representative of Cyprus to the President of the Council (S/2001/136).

³⁰⁶ See the letter dated 2 July 2003 from the representative of Fiji to the President of the Council (S/2003/753); and letters dated 7 September 2000 (S/2000/863), 25 September 2000 (S/2000/900), 21 March 2001 (S/2001/257), 9 April 2001 (S/2001/341 and S/2001/349), 6 August 2001 (S/2001/769), 10 October 2001 (S/2001/957), 23 September 2002 (S/2002/1077, S/2002/1078, S/2002/1079, S/2002/1080, S/2002/1081 and S/2002/1082), 24 September 2002 (S/2002/1074), 23 October 2002 (S/2002/1188), 11 November 2002 (S/2002/1238), 3 March 2003 (S/2003/254), 24 March 2003 (S/2003/365), 3 June 2003 (S/2003/613), 21 July 2003 (S/2003/753), 6 October 2003 (S/2003/949), 4 November 2003 (S/2003/1072) and 11 November 2003 (S/2003/1179) from the representative of the League of Arab States to the President of the Council.

reporting between the Council and regional organizations.

A. General consideration of the provisions of Chapter VIII

On several occasions, as described below, the Council discussed the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter in the context of its deliberations on thematic and cross-cutting issues.

Ensuring an effective role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Africa

At the 4194th meeting, on 7 September 2000, the President of China, while underscoring the responsibility of the Council for the maintenance of international peace and security, stressed the need to pay close attention to the opinions of regional organizations, such as the Organization of African Unity.³⁰⁷ The President of France also emphasized the need to strengthen the partnership between the Council and regional organizations. He noted that some progress had been made, but closer consultations at an earlier stage were critical when planning to call on the United Nations to facilitate implementation of an agreement or to take over a regional action.³⁰⁸ The President of Mali noted that cooperation with regional organizations should be strengthened to enable the United Nations to be more effective at prevention and at deploying locally based operations. He added that the international community and the Council had to employ a consistent strategy to build the capacity of OAU and of a future African union, and of regional organizations, as well as to cooperate with them.³⁰⁹ A few speakers called for greater coordination³¹⁰ and consultation with regional organizations.³¹¹

By resolution 1318 (2000), adopted at the same meeting, the Security Council called for the strengthening of cooperation and communication between the United Nations and regional or subregional organizations or arrangements, in

³⁰⁷ S/PV.4194, pp. 7-8.

³⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

³¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Argentina) and p. 12 (Tunisia).

³¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Namibia).

accordance with Chapter VIII of the Charter, and in particular with respect to peacekeeping operations.³¹²

At the 4288th meeting, on 7 March 2001, several speakers stressed the need to strengthen cooperation and communication with regional and subregional organizations, citing examples of Council meetings with the ministerial delegation of the Economic Community of West African States and the Political Committee of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement process, both on the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo.³¹³ The representative of Canada held that, while the Secretary-General had made substantial progress in improving the ability to work with regional and subregional bodies, such progress had not been matched by the Council, which had been too often absent when peace agreements were negotiated, resulting in the United Nations falling short of fulfilling its commitments. He noted, however, that when the Council had engaged regional or subregional bodies, too often the result had been to delay effective Council action.³¹⁴ Similarly, while acknowledging the existing cooperation between the Council and regional organizations, the representative of France underscored the importance of implementing that cooperation in a satisfactory manner. Pointing out the limited capacity of regional and subregional organizations to implement their decisions, he advocated the early involvement of the Council in the preparation of regional action, so that the Council could assume a mandate or undertake a mission from the regional organizations.³¹⁵

Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach

At the 4272nd meeting, held on 5 February 2001, several speakers welcomed the timing of the debate in the light of the fourth high-level meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations³¹⁶ on 6 and

³¹² Resolution 1318 (2000), annex, section VII, first paragraph.

³¹³ S/PV.4288, p. 4 (Canada); p. 7 (Sweden) and pp. 8-9 (Argentina); S/PV.4288 (Resumption 1); p. 2 (Mali); p. 4 (France); p. 9 (China); p. 12 (United Kingdom); pp. 15-16 (United States); p. 18 (Tunisia); p. 20 (Norway); and p. 23 (Mauritius).

³¹⁴ S/PV.4288, p. 4.

³¹⁵ S/PV.4288 (Resumption 1), p. 5.

³¹⁶ S/PV.4272, p. 13 (Singapore); p. 24 (Mali); and p. 27 (Mauritius); S/PV.4272 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Sweden, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); p. 8 (Republic of Korea); p. 20 (Mongolia);

7 February 2001, which concerned cooperation with regional organizations in peacebuilding.³¹⁷ With respect to developing a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy, a number of speakers maintained that an integrated approach required thorough and timely coordination between actors on the ground and those at the centre and, most notably, between the United Nations and regional organizations.³¹⁸ The representative of the United Kingdom noted that the capacity of regional organizations could be extended, for example, by sharing information and analysis, the “double-hatting” of special envoys, and the arrangement of specialized training and secondments.³¹⁹ The representative of Colombia held that peacebuilding missions need not be carried out principally by the United Nations. Rather, depending on the specific conditions, the lead could be taken by a regional organization.³²⁰

Some speakers also argued that the United Nations and the regional actors possessed different strengths and capabilities in the area of conflict prevention and peacebuilding, and therefore the focus should be on achieving greater complementarity and synergy between the United Nations and regional organizations, using their respective comparative advantages.³²¹

Role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts

At the 4174th meeting, on 20 July 2000, some representatives expressed support for stronger cooperation with regional organizations.³²² While

and p. 25 (Malaysia).

³¹⁷ For details, see the letter dated 12 February 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council (S/2001/138).

³¹⁸ S/PV.4272, p. 8 (Jamaica); p. 10 (United States); p. 11 (United Kingdom); p. 20 (Ireland); p. 21 (Norway); p. 24 (Mali); and p. 26 (Bangladesh); S/PV.4272 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Sweden); p. 8 (Nigeria); p. 17 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 18 (Japan); and p. 25 (Argentina).

³¹⁹ S/PV.4272, p. 10.

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

³²¹ S/PV.4272 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Sweden, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 19 (Romania, on behalf of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe).

³²² S/PV.4174, p. 5 (United States); pp. 6-7 (United Kingdom); p. 11 (Russian Federation); p. 14 (Tunisia); p. 21 (Canada); p. 23 (Ukraine); and p. 27 (France); S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 16 (Kenya).

commenting on the increasingly important role played by regional organizations in the maintenance of peace and security and conflict prevention, in line with their mandate under Chapter VIII of the Charter, some speakers reminded the Council that intervention by regional organizations needed to be done with its authorization, as provided for by Article 53 of the Charter.³²³ Other speakers, while urging for more cooperation with regional arrangements, reaffirmed the primacy of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security.³²⁴ Furthermore, the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania asserted that preventive action at the regional level, in the context of Chapter VIII, needed to be enhanced and that regional arrangements could act as an effective spearhead for subsequent Council action.³²⁵ The representative of Canada cited examples of cooperation, albeit “far from perfect”, between the United Nations and regional organizations such as those in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia and Eritrea, and Sierra Leone, where regional organizations had taken the lead in the negotiation of peace agreements with the United Nations following the implementation phase. He argued that for such joint efforts to succeed, close coordination was needed.³²⁶ The representative of Indonesia called for regional organizations to play an active role in initiating and implementing conflict-prevention measures.³²⁷ The representative of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), commenting that conflict prevention differed from one region to the next, noted that creating an effective coordination mechanism among the United Nations agencies and regional organizations would make it possible to derive benefits, as laid out in Chapter VIII of the Charter, from the comparative advantages of every organization.³²⁸

By a presidential statement of the same date, the Council recognized the important role that regional organizations played in the prevention of armed conflicts and re-emphasized the need for effective and sustained cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and regional organizations and

arrangements, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter. The Council expressed its willingness, within its responsibilities, to support the efforts of the Secretary-General in collaborating with the leadership of regional organizations and arrangements in order to develop strategies and programmes to be employed at the regional level. In that regard, the Council encouraged the strengthening of the modalities of cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations and arrangements, including in early warning and the mutual exchange of information. Additionally, it recognized the need to enhance the capacity of the Organization of African Unity.³²⁹

In his report dated 7 June 2001, included in the agenda of the 4360th meeting, held on 30 August 2001, the Secretary-General recognized that Chapter VIII of the Charter provided a broad mandate for interaction between the United Nations and regional organizations in conflict prevention. He held that regional organizations, because of their proximity, could contribute to conflict prevention in a number of ways, as they could provide a local forum for efforts to decrease tensions, and promote and facilitate a comprehensive regional approach to cross-border issues.³³⁰

By resolution 1366 (2001) of 30 August 2001, the Council, bearing in mind its primary responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security and reaffirming its role in the prevention of armed conflicts, called upon Member States as well as regional and subregional organizations and arrangements to support the development of a comprehensive conflict prevention strategy, as proposed by the Secretary-General in his report of 7 June 2001.³³¹ It called for the enhancement of the capacity for conflict prevention of regional organizations, in particular in Africa, by extending international assistance to, inter alia, OAU, its successor organization and ECOWAS.³³²

³²³ S/PV.4174, p. 13 (China); and p. 18 (Namibia).

³²⁴ Ibid., p. 14 (Tunisia); and p. 23 (Ukraine).

³²⁵ S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 14.

³²⁶ S/PV.4174, p. 21.

³²⁷ S/PV.4174 (Resumption 1), p. 11.

³²⁸ Ibid., p. 18.

³²⁹ S/PRST/2000/25.

³³⁰ S/2001/574, paras. 137-138.

³³¹ Ibid., recommendation 26.

³³² Resolution 1366 (2001), paras. 3, 19 and 20.

The Security Council and regional organizations: facing the new challenges to international peace and security

At the 4739th meeting, on 11 April 2003, the Security Council held its first thematic debate on the agenda item entitled “The Security Council and regional organizations: facing the new challenges to international peace and security”. While recalling the primary responsibility of the Council for the maintenance of international peace and security, a number of speakers stated that cooperation with regional organizations was important and that a dynamic relationship with regional organizations needed to be developed, on the basis of the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter.³³³ The representative of Germany, welcoming the initiative of the President to discuss questions related to Chapter VIII, commented that the potential of that Chapter seemed to be unfolding in a positive manner. However, he noted that if the primacy of the Council in the maintenance of international peace and security was rejected, the very foundation of international law as represented by the Charter would be brought into question. Therefore, it was imperative that regional security operations remained mandated by the Council. The representative added that to bring the primacy of the United Nations and the Council and the complementarity of regional organizations into sync with one another, regular dialogue between them should take place.³³⁴ The representative of France echoed that position.³³⁵ The representative of Angola reasserted the key role regional organizations played, but added that they could not substitute for the role and character of the United Nations as a universal Organization.³³⁶ The representative of Chile commented that the fruitful work of regional organizations should be promoted through a dynamic and energetic relationship with the Council within the framework of Chapter VIII, adding that there were clear benefits to the close synergy between those organizations and the Council.³³⁷ The representative of the United States asserted that regional organizations had a greater vested interest and sensitivity in regional situations and underlined that the

United Nations should rely increasingly on regional organizations to assume responsibility for peacekeeping efforts and, in that regard, welcomed the decision of the African Union to establish a Peace and Security Council.³³⁸

Referring to the “distressing circumstances” in the Middle East, the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States noted that the League had played the role expected of it by responding to the deteriorating situation in the region with regard to Palestine, Iraq and regional security, all in line with the principles and purposes of the Charter and the Articles relevant to the role of the Council and regional organizations in the pacific settlement of disputes. He further stated that LAS, working collectively with Arab diplomacy, had made a tremendous effort in support of the Council’s mission to inspect weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Recalling that Chapter VIII allowed regional organizations considerable leeway in the settlement of disputes, while leaving primary responsibility with the Council, the representative of LAS stated that the Council did not deal with all regional organizations on the same footing, as it sometimes utilized some regional organizations while at other times it ignored others in a similar situation.³³⁹ The representative of Pakistan reiterated that regional arrangements were valuable only so long as they acted on the basis of the principles of the Charter.³⁴⁰

Referring to the need for a sensible division of labour among regional and subregional structures, by taking each of their comparative advantages into account, the representative of the Russian Federation reaffirmed that authorization by, and accountability to, the Council should be inherent in any regional or coalition peacekeeping operation, particularly when enforcement action was included in its mandate.³⁴¹

Citing Articles 52, 53 and 54 of the Charter, which recognized the potential of regional organizations in conflict prevention and the maintenance of peace, the representative of Cameroon stated that regional organizations aspired to, and had managed to, become more involved in conflict prevention and peacekeeping operations carried out by

³³³ S/PV.4739 and Corr.1, p. 22 (Russian Federation); p. 23 (Bulgaria); and p. 28 (China).

³³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

³³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

³³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

³³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-16.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

³⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

the United Nations in their respective areas.³⁴² The representative of Greece, speaking on behalf of the European Union and associated countries,³⁴³ commented that, in relation to operational interaction, the European Union was intensifying its practical cooperation with the United Nations system and other regional and subregional organizations. He highlighted the European Union Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina as the “first example of the practical possibilities of cooperation” between the United Nations and the European Union crisis management operations. He further expressed the view that in order to strengthen the collective security system of the United Nations, regional arrangements or agencies should enhance their role in conflict prevention.³⁴⁴

Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peacebuilding

At the 4118th meeting, on 23 March 2000, the representative of Algeria asserted that the growing reluctance of some countries to participate in peacekeeping operations, especially in Africa, had led to the greater involvement of regional organizations. That, in turn, made more acute the problem of the relationship between the United Nations and regional peacekeeping organizations, against the backdrop of the problem of financing operations and the material, logistic and military capacities of the regional organizations in playing their new role.³⁴⁵ Underscoring the role of regional organizations in post-conflict peacebuilding, the representative of Mongolia expressed the view that the international community and regional organizations should play an important role in addressing the problems of various post-conflict groups on the basis of new power-sharing or other agreed arrangements. He noted that, bearing in mind their nature, obligations and interests, regional organizations had a special stake and role to play in post-conflict peacebuilding — a role that no other international body could effectively fulfil.³⁴⁶

³⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 26.

³⁴³ Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia; and Bulgaria and Romania.

³⁴⁴ S/PV.4739 and Corr.1, p. 29.

³⁴⁵ S/PV.4118, p. 20.

³⁴⁶ S/PV.4118 (Resumption 1), p. 4.

Strengthening cooperation between the United Nations system and the Central African region in the maintenance of peace and security

At the 4630th meeting, on 22 October 2002, some speakers called for strengthening the relationship between the Security Council and African regional and subregional organizations.³⁴⁷ In that context, the representative of Egypt urged the Council to give its political weight to the limited peacekeeping operations that regional organizations were able to undertake.³⁴⁸ Asserting that the African Union and subregional organizations could work closely with the United Nations on the basis of a comparative advantage in advocacy, preventive actions and peacemaking, the representative of Mauritius commented that subregional institutions could, in certain situations, advise the United Nations as to whether the situations necessitated that the Organization play a lead role or that of a simple coordinator. He concluded that in that way their respective roles would be clearly defined at the very early stages of emerging conflicts.³⁴⁹ The representative of the Russian Federation pointed out that regional organizations, owing to their geographical proximity and greater familiarity with unique local situations, could take the initiative in preventive diplomacy and the peaceful settlement of disputes, as demonstrated in Angola and, to a certain extent, the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He added, however, that peacekeeping operations by regional organizations could be launched only with “clear authorization by the Security Council”.³⁵⁰ The representative of Mexico asserted that cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations, recognized in Chapter VIII of the Charter, ensured not only better knowledge of the situation on the ground, but also a strategy that was commensurate with needs.³⁵¹

³⁴⁷ S/PV.4630, p. 21 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); p. 22 (Equatorial Guinea); p. 24 (Denmark, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); p. 26 (Egypt); and p. 27 (Japan); S/PV.4630 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (United States); p. 12 (China); p. 13 (Syrian Arab Republic); pp. 15-16 (Ireland); and p. 29 (Cameroon).

³⁴⁸ S/PV.4630, p. 26.

³⁴⁹ S/PV.4630 (Resumption 1), p. 11.

³⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

³⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

The role of the Security Council in the pacific settlement of disputes

At the 4753rd meeting, on 13 May 2003, referring to the various ways in which the Security Council had used Chapter VI in recent years, the Secretary-General mentioned Council attempts to work more closely with regional and subregional organizations to prevent and resolve conflicts in Africa.³⁵² He recalled some of the recommendations contained in his report of 7 June 2001,³⁵³ including the use of regional prevention mechanisms. Some speakers highlighted the importance of coordination by the Council with regional organizations in the pacific settlement of disputes.³⁵⁴ A few speakers noted that regional organizations played a crucial role in assisting the Council in understanding the root causes of conflict and in advising on the best way to cope with a situation. They further emphasized that regional organizations had closer knowledge and were particularly well placed to provide early warning and to maintain political mechanisms for the settlement of disputes.³⁵⁵ The representative of Guinea, while noting that the Council had a crucial role to play in seeking pacific settlement of conflicts, emphasized that regional organizations were appropriate channels for the prevention, management and settlement of conflicts.³⁵⁶ Other speakers emphasized the role of the Council under Chapter VIII to encourage the pacific settlement of disputes through regional arrangements.³⁵⁷ The representative of Greece, speaking on behalf of the European Union and associated countries,³⁵⁸ urged States parties to regional arrangements to try to achieve pacific settlement of their disputes through such mechanisms, in accordance with Articles 33 and 52 of the Charter.³⁵⁹

³⁵² S/PV.4753, pp. 2-3.

³⁵³ S/2001/574.

³⁵⁴ S/PV.4753, p. 12 (Spain); pp. 14-15 (Germany); p. 19 (Chile); p. 20 (Bulgaria); pp. 20-21 (Guinea); pp. 21-22 (France); p. 25 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 27 (Cameroon).

³⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16 (Germany); and p. 27 (Cameroon).

³⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

³⁵⁷ S/PV.4753 (Resumption 1), p. 11 (Colombia); p. 13 (Ethiopia); and p. 14 (Armenia).

³⁵⁸ Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovak Republic and Slovenia; Bulgaria and Romania and Turkey; and Iceland.

³⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

The situation in Africa

By a presidential statement dated 31 January 2002,³⁶⁰ the Security Council, recalling its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security as well as the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, underscored the importance of partnership and enhanced coordination and cooperation, based on complementarity and comparative advantage, between the United Nations, OAU and subregional organizations in Africa in the promotion of regional peace and stability. The Council also emphasized the importance of enhanced cooperation and of ensuring better coordination between the United Nations and OAU with the view to achieving a lasting solution to conflicts. The Council further expressed its readiness to deepen its cooperation with OAU and subregional organizations and invited them to inform it at the earliest possible stage over their decisions and initiatives that could have implications relating to its responsibilities under the Charter. In addition, the Council called on the United Nations system to intensify its cooperation with OAU and subregional organizations in Africa in the field of capacity-building, particularly in early warning, conflict prevention and peacekeeping. It also stressed the importance of effective interaction between the United Nations system and OAU and subregional organizations through the exchange of information and analysis at the conflict prevention stage; coordination and clear understanding of respective roles in forwarding peace processes; and coordinated support to national and regional peacebuilding efforts.

At the 4460th meeting, on 29 January 2002, many speakers focused on the need to strengthen and develop the relationship between the United Nations, OAU and African subregional organizations in order to develop integrated approaches to conflict prevention, conflict settlement, and post-conflict peacebuilding, reconstruction and development.³⁶¹ Some speakers

³⁶⁰ S/PRST/2002/2.

³⁶¹ S/PV.4460, p. 10 (United Kingdom); p. 12 (Ireland); p. 14 (Norway); p. 16 (Mexico); p. 18 (Guinea); p. 20 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); p. 23 (Algeria); p. 24 (Senegal); p. 26 (Zambia); pp. 28-29 (Mozambique); and p. 33 (South Africa); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 2 (Colombia); pp. 3-4 (China); p. 5 (Russian Federation); p. 7 (Bulgaria); pp. 8-9 (Cameroon); p. 10 (Singapore); pp. 12-13 (Syrian Arab

supported the proposal by Mauritius to establish a working group to examine ways of improving relations between OAU and the United Nations.³⁶² Given the primary responsibility of the United Nations in matters of international peace and security, the representative of Mexico considered it necessary to strengthen support for the regional and subregional measures adopted in Africa because the United Nations had neither the capacity nor the resources to deal with all the problems that might arise on the African continent.³⁶³ The representative of South Africa, while recalling Article 24 of the Charter, expressed the belief that the mandate of the Council was not premised on isolation and included maintaining peace and security through regional and subregional arrangements, as specified in Chapter VIII of the Charter.³⁶⁴ The representative of Cameroon noted that Central Africa, as a partner of the Council, met the requirements of Articles 52 and 53 of the Charter, promoting conflict settlement on a regional level.³⁶⁵

Pointing out that the maintenance of international peace and security was first and foremost the responsibility of the Council and that there should be no dilution by shifting the obligation to regional organizations, the representative of India observed that while the idea of building an African peacekeeping capacity looked attractive, such organizations should be backed politically and, more importantly, through an infusion of the resources required. Citing the important role that regional and subregional organizations played in Ethiopia and Eritrea or Burundi, he nevertheless remained sceptical of the tendency, particularly evident in Africa, to transfer responsibility and subcontract initiatives to regional and subregional organizations, which might not necessarily be prepared for them.³⁶⁶

Republic); p. 17 (United States); pp. 23-24 (Spain, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); p. 26 (Tunisia); p. 28 (Bangladesh); p. 30 (Cuba); p. 32 (Côte d'Ivoire); and p. 37 (Nigeria); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 2); pp. 3-4 (Ghana); p. 5 (Jamaica); p. 10 (Ukraine); and p. 13 (Malaysia).

³⁶² S/PV.4460, p. 10 (United Kingdom); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1); p. 14 (France); S/PV.4460 (Resumption 2); p. 15 (Kenya).

³⁶³ S/PV.4460, p. 16.

³⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

³⁶⁵ S/PV.4460 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

³⁶⁶ S/PV.4460 (Resumption 2), p. 8.

Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month

Conflicts in Africa: Security Council missions and United Nations mechanisms to promote peace and security

At the 4766th meeting, on 30 May 2003, a number of speakers emphasized the importance of coordination and cooperation between the Security Council and regional and subregional bodies,³⁶⁷ while others underlined the importance of providing regional arrangements with financial and political support.³⁶⁸ The representative of Cameroon maintained that the Council had, in a consistent and encouraging way, developed an exemplary institutional relationship with the Economic Community of West African States, citing the situation in Côte d'Ivoire as one example, but added that the Council had sometimes proved to be highly selective when there had been a contradictory regional decision on a conflict under consideration.³⁶⁹ The representative of the Russian Federation shared his satisfaction with the intensification of the peacekeeping efforts of the African Union, ECOWAS, the Southern African Development Community and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, but expressed concern that, in some cases, the assessments of the Council and the African institutions did not coincide and that the requests of the African partners did not always find Council support.³⁷⁰ Citing the role of the African Union, among others, in resolving the situations in Central and Western Africa, the representative of Tunisia held that the efforts and initiatives to be carried out should be based on parameters established by African States themselves in pursuance of the principles and objectives of the

³⁶⁷ S/PV.4766, p. 8 (Mauritius); p. 12 (Angola); p. 13 (Mexico); p. 15 (Egypt); p. 18 (Burundi); and p. 20 (Cameroon); S/PV.4766 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Bulgaria); p. 5 (Japan); p. 6 (Malaysia); p. 7 (Chile); p. 10 (Greece, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); and p. 14 (Philippines).

³⁶⁸ S/PV.4766, p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 15 (Egypt); and p. 21 (United States); S/PV.4766 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Bulgaria); p. 5 (Japan); p. 6 (Malaysia); p. 7 (Chile); p. 10 (Greece, on behalf of the European Union and associated countries); p. 12 (Guinea); p. 13 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 17 (China); p. 18 (Russian Federation); and p. 20 (Tunisia).

³⁶⁹ S/PV.4766, p. 20.

³⁷⁰ S/PV.4766 (Resumption 1), p. 18.

African Union and in close cooperation with the Council.³⁷¹

B. Encouragement or calls by the Security Council for action by regional arrangements in the pacific settlement of disputes

During the period under review, the Security Council, on various occasions, expressed encouragement and support for efforts undertaken by regional organizations in the pacific settlement of disputes, including the peace processes carried out under the auspices of regional organizations, such as the Lusaka process undertaken by OAU on behalf of the Democratic Republic of Congo. The Council also supported the deployment of the subregional peacekeeping force in Côte d'Ivoire by the Economic Community of West African States. In Sierra Leone, a United Nations mission took over some functions assigned to the ECOWAS peacekeeping mission and the two operated side by side. Furthermore, to harmonize the activities of the Organization and to promote cooperation with ECOWAS, the Council supported the establishment of the first United Nations regional peacebuilding office — the United Nations Office in West Africa (UNOWA). The practice of the Council in that regard is set out below, by region and by chronological order.

Africa

The situation in Côte d'Ivoire

In connection with the situation in Côte d'Ivoire, the Security Council supported the efforts by ECOWAS to achieve a pacific settlement of the conflict, which included support for deployment of a subregional peacekeeping force.

By a presidential statement dated 20 December 2002,³⁷² the Council strongly supported the efforts of ECOWAS to promote a peaceful resolution of the conflict and urged the leaders of ECOWAS to continue their efforts in a coordinated manner. Furthermore, the Council expressed its full support for the deployment in Côte d'Ivoire of the Economic Community of West

African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) by 31 December 2002, as called for in the final communiqué of the ECOWAS Summit in Dakar, adopted on 18 December 2002.³⁷³

By resolution 1464 (2003) of 4 February 2003, the Council recalled its full support for the efforts of ECOWAS to promote a peaceful settlement of the conflict, and also expressed its appreciation for the efforts of the African Union to reach a settlement.³⁷⁴ By the same resolution, the Council welcomed the deployment of the ECOWAS forces with a view to contributing to a peaceful solution of the crisis and, in particular, to the implementation of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement.³⁷⁵

At the 4746th meeting, on 29 April 2003, the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS expressed the view that the Council was being challenged to find ways to support worthy subregional efforts to maintain peace and security, which, after all, was the primary responsibility of the Council. In addition, he suggested that the Council should look at cases of "successful subregional deployment of troops under Chapter VIII" of the Charter to stabilize crisis situations and deliberate whether it might not be prudent for the Council to provide the requisite resources for such forces. Citing Côte d'Ivoire as an example, he argued that the Council should encourage ECOWAS and other subregional organizations to continue to play a leading role and called for the creation of the right synergy and collaborative working relationships between ECOWAS and the Council to deal with issues of peace and security.³⁷⁶

In accordance with rule 55 of the rules of procedure, at the close of the 4747th meeting, held in private on 29 April 2003, the Council issued a communiqué through the Secretary-General, welcoming the action taken by ECOWAS with a view to resolving the crisis in Côte d'Ivoire. Furthermore, by resolution 1479 (2003) of 13 May 2003, the Council established the United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (MINUCI) with a mandate to facilitate the implementation by the Ivorian parties of the Linas-

³⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

³⁷² S/PRST/2002/42.

³⁷³ S/2002/1386, annex.

³⁷⁴ Resolution 1464 (2003), fourth preambular paragraph.

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 8. The Linas-Marcoussis Agreement was signed by the Ivorian political forces in Linas-Marcoussis, France, on 23 January 2003 (S/2003/99, annex I).

³⁷⁶ S/PV.4746, p. 7.

Marcoussis Agreement, complementing the operations of ECOWAS forces.³⁷⁷

By a presidential statement dated 25 July 2003, the Council welcomed the satisfactory deployment of the ECOWAS peacekeeping force in the western part of the country to support the implementation of the ceasefire agreement reached on 3 May 2003. By resolution 1514 (2003) of 13 November 2003, the Council continued to reiterate its full support for the efforts of ECOWAS in promoting a peaceful settlement of the conflict.³⁷⁸

The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone

Letter dated 30 April 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/434)

At the 4319th meeting, on 14 May 2001, at which no action was taken, the Council discussed, inter alia, the efforts of ECOWAS to advance the peace process and the report of the Inter-Agency Mission to West Africa.³⁷⁹ The Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations noted the efforts of ECOWAS to advance the peace process.³⁸⁰ The representative of Tunisia stated that ECOWAS should be fully involved in the activities in the subregion and supported the recommendations of the Inter-Agency Mission regarding the provision of assistance to ECOWAS to strengthen its institutional, logistical and financial capacities to enable it to shoulder its weighty responsibilities. He further recalled that the United Nations and the Council were called upon to support the initiatives of that subregional organization under Chapter VIII of the Charter, particularly its initiatives to settle the problems by political means and to put an end to the humanitarian crisis in the subregion.³⁸¹ Many speakers supported the role played by ECOWAS in the context of the West Africa region and called for more cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and ECOWAS.³⁸² Furthermore, a number of

speakers welcomed the recommendation of the above-mentioned report to establish a United Nations office for West Africa.³⁸³

On the basis of its consideration of the report of the Inter-Agency Mission to West Africa,³⁸⁴ the Council, by a presidential statement dated 19 December 2001,³⁸⁵ fully supported the initiatives taken with a view to implementing the recommendations in the report. In particular, the Council welcomed the establishment of the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for West Africa to ensure, inter alia, the strengthening of harmonization and coordination of the activities of the United Nations system in an integrated regional perspective and the development of a fruitful partnership with ECOWAS, other subregional organizations and international and national actors. The Council stressed the need to strengthen further the capacities of ECOWAS in areas that would enable it to act as the “engine of subregional integration and increased cooperation with the United Nations system”.

The situation in Sierra Leone

In Sierra Leone, the Security Council welcomed the efforts by ECOWAS in the peaceful settlement of the dispute, and provided its support by expanding the peacekeeping operation of the United Nations to take over some functions performed by the ECOWAS peacekeeping operation, both of which continued to operate side by side throughout the reporting period.

In his report of 11 January 2000, the Secretary-General observed that, following the decision of Nigeria to withdraw its troops from Sierra Leone, the ECOWAS Monitoring Group would be unable to continue to perform the vital functions of providing security and protection to the Government of Sierra Leone. He therefore recommended that the Council authorize the expansion of the mandate of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL), established by resolution 1270 (1999) of 22 October

³⁷⁷ Resolution 1479 (2003), para. 2.

³⁷⁸ Resolution 1514 (2003), ninth preambular paragraph.

³⁷⁹ S/2001/434.

³⁸⁰ S/PV.4319, p. 3.

³⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

³⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14 (Mali); pp. 15-16 (United Kingdom); p. 17 (Tunisia); p. 20 (Bangladesh); p. 21 (Russian Federation); p. 22 (Colombia); p. 23 (France); p. 25 (Jamaica); p. 26 (Singapore); p. 28 (China); p. 29

(Ukraine); p. 30 (Mauritius); p. 30 (Norway); and p. 31 (United States).

³⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 14 (Mali); p. 16 (United Kingdom); p. 21 (Bangladesh); p. 23 (France); p. 25 (Jamaica); p. 28 (China); and p. 29 (Ukraine).

³⁸⁴ S/2001/434.

³⁸⁵ S/PRST/2001/38.

1999, in order for UNAMSIL to assume the functions that were assigned to ECOMOG.³⁸⁶

By resolution 1289 (2000) of 7 February 2000, the Council welcomed the efforts made by ECOMOG and UNAMSIL towards the implementation of the Peace Agreement, signed in Lomé on 7 July 1999.³⁸⁷ In addition, the Council, while taking note of the decision of the Governments of Ghana, Guinea and Nigeria, to withdraw their remaining ECOMOG contingents from Sierra Leone,³⁸⁸ expressed its appreciation of ECOMOG for its indispensable contribution towards the restoration of democracy and the maintenance of peace, security and stability in Sierra Leone. The Council, in deciding to expand the mandate of UNAMSIL,³⁸⁹ stressed the importance of a smooth transition between ECOMOG and UNAMSIL for the successful implementation of the Peace Agreement and the stability of Sierra Leone and, in that regard, urged all those concerned to consult over the timing of troop movements and withdrawals.³⁹⁰ By subsequent resolutions and presidential statements, the Council continued to support and encourage the efforts of ECOWAS towards a lasting and final settlement of the crisis in the Mano River Union region.³⁹¹ In particular, by resolution 1370 (2001) of 20 November 2001, the Council underlined the importance of the continuing political and other support that the United Nations provided to the efforts made by ECOWAS to stabilize the region.³⁹²

The situation in Liberia

With regard to the situation in Liberia, the Security Council continuously commended the efforts by ECOWAS and the African Union towards the restoration of peace and stability in the region. In particular, following the signing of the ceasefire agreement in July 2003, the Council commended the

role of ECOWAS in facilitating the peace process, citing Chapter VIII of the Charter.

By a series of resolutions, the Council welcomed the continued efforts of ECOWAS to restore peace and security in the region and bring lasting peace in Liberia.³⁹³ By a presidential statement dated 13 December 2002, the Council recognized that the success of a comprehensive international strategy to Liberia rested on the direct and active involvement of the African Union, ECOWAS and the International Contact Group, working with the United Nations offices in the region in accordance with their mandates.³⁹⁴ By resolution 1478 (2003) of 6 May 2003, the Council called upon the parties to enter without delay into bilateral ceasefire negotiations under the auspices of ECOWAS and the newly appointed mediator of ECOWAS.³⁹⁵

By resolution 1497 (2003) of 1 August 2003, the Council commended ECOWAS for its leadership role in facilitating the achievement of the Agreement on Ceasefire and Cessation of Hostilities between the Government of the Republic of Liberia and Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy and the Movement for Democracy in Liberia, signed in Accra on 17 June 2003,³⁹⁶ and recognized the role it had played and necessarily would continue to play in the Liberia peace process, “consistent with Chapter VIII of the Charter”.³⁹⁷

At the 4815th meeting, on 27 August 2003, the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS noted that the excellent working relationship between the Council and ECOWAS in the resolution of the Liberian crisis was “a shining example of the partnership that should exist between the United Nations and regional organizations in tackling regional issues of peace and security”. He added that there was much to gain from deepening collaboration to better handle conflicts and political instability in that region.³⁹⁸ By a presidential

³⁸⁶ S/2000/13, paras. 43-44.

³⁸⁷ S/1999/777, annex.

³⁸⁸ See letter dated 23 December 1999 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President (S/1999/1285).

³⁸⁹ See chapter V for details.

³⁹⁰ Resolution 1289 (2000), paras. 1, 2, 7-10, 12 and 14.

³⁹¹ Resolutions 1315 (2000), second preambular paragraph; 1346 (2001), para. 11; 1370 (2001), para. 11; 1400 (2002), para. 11; 1436 (2002), para. 12; 1470 (2003), para. 13; and 1508 (2003), para. 8; S/PRST/2000/14; and S/PRST/2000/31.

³⁹² Resolution 1370 (2001), para. 11.

³⁹³ Resolutions 1408 (2002), sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs; 1478 (2003), sixth preambular paragraph; and 1509 (2003), eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs.

³⁹⁴ S/PRST/2002/36.

³⁹⁵ Resolution 1478 (2003), sixth preambular paragraph and para. 5.

³⁹⁶ S/2003/657, annex.

³⁹⁷ Resolution 1497 (2003), fifth preambular paragraph.

³⁹⁸ S/PV.4815, pp. 5-6.

statement issued at the same meeting,³⁹⁹ the Council expressed its appreciation for the efforts of ECOWAS in negotiating the Comprehensive Peace Agreement between the Government of Liberia, rebel groups, political parties and civil society, signed in Accra, on 18 August 2003.

In respect of the role played by the African Union, by resolution 1509 (2003) of 19 September 2003, the Council welcomed the continued support of the African Union for the leadership role of ECOWAS in the peace process in Liberia, and further encouraged the African Union to continue to support the peace process through close collaboration and coordination with ECOWAS and the United Nations.⁴⁰⁰

The situation in Burundi

In Burundi, the Security Council continued to support the peace process in cooperation with the Organization of African Unity/African Union. Following the establishment by the African Union of a peacekeeping force in Burundi in April 2003, the Council renewed its support for such a regional effort and began to consider ways to further support the regional peacekeeping operation on the ground.

By resolution 1375 (2001) of 29 October 2001, the Council commended the continued efforts of, and support from, the Organization of African Unity/African Union for the peace process in Burundi.⁴⁰¹ By a presidential statement dated 18 December 2002,⁴⁰² the Council paid tribute to the role that the African Union, among other actors, had played in the process towards the signing of the Ceasefire Agreement between the Transitional Government of Burundi and the Conseil national pour la défense de la démocratie-Forces pour la défense de la démocratie, signed at Arusha on 2 December 2002.⁴⁰³

At the 4655th meeting, on 4 December 2002, the Facilitator of the Burundi peace process noted that the implementation process of the Ceasefire Agreement would require strong support from the United Nations. While aware of the difficulties of deploying a United Nations peacekeeping operation in the absence of a

total ceasefire as in Burundi, he noted that regional States felt that “creativity and innovation” in looking at the situation would make it possible for the United Nations to become involved. He argued that the United Nations’ support for a unique situation in Burundi was possible under Chapter VIII of the Charter, which supported the establishment of regional initiatives for the resolution of conflicts, provided that such arrangements were consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations, as well as Chapter VI, which provided for the use of regional initiatives for the resolution of disputes without the active, direct involvement of the United Nations, but with its full support. The Facilitator also explained that the decision by regional leaders to deploy the African mission was based on the understanding that it was a bridging mechanism to open the way for the United Nations. He called for support from the Council as the African countries did not have all the resources.⁴⁰⁴

At the same meeting, the representative of Ireland noted that the efforts of all regional actors reflected well on the attempts of the African Union to find African solutions to the problems of the region.⁴⁰⁵ Some speakers, while recognizing the peace process in Burundi as a regional initiative, held that the Council had a role to play in the settlement of the dispute.⁴⁰⁶ The representative of France asserted that the Council would have to reflect on its support for a possible African mission or whatever formula the Secretary-General could recommend in support of the peace process, once all the parties had agreed to a ceasefire.⁴⁰⁷

On 2 April 2003, the African Mission in Burundi (AMIB) was established to provide security for the cantonment of combatants and to assist the demobilization, disarmament and reintegration of the armed groups.⁴⁰⁸ By a presidential statement dated 2 May 2003,⁴⁰⁹ the Council expressed its support for the speedy deployment of AMIB to facilitate the continuing implementation of the ceasefire agreements.

At the 4876th meeting, on 4 December 2003, the Facilitator commented that the establishment of the

³⁹⁹ S/PRST/2003/14.

⁴⁰⁰ Resolution 1509 (2003), ninth preambular paragraph.

⁴⁰¹ Resolution 1375 (2001), seventh preambular paragraph.

⁴⁰² S/PRST/2002/40.

⁴⁰³ S/2002/1329, annex I.

⁴⁰⁴ S/PV.4655, pp. 3-4 and p. 13.

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁴⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Norway); p. 7 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 8 (Singapore); and p. 10 (United States).

⁴⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁴⁰⁸ S/2003/1146, paras. 25-32.

⁴⁰⁹ S/PRST/2003/4.

African Union mission was “in line with Chapter VIII of the Charter” and called for “more direct” United Nations involvement to achieve the continued success of the Burundi peace process. The Facilitator held that conditions were conducive for the United Nations to take over AMIB, “re-hat” the existing military contingent and deploy a United Nations peacekeeping operation. He underscored that, in the interim, AMIB needed material, logistical and financial support to enable it to continue its work while preparations continued for more robust involvement by the United Nations.⁴¹⁰ A number of speakers expressed their appreciation to the African Union and countries in the region for solving regional problems by their own efforts.⁴¹¹ Noting the importance of reinforcing efforts on the ground, some speakers supported the idea of establishing a United Nations peacekeeping operation to supplement or eventually replace AMIB.⁴¹² In that context, the representative of Angola stressed that the presence of the African Union reflected the important engagement of Africa in peacebuilding in Burundi, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, and contended that it was necessary for the Council to apply equal standards to Burundi, as in Liberia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁴¹³

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Security Council supported the efforts by Southern African Development Community and the Organization of African Unity/African Union to advance the peace process.

By a presidential statement dated 26 January 2000, the Council valued the vital contribution of SADC and expressed its appreciation for the role of the Organization of African Unity in the Lusaka process.⁴¹⁴ By resolution 1332 (2000) of 14 December 2000, the Council stressed the need for a coordinated

approach involving the United Nations and OAU to create new momentum for further progress in the peace process.⁴¹⁵ By a presidential statement dated 23 July 2002,⁴¹⁶ the Council welcomed the efforts and good offices of South Africa, in its capacity as chair of the African Union, to help the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda reach an agreement to tackle the problem of the armed groups and to take forward the withdrawal of Rwandan troops. In addition, the Council welcomed the support of the African Union for that process.

Furthermore, by a series of resolutions,⁴¹⁷ the Council continuously reaffirmed the importance of holding, at the appropriate time, an international conference on peace, security, democracy and development in the Great Lakes region under the auspices of the United Nations and OAU, with the participation of all the Governments of the region and all others concerned.

The situation in Somalia

During the period under review, by a series of decisions,⁴¹⁸ the Security Council continued to support and encourage the efforts made by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, the Organization of African Unity/African Union and the League of Arab States to find a political solution to the crisis in Somalia and called for closer interaction between those organizations and the Council in support of national reconciliation.

In his report of 25 October 2002,⁴¹⁹ the Secretary-General observed that the international community had welcomed the opening of the Somali National Reconciliation Conference at Eldoret, Kenya, on 15 October 2002, and stressed that efforts made by all the IGAD countries to bring about a coherent regional approach towards national reconciliation in Somalia were appreciated. He added that the progress made by the peace process since the ninth IGAD Summit in Khartoum in January 2002 had indeed been

⁴¹⁰ S/PV.4876, pp. 2-5.

⁴¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (China); p. 9 (United Kingdom); p. 9 (Germany); p. 10 (United States); p. 11 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 11 (Russian Federation); p. 12 (Spain); p. 12 (Guinea); and p. 15 (Bulgaria).

⁴¹² *Ibid.*, p. 6 (France); p. 7 (Angola); pp. 7-8 (Pakistan); p. 9 (United Kingdom); pp. 13-14 (Guinea); and p. 14 (Cameroon).

⁴¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁴¹⁴ S/PRST/2000/2.

⁴¹⁵ Resolution 1332 (2000), nineteenth preambular paragraph.

⁴¹⁶ S/PRST/2002/22.

⁴¹⁷ Resolutions 1291(2000), para. 18; 1304 (2000), para. 18; and 1355 (2001), para. 26.

⁴¹⁸ Resolution 1425 (2002); and S/PRST/2000/22; S/PRST/2001/1; S/PRST/2001/30; S/PRST/2002/8; and S/PRST/2002/35.

⁴¹⁹ S/2002/1201, para. 56.

significant and underlined the important role regional organizations could and did play in resolving conflicts.

By a presidential statement dated 11 November 2003,⁴²⁰ the Council reiterated its firm support for the Somali National Reconciliation Process launched under the auspices of IGAD and expressed its readiness to support IGAD in the implementation of the agreements reached. Furthermore, the Council commended the support given by the African Union to the Somali National Reconciliation Process, including its participation in the Process and its commitment to deploy a military observer mission to Somalia once a comprehensive agreement was reached.

The situation between Ethiopia and Eritrea

With regard to the situation between Ethiopia and Eritrea, the Council continued to support the role of the Organization of African Unity/African Union, under the auspices of which the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities had been signed.⁴²¹

By resolutions 1297 (2000) of 12 May 2000 and 1298 (2000) of 17 May 2000, the Council, expressing its strong support for the efforts of OAU to achieve a peaceful resolution of the conflict, demanded the earliest possible reconvening of substantive peace talks, under the auspices of the OAU, which would conclude a peaceful definitive settlement of the conflict.⁴²² By resolution 1298 (2000), the Council requested that the current Chairman of OAU consider dispatching his Personal Envoy to the region to seek immediate cessation of hostilities and resumption of the peace talks.⁴²³

By resolution 1312 (2000) of 31 July 2000, the Council, commending OAU for successfully facilitating the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities between the Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia and the Government of the State of Eritrea, signed in Algiers on 18 June 2000,⁴²⁴ welcomed the discussions between the Secretariats of the United Nations and OAU on cooperation in the implementation of the Agreement.⁴²⁵

⁴²⁰ S/PRST/2003/19.

⁴²¹ S/2000/601, annex.

⁴²² Resolutions 1297 (2000), fifth preambular paragraph and para. 5, and 1298 (2000), para. 4.

⁴²³ Resolution 1298 (2000), para. 5.

⁴²⁴ S/2000/601, annex.

⁴²⁵ Resolution 1312 (2000), second preambular paragraph and para. 2.

By resolution 1320 (2000) of 15 September 2000, the Council stressed its commitment to work in coordination with OAU and the parties to implement fully the Agreement.⁴²⁶ By subsequent decisions,⁴²⁷ the Council further commended the efforts of OAU, among others, for its role in achieving the Agreement. The Council also reaffirmed its strong support for the role played by the Organization of African Unity/African Union Liaison Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea.⁴²⁸

Letter dated 2 October 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2003/934)

With regard to the peace talks between the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A), the Council, by a presidential statement dated 10 October 2003,⁴²⁹ welcomed the agreement on security arrangements reached between the parties in Naivasha, Kenya, on 25 September 2003, and expressed its appreciation of the key role played by IGAD, among others, in the Sudan peace talks.

Europe

Letter dated 4 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/191)

The situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

By resolution 1345 (2001) of 21 March 2001, the Security Council welcomed the international efforts, including those of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo, the Kosovo Force (KFOR), the European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, in cooperation with the Governments of the former Yugoslav Republic

⁴²⁶ Resolution 1320 (2000), sixth preambular paragraph.

⁴²⁷ S/PRST/2000/34; S/PRST/2001/4; and S/PRST/2001/14.

⁴²⁸ Resolutions 1369 (2001), sixth preambular paragraph; 1398 (2002), eighth preambular paragraph; and 1430 (2002), seventh preambular paragraph.

⁴²⁹ S/PRST/2003/16.

of Macedonia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and other States, to prevent the escalation of ethnic tensions in the area. The Council also welcomed the contribution of the European Union to a peaceful solution to the problems in certain municipalities in southern Serbia and its decision to substantially increase the presence of the European Union Monitoring Mission there. It further welcomed the cooperation between NATO and the authorities of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in addressing security problems in parts of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and certain municipalities in southern Serbia.⁴³⁰

By a presidential statement dated 13 August 2001,⁴³¹ the Security Council welcomed the efforts of the European Union, NATO and OSCE in support of the Framework Agreement on the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, signed in Skopje on 13 August 2001. By resolution 1371 (2001) of 26 September 2001, the Council, welcomed the efforts of the European Union and OSCE to contribute to the implementation of the Framework Agreement, in particular through the presence of international observers.⁴³²

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

During the period under review, the Security Council welcomed the transition of responsibilities from the International Police Task Force of the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH) to the European Union Police Mission, on 1 January 2003 and noted the contribution by OSCE to the implementation of the Peace Agreement.

By a series of resolutions, the Council emphasized its appreciation of, among others, the personnel of OSCE for its contribution to the implementation of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the annexes thereto.⁴³³

⁴³⁰ Resolution 1345 (2001), fourth, fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs.

⁴³¹ S/PRST/2001/20.

⁴³² Resolution 1371 (2001), para. 4.

⁴³³ Resolutions 1305 (2000), fourth preambular paragraph; 1357 (2001), fourth preambular paragraph; 1423 (2002), fifth preambular paragraph; and 1491 (2003), fifth preambular paragraph.

By resolution 1423 (2002) of 12 July 2002, and similarly by a presidential statement dated 12 December 2002, the Council welcomed the decision of the European Union to send a Police Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1 January 2003 to assume responsibilities from IPTF at the end of the mandate of UNMIBH on 31 December 2002, as well as the close coordination between the European Union, UNMIBH and the High Representative to ensure a seamless transition.⁴³⁴

At the 4631st meeting, on 23 October 2002, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Bosnia and Herzegovina⁴³⁵ noted that the first operation by the European Union would be a practical embodiment of the recommendation called for in the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations of August 2000, on greater cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations in peacekeeping.⁴³⁶ At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation underscored that the Council, as the main body responsible for peacekeeping and international security, would, even after UNMIBH had completed its work, continue to receive, on a regular basis, reports on the process of implementation of the police operation in that country.⁴³⁷

By resolution 1491 (2003) of 11 July 2003, the Council welcomed the deployment by the European Union of its Police Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina since 1 January 2003.⁴³⁸

At the 4837th meeting, on 8 October 2003, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that he considered it a highly desirable trend that regional organizations were taking over responsibilities from the United Nations, as seen in Bosnia and Herzegovina and also in Africa.⁴³⁹

The situation in Georgia

In Georgia, by a series of its decisions, the Council welcomed the important contributions that the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG) and the collective peacekeeping force of

⁴³⁴ Resolution 1423 (2002), para. 20 and S/PRST/2002/33.

⁴³⁵ S/2000/809.

⁴³⁶ S/PV.4631, pp. 10-11.

⁴³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁴³⁸ Resolution 1491 (2003), para. 19.

⁴³⁹ S/PV.4837, p. 15.

the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), operating side by side, made in stabilizing the situation in the conflict zone. The Council also noted the close working relationship between UNOMIG and the CIS peacekeeping force, and stressed the importance of continuing and increasing close cooperation and coordination between them in the performance of their respective mandates.⁴⁴⁰ Furthermore, during the reporting period, the Council continued to express its support for the sustained efforts of OSCE to promote the stabilization of the situation and the achievement of a comprehensive political settlement, which included a settlement of the political status of Abkhazia within the State of Georgia.⁴⁴¹

Middle East

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

In Iraq, during the period under review, the Security Council recognized the efforts of such organizations as the League of Arab States and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, for a peaceful resolution of the situation.

By a letter dated 16 September 2002 addressed to the President, the Secretary-General transmitted a letter of the same date from the representative of Iraq addressed to the Secretary-General, informing the Council that, in response to the appeals of the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and LAS, his country had decided to allow the return of the United Nations weapons inspectors to Iraq without conditions.⁴⁴²

By resolution 1441 (2002) of 8 November 2002, the Council established an enhanced inspection regime with the aim of bringing to full and verified completion the disarmament process established by resolution 687 (1991) and subsequent resolutions. The Council also

commended the Secretary-General and the members of LAS for their efforts.⁴⁴³

At the 4717th meeting, on 11 March 2003, held in response to the request from the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM),⁴⁴⁴ the representative of Algeria pointed out that the Council had to listen to the regional organizations and other groupings — be it the European Union, OAU, LAS or OIC — who had spoken out for a peaceful settlement to the crisis, the primacy of the role of the United Nations and respect for international legality. He asserted that the Council was all the more duty-bound to do so because close cooperation between the Council and regional organizations was desirable, encouraged and clearly provided for by the Charter and because all those bodies and regional groupings were calling on the Council unanimously to ensure that the logic of peace prevailed over that of war.⁴⁴⁵

C. Calls by the Security Council for involvement of regional arrangements in the implementation of Chapter VII measures

During the period under review, regional arrangements were increasingly called upon to assist in the implementation of measures imposed by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter, as in the cases of Afghanistan, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Somalia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. In Liberia, the Council requested input from the Economic Community of West African States with a view to the termination of such measures. The practice of the Council in this regard is set out below by region.

The situation in Sierra Leone

By resolution 1306 (2000) of 5 July 2000, the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, requested the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997), to strengthen the existing contacts with, inter alia, regional organizations, in particular ECOWAS and the Organization of African Unity, with a view to

⁴⁴⁰ Resolutions 1287 (2000), tenth preambular paragraph; 1311 (2000), ninth preambular paragraph; 1339 (2001), eighth preambular paragraph; 1364 (2001), preambular paragraph 8 and para. 20; 1393 (2002), seventh preambular paragraph; 1427 (2002), seventh preambular paragraph; 1462 (2003), seventh preambular paragraph; and 1494 (2003), eighth preambular paragraph; and S/PRST/2000/16; S/PRST/2000/32; and S/PRST/2001/9.

⁴⁴¹ Resolutions 1287 (2000), para. 3; 1311 (2000), para. 2; 1339 (2001), para. 2; 1393 (2002), para. 2; 1427 (2002), para. 2; 1462 (2003), para. 3; and 1494 (2003), para. 3.

⁴⁴² S/2002/1034, annex.

⁴⁴³ Resolution 1441 (2002), sixteenth preambular paragraph and para. 2.

⁴⁴⁴ See letter dated 7 March 2003 from the representative of Malaysia to the President of the Council (S/2003/283).

⁴⁴⁵ S/PV.4717, p. 11.

identifying ways to improve the effective implementation of the arms embargo imposed by paragraph 2 of resolution 1171 (1998).⁴⁴⁶

The situation in Liberia

In connection with the situation in Liberia, the Council cooperated with the Economic Community of West African States in the implementation and termination of the mandatory measures against Liberia. Additionally, the Council extended logistical support to the ECOWAS forces in Liberia and subsequently, on 1 October 2003, reassigned those forces as United Nations peacekeepers.

By resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001, the Council welcomed the intention of ECOWAS to monitor, in close cooperation with the United Nations, the implementation of measures to prohibit the export of rough diamonds from Sierra Leone pursuant to resolution 1306 (2000) of 5 July 2000 and to report thereon after a period of two months.⁴⁴⁷ By a series of resolutions, the Council further invited ECOWAS to report regularly to the Security Council Committee established pursuant to paragraph 14 of resolution 1343 (2001) on all activities undertaken by its members in the implementation of relevant measures.⁴⁴⁸

Furthermore, by resolution 1478 (2003) of 6 May 2003, the Council, following the establishment of the Panel of Experts, called upon all members of ECOWAS to cooperate fully with the Panel in the identification of violations of the arms embargo against Liberia.⁴⁴⁹

In respect of the termination of sanctions against Liberia,⁴⁵⁰ the Council, by a series of resolutions, expressed its readiness to terminate the measures imposed with regard to Liberian-registered aircraft, and the ban on the import of rough diamonds not controlled through the certificate of origin regime of the Government of Sierra Leone, taking into account, inter alia, input from ECOWAS.⁴⁵¹

In connection with peacekeeping activities, the Council, by resolution 1497 (2003) of 1 August 2003, authorized the establishment of a Multinational Force in Liberia under Chapter VII of the Charter. The Council also authorized the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone to extend the necessary logistical support to the forward elements of ECOWAS in the Multinational Force in Liberia for a limited duration.⁴⁵²

By resolution 1509 (2003) of 19 September 2003, the Council commended the rapid and professional deployment to Liberia of the forces of the ECOWAS Mission in Liberia (ECOMIL), pursuant to resolution 1497 (2003).⁴⁵³ Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, the Council also established the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) and requested the Secretary-General to transfer authority from the forces of ECOMIL to UNMIL on 1 October 2003.⁴⁵⁴ In his report dated 15 December 2003, the Secretary-General informed the Council that UNMIL had taken over peacekeeping duties from ECOMIL on 1 October 2003, as stipulated in resolution 1509 (2003), and all ECOMIL troops had been reassigned to UNMIL as United Nations peacekeepers.⁴⁵⁵

The situation in Somalia

The Security Council called upon regional organizations, in particular the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, the African Union and the League of Arab States, to cooperate with it and its subsidiary bodies in the implementation of the arms embargo against Somalia imposed by resolutions 733 (1992) and 1356 (2001).

By resolution 1474 (2003) of 8 April 2003, the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, decided to re-establish a Panel of Experts whose mandate included exploring the possibility of establishing a monitoring mechanism for the implementation of the arms embargo with partners inside and outside Somalia, "in close cooperation with regional and international organizations, including with the African Union." The Council also called upon regional organizations, in particular the African Union and LAS, to assist Somali parties and the States in the

⁴⁴⁶ Resolution 1306 (2000), para. 22.

⁴⁴⁷ Resolution 1343 (2001), sixth preambular paragraph and para. 2 (c).

⁴⁴⁸ Resolutions 1408 (2002), para. 12, and 1478 (2003), para. 21.

⁴⁴⁹ Resolution 1478 (2003), para. 30.

⁴⁵⁰ For details, see chap. XI, part III.

⁴⁵¹ Resolutions 1343 (2001), para. 2 (a)-(g); 1408 (2002), para. 6; and 1478 (2003), para. 12.

⁴⁵² Resolution 1497 (2003), paras. 1-3.

⁴⁵³ Resolution 1509 (2003), tenth preambular paragraph.

⁴⁵⁴ Resolution 1509 (2003), para. 1.

⁴⁵⁵ S/2003/1175, para. 2.

region in their efforts to implement fully the arms embargo.⁴⁵⁶ By resolution 1519 (2003) of 16 December 2003, the Council, acting under Chapter VII, called upon regional organizations, in particular IGAD, the African Union and LAS, to establish focal points to enhance cooperation with the Monitoring Group established by the same resolution and to facilitate the exchange of information.⁴⁵⁷

The situation in Afghanistan

In Afghanistan, the Security Council cooperated with regional organizations in the implementation of sanctions measures.

By resolution 1333 (2000) of 19 December 2000, the Council, in imposing further measures, requested its Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) to establish and maintain, on the basis of information provided by States and regional organizations, an updated list of all points of entry and landing areas for aircraft within the territory of Afghanistan under the control of the Taliban and of individuals and entities designated as being associated with Osama bin Laden.⁴⁵⁸ A similar reference was made in resolution 1390 (2002) of 28 January 2002.⁴⁵⁹

Letter dated 4 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/191)

The situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

By resolution 1345 (2001) of 21 March 2001, the Council called on the Kosovo Force to continue to strengthen its efforts to prevent unauthorized movement and illegal arms shipments across borders and boundaries in the region, to confiscate weapons within Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and to continue to keep the Council informed in accordance with resolution 1160 (1998).⁴⁶⁰

By resolution 1371 (2001) of 26 September 2001, the Security Council welcomed the efforts of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo and KFOR to implement fully resolution 1244 (1999), in particular by further strengthening efforts to prevent unauthorized movement and illegal arms shipments across borders and boundaries, to confiscate illegal weapons within Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and to keep the Council informed.⁴⁶¹

D. Consideration or authorization by the Security Council of enforcement action by regional arrangements

During the period under review, the Security Council gave its authorization to regional arrangements to take the necessary action in their peacekeeping activities, as in the cases of Afghanistan and Côte d'Ivoire. In the case of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Council recalled the authorization it had given the Kosovo Force by resolution 1244 (1999) of 10 June 1999. In one instance, the Council considered but did not take a decision on authorization of the use of force by a regional organization.

The situation in Guinea following recent attacks along its borders with Liberia and Sierra Leone

The situation in Sierra Leone

At the 4319th meeting, on 14 May 2001, the Council discussed the request by the Economic Community of West African States for assistance in deploying an interposition force along the borders of Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone, and the report of the Inter-Agency Mission to West Africa.⁴⁶² Several speakers supported the deployment of an interposition force to monitor along the borders.⁴⁶³ The representative of the Russian Federation expressed the

⁴⁵⁶ Resolution 1474 (2003), paras. 3 (g) and 11.

⁴⁵⁷ Resolution 1519 (2003), para. 5.

⁴⁵⁸ Resolution 1333 (2001), para. 16 (a) and (b).

⁴⁵⁹ Resolution 1390 (2002), para. 5 (a).

⁴⁶⁰ Resolution 1345 (2001), para. 10. See, for example, S/2000/50, S/2000/152, S/2000/235, S/2000/318, S/2000/489, S/2000/634, S/2000/814, S/2000/891, S/2000/1120, S/2000/1246, S/2001/205, S/2001/333,

S/2001/465, S/2001/578, S/2001/707, S/2001/832, S/2001/910, S/2001/1002, S/2001/1131, S/2002/122, S/2002/183, S/2002/366, S/2002/611, S/2002/725, S/2002/978, S/2002/984, S/2002/1111, S/2002/1225, S/2002/1404, S/2002/1421, S/2003/130, S/2003/301, S/2003/378, S/2003/511, S/2003/616, S/2003/682, S/2003/855, S/2003/931 and S/2003/1141.

⁴⁶¹ Resolution 1371 (2001), para. 7.

⁴⁶² S/2001/434.

⁴⁶³ S/PV.4319, p. 17 (Tunisia); p. 20 (Bangladesh); and p. 24 (Jamaica).

view that building trust in the subregion could be furthered by the deployment of ECOWAS troops to areas of most intensive activity by the unlawful armed groups, while stressing that such an operation should be based on the agreement of all States on whose territories it would be conducted and on the basis of the mandate that included an enforcement component authorized by the Security Council.⁴⁶⁴ No decisions of the Council were taken on the matter during the reporting period.

The situation in Côte d'Ivoire

By resolution 1464 (2003) of 4 February 2003, the Council, recalling the decision taken at the ECOWAS Summit, held in Accra on 29 September 2002, to deploy a peacekeeping force in Côte d'Ivoire, authorized Member States participating in the ECOWAS forces, in accordance with Chapter VIII of the Charter, to "take the necessary steps" to guarantee the security and freedom of movement of their personnel and to ensure the protection of civilians immediately threatened with physical violence within their zones of operation. In addition, the Council requested that ECOWAS, through the command of its force, report to the Council periodically, through the Secretary-General, on all aspects of implementation of its mandate.⁴⁶⁵ The ECOWAS forces, whose authorization was renewed by resolution 1498 (2003) of 4 August 2003, remained on the ground in parallel to the United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire, which was established by resolution 1479 (2003) of 13 May 2003.⁴⁶⁶

Letter dated 4 March 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/191)

By resolution 1345 (2001) of 21 March 2001,⁴⁶⁷ the Council welcomed the efforts of KFOR to implement resolution 1244 (1999) of 10 June 1999, whereby, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, the Council had authorized Member States and relevant international organizations to establish an international

⁴⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁴⁶⁵ Resolution 1464 (2003), third preambular paragraph and paras. 8-10. See, for example, S/2003/472.

⁴⁶⁶ Resolution 1479 (2003), para. 2.

⁴⁶⁷ Resolution 1345 (2001), first preambular paragraph.

security presence in Kosovo, with substantial North Atlantic Treaty Organization participation.⁴⁶⁸

The situation in Afghanistan

By resolution 1386 (2001) of 20 December 2001, the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, authorized, as envisaged in annex 1 to the Bonn Agreement, the establishment for six months of an International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) to assist the Afghan Interim Authority in the maintenance of security in Kabul and its surrounding areas, so that the Authority and the personnel of the United Nations could operate in a secure environment.⁴⁶⁹ The Council requested ISAF to provide periodic reports on progress towards the implementation of its mandate through the Secretary-General.⁴⁷⁰

By resolutions 1413 (2002) of 23 May 2002 and 1444 (2002) of 27 November 2002, the Council decided to extend the authorization of ISAF, as defined in resolution 1386 (2001).⁴⁷¹

In a letter dated 7 October 2003 addressed to the President, the Secretary-General transmitted letters dated 2 October and 6 October 2003, respectively, from the Secretary-General of NATO, in which the latter informed the Secretary-General that NATO had assumed strategic command, control and coordination of ISAF on 11 August 2003, and that NATO had under consideration a possible expansion of the Force's mission.⁴⁷² By resolution 1510 (2003) of 13 October 2003, the Council, noting the above-mentioned letter and acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, authorized expansion of the mandate of ISAF, and requested the leadership of ISAF to provide quarterly reports on the implementation of its mandate to the Council through the Secretary-General.⁴⁷³

⁴⁶⁸ Resolution 1244 (1999), para. 7 and annex II, principle 4. By resolution 1244 (1999), the Council also requested the Secretary-General to report to it at regular intervals on the implementation of the resolution, including reports from the leadership of the international civil and security presences (para. 20).

⁴⁶⁹ Resolution 1386 (2001), para. 1.

⁴⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, para. 9. See for example, S/2002/274, S/2002/740, S/2002/940, S/2002/1092, S/2002/1196, S/2002/1340, S/2003/210, S/2003/555 and S/2003/807, among others.

⁴⁷¹ Resolutions 1413 (2002), para. 1, and 1444 (2002), para. 1.

⁴⁷² S/2003/970, annexes I and II.

⁴⁷³ Resolution 1510 (2003), paras. 1 and 5.

E. Consultation, briefing and reporting by regional arrangements

The increasing collaboration between the Security Council and regional arrangements witnessed a corresponding growth in the exchange of information between the two, using different modalities.

During the reporting period, the practice continued whereby the Security Council was kept informed of the activities of regional organizations by means of communications addressed to the President of the Council or the Secretary-General from various organs or States holding the rotating Chairmanship/Presidency or simply membership of the regional organizations, from States parties to a situation, or from other States concerning matters pertaining to regional organizations.⁴⁷⁴ Moreover, while the reporting obligation of regional organizations under Article 54 of the Charter applied to all activities undertaken or contemplated by them, in several instances where the Council authorized coercive measures within the meaning of Article 53, it explicitly requested the involved regional organizations to report to it on a regular basis.⁴⁷⁵

In addition to communications transmitting mainly reports, resolutions, memoranda and statements from regional arrangements, the Council has

increasingly utilized the practice of receiving briefings by regional organizations at its formal meetings concerning activities undertaken or in contemplation by them for the maintenance of international peace and security, independently or in cooperation with the Council.⁴⁷⁶ Regional organizations were frequently invited to participate and make statements in the context of thematic debates, as well as in Council deliberations on a number of specific situations of immediate concern to them.⁴⁷⁷ In the context of its closed consultative meetings with troop-contributing countries, the Council, by resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section B, explicitly listed representatives of regional and subregional organizations among the parties to be invited, whether they were contributing troops or not.⁴⁷⁸

Furthermore, during the period under review, the Council welcomed and established several consultative mechanisms with a view to building a dialogue with regional organizations. For example, by presidential statements dated 19 December 2001 and 31 January 2002,⁴⁷⁹ the Council welcomed the establishment of the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for West Africa to ensure, among other things, the development of a fruitful partnership with the Economic Community of West African States and other subregional organizations. With respect to

⁴⁷⁴ See the letter dated 2 July 2003 from the representative of Fiji to the President of the Council (S/2003/753); and letters dated 7 September 2000 (S/2000/863), 25 September 2000 (S/2000/900), 21 March 2001 (S/2001/257), 9 April 2001 (S/2001/341 and S/2001/349), 6 August 2001 (S/2001/769), 10 October 2001 (S/2001/957), 23 September 2002 (S/2002/1077, S/2002/1078, S/2002/1079, S/2002/1080, S/2002/1081 and S/2002/1082), 24 September 2002 (S/2002/1074), 11 November 2002 (S/2002/1238), 3 March 2003 (S/2003/254), 24 March 2003 (S/2003/365), 3 June 2003 (S/2003/613), 21 July 2003 (S/2003/753), 6 October 2003 (S/2003/949), 4 November 2003 (S/2003/1072) and 11 November 2003 (S/2003/1079) from the representative of the League of Arab States to the President of the Council.

⁴⁷⁵ For example, in connection with the item entitled "The situation in Côte d'Ivoire", the Council, by paragraph 10 of resolution 1464 (2003) requested ECOWAS to report periodically on all aspects of the implementation of its mandate. Similarly, in connection with the item entitled "The situation in Afghanistan", by paragraphs 2 and 5 of resolution 1510 (2003), the Council requested ISAF to submit quarterly reports.

⁴⁷⁶ For example, ECOWAS was invited to brief the Council at the 4720th meeting, on 18 March 2003, in connection with the item entitled "Proliferation of small arms and light weapons and mercenary activities: threats to peace and security in West Africa." ECOWAS and the African Union briefed the Council at the 4739th meeting, on 11 April 2003, in connection with the item entitled "The Security Council and regional organizations: facing the new challenges to international peace and security". At the 4815th meeting, on 27 August 2003, in connection with the item entitled "The situation in Liberia" and at the 4873rd meeting, on 24 November 2003, in connection with the item entitled "The situation in Côte d'Ivoire", the Council heard briefings by the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS. At the 4860th meeting, on 18 November 2003, in connection with the item entitled "The situation in Guinea-Bissau", the Council heard a briefing by the representative of the Chairman of ECOWAS.

⁴⁷⁷ For a comprehensive table of the participation of representatives of regional organizations in meetings of the Council, see chap. III, annex II.

⁴⁷⁸ Resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sect. B, para. 3 (g) and (h).

⁴⁷⁹ S/PRST/2001/38 and S/PRST/2002/2, respectively.

threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts, the Council, by a presidential statement dated 15 April 2002,⁴⁸⁰ invited the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism to build a dialogue with international, regional, and subregional organizations active in the areas covered by that resolution. Furthermore, by resolution 1377 (2001) of

⁴⁸⁰ S/PRST/2002/10.

12 November 2001, the Council invited the Committee to explore with international, regional, and subregional organizations the promotion of best practices in those areas, the availability of existing assistance programmes that might facilitate the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) and the promotion of possible synergies between those assistance programmes.⁴⁸¹

⁴⁸¹ Resolution 1377 (2001), annex.

Part IV

Consideration of the miscellaneous provisions of the Charter

Article 103

In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail.

Note

During the period under review, Article 103 was not explicitly invoked in any resolution or decision. However, the Security Council, in a number of resolutions imposing mandatory measures under Chapter VII of the Charter against Afghanistan, Eritrea and Ethiopia, Liberia and Sierra Leone, implicitly referred to the principle enshrined in Article 103, by emphasizing the primacy of the obligations under the Charter over those contracted by Member States under any other international agreement. For example, by resolution 1298 (2000) of 17 May 2000, in connection with the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia, the Council called upon all States and all international and regional organizations to act strictly in conformity with the resolution, “notwithstanding the existence of any rights granted or obligations conferred or imposed by any international agreement or of any contract entered into or any licence or permit granted prior to the entry into force of measures” imposed by the resolution.⁴⁸² Similar language was used in resolutions 1306 (2000) of 5 July 2000⁴⁸³ and 1333 (2000) of 19 December 2000,⁴⁸⁴ by which the Council imposed mandatory

⁴⁸² Resolution 1298 (2000), para. 9.

⁴⁸³ Resolution 1306 (2000), para. 9.

⁴⁸⁴ Resolution 1333 (2000), para. 17.

measures against Sierra Leone and against individuals or entities belonging to or associated with Al-Qaida and/or the Taliban, respectively.

Additionally, by resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001, by which the Council imposed measures against Liberia, the Council called upon States and international and regional organizations to act strictly in accordance with the provisions of the resolution, notwithstanding the existence of any rights or obligations entered into or any licence or permit granted prior to the date of adoption of the resolution.⁴⁸⁵

Article 103 was explicitly referred to once in the deliberations of the Council, at the 4568th meeting, on 10 July 2002, in connection with the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in which Member States discussed the question of impunity of United Nations peacekeepers under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court that entered into force on 1 July 2002 (case 21).⁴⁸⁶ Furthermore, during the deliberations in connection with the situation in Angola, the Council touched upon the principle enshrined in Article 103, including obligations arising pursuant to decisions of the Council imposing mandatory measures under Chapter VII of the Charter (case 22).

There was also one communication during the reporting period in which explicit reference to Article 103 was made.⁴⁸⁷

⁴⁸⁵ Resolution 1343 (2001), para. 22.

⁴⁸⁶ S/PV.4568, p. 23 (Singapore).

⁴⁸⁷ S/2001/136.

Case 21

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

United Nations peacekeeping

In connection with the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, at the 4563rd meeting, on 30 June 2002, a draft resolution,⁴⁸⁸ by which the Security Council would have extended the mandate of the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina for six months, was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council. The representative of the United States, before voting, explained his concern regarding the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court which would enter into force on 1 July 2002, in particular the need for his Government to ensure national jurisdiction over its personnel and officials involved in United Nations peacekeeping. He stressed that the proposal by his Government, calling for the establishment of immunity for United Nations peacekeeping, built on immunities that were already recognized in the United Nations system and reflected in status-of-forces and status-of-mission agreements. He further insisted that the Rome Statute itself recognized the concept of immunity and that the consequence of providing United Nations peacekeepers with such immunity would be the creation of a legal obligation on States to observe that immunity. He expressed the view that pursuant to Article 98 of the Rome Statute of the Court, the compliance of parties to the Statute with such obligations was “entirely consistent” with the Statute.⁴⁸⁹

Following that meeting, in his letter dated 3 July 2002 to the President, the representative of Canada requested an open meeting of the Council, stressing that the issue raised in the deliberations of the Council concerning UNMIBH involved not just the extension of the mission, but a “potentially irreversible decision negatively affecting the integrity of the Rome Statute of the Court, the integrity of treaty negotiations more generally, the credibility of the Council, the viability of international law with respect to the investigation and prosecution of grievous crimes, and the established responsibilities of States under international law to act on such crimes”.⁴⁹⁰

⁴⁸⁸ S/2002/712.

⁴⁸⁹ S/PV.4563, pp. 2-3.

⁴⁹⁰ S/2002/723.

At the 4568th meeting, held on 10 July 2002 in response to the request contained in the above-mentioned letter, most speakers voiced their concerns over the draft text that was circulating among members of the Council⁴⁹¹ in connection with granting immunity from prosecution to United Nations peacekeepers from States not parties to the Rome Statute. Pointing out that sufficient safeguards against unwarranted and politically motivated prosecution were included in the Statute, a number of speakers expressed opposition to the circulating text as it would attempt to modify a provision of an international treaty, by means of a Council resolution, and undermine the viability and the integrity of the multinational legal framework.⁴⁹²

Furthermore, some speakers stated that, if such a text were to be adopted, Member States that were parties to the Statute would be forced to question the legality of the Council decision and the role of the Council.⁴⁹³ In that connection, the representative of Mongolia pointed out that no State should be placed in a situation in which it was “forced to breach its international obligations” under either the Charter or the Statute.⁴⁹⁴ The representative of Brazil expressed the view that the Council was not vested with treaty-making and treaty-reviewing powers and could not create new obligations for the States parties to the Statute, which could be amended only through the procedures provided in the Statute.⁴⁹⁵ The representative of Ukraine also argued against the creation of a conflict between the powers of the Council under Chapter VII of the Charter and the legal obligations entered into by Member States in compliance with the provisions of the Charter.⁴⁹⁶ Stating that Article 103 provided for Charter obligations to prevail in the event of a conflict between Charter obligations and other international obligations,

⁴⁹¹ Not issued as a document of the Council.

⁴⁹² S/PV.4568, p. 3 (Canada); p. 5 (New Zealand); p. 6 (South Africa); p. 11 (France); p. 15 (Costa Rica, on behalf of the Rio Group); p. 15 (Islamic Republic of Iran); p. 16 (Jordan); p. 22 (Brazil), p. 24 (Singapore); and pp. 26-27 (Mexico); S/PV.4568 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 2 (Fiji); p. 5 (Guinea); p. 8 (Malaysia); p. 9 (Germany); p. 9 (Syrian Arab Republic); and p. 14 (Cuba).

⁴⁹³ S/PV.4568, p. 4 (Canada); p. 6 (New Zealand); and p. 20 (Liechtenstein).

⁴⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁴⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁴⁹⁶ S/PV.4568 (Resumption 1) and Corr.1, p. 4.

the representative of Singapore raised the question of the desirability of Council action in connection with the International Criminal Court.⁴⁹⁷

The representative of the United States, reiterating concerns over the legal exposure of his country's peacekeepers under the Rome Statute, argued that his country respected the obligation of those States that had ratified the Statute and that in its proposals before the Council, it sought to work "within the provisions of the Statute". He further stated that the proposed solution was consistent with the obligations of all Member States, including those that were parties to the Statute.⁴⁹⁸

At the 4572nd meeting, on 12 July 2002, under the item entitled "United Nations peacekeeping", the Council adopted resolution 1422 (2002) by which, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, it requested the International Criminal Court to suspend for 12 months starting 1 July 2002 any investigations or prosecutions involving personnel from States not Parties to the Rome Statute of the Court.⁴⁹⁹ The Council also expressed the intention to renew the above-mentioned request under the same conditions each 1 July for further 12-month periods for as long as it might be necessary and decided that Member States should take no action inconsistent with the provision for deferral and "with their international obligations". By resolution 1487 (2003) of 12 June 2003, the Council extended the provisions of resolution 1422 (2002) for a further 12-month period starting 1 July 2003.

Case 22

The situation in Angola

The monitoring mechanism established by resolution 1295 (2000) to monitor sanctions imposed against the União Nacional Para a Independência Total de Angola, in its final report dated 21 December 2000,⁵⁰⁰ noted that the Schengen Agreement seemed to

conflict with the sanctions imposed by resolution 1127 (1997), or was at least used as a reason for not implementing the sanctions fully. In addition, it pointed out that while paragraph 10 of resolution 1127 (1997) called upon States to act strictly in accordance with the provisions of the resolution, notwithstanding the existence of any rights or obligations conferred or imposed by any international agreements, many countries considered themselves unable to expel senior officials of UNITA and send them to Angola for reasons relating to the adherence of international instruments regarding refugees and political asylum.⁵⁰¹ In conclusion, the report recommended that the States parties to the Schengen Agreement should look into the problem of UNITA abusing its structures with a view to closing existing loopholes.⁵⁰²

At the 4283rd meeting, on 22 February 2001, members of the Council considered the above-mentioned report of the monitoring mechanism. The representative of Ukraine agreed that the relevant requirements of resolution 1127 (1997) regarding the travel restrictions on UNITA representatives should be fully implemented, "notwithstanding the existence of any rights or obligations under any other international agreements".⁵⁰³ The representative of Bangladesh, referring to the report of the mechanism, emphasized that there was "a conflict between the national obligation of member States of the Schengen Agreement to allow their nationals free movement across their borders and the international obligation flowing from the relevant Council resolutions".⁵⁰⁴

At the 4418th meeting, on 15 November 2001, the representative of Angola stressed that obligations resulting from Council resolutions prevailed over any other obligation to which Member States might be subject by virtue of any treaty or international agreement to which they were or might become party, and that such principle should also be applied to sanctions against UNITA.⁵⁰⁵

⁴⁹⁷ S/PV.4568, pp. 23-24.

⁴⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

⁴⁹⁹ Resolution 1422 (2002), para. 1.

⁵⁰⁰ S/2000/1225 and Corr.1 and Corr.2.

⁵⁰¹ *Ibid.*, para. 109.

⁵⁰² *Ibid.*, para. 234.

⁵⁰³ S/PV.4283, p. 16.

⁵⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁵⁰⁵ S/PV.4418, p. 5.

Index by Articles of the Charter and rules of procedure

I. ARTICLES OF THE CHARTER

CHAPTER I (Purposes and Principles)

Article 1, 654, 779, 898, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1045
 Article 2, 432, 654, 655, 670, 691, 713, 779,
 792, 837, 896, 1023, 1028, 1029, 1032,
 1038, 1040, 1041, 1043, 1044, 1045

CHAPTER II (Membership)

Article 4, 223, 255, 261, 837
 Article 5, 223, 255
 Article 6, 223, 255

CHAPTER IV (The General Assembly)

Article 10, 216, 218, 1050
 Article 11, 216, 218, 846, 848, 856, 1050
 Article 12, 216, 221, 222
 Article 14, 1050
 Article 15, 224

CHAPTER V (The Security Council)

Article 23, 216, 217
 Article 24, 224, 362, 556, 648, 654, 786, 1023,
 1046, 1047, 1048, 1050, 1053, 1054, 1055,
 1056, 1067
 Article 25, 1023, 1056, 1057, 1058
 Article 27, 135, 138, 139, 829
 Article 28, 5, 791
 Article 29, 165, 811
 Article 30, 3
 Article 31, 57, 65, 589
 Article 32, 57, 64, 589

CHAPTER VI (Pacific Settlement of Disputes)

Article 33, 837, 845, 846, 860, 863, 881, 894,
 901, 902, 907, 911, 1066
 Article 34, 845, 846, 856, 863, 894, 904, 905,
 906
 Article 35, 57, 738, 845, 846, 848, 850, 863,
 894, 906, 907
 Article 36, 829, 845, 847, 860, 863, 894, 907
 Article 37, 845, 847, 848, 860, 863
 Article 38, 845, 847, 860, 863

CHAPTER VII (Action with respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression)

Article 39, 384, 513, 909, 918, 919, 924,
 926, 929
 Article 40, 384, 513, 918, 924, 937, 941
 Article 41, 165, 167, 168, 304, 384, 513, 786,
 787, 918, 924, 942, 950, 951, 964, 995, 997,
 998, 1040, 1041
 Article 42, 384, 513, 918, 924, 969, 971, 974,
 975, 977, 995, 997, 998, 999, 1040

Article 43, 918, 982, 984, 988, 990, 992

Article 44, 918, 982, 984, 990, 991, 992

Article 45, 216, 918, 983, 984

Article 46, 216, 918, 983, 984, 993

Article 47, 216, 250, 251, 918, 983, 984, 993, 994

Article 48, 918, 994, 995

Article 49, 918, 998, 1004

Article 50, 219, 797, 798, 918, 1000, 1001,
 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005

Article 51, 278, 359, 691, 784, 787, 788, 918,
 1006, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012,
 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019,
 1039, 1040

CHAPTER VIII (Regional Agreements)

Article 52, 893, 1023, 1059, 1060, 1064, 1066,
 1067

Article 53, 792, 1023, 1059, 1060, 1063, 1064,
 1067, 1079

Article 54, 27, 1023, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1064,
 1079

CHAPTER IX (International Economic and Social Co-operation)

Article 55, 654

CHAPTER X (The Economic and Social Council)

Article 65, 231, 232, 233, 236, 238, 240, 241,
 439, 791

CHAPTER XII (International Trusteeship System)

Article 77, 791

Article 82, 791

Article 83, 241

CHAPTER XIII (The Trusteeship Council)

Article 87, 241

Article 88, 241

CHAPTER XIV (The International Court of Justice)

Article 93, 223

Article 94, 243, 244, 245

Article 96, 243, 791

CHAPTER XV (The Secretariat)

Article 97, 223, 224

Article 98, 15, 245

Article 99, 220, 245, 249, 250, 792, 793, 846,
 847, 848, 855, 880, 881, 894, 898, 908, 909,
 910, 911, 912, 929

CHAPTER XVI (Miscellaneous Provisions)

Article 103, 1023, 1080, 1081

II. PROVISIONAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

CHAPTER I (Meetings)

- Rule 1, 4, 5
- Rule 2, 4, 5, 6, 644
- Rule 3, 4, 6
- Rule 4, 4, 5, 6
- Rule 5, 4, 5

CHAPTER II (Agenda)

- Rule 6, 4, 27
- Rule 7, 4, 27
- Rule 8, 4, 27
- Rule 9, 4, 28
- Rule 10, 4, 30
- Rule 11, 4, 30, 31, 222
- Rule 12, 4, 27

CHAPTER III (Representation and Credentials)

- Rule 13, 4, 12
- Rule 14, 4, 12
- Rule 15, 4, 12
- Rule 16, 4
- Rule 17, 4

CHAPTER IV (Presidency)

- Rule 18, 4, 12
- Rule 19, 4, 12, 13
- Rule 20, 4, 12

CHAPTER V (Secretariat)

- Rule 21, 4, 15
- Rule 22, 4, 15
- Rule 23, 4, 15
- Rule 24, 4, 15
- Rule 25, 4, 15
- Rule 26, 4, 15

CHAPTER VI (Conduct of Business)

- Rule 27, 4, 15, 16
- Rule 28, 4, 15, 131, 165, 167, 180, 275, 739
- Rule 29, 4, 15
- Rule 30, 4, 15
- Rule 31, 4, 15
- Rule 32, 4, 15

Rule 33, 4, 15, 16, 21, 30, 333

Rule 34, 4, 15

Rule 35, 4, 15

Rule 36, 4, 15

Rule 37, 4, 15, 17, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 67, 269, 589

Rule 39, 4, 15, 17, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 66, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 99, 101, 102, 103, 113, 115, 117, 128, 129, 131, 269, 589

CHAPTER VII (Voting)

Rule 40, 4, 242

CHAPTER VIII (Languages)

Rule 41, 4, 21

Rule 42, 4, 21

Rule 43, 4, 21

Rule 44, 4, 22

Rule 45, 4, 21

Rule 46, 4, 21

Rule 47, 4, 21

CHAPTER IX (Publicity of Meetings, Records)

Rule 48, 4, 23, 224

Rule 49, 4, 23

Rule 50, 4, 23

Rule 51, 4, 23

Rule 52, 4, 23

Rule 53, 4, 23

Rule 54, 4, 23

Rule 55, 4, 23, 224, 1068

Rule 56, 4, 23

Rule 57, 4, 23

CHAPTER X (Admission of New Members)

Rule 58, 4, 255

Rule 59, 4, 166, 255, 260, 261

Rule 60, 4, 223, 226, 255, 258, 260

CHAPTER XI (Relations with other United Nations Organs)

Rule 61, 4, 242

SUBJECT INDEX

- Abkhazia situation.** *See* Georgia situation
- Abstention**
- admission of new Member States, 139
 - Afghanistan situation, 139
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 139, 140
 - generally, 138
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 140, 141
 - Liberia situation, 141
 - Lockerbie bombing, 141
 - Middle East situation, 139, 140, 141
 - Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, 140
 - obligatory abstention, 138
 - peacekeeping operations, 140
 - Sierra Leone situation, 139
 - voluntary abstention, 139
 - Western Sahara situation, 139
- Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Burundi,** 240
- Ad hoc commissions.** *See also specific entity or situation*
- generally, 206
- Ad hoc criminal tribunals.** *See also specific entity or situation*
- generally, 207
- Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa**
- Africa situation
 - briefings on, 423, 1052
 - statements on, 238
 - establishment, 183
 - Guinea-Bissau situation
 - briefings on, 239
 - statements on, 239
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 105, 106, 107
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 38
 - President, decisions recorded in notes, 153, 154
- Ad hoc working groups,** 182
- Admission of new Member States**
- abstention, 139
 - adoption of resolutions or decisions without vote, 144
 - applications recommended by Security Council, 256
 - discussion of question in Security Council, 256
 - General Assembly, practice in relation to recommendations by Security Council, 223
 - pending applications, 257
 - practices relating to applicability of Article 4 of Charter, 261
 - presentation of applications, 260
 - President, decisions announced in statements, 144, 145, 148, 149
 - procedures within Security Council, 260
 - referral of applications to Committee on the Admission of New Members, 260
 - Resolution 1290 (2000), 139, 258
 - Resolution 1326 (2000), 144, 258
 - Resolution 1414 (2002), 144, 259, 1025
 - Resolution 1426 (2002), 144, 259
 - Switzerland, 45, 256, 259
 - Timor-Leste, 45, 256, 259, 1025, 1163
 - Tuvalu, 45, 256, 257, 258, 261
 - Yugoslavia, 45, 256, 258
- Afghanistan**
- Afghanistan situation
 - briefings on, 519, 523
 - letter dated 14 September 2001, 848, 850
 - letter dated 19 December 2001, 518
 - letter dated 10 October 2003, 533
 - letter regarding, 521
 - statements on, 512, 513, 515, 518, 522, 524, 526, 532, 924
 - terrorism, letter dated 14 September 2001, 738
- Afghanistan situation**
- abstention, 139
 - Afghanistan
 - briefings by, 519, 523
 - letter dated 14 September 2001, 848, 850
 - letter dated 19 December 2001, 518
 - letter dated 10 October 2003, 533
 - letter regarding, 521
 - statements by, 512, 513, 515, 518, 522, 524, 526, 532, 924
 - Angola, statements by, 924
 - Argentina, statements by, 512, 972
 - Asia and the Pacific Division of the Department of Political Affairs, briefings by, 511
 - Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 528, 530
 - Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, statements by, 522
 - Australia
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements by, 522
 - Belgium, letter dated 20 November 2001, 1008

- Bulgaria, statements by, 522
- Canada
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements by, 512, 522, 951
- Chile
 - letter dated 16 November 2001, 1008
 - statements by, 972
- China, statements by, 514, 515, 951, 952, 971
- Colombia, statements by, 968
- Deputy Secretary-General, briefings by, 521
- determinations of threats to the peace, 921, 924
- domestic affairs, non-intervention in, 1030
- Egypt, statements by, 1007
- European Union, letter dated 8 and 17 October 2001, 1007
- food and security and, 822
- France
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements by, 512, 513, 517, 521, 532, 533, 924, 952
- Germany
 - briefings by, 529
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements by, 529, 532, 972
- India, statements by, 526, 924
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 69, 76, 78, 85, 89, 94, 98, 105, 111, 113, 116, 118, 121, 122, 125, 127, 131, 132, 525, 527, 528, 530
- Iran, statements by, 515, 517, 522, 524, 526, 532, 924, 972
- Italy, statements by, 517, 972
- Japan
 - briefings by, 529
 - statements by, 529
- Kazakhstan, statements by, 532, 972
- Malaysia, statements by, 513, 517, 951, 1008
- Mali, statements by, 952
- Mauritius, statements by, 952
- measures involving use of armed force, 969, 971, 984
- measures not involving use of armed force, 942, 951
- NATO, letter dated 2 and 6 October 2003, 533
- Netherlands
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements by, 951, 971
- new Security Council action, 42
- New Zealand
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements by, 522
- Norway, statements by, 517, 971, 1007
- obligations of Member States, 995, 996, 997, 999
- pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 873, 888
- Pakistan, statements by, 515, 517, 522, 526, 952, 972
- Poland, letter regarding, 1007
- President
 - decisions announced in statements, 145, 150
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 157, 158, 160, 161
 - decisions recorded in notes, 153
 - statements by, 512, 532, 873, 888, 921, 940, 1030
- provisional measures, 940
- regional arrangements, 1077, 1078
- Resolution 1333 (2000), 139, 514, 888, 921, 924, 941, 942, 951, 1077
- Resolution 1363 (2001), 516, 943
- Resolution 1378 (2001), 518, 889
- Resolution 1383 (2001), 518, 873, 889
- Resolution 1386 (2001), 519, 969, 984, 997, 999, 1042, 1078
- Resolution 1388 (2002), 519, 943
- Resolution 1390 (2002), 519, 943, 1077
- Resolution 1401 (2002), 522, 889
- Resolution 1413 (2002), 524, 1078
- Resolution 1419 (2002), 525
- Resolution 1444 (2002), 527, 1078
- Resolution 1453 (2002), 528, 873
- Resolution 1471 (2003), 530
- Resolution 1510 (2003), 143, 533, 1078, 1079
- Russian Federation
 - letter regarding, 521
 - statements by, 512, 514, 515, 517, 522, 524, 526, 532, 952
- sanctions, 943
- Secretary-General
 - briefings by, 516, 520
 - letter dated 21 May 2001, 514, 516
 - letter dated 5 December 2001, 518
 - letter dated 25 November 2002, 527
 - letter dated 7 October 2003, 533, 1078
 - letter dated 13 October 2003, 533
 - relations of Security Council with, 247
 - reports by, 511, 512, 520, 521, 522, 525, 529, 530, 889
- Security Council Committees
 - briefings by, 515

- letter dated 4 April 2000, 511
 reports by, 514, 952
 statements by, 516
 Security Council Missions, 11, 122, 832, 835, 857
 self-defence, 1007
 Singapore, statements by, 524, 952, 968, 1016
 Spain, statements by, 522
 Special Representative of the Secretary-General
 for Afghanistan
 briefings by, 516, 520, 525, 526, 527, 528, 530
 statements by, 971
 Tunisia, statements by, 952
 Turkey
 letter dated 21 October 2002, 527
 statements by, 524
 Ukraine, statements by, 513, 952
 UN Office on Drugs and Crime, briefings by, 531
 Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping
 Operations
 briefings by, 529, 531, 533
 statements by, 529
 Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs,
 briefings by, 520, 523, 524
 United Kingdom
 letter dated 19 December 2001, 518
 letter dated 14 March 2002, 521
 letter regarding, 1007
 statements by, 512, 513, 517, 522, 526, 532
 United States
 letter dated 7 October 2001, 1007
 statements by, 512, 513, 515, 517, 521, 524,
 526, 532, 924, 952, 971
 Uzbekistan, statements by, 952
- Africa Day**
 President, decisions recorded in notes, 153
- Africa situation.** *See also specific country*
- Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention
 and Resolution in Africa
 briefings by, 423, 1052
 statements by, 238
- Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs,
 statements by, 424
- Cameroon, statements by, 1067
- China, statements by, 966
- Colombia, statements by, 966
- Cuba, statements by, 1052
- Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator,
 statements by, 426
- Deputy Secretary-General
 briefings by, 421
 statements by, 420
- ECOSOC
 briefings by, 421
 statements by, 237, 238, 424
- ECOWAS, briefings by, 427
- food and security and, 823
- General Assembly, recommendations to Security
 Council, 219
- Guinea, statements by, 425, 966
- India, statements by, 1052, 1067
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 63, 67,
 78, 108, 113, 114, 115, 116, 234
- Ireland, statements by, 966
- Mauritius
 letter dated 10 January 2002, 420
 statements by, 966
- measures not involving use of armed force, 966
- Mexico, statements by, 966, 1067
- new Security Council action, 43
- Norway, statements by, 966
- Organization of African Unity
 briefings by, 421
 statements by, 424
- pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
 regarding, 888
- President
 decisions announced in statements, 148
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 156, 157,
 158, 160, 162
 decisions recorded in notes, 153
 note dated 1 March 2002, 423
 statements by, 233, 238, 419, 423, 425, 888,
 1066
- regional arrangements, 1066
- Russian Federation, statements by, 1067
- Secretary-General, briefings by, 419, 425
- Security Council Committees, statements by, 426
- Sierra Leone, statements by, 425
- South Africa, statements by, 1067
- Tunisia, statements by, 1067
- UN Development Programme, briefings by, 419,
 427
- Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping
 Operations, statements by, 426
- Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs,
 briefings by, 427
- United Kingdom, letter dated 15 July 2002, 426
- United States, statements by, 426
- World Bank, briefings by, 419

African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 51

African Union. *See also* Organization of African Unity (OAU)

Central African region, statements on, 452, 465, 903

Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 360
regional organizations, statements on, 827
small arms, briefings on, 788

Agenda

adoption of
generally, 28
phrasing of items, 29
postponement of consideration of items, 29
scope of items in relation to scope of discussion, 28
Canada, statements by, 28
Colombia, statements by, 28
Egypt, statements by, 29
Japan, statements by, 29
matters of which Security Council seized
addition, retention and deletion of items, 31
generally, 30
practice regarding retention and deletion, 31
President, statements by, 27
provisional agenda
circulation of communications, 27
communication of, 27
generally, 27
preparation of, 27
United Kingdom, statements by, 28
Yugoslavia, statements by, 28

Agenda for Peace

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49, 50

AIDS. *See* HIV/AIDS

Albania

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 655, 663, 672
Kosovo situation, statements on, 579, 1026

Albania situation

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 52

Algeria

Central African Republic situation, letter regarding, 412
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 368
Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute
letter dated 12 May 2000, 428

letter dated 19 June 2000, 430

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 978, 1058, 1075

Middle East situation, statements on, 608, 612, 632

Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, letter dated 1 June 2000, 962
post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 710, 711, 1065

Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 980, 988
Western Sahara situation, letters regarding, 273, 274

Al-Qaida and Taliban. *See also* Terrorism

Monitoring Group, reports by, 174
President, decisions recorded in notes, 153
Resolution 1333 (2000), 173, 174, 1080
Resolution 1363 (2001), 174
Resolution 1390 (2002), 174, 943
Resolution 1452 (2002), 943
Resolution 1455 (2003), 173, 174, 943
sanctions, 943
Security Council Committees
establishment, 173
mandate implementation, 173
monitoring and reporting, 173
reports by, 174
special economic problems, 1006

Angola (elected member of Security Council 2003)

Afghanistan situation, statements on, 924
Angola situation, statements on, 297, 299, 303, 305, 308, 311, 313, 315, 954, 1082
Burundi situation, statements on, 331, 1072
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 782
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 363, 379, 394
Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 458
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 664, 679, 976
peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
regional organizations, statements on, 1064
Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 508

Angola situation

Angola, statements by, 297, 299, 303, 305, 308, 311, 313, 315, 954, 1082
Argentina, statements by, 302, 307
assistance from Member States, 1041
Bangladesh, statements by, 953, 1082
Belgium
letter regarding, 302
statements by, 300, 303, 953
Brazil, statements by, 953

- Bulgaria
notes verbales regarding, 302
statements by, 300, 303, 953
- Burkina Faso
letter regarding, 302
statements by, 300, 303, 308
- Canada, statements by, 303, 307, 311, 954
- Cape Verde, statements by, 954
- China, statements by, 299
- Colombia, statements by, 307, 313, 953
determinations of threats to the peace, 919
- European Union, statements on behalf of, 953
- France, statements by, 299, 307, 953
- Gabon
letter regarding, 302
statements by, 303
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 63, 67, 68, 73, 79, 90, 94, 98, 105, 106, 107, 111, 112, 301
- Ireland, statements by, 309, 311
- Jamaica, statements by, 299, 303
- Malawi, statements by, 311, 953
- Malaysia, statements by, 298, 302
- Mali, statements by, 307, 953
matters of which Security Council seized, 38
- Mauritius, statements by, 307, 311, 953, 954
- measures not involving use of armed force, 944, 952
- Monitoring Mechanism on Sanctions against UNITA, reports by, 306, 308, 310, 317, 952, 1082
- Morocco, statements by, 299
- Mozambique, statements by, 307, 953
- Namibia, statements by, 297, 299, 311, 954
- Netherlands, statements by, 297, 298, 302
- new Security Council action, 41
- Norway, statements by, 307, 313
- obligations of Member States, 995
- peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 861, 864, 882
- Panel of Experts, reports by, 170, 297, 298
- Portugal
letter dated 26 April 2002, 315
letter regarding, 302
statements by, 313
- President
decisions announced in statements, 147, 148
decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159
decisions recorded in notes, 152
notes regarding, 306, 308
statements by, 309, 311, 313, 864, 865, 882, 1041
- Resolution 1294 (2000), 301, 882
- Resolution 1295 (2000), 167, 170, 304, 919, 944, 1001, 1041, 1082
- Resolution 1336 (2001), 306
- Resolution 1348 (2001), 309
- Resolution 1374 (2001), 310
- Resolution 1404 (2002), 314
- Resolution 1412 (2002), 315, 865, 944
- Resolution 1432 (2002), 316
- Resolution 1433 (2002), 317, 865, 883
- Resolution 1439 (2002), 317, 944
- Resolution 1448 (2002), 171, 318, 944
- Russian Federation, letter dated 26 April 2002, 315
- Rwanda
letter regarding, 302
statements by, 300, 304, 308
- sanctions, 944
- Secretary-General
relations of Security Council with, 247
reports by, 296, 301, 304, 316, 318
- Security Council Committees
briefings by, 296, 298, 306
establishment, 170
letter dated 21 December 2000, 306
letter dated 12 October 2001, 310
letter dated 14 October 2002, 317
letter dated 10 March 2000, 297, 301
mandate implementation, 170
monitoring and reporting, 170
statements by, 301, 302
termination of mandate, 171, 211
- Singapore, statements by, 311
- South Africa, statements by, 299
- special economic problems, 1001
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Angola, briefings by, 318
- Togo
letter regarding, 302
statements by, 300, 303, 308, 953
- Tunisia, statements by, 299, 954
- Uganda
letter regarding, 298, 302
statements by, 300
- Ukraine, statements by, 303, 311, 953, 954, 1082
- Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa

- briefings by, 310, 312, 314, 953, 954
- statements by, 305
- Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief, briefings by, 315
- Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 296
- United Kingdom, statements by, 297, 298, 302
- United States
 - letter dated 26 April 2002, 315
 - statements by, 306, 312
- Zimbabwe, statements by, 304, 311
- Anniversary of 11 September 2001**
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 37
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 149
 - statements by, 37, 764
 - Secretary-General, statements by, 764
 - United States, statements by, 764
- Argentina (elected member of Security Council 2000)**
 - Afghanistan situation, statements on, 512, 972
 - Angola situation, statements on, 302, 307
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 365, 373, 1008, 1033
 - ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 721, 723
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, statements on, 432
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 438, 439, 440
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 65
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 643, 671, 975, 1038
 - no exit without strategy, statements on, 809
 - prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 896, 898
 - Rwanda situation, statements on, 320
 - sanctions, statements on, 963
 - Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 337, 339, 960, 982, 989
 - Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 471, 475
 - troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with
 - letter regarding, 812
 - statements on, 810, 993
 - Western Sahara situation, statements on, 272
- Armenia**
 - pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 1016
- Asia and the Pacific Division of the Department of Political Affairs**
 - Afghanistan situation, briefings on, 511
- Assessments of work of Security Council**
 - generally, 14
 - Military Staff Committee, relations of Security Council with other UN organs, 251
- Assistance from Member States**
 - Angola situation, 1041
 - Article 41, under, 1041
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 1040
 - generally, 1040
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1041
 - Liberia situation, 1041
 - multinational forces, 1042
 - peacekeeping operations, 1042
 - regional arrangements, 1042
 - Somalia situation, 1041
- Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women**
 - women and peace and security, briefings on, 802, 804
- Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations**
 - Afghanistan situation, briefings on, 528, 530
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, briefings on, 543, 552
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, briefings on, 386
 - Kosovo situation, briefings on, 566, 568, 576, 577, 580, 583, 584, 586
 - Sierra Leone situation, briefings on, 337
 - Tajikistan situation, briefings on, 509
 - Timor-Leste situation
 - briefings on, 469, 470, 471, 474, 476, 486, 488, 492, 501, 504
 - statements on, 472, 487
- Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs**
 - Afghanistan situation, statements on, 522
 - Africa situation, statements on, 424
 - Bougainville situation, briefings on, 536, 538
 - Central African region, briefings on, 451, 463, 902
 - Guinea situation, briefings on, 447
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, briefings on, 442
 - Middle East situation
 - briefings on, 630
 - statements on, 1014
 - sanctions, statements on, 799, 800, 965
 - West Africa region, briefings on, 449

Australia

- Afghanistan situation
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements on, 522
- Bougainville situation, statements on, 537, 538
- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773
- conduct of business, statements on, 18
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 655, 663, 927, 1039
- Middle East situation, statements on, 632
- sanctions, statements on, 963, 964
- terrorism, statements on, 746
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 473, 474, 477, 490, 502, 504, 505, 508
- women and peace and security, statements on, 936

Austria

- children and armed conflict, statements on, 734
- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 911

Azerbaijan

- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 781, 782
- terrorism, letter dated 25 September 2001, 738

Bahrain

- Middle East situation
 - letter dated 11 June 2002, 625, 852
 - statements on, 930
- terrorism, statements on, 757

Bangladesh (elected member of Security Council 2000-2001)

- Angola situation, statements on, 953, 1082
- children and armed conflict, statements on, 966
- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 368, 376, 380, 385, 394, 954, 972
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 723, 724, 990
- Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 438
- Liberia situation, statements on, 277
- Middle East situation, statements on, 613, 616, 622
- no exit without strategy, statements on, 808
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 981, 988
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 469, 476, 487
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 992

- women and peace and security, statements on, 803

Belarus

- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 967
- humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 713, 933
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 958
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 908
- Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 590

Belgium

- Afghanistan situation, letter dated 20 November 2001, 1008
- Angola situation
 - letter regarding, 302
 - statements on, 300, 303, 953
- Burundi situation, letter dated 15 October 2001, 325
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 - letter dated 17 August 2001, 386
 - statements on, 389, 393, 402, 955
 - letter dated 5 March 1992, deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 48
- Liberia situation, statements on, 278
- Middle East situation, letter dated 8 and 10 August 2001, 614

Benin

- small arms, statements on, 790

Bihac

- deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49

BONUCA. See UN Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic (BONUCA)**Bosnia and Herzegovina**

- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation
 - briefings on, 558
 - letter dated 6 February 2001, 849, 855
 - statements on, 543, 547, 548, 549, 553, 557
- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 697, 700

Bosnia and Herzegovina situation

- abstention, 139, 140
- Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 543, 552
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
 - briefings by, 558
 - letter dated 6 February 2001, 849, 855
 - statements by, 543, 547, 548, 549, 553, 557
- Brazil, statements by, 1081

- Bulgaria, statements by, 554, 556
- Canada
letter dated 3 July 2002, 555, 1052, 1081
statements by, 544, 546, 556, 1053
- China, statements by, 546
- Croatia, statements by, 549
- determinations of threats to the peace, 922, 924
- draft resolutions, 141, 554
- European Union, statements on behalf of, 553
- Fiji, statements by, 1053
- France, statements by, 544, 552, 555, 557, 560
- Germany, statements by, 560
- High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina
briefings by, 547, 549, 551, 552, 558, 559
reports by, 544, 547, 551, 552, 557, 559
- India, statements by, 557
- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, briefings by, 560
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 69, 75, 81, 87, 90, 92, 97, 101, 111, 115, 116, 130, 546, 550, 553, 555, 557, 559
- Iran, statements by, 556, 1053, 1054
- Jordan, statements by, 556, 1053, 1054
- Liechtenstein, statements by, 1054
- measures involving use of armed force, 969, 984
- Mongolia, statements by, 1053, 1081
- Netherlands, statements by, 543, 548
- new Security Council action, 41
- New Zealand, statements by, 1053, 1054
- Nigeria, statements by, 1054
- obligations of Member States, 998, 1000, 1081
- pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 875, 890
- Pakistan, statements by, 1054
- Portugal
letter dated 23 May 2000, 544
letter dated 14 June 2000, 545
- President
decisions announced in statements, 146, 149
decisions recorded in letters, 154, 159
statements by, 544, 545, 546, 549, 559, 891
- provisional measures, 941
- regional arrangements, 1074
- Resolution 1305 (2000), 139, 201, 545, 875, 890, 922, 941, 969, 984, 998, 1000
- Resolution 1357 (2001), 201, 550
- Resolution 1396 (2002), 553
- Resolution 1418 (2002), 201, 553
- Resolution 1420 (2002), 201, 555
- Resolution 1421 (2002), 201, 555
- Resolution 1422 (2002), 201
- Resolution 1423 (2002), 201, 557, 1074
- Resolution 1491 (2003), 559, 1074
- Russian Federation, statements by, 543, 545, 546, 547, 551, 552, 558, 560, 1074
- Secretary-General
briefings by, 558
letter dated 4 May 2000, 544
letter dated 18 October 2000, 547
letter dated 14 September 2001, 551
letter dated 26 February 2002, 552
letter dated 18 October 2002, 557
letter dated 25 September 2003, 559
reports by, 543, 544, 545, 548, 550, 551, 553, 554, 555, 558
statements by, 552, 554
- Singapore, statements by, 1081
- South Africa, statements by, 1053, 1054
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of UN Operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina
briefings by, 544, 548, 550, 553, 558
statements by, 550, 1074
- Sweden, letter dated 26 February and 8 March 2001, 549
- Ukraine, statements by, 1081
- Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 546, 547
- United Kingdom, statements by, 546, 560, 1074
- United States, statements by, 546, 548, 554, 556, 924, 1053, 1081, 1082
- veto of draft resolutions, 554
- voting, non-procedural matters, 137
- Yugoslavia, statements by, 547, 550
- Bougainville situation**
Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 536, 538
- Australia, statements by, 537, 538
- Cameroon, statements by, 536
- Germany, statements by, 537
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 71, 82, 86, 113, 119, 122, 539
- matters of which Security Council seized, 33
- Mexico, statements by, 538
- new Security Council action, 44
- New Zealand, statements by, 538
- pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 875, 890

- Papua New Guinea, statements by, 536, 538
- President
 decisions announced in statements, 145
 decisions recorded in letters, 157, 158, 160, 162
 letter dated 23 December 2003, 890
 statements by, 33, 539, 875
- Secretary-General, reports by, 536
- Singapore, statements by, 536
- Solomon Islands, letter dated 10 November 2000, 33, 71, 145, 539, 875
- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 537
- Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 534
- United Kingdom, statements by, 536
- United States, statements by, 535, 537
- Brazil**
 Angola situation, statements on, 953
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1081
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 725
 humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 933, 1048
 invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 66
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 958
 Middle East situation, statements on, 931, 1013
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 910, 912
 small arms, statements on, 968, 1051
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 477
- Briefings.** *See also specific entity or situation generally,* 840
- Bulgaria (elected member of Security Council 2002-2003)**
 Afghanistan situation, statements on, 522
 Angola situation
 notes verbales regarding, 302
 statements on, 300, 303, 953
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 554, 556
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 776, 778
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 955
 food and security, statements on, 823, 824, 825
 Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 660, 664, 668, 958, 1003, 1004
 Kosovo situation, statements on, 581, 584
 Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 334
 Middle East situation, statements on, 630, 632, 633
 mine action, statements on, 817
 pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 901, 907
 peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
 sanctions, statements on, 800, 801
 terrorism, statements on, 751, 761
- Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery**
 Central African region, briefings on, 452
- Burkina Faso**
 Angola situation
 letter regarding, 302
 statements on, 300, 303, 308
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 779
 Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 347
 small arms, statements on, 790
 terrorism, statements on, 754
- Burundi**
 Burundi situation
 letter dated 14 March 2001, 849, 855
 statements on, 323, 328
 children and armed conflict, statements on, 734
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 letter dated 1 May 2001, 378
 letter dated 13 December 2001, 392
 statements on, 379, 382, 393
 Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 358, 359, 365
 letter dated 11 May 2001, 1016
- Burundi situation**
 Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Burundi, 240
 Angola, statements by, 331, 1072
 Belgium, letter dated 15 October 2001, 325
 Burundi
 letter dated 14 March 2001, 849, 855
 statements by, 323, 328
 Cameroon, statements by, 331
 China, statements by, 331
 Colombia, statements by, 329
 ECOSOC
 briefings by, 240, 331
 letter dated 25 August 2003, 240
 Facilitator of Burundi Peace Process
 briefings by, 322, 324
 statements by, 1071

- France, statements by, 329, 331, 1071
Germany, statements by, 331
Guinea, statements by, 331
investigations and fact-finding, 327
invitations to participate in proceedings, 67, 74,
79, 86, 93, 98, 101, 102, 103, 128, 129, 234,
324, 325, 326, 328, 329, 330
Ireland, statements by, 1071
Malaysia, statements by, 323
Netherlands, statements by, 323
new Security Council action, 42
pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
regarding, 865, 883
President
decisions announced in statements, 145, 146,
147, 148, 150, 151
decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158,
159, 161
statements by, 42, 233, 324, 325, 327, 328,
329, 330, 332, 865, 866, 883, 1071
regional arrangements, 1071
Regional Peace Initiative for Burundi, briefings
by, 327
Resolution 1286 (2000), 323, 865
Resolution 1375 (2001), 143, 326, 883, 1071
Russian Federation, statements by, 323
Secretary-General
briefings by, 322, 324
reports by, 327, 329, 332
self-defence, invocation of right, 1016
South Africa
briefings by, 329, 330
letter dated 25 October 2001, 325
Special Representative of the Secretary-General
for the Great Lakes region, briefings by, 326
Uganda, briefings by, 327
United Kingdom, statements by, 323, 326, 331
United States, statements by, 329
- Cambodia situation**
deleted from matters of which Security Council
seized, 52
- Cameroon (elected member of Security Council
2002-2003)**
Africa situation, statements on, 1067
Bougainville situation, statements on, 536
Burundi situation, statements on, 331
Central African region
letter dated 21 October 2002, 451, 453
statements on, 464, 902
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 408, 955
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 659, 664,
668, 678, 679, 958, 975
justice and rule of law, statements on, 837
Middle East situation, statements on, 622
pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 907
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 894
regional organizations, statements on, 1064
small arms, statements on, 934
terrorism, statements on, 760, 762
Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 499
- Canada (elected member of Security Council 2000)**
Afghanistan situation
letter regarding, 1007
statements on, 512, 522, 951
Agenda, statements on, 28
Angola situation, statements on, 303, 307, 311,
954
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation
letter dated 3 July 2002, 555, 1052, 1081
statements on, 544, 546, 556, 1053
children and armed conflict, statements on, 734
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773,
774, 779, 781, 911, 967, 968
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 363, 365, 368, 372, 373, 402,
972
ensuring effective role of Security Council in
maintenance of peace and security, statements
on, 722, 723, 725, 1062
HIV/AIDS, statements on, 716
humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and
security, statements on, 1047
International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia,
statements on, 702
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 643, 647,
663, 666, 978, 1003, 1055
justice and rule of law, statements on, 839
Middle East situation, statements on, 1012
no exit without strategy, statements on, 808, 809
peacekeeping operations, letter dated 6 June
2003, 813
post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 711
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 1063
refugees, statements on, 768
responsibility of Security Council in maintenance
of peace and security, statements on, 708
Rwanda situation, statements on, 321
sanctions, statements on, 963, 964

- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 341, 348, 349, 960, 980, 988
 small arms, statements on, 787
 Tajikistan situation, statements on, 510
 terrorism, statements on, 744
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 468, 471, 473, 480, 489, 490, 492
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with
 letter regarding, 812
 statements on, 811, 993
- Cape Verde**
 Angola situation, statements on, 954
- Central African region**
 African Union, statements by, 452, 465, 903
 Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 451, 463, 902
 Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, briefings by, 452
 Cameroon
 letter dated 21 October 2002, 451, 453
 statements by, 464, 902
 Chad, letter dated 29 November 2002, 38, 83, 453, 852
 Chile, statements by, 465, 903
 Congo, Democratic Republic of, statements by, 465, 833, 903
 determinations of threats to the peace, 936
 ECCAS, statements by, 465, 903
 ECOSOC, briefings by, 452
 Egypt, statements by, 1065
 Equatorial Guinea, statements by, 465, 903
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 452
 France
 briefings by, 832
 statements by, 464, 902
 Germany, statements by, 464, 903
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 82, 83, 88, 105, 114, 115, 116, 119, 122, 129, 234
 Japan, statements by, 452
 matters of which Security Council seized, 37, 38, 40
 Mauritius, statements by, 1065
 Mexico
 briefings by, 834
 statements by, 1065
 pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 861
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 149
 statements by, 11, 37, 453, 835
 referral of disputes to Security Council, 852
 regional arrangements, 1065
 Russian Federation, statements by, 465, 903, 936, 1065
 Rwanda, statements by, 833
 Secretary-General
 letter dated 10 November 2003, 463
 reports by, 463
 Security Council Missions, 11, 122, 831, 832, 857, 902
 Spain, statements by, 464, 903
 Tanzania, statements by, 833
 United Kingdom
 briefings by, 834
 statements by, 464, 903
 United States, statements by, 452, 465, 903
 World Bank, briefings by, 451
- Central African Republic**
 Central African Republic situation, statements on, 414
- Central African Republic situation**
 Algeria, letter regarding, 412
 Central African Republic, statements by, 414
 France, statements by, 417
 International Organization of la Francophonie, statements by, 414
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 72, 82, 97, 100, 101, 417, 418
 Jamaica, statements by, 416
 new Security Council action, 43
 Organization of African Unity, letter regarding, 412
 pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 883
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 144, 146, 147, 149
 decisions recorded in letters, 155, 159, 161
 statements by, 413, 414, 415, 417, 418, 883
 Regional Bureau for Africa, briefings by, 414
 Russian Federation, statements by, 417
 Secretary-General, reports by, 412, 413, 414, 415
 Singapore, statements by, 417
 Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Central African Republic, briefings by, 413, 416
 United Kingdom, statements by, 417
 United States, statements by, 417
 World Bank, briefings by, 414, 416

Central America situation

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 52

Chad

Central African region, letter dated 29 November 2002, 38, 83, 453, 852

Chad-Libya dispute

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 48

Children and armed conflict

Austria, statements by, 734
Bangladesh, statements by, 966
Burundi, statements by, 734
Canada, statements by, 734
Colombia, statements by, 728
Congo, Democratic Republic of, statements by, 734
Costa Rica, statements by, 906, 911
Deputy Secretary-General, briefings by, 726
determinations of threats to the peace, 923, 932
France, statements by, 932, 966
India, statements by, 728, 932
Indonesia, statements by, 967
invitations to participate in proceedings, 62, 70, 76, 83, 90, 91, 93, 98, 100, 111, 114, 117, 125, 128
Iraq, statements by, 728, 966, 967
Japan, statements by, 733
Korea, Republic of, statements by, 967
Malaysia, statements by, 966, 967
measures not involving use of armed force, 950, 966
Mexico, statements by, 734
Myanmar, statements by, 734
new Security Council action, 44
Pakistan, statements by, 734
President
decisions announced in statements, 148
statements by, 731, 732
Resolution 1314 (2000), 728, 923, 950, 1046
Resolution 1379 (2001), 250, 731, 911, 1046
Resolution 1460 (2003), 44, 735
Russian Federation, statements by, 734, 735
Secretary-General
briefings by, 730, 731, 733
relations of Security Council with, 250
reports by, 125, 128, 726, 728, 729, 731, 732, 735, 911, 932
South Africa, statements by, 730

Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children in Armed Conflict
briefings by, 727, 730, 731, 733, 747
statements by, 966

Tunisia, statements by, 966

Ukraine, statements by, 966

UNICEF, briefings by, 727, 730, 732, 733, 741

United Kingdom, statements by, 730, 733, 734

Chile (elected member of Security Council 2003)

Afghanistan situation
letter dated 16 November 2001, 1008
statements on, 972
Central African region, statements on, 465, 903
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 935, 968
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 973
Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 458
Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441, 443
HIV/AIDS, statements on, 720
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 664, 667, 974
Middle East situation, statements on, 930
regional organizations, statements on, 828, 1064
sanctions, statements on, 801, 965
small arms, statements on, 785
terrorism, statements on, 747, 760, 765

China (permanent member of Security Council)

Afghanistan situation, statements on, 514, 515, 951, 952, 971
Africa situation, statements on, 966
Angola situation, statements on, 299
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 546
Burundi situation, statements on, 331
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 770, 934, 967, 1044
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 363, 375, 380, 385, 388, 389, 393, 955, 973
Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 458
ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 721, 1061
Guinea situation, statements on, 445
humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 713, 1048
International Tribunal for Rwanda, statements on, 697
International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 693, 695, 697

- invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 64
- Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 690
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 638, 641, 642, 643, 647, 653, 657, 658, 667, 681, 976, 977, 979
- Kosovo situation, statements on, 565, 566, 567, 570, 1026
- Liberia situation, statements on, 277
- Middle East situation, statements on, 610, 633
- no exit without strategy, statements on, 993
- pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 901
- peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 792, 896, 898, 904
- protection of UN personnel, statements on, 795
- regional organizations, statements on, 828
- responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 708
- sanctions, statements on, 800, 801, 963
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339, 341, 349, 981
- small arms, statements on, 784, 787
- Somalia situation, statements on, 286
- terrorism
 - letter dated 27 September 2001, 738
 - statements on, 737, 740, 749, 761
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 468, 471, 481, 485
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 811
- Tuvalu, admission of, statements on, 261
- Western Sahara situation, statements on, 271
- Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 588, 590
- Civilian police in peacekeeping operations**
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 53
- Civilians in armed conflict**
 - Angola, statements by, 782
 - Australia, statements by, 773
 - Austria, statements by, 911
 - Azerbaijan, statements by, 781, 782
 - Bangladesh, statements by, 773
 - Bulgaria, statements by, 776, 778
 - Burkina Faso, statements by, 779
 - Canada, statements by, 773, 774, 779, 781, 911, 967, 968
 - Chile, statements by, 935, 968
 - China, statements by, 770, 934, 967, 1044
 - Colombia, statements by, 934
 - Deputy Secretary-General
 - briefings by, 771, 934
 - statements by, 906
 - determinations of threats to the peace, 923, 934
 - domestic affairs, non-intervention in, 1044
 - Egypt, statements by, 779, 781, 782, 905, 1044
 - European Union, statements on behalf of, 782, 905
 - France, statements by, 1051
 - generally, 1051
 - Germany, statements by, 968
 - Guinea, statements by, 776
 - High Commissioner for Refugees, briefings by, 772, 906
 - India, statements by, 772, 773
 - Indonesia, statements by, 773, 906
 - International Committee of the Red Cross, briefings by, 769, 778
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 75, 83, 88, 94, 99, 100, 101, 112, 117, 127
 - Iraq, statements by, 967
 - Ireland, statements by, 774, 776, 779
 - Jamaica, statements by, 770, 773, 774, 967
 - Japan, statements by, 782
 - Jordan, statements by, 773
 - Korea, Republic of, statements by, 967
 - measures not involving use of armed force, 967
 - Mexico, statements by, 780, 910
 - Netherlands, statements by, 770
 - new Security Council action, 45
 - Norway, statements by, 774, 781
 - Pakistan, statements by, 773, 780, 967
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 148, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 157
 - letter dated 14 February 2001, 227
 - letter dated 21 June 2001, 774
 - statements by, 771, 776, 779, 782, 1052
 - Resolution 1296 (2000), 227, 770, 923, 934, 1044, 1046
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 782, 911, 934, 935, 1052
 - Secretary-General
 - briefings by, 769, 777
 - reports by, 768, 771, 776, 779, 905, 906, 910
 - Sierra Leone, statements by, 782, 967
 - Singapore, statements by, 773, 774, 775, 776, 779
 - Switzerland, statements by, 967
 - Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 1052

- Tunisia, statements by, 1044
Ukraine, statements by, 906
Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator briefings by, 772, 774, 775, 777, 780, 781
statements by, 776
United Kingdom, statements by, 770, 776, 779, 780, 906, 911
United States, statements by, 770, 776, 1052
Yemen, statements by, 934
- Colombia (elected member of Security Council 2001-2002)**
Afghanistan situation, statements on, 968
Africa situation, statements on, 966
Agenda, statements on, 28
Angola situation, statements on, 307, 313, 953
Burundi situation, statements on, 329
children and armed conflict, statements on, 728
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 934
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 389, 954, 955
Guinea situation, statements on, 445
humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 1048
invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 66
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 974, 979
post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 1050, 1062
reports by Secretary-General, statements on, 224
Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 348
small arms, letter dated 25 July 2001, 783, 785, 935
Somalia situation, statements on, 291
terrorism, statements on, 737, 741, 744, 749, 752, 760, 761
Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 484, 491, 493
troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 251, 994
- Combating terrorism**
General Assembly, recommendations to Security Council, 221
invitations to participate in proceedings, 120
matters of which Security Council seized, 38
President, statements by, 1079
Resolution 1373 (2001), 180, 181, 1079
Resolution 1377 (2001), 181, 1080
Resolution 1456 (2003), 181
Security Council Committees
composition, 181
establishment, 180
letter dated 14 February 2003, 181
mandate implementation, 181
reports by, 181
- Committee on the Admission of New Members, 260**
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People
Middle East situation
letter dated 24 March 2000, 229
letter dated 2 October 2000, 229
letter dated 7 March 2001, 229
letter dated 24 March 2001, 229
letter dated 5 April 2001, 229
letter dated 19 April 2001, 230
letter dated 22 August 2001, 230
letter dated 28 September 2001, 230
letter dated 23 October 2001, 230
letter dated 4 December 2001, 230
letter dated 5 March 2002, 230
letter dated 23 April 2002, 230
letter dated 14 August 2002, 230
letter dated 21 April 2003, 231
letter dated 17 July 2003, 231
statements on, 627
relations of Security Council with, 227
- Committees.** *See specific entity or situation*
- Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries**
Guinea-Bissau situation
briefings on, 442
statements on, 440
- Conduct of business**
Australia, statements by, 18
Mali, statements by, 17
Mauritius, statements by, 17
President, statements by, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21
provisional rules of procedure regarding application of Rules 27–36, 16
generally, 15
Singapore, statements by, 16, 17, 18
Ukraine, statements by, 17
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation**
Algeria, statements by, 368
Angola, statements by, 363, 379, 394
Argentina, statements by, 365, 373, 1008, 1033
assistance from Member States, 1040
Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 386
Bangladesh, statements by, 368, 376, 380, 385, 394, 954, 972

- Belgium
 letter dated 17 August 2001, 386
 statements by, 389, 393, 402, 955
- Bulgaria, statements by, 955
- Burundi
 letter dated 1 May 2001, 378
 letter dated 13 December 2001, 392
 statements by, 379, 382, 393
- Cameroon, statements by, 408, 955
- Canada, statements by, 363, 365, 368, 372, 373, 402, 972
- Chile, statements by, 973
- China, statements by, 363, 375, 380, 385, 388, 389, 393, 955, 973
- Colombia, statements by, 389, 954, 955
- Congo, Democratic Republic of
 briefings by, 375
 letter dated 28 January and 11 February 2000, 364
 letter dated 26 April 2000, 178
 letter dated 1 June 2000, 178
 letter dated 13 July 2001, 1035
 letter dated 18 July 2001, 1009
 letter dated 1 August 2001, 386, 849, 853, 855
 letter dated 23 October 2001, 388
 letter dated 3 December 2001, 392
 letter dated 5 December 2001, 392
 letter dated 6 December 2001, 392
 letter dated 25 February 2002, 1009
 letter dated 28 February 2002, 1009
 letter dated 18 March 2002, 395, 849, 853, 855, 1009
 statements by, 362, 363, 365, 368, 370, 374, 379, 382, 383, 384, 385, 388, 393, 394, 398, 400, 405, 409, 410, 1008, 1009, 1032, 1035, 1036
 determinations of threats to the peace, 919
- Egypt, statements by, 382
- Emergency Relief Coordinator
 briefings by, 372
 statements by, 373
- European Union
 briefings by, 409
 statements on behalf of, 382, 390, 973
- force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032
- France, statements by, 365, 373, 375, 379, 386, 387, 388, 389, 402, 973
- Germany, statements by, 408, 409, 956
- High Commissioner for Human Rights
 briefings by, 404, 407
 reports by, 405
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 67, 73, 77, 83, 89, 93, 94, 98, 101, 102, 103, 126, 127, 130, 132, 395, 396, 397, 399, 406, 411, 412
- Ireland, statements by, 383, 393, 402, 954
- Italy, letter dated 14 July 2003, 408
- Jamaica, statements by, 368, 393, 954
- Japan, statements by, 410, 955, 973
- Malaysia, statements by, 368
- Mali, statements by, 373, 375, 382
- Mauritius, statements by, 375, 382, 394, 402
- measures involving use of armed force, 970, 972, 985
- measures not involving use of armed force, 944, 954
- Mexico, statements by, 405, 973
- Mozambique, statements by, 388, 972
- Namibia, statements by, 365, 368, 373, 379, 380, 383, 386, 388, 394, 972, 1032
- Nepal, statements by, 974
- Netherlands, statements by, 365
- new Security Council action, 43
- Nigeria, statements by, 393, 394, 954
- Norway, statements by, 402
- obligations of Member States, 995, 997, 1000
- Organization of African Unity, statements by, 362, 1033
- peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions
 regarding, 861, 866, 884
- Pakistan, statements by, 368, 956, 973
- Panel of Experts
 briefings by, 379, 392, 400
 establishment, 178
 mandate implementation, 178
 reports by, 180, 378, 391, 399, 412, 954, 955
 statements by, 402
 termination of mandate, 180
- Philippines, statements by, 973
- Political Committee on the Implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement
 briefings by, 377
 statements by, 369, 370, 377, 390
- President
 decisions announced in statements, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160
 decisions recorded in notes, 153
 letter dated 24 April 2000, 178
 letter dated 12 July 2002, 179

- statements by, 29, 43, 178, 179, 180, 364, 366, 368, 369, 371, 375, 376, 380, 385, 387, 389, 390, 394, 395, 396, 397, 399, 406, 412, 857, 867, 884, 1030, 1035, 1037, 1072
 - provisional measures, 938
 - regional arrangements, 1072
 - Resolution 1291 (2000), 178, 366, 866, 884, 919, 938, 970, 985, 1034, 1046
 - Resolution 1304 (2000), 370, 866, 920, 938, 1030, 1034, 1046
 - Resolution 1316 (2000), 371
 - Resolution 1323 (2000), 372
 - Resolution 1332 (2000), 192, 374, 866, 985, 1034, 1072
 - Resolution 1341 (2001), 377, 938, 1046
 - Resolution 1355 (2001), 10, 383, 938, 985, 1046
 - Resolution 1376 (2001), 391, 1036
 - Resolution 1399 (2002), 396, 939
 - Resolution 1417 (2002), 397, 985, 1036
 - Resolution 1445 (2002), 403, 867, 885, 939, 1037
 - Resolution 1457 (2003), 179, 403
 - Resolution 1468 (2003), 405, 861, 939, 1031
 - Resolution 1484 (2003), 406, 856, 920, 970, 997, 1000, 1038
 - Resolution 1489 (2003), 407
 - Resolution 1493 (2003), 410, 939, 944, 970, 985, 1032
 - Resolution 1499 (2003), 180, 411
 - Resolution 1501 (2003), 411, 1042
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 362, 365, 368, 373, 376, 383, 384, 389, 394, 402, 955, 973, 1033
 - Rwanda
 - letter dated 13 December 2000, 374
 - letter dated 18 February 2001, 376
 - letter dated 24 April 2001, 378
 - letter dated 1 May 2001, 378
 - letter dated 19 July 2001, 1035
 - letter dated 1 August 2001, 386
 - letter dated 8 August 2001, 386
 - letter dated 23 November and 7 December 2001, 392
 - letter dated 10 December 2001, 392
 - letter dated 18 March 2002, 395
 - letter dated 15 April 2002, 1009
 - letter dated 23 October 2002, 401
 - letter dated 28 October 2002, 401
 - statements by, 379, 382, 398, 401, 402, 405, 1033, 1036
- Secretary-General
- briefings by, 361, 375, 376, 384, 390, 398, 409, 1032
 - letter dated 31 January 2000, 178
 - letter dated 18 April 2000, 178
 - letter dated 14 August 2000, 371
 - letter dated 12 April 2001, 178, 378, 380
 - letter dated 24 April 2001, 380
 - letter dated 25 June 2001, 179
 - letter dated 10 November 2001, 179, 391, 394
 - letter dated 15 May 2002, 855
 - letter dated 9 July 2002, 179
 - letter dated 15 October 2002, 179, 399, 401, 403, 411
 - letter dated 26 February 2003, 180
 - letter dated 25 June 2003, 407
 - letter dated 14 August 2003, 411
 - letter dated 23 October 2003, 411
 - relations of Security Council with, 246, 247
 - reports by, 364, 366, 371, 374, 376, 377, 380, 383, 387, 389, 395, 396, 403, 405, 406, 410, 985
 - statements by, 410, 1034
- Security Council Missions, 10, 830, 857
- self-defence, 1008
- Singapore, statements by, 383, 385, 386, 388, 402
- South Africa
 - letter dated 9 August 2000, 193
 - letter dated 25 October 2002, 401
 - note verbale dated 31 January 2000, 364
 - statements by, 362, 398, 401, 973
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children in Armed Conflict, briefings by, 381
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, briefings by, 384, 388, 409
- Sudan, letter dated 20 November 2001, 392
- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 401
- Tanzania, statements by, 379
- Tunisia, statements by, 365, 370, 380, 386, 389
- Uganda
 - letter dated 26 January and 3 February 2000, 364
 - letter dated 20 February 2001, 376
 - letter dated 16 April 2001, 378
 - letter dated 14 November 2001, 392
 - letter dated 21 November and 10 December 2001, 392
 - letter dated 25 October 2002, 401

- letter dated 4 November 2002, 401
statements by, 363, 379, 383, 393, 394, 401,
955, 972, 1033
- Ukraine, statements by, 368, 1034
- Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping
Operations, briefings by, 381, 404, 407, 408
- United Kingdom, statements by, 363, 372, 376,
377, 386, 402, 973
- United States, statements by, 365, 369, 372, 373,
375, 384, 385, 387, 393, 394, 955, 1008, 1034
- Zambia, statements by, 362, 393
- Zimbabwe, statements by, 362, 379, 384, 393,
394, 401, 402, 955, 972, 1008, 1032
- Congo (Democratic Republic) — Uganda dispute**
ICJ proceedings, 244
Resolution 1304 (2000), 244
- Congo (Republic) situation**
deleted from matters of which Security Council
seized, 53
- Congo, Democratic Republic of**
Central African region, statements on, 465, 833,
903
children and armed conflict, statements on, 734
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
briefings on, 375
letter dated 28 January and 11 February 2000,
364
letter dated 26 April 2000, 178
letter dated 1 June 2000, 178
letter dated 13 July 2001, 1035
letter dated 18 July 2001, 1009
letter dated 1 August 2001, 386, 849, 853, 855
letter dated 23 October 2001, 388
letter dated 3 December 2001, 392
letter dated 5 December 2001, 392
letter dated 6 December 2001, 392
letter dated 25 February 2002, 1009
letter dated 28 February 2002, 1009
letter dated 18 March 2002, 395, 849, 853,
855, 1009
statements on, 362, 363, 365, 368, 370, 374,
379, 382, 383, 384, 385, 388, 393, 394, 398,
400, 405, 409, 410, 1008, 1009, 1032, 1035,
1036
Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 357,
359
terrorism, statements on, 754
- Constitutional discussion bearing on pacific
settlement of disputes**
generally, 893
prevention of armed conflict, 894
- Convention for the Elimination of Mercenarism in
Africa**, 790
- Convention on the Prohibition of the Use,
Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of
Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their
Destruction**, 818
- Convention on the Rights of the Child**, 730, 733
- Costa Rica**
children and armed conflict, statements on, 906,
911
HIV/AIDS, statements on, 1049
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 904
small arms, statements on, 784, 936, 968
Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 503
- Côte d'Ivoire**
Côte d'Ivoire situation
briefings on, 457
statements on, 456
letter dated 28 April 2003, 1016
small arms, statements on, 790
- Côte d'Ivoire situation**
Angola, statements by, 458
Chile, statements by, 458
China, statements by, 458
Côte d'Ivoire
briefings by, 457
statements by, 456
determinations of threats to the peace, 919
domestic affairs, non-intervention in, 1030
- ECOWAS**
briefings by, 461
letter dated 19 December 2002, 454, 855, 859
statements by, 456, 1068
- France, letter dated 27 January 2003, 454
- Ghana, statements by, 455
- Guinea, statements by, 456
- investigations and fact-finding, 857, 859
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 83, 85,
130, 454, 457, 459, 460, 462
- matters of which Security Council seized, 38
- measures involving use of armed force, 970, 984
- Mexico, statements by, 458
- Nigeria, statements by, 456
- obligations of Member States, 998
- pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
regarding, 866, 884
- President
decisions announced in statements, 150, 151
decisions recorded in letters, 160, 161

- statements by, 38, 454, 455, 459, 462, 860, 884, 937, 1030, 1042, 1068, 1069
 - provisional measures, 937
 - regional arrangements, 1068, 1078
 - Resolution 1464 (2003), 454, 866, 884, 919, 970, 984, 1030, 1060, 1068, 1078, 1079
 - Resolution 1479 (2003), 457, 866, 884, 937, 1068
 - Resolution 1498 (2003), 459, 970, 985, 1078
 - Resolution 1514 (2003), 460, 1069
 - Secretary-General
 - relations of Security Council with, 246
 - reports by, 456, 459
 - statements by, 455, 460
 - self-defence, invocation of right, 1016
 - Counter-Terrorism Committee**
 - briefings by, 742, 745, 748, 750, 756, 758, 760, 762
 - letter dated 2 January 2002, 1057
 - letter dated 15 July 2003, 759
 - letter dated 22 December 2003, 1047
 - President, decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153, 154
 - statements by, 746, 749, 751, 753, 765
 - Croatia**
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 549
 - Croatia situation
 - letter dated 10 January 2000, 561
 - letter dated 5 January 2001, 561
 - letter dated 9 July 2001, 561
 - letter dated 7 January 2002, 561
 - letter dated 10 April 2002, 561
 - letter dated 10 December 2002, 562
 - International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 701
 - post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 710
 - Croatia situation**
 - Croatia
 - letter dated 10 January 2000, 561
 - letter dated 5 January 2001, 561
 - letter dated 9 July 2001, 561
 - letter dated 7 January 2002, 561
 - letter dated 10 April 2002, 561
 - letter dated 10 December 2002, 562
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 67, 75, 113, 560, 562
 - new Security Council action, 42
 - peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 876
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 149
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155
 - statements by, 42, 562, 876
 - Resolution 1285 (2000), 560, 876
 - Resolution 1307 (2000), 560
 - Resolution 1335 (2001), 560, 876
 - Resolution 1362 (2001), 560
 - Resolution 1387 (2002), 560, 876
 - Resolution 1424 (2002), 560, 561
 - Resolution 1437 (2002), 560, 561, 876
 - Secretary-General, reports by, 561, 562
 - Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 562
- Yugoslavia**
 - letter dated 24 December 1999, 561
 - letter dated 22 December 2000, 561
 - letter dated 3 July 2001, 561
 - letter dated 28 December 2001, 561
 - letter dated 10 April 2002, 561
- Cuba**
 - Africa situation, statements on, 1052
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 652, 672, 1011
 - Middle East situation, statements on, 608, 616, 1012
 - sanctions, statements on, 963
 - terrorism, statements on, 757
 - Cuba aircraft incident**
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 52
 - Cyprus**
 - force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, letters on, 1028
 - regional arrangements, letter dated 14 February 2001, 1061
 - Cyprus situation**
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 126
 - new Security Council action, 41
 - peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 861, 876, 891
 - President
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 162
 - statements by, 540, 542
 - Resolution 1303 (2000), 540
 - Resolution 1331 (2000), 540
 - Resolution 1354 (2001), 540

- Resolution 1384 (2001), 540
 Resolution 1416 (2002), 540
 Resolution 1442 (2002), 540
 Resolution 1475 (2003), 542, 876, 891
 Resolution 1486 (2003), 542
 Resolution 1517 (2003), 41, 542
 Russian Federation, statements by, 542
 Secretary-General
 relations of Security Council with, 246
 reports by, 540, 542, 891
 Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on
 Cyprus, briefings by, 541
- Democratic Republic of Congo.** *See* Congo,
 Democratic Republic of
- Denmark**
 no exit without strategy, statements on, 809
- Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator**
 Africa situation, statements on, 426
 Guinea situation, briefings on, 446
- Deputy Secretary-General**
 Afghanistan situation, briefings on, 521
 Africa situation
 briefings on, 421
 statements on, 420
 children and armed conflict, briefings on, 726
 civilians in armed conflict
 briefings on, 771, 934
 statements on, 906
 Iraq humanitarian situation, briefings on, 688
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 651, 1055
 prevention of armed conflict
 reports by, 237
 statements on, 793
 protection of UN personnel, briefings on, 794
 Timor-Leste situation
 briefings on, 503
 statements on, 1025
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening
 cooperation with, briefings on, 810
- Determinations of threats to the peace**
 Afghanistan situation, 921, 924
 Angola situation, 919
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 922, 924
 Central African region, 936
 children and armed conflict, 923, 932
 civilians in armed conflict, 923, 934
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 919
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, 919
 decisions under Article 39, 919
 discussion relating to Article 39, 924
- Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 920
 food and security, 932
 generally, 919
 HIV/AIDS, 923, 931, 932
 humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and
 security, 933
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 922, 925
 justice and rule of law, 932
 Liberia situation, 920
 Macedonia situation, 922
 Middle East situation, 930
 peacekeeping operations, 936
 prevention of armed conflict, 923, 935
 Sierra Leone situation, 921
 small arms, 934, 935
 Somalia situation, 921
 terrorism, 923
 Timor-Leste situation, 922
 women and peace and security, 936
- Djibouti**
 Somalia situation
 briefings on, 287
 statements on, 285
 Sudan situation, letter dated 5 April 2000, 1060
- Domestic affairs, non-intervention in**
 affirmation of principle, 1030
 Afghanistan situation, 1030
 civilians in armed conflict, 1044
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, 1030
 generally, 1043
 humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and
 security, 1044
 Iraq, letter dated 26 May 2001 and 20 December
 2002, 1043
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1045
 Somalia situation, 1030
 Yugoslavia, letter dated 5 October 2000, 1043
- Draft report of Security Council**
 new Security Council action, 46
 President, decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153,
 154
- Draft resolutions**
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 141, 554
 Middle East situation, 142, 212, 222, 611, 613,
 617, 630, 632, 634
- DRC.** *See* Congo, Democratic Republic of
- East Timor situation.** *See* Timor-Leste situation
- ECCAS.** *See* Economic Community of Central African
 States (ECCAS)

Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)

- Africa situation
 - briefings on, 421
 - statements on, 237, 238, 424
- Burundi situation
 - briefings on, 240, 331
 - letter dated 25 August 2003, 240
- Central African region, briefings on, 452
- Guinea-Bissau situation
 - briefings on, 441
 - letter dated 5 February 2003, 239
- relations of Security Council with constitutional discussion, 233
 - generally, 231
 - requests or references, 231

Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS)

- Central African region, statements on, 465, 903

Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)

- Africa situation, briefings on, 427
- Côte d'Ivoire situation
 - briefings on, 461
 - letter dated 19 December 2002, 454, 855, 859
 - statements on, 456, 1068
- Liberia situation
 - briefings on, 283, 959
 - statements on, 1070
- regional organizations, statements on, 827
- small arms, briefings on, 788

ECOSOC. *See* Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)

Egypt

- Afghanistan situation, statements on, 1007
- Agenda, statements on, 29
- Central African region, statements on, 1065
- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 779, 781, 782, 905, 1044
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 382
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 725, 967
- humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 713, 1048
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 - letter dated 17 April 2000, 1003
 - statements on, 957
- Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 1015

maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 1005

Middle East situation

- letter dated 13 December 2001, 854
- Middle East situation, statements on, 607, 609, 612, 617, 628, 858, 1055
- no exit without strategy, statements on, 808, 809
- post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 820, 1050
- protection of UN personnel, statements on, 795
- small arms, statements on, 786, 787
- Somalia situation, statements on, 289
- terrorism, statements on, 753, 1016
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 992
- women and peace and security, statements on, 936

El Salvador

- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 978

Emergency Relief Coordinator

- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 - briefings on, 372
 - statements on, 373

Ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security

- Argentina, statements by, 721, 723
- Bangladesh, statements by, 723, 724, 990
- Belarus, statements by, 967
- Brazil, statements by, 725
- Canada, statements by, 722, 723, 725, 1062
- China, statements by, 721, 1061
- Egypt, statements by, 725, 967
- European Union, statements on behalf of, 725
- France, statements by, 721, 725, 1061, 1062
- investigations and fact-finding, 857
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 74
- Jamaica, statements by, 721, 724
- Japan, statements by, 725
- Malaysia, statements by, 722
- Mali, statements by, 724, 905, 1061
- matters of which Security Council seized, 32, 33
- Mauritius, statements by, 725
- measures involving use of armed force, 987, 990, 991, 993
- measures not involving use of armed force, 967
- Military Staff Committee, relations of Security Council with other UN organs, 250
- Namibia, statements by, 722, 724, 967
- Netherlands, statements by, 721
- Norway, statements by, 725

- President
 decisions announced in statements, 145, 146
 decisions recorded in notes, 152
 statements by, 32, 721, 725
 regional arrangements, 1061
 Resolution 1318 (2000), 722, 987, 990, 1029, 1046, 1060, 1061
 Resolution 1327 (2000), 33, 250, 723, 857, 987, 990, 991, 993
 Russian Federation, statements by, 251, 725, 993
 Secretary-General
 briefings by, 721, 724
 relations of Security Council with, 246
 Singapore, statements by, 725
 Sweden, statements by, 967
 Tunisia, statements by, 723
 Ukraine, letter dated 28 February 2001, 724, 725
 United Kingdom, statements by, 723, 725
 United States, statements by, 722
 Working Group on the Brahimi Report
 letter dated 10 November 2000, 722
 reports by, 722
- Equatorial Guinea**
 Central African region, statements on, 465, 903
- Eritrea**
 Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute
 letter dated 12 May 2000, 428, 1017
 letter dated 19 May 2000, 956
 letter dated 9 June 2000, 1017
 letter dated 20 and 21 July 2000, 430
 letter dated 15 March 2001, 433
 statements on, 431, 436
 Sierra Leone situation, letter dated 10 May 2000, 338, 848, 852
- Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute**
 Algeria
 letter dated 12 May 2000, 428
 letter dated 19 June 2000, 430
 Argentina, statements by, 432
 determinations of threats to the peace, 920
 Eritrea
 letter dated 12 May 2000, 428, 1017
 letter dated 19 May 2000, 956
 letter dated 9 June 2000, 1017
 letter dated 20 and 21 July 2000, 430
 letter dated 15 March 2001, 433
 statements by, 431, 436
 Ethiopia
 letter dated 7 April 2000, 1017, 1047
 letter dated 11 and 12 May 2000, 428
 letter dated 15 May 2000, 429, 956
 letter dated 18 May 2000, 956
 letter dated 2 June 2000, 1017
 letter dated 26 June and 18 July 2000, 430
 letter dated 9 January 2001, 956
 statements by, 431, 436
 force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1031
 Germany, letter dated 13 April 2000, 848
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 76, 81, 109
 measures not involving use of armed force, 944, 956
 new Security Council action, 44
 obligations of Member States, 995, 996
 peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 862, 867, 885
 Portugal, letter dated 12 May 2000, 429
- President**
 decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 148, 150
 decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159
 letter dated 7 July 2000, 194
 statements by, 175, 250, 432, 434, 435, 868, 869, 885, 945
 provisional measures, 939
 regional arrangements, 1073
 Resolution 1297 (2000), 10, 428, 867, 920, 939, 1073
 Resolution 1298 (2000), 166, 174, 211, 248, 429, 920, 940, 944, 1073, 1080
 Resolution 1312 (2000), 430, 867, 945, 1042, 1073
 Resolution 1320 (2000), 431, 867, 885, 945, 1073
 Resolution 1344 (2001), 433, 868
 Resolution 1369 (2001), 434, 868
 Resolution 1398 (2002), 436, 885
 Resolution 1430 (2002), 436
 Resolution 1434 (2002), 437, 868
 Resolution 1466 (2003), 437, 868, 885
 Resolution 1507 (2003), 44, 437, 869
 Russian Federation, statements by, 434, 956
- Secretary-General**
 briefings by, 431
 letter dated 5 and 29 July 2002, 436
 relations of Security Council with, 247
 reports by, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 436, 437
 Security Council Committees
 establishment, 174

- mandate implementation, 175
- monitoring and reporting, 175
- termination of mandate, 175, 211
- Security Council Missions, 10, 11, 428, 435, 830, 831, 857
- self-defence, invocation of right, 1017
- Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 430, 433
- Eritrea-Sudan dispute**
 - self-defence, invocation of right, 1019
 - Sudan, letter dated 7 October 2002, 1019
- Ethiopia**
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute
 - letter dated 7 April 2000, 1017, 1047
 - letter dated 11 and 12 May 2000, 428
 - letter dated 15 May 2000, 429, 956
 - letter dated 18 May 2000, 956
 - letter dated 2 June 2000, 1017
 - letter dated 26 June and 18 July 2000, 430
 - letter dated 9 January 2001, 956
 - statements on, 431, 436
 - Somalia situation, statements on, 286
- European Union**
 - Afghanistan situation, letter dated 8 and 17 October 2001, 1007
 - Angola situation, statements on behalf of, 953
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on behalf of, 553
 - Central African region, statements on behalf of, 452
 - civilians in armed conflict, statements on behalf of, 782, 905
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 - briefings on, 409
 - statements on behalf of, 382, 390, 973
 - ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on behalf of, 725
 - Georgia situation, briefings on, 596
 - HIV/AIDS, statements on behalf of, 715, 717
 - humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on behalf of, 909
 - Kosovo situation, statements on behalf of, 582
 - Middle East situation, statements on behalf of, 628, 1014
 - peaceful settlement of disputes, statements on behalf of, 907, 908
 - prevention of armed conflict, statements on behalf of, 896
 - regional organizations, statements on behalf of, 827, 1065
 - Sierra Leone situation, statements on behalf of, 981, 989
 - small arms, statements on behalf of, 787
 - Somalia situation, statements on behalf of, 291
 - Tajikistan situation, statements on behalf of, 510
 - terrorism
 - letter dated 12 and 25 September 2001, 738
 - statements on behalf of, 744, 746, 749, 761
 - Timor-Leste situation, statements on behalf of, 473, 477, 479, 490, 496, 499
 - women and peace and security, statements on behalf of, 806
 - Yugoslavia situation, briefings on, 590
- Events of 11 September 2001.** *See* Terrorism
- Expert Group to Conduct a Review of the Effective Operation and Functioning of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda**
 - International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, reports on, 701
- Facilitator of Burundi Peace Process**
 - briefings by, 322, 324
 - statements by, 1071
- Fiji**
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1053
 - regional arrangements, letter dated 2 July 2003, 1061, 1079
- Food and security**
 - Afghanistan situation and, 822
 - Africa situation and, 823
 - Bulgaria, statements by, 823, 824, 825
 - determinations of threats to the peace, 932
 - France, statements by, 822
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 115, 128
 - Ireland, statements by, 824
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 37
 - Mauritius, statements by, 824
 - Mexico, statements by, 822
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 241, 822, 823
 - Singapore, statements by, 824
 - Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 822, 825
 - United Kingdom, statements by, 241, 822, 823, 824, 825
 - United States, statements by, 824
 - World Food Programme
 - briefings by, 128, 241, 822, 823, 825, 932
 - statements by, 824

Force, duty to refrain from threat or use of

affirmation of principle, 1029
 condemnation of hostile action, 1030
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032
 Cyprus, letters by, 1028
 decisions regarding, 1029
 Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 1031
 generally, 1028
 Guinea situation, 1031
 Iraq, letters by, 1028
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1038
 Israel-Syria dispute, 1039
 League of Arab States, letter dated 24 March 2003, 1029
 Liberia situation, 1031
 Mali, letter dated 11 June 2002, 1028
 Middle East situation, 1030, 1031
 Sierra Leone situation, 1031
 Somalia situation, 1031
 Yugoslavia, letter dated 5 October 2000, 1028

France (permanent member of Security Council)

Afghanistan situation
 letter regarding, 1007
 statements on, 512, 513, 517, 521, 532, 533, 924, 952
 Angola situation, statements on, 299, 307, 953
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 544, 552, 555, 557, 560
 Burundi situation, statements on, 329, 331, 1071
 Central African region
 briefings on, 832
 statements on, 464, 902
 Central African Republic situation, statements on, 417
 children and armed conflict, statements on, 932, 966
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 1051
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
 statements on, 365, 373, 375, 379, 386, 387, 388, 389, 402, 973
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, letter dated 27 January 2003, 454
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 721, 725, 1061, 1062
 food and security, statements on, 822
 Great Lakes region situation
 briefings on, 357
 reports on, 359

statements on, 356, 359
 Guinea situation, statements on, 445
 Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 438, 441, 442, 443
 HIV/AIDS, statements on, 719
 humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 712, 1044, 1048
 International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 702
 invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 65
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 letter dated 24 February 2003, 927
 statements on, 638, 643, 646, 655, 657, 658, 660, 661, 664, 667, 668, 674, 675, 678, 679, 682, 683, 684, 685, 926, 957, 958, 959, 976, 977, 979, 1003, 1028
 Kosovo situation, statements on, 571, 584
 letter dated 4 April 1991, deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 48
 Liberia situation, statements on, 277, 282
 Lockerbie bombing
 letter dated 12 September 2003, 961
 statements on, 333, 334, 961
 Middle East situation, statements on, 613, 615, 623, 625, 630, 633, 858, 1014
 mine action, statements on, 817, 818
 no exit without strategy, statements on, 809
 peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
 post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 710, 819
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 909, 910
 protection of UN personnel, statements on, 795
 regional organizations, statements on, 828, 1064
 Rwanda situation, statements on, 321
 sanctions, statements on, 799, 800, 801, 962, 965
 Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339, 342, 349, 960, 961, 982, 989
 small arms, statements on, 790
 Somalia situation, statements on, 290, 291
 terrorism, statements on, 737, 741, 762, 766, 1015
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 469, 470, 471, 473, 476, 485, 487, 489, 490, 492, 500, 508
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 811
 Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 588

Functions and powers of Security Council

other functions and powers, 842

Gabon

Angola situation

letter regarding, 302

statements on, 303

Mubarak assassination attempt extradition

request, letter dated 2 June 2000, 962

Gambia

Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1011

Sierra Leone situation

letter dated 28 December 2000 and 23 January 2001, 347

statements on, 347

General Assembly

admission of new Member States, practice in relation to recommendations by Security Council, 223

Africa situation, recommendations to Security Council, 219

appointment of Secretary-General, practice in relation to recommendations by Security Council, 224

combating terrorism, recommendations to Security Council, 221

Middle East situation

practice in relation to Article 12 of Charter, 222

recommendations to Security Council, 221

prevention of armed conflict, recommendations to Security Council, 220

referral of disputes to Security Council by, 856

relations of Security Council with

election of non-permanent members, 217

generally, 216

maintenance of peace and security,

recommendations to Security Council, 218

practice in relation to Article 12 of Charter, 221

practice in relation to recommendations by Security Council, 223

reports by Security Council, 224

subsidiary organs, 226

sanctions, recommendations to Security Council, 219

Timor-Leste situation, briefings on, 484

Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian

Demining

mine action, briefings on, 816

Georgia

Georgia situation

briefings on, 595

letter dated 16 June 2000, 593

letter dated 13 September 2002, 1017

letter dated 15 September 2002, 1017

statements on, 595

Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 968

terrorism

letter dated 25 September 2001, 738

statements on, 753

Georgia situation

European Union, briefings by, 596

Georgia

briefings by, 595

letter dated 16 June 2000, 593

letter dated 13 September 2002, 1017

letter dated 15 September 2002, 1017

statements by, 595

invitations to participate in proceedings, 75, 81, 87, 97, 125, 595, 597, 599

Jamaica, statements by, 591

new Security Council action, 41

peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 877, 891

President

decisions announced in statements, 145, 146

decisions recorded in letters, 154, 159

statements by, 592, 594, 595, 596, 877, 891, 892

regional arrangements, 1074

Resolution 1287 (2000), 142, 591, 877, 891

Resolution 1311 (2000), 593, 877

Resolution 1339 (2001), 595, 877, 891

Resolution 1364 (2001), 597, 892

Resolution 1393 (2002), 597, 878, 892

Resolution 1427 (2002), 598, 878

Resolution 1462 (2003), 598

Resolution 1494 (2003), 41, 599

Russian Federation

letter dated 26 January 2000, 591

letter dated 26 June 2000, 593

letter dated 25 July 2000, 594

letter dated 11 September 2002, 1017

Secretary-General

relations of Security Council with, 247

reports by, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599

self-defence, invocation of right, 1017

Ukraine

briefings by, 595

letter dated 17 March 2001, 595

voting, absence, 142

Germany (elected member of Security Council 2003)

- Afghanistan situation
 - briefings on, 529
 - letter regarding, 1007
 - statements on, 529, 532, 972
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 560
 - Bougainville situation, statements on, 537
 - Burundi situation, statements on, 331
 - Central African region, statements on, 464, 903
 - civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 968
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 408, 409, 956
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, letter dated 13 April 2000, 848
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441, 442
 - HIV/AIDS, statements on, 719
 - International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 700
 - Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 689
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 - letter 24 February 2003, 927
 - statements on, 667, 680, 683, 685, 959, 976, 979, 1028
 - Kosovo situation, statements on, 584, 585
 - Liberia situation, statements on, 282
 - Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 334, 962
 - Middle East situation, statements on, 632
 - mine action, statements on, 817
 - no exit without strategy, statements on, 809, 900
 - pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 901, 905
 - prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 894
 - regional organizations, statements on, 1064
 - sanctions
 - briefings on, 798
 - statements on, 800, 965
 - terrorism, statements on, 761, 762
- ## **Ghana**
- Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 455
 - troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, letter regarding, 812
- ## **Great Lakes region situation**
- African Union, statements by, 360
 - Burundi, statements by, 358, 359, 365
 - Congo, Democratic Republic of, statements by, 357, 359
 - France
 - briefings by, 357

- reports by, 359
- statements by, 356, 359
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 75, 81, 88, 126, 129
- Ireland, statements by, 356, 358
- Jamaica, statements by, 358
- new Security Council action, 43
- Norway, statements by, 356
- President
 - decisions announced in statements, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161
 - statements by, 43, 361
- Rwanda
 - briefings by, 356
 - statements by, 358, 359
- Secretary-General
 - briefings by, 356, 357
 - reports by, 356, 358, 360, 903
- Security Council Missions, 10, 11, 381, 383, 831, 848, 857
- South Africa, statements by, 359
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes region, statements by, 361
- United Kingdom, statements by, 356, 358, 360
- United States, statements by, 356
- Zambia, letter dated 24 May 2001, 357

Greece

- peacekeeping operations, letter dated 10 June 2003, 813

Group of Arab States

- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, letter dated 24 March 2003, 669
- Middle East situation
 - letter dated 2 October 2000, 605
 - letter dated 13 March 2001, 611
 - letter dated 15 August 2001, 614
 - letter dated 20 February 2002, 618
 - letter dated 29 March 2002, 620
 - letter dated 1 April 2002, 621
 - letter dated 6 April 2002, 622
 - letter dated 17 April 2002, 623
 - letter dated 2 May 2002, 625, 852
 - letter dated 23 July 2002, 626
 - letter dated 12 September 2003, 631
 - letter dated 9 October 2003, 633, 634
 - statements on behalf of, 859
- small arms, statements on behalf of, 1051
- terrorism, statements on behalf of, 743, 744

Guinea (elected member of Security Council 2003)

Africa situation, statements on, 425, 966
Burundi situation, statements on, 331
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 776
Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 456
Guinea situation, statements on, 445
Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 443
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 664, 958
Liberia situation
 letter dated 26 February 2001, 275
 statements on, 279
mine action, statements on, 817
pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 1066
peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
sanctions, statements on, 801
Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 349
terrorism, statements on, 760, 761
Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 508

Guinea situation

Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 447
China, statements by, 445
Colombia, statements by, 445
Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator, briefings by, 446
force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1031
France, statements by, 445
Guinea, statements by, 445
High Commissioner for Refugees
 briefings by, 444
 statements by, 445
invitations to participate in proceedings, 71, 73, 77, 99, 101, 443
Ireland, statements by, 447
Jamaica, statements by, 444, 447
Mali
 letter dated 11 April 2001, 446
 letter regarding, 443
 statements by, 445, 447
matters of which Security Council seized, 33, 34, 36
Mauritius, statements by, 445
pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 869, 885
President
 decisions announced in statements, 146, 147
 decisions recorded in letters, 158
 statements by, 33, 36, 443, 869, 885, 1031, 1069

regional arrangements, 1069
Russian Federation, statements by, 447
Secretary-General, letter dated 30 April 2001, 36, 77, 99, 147, 158, 446
Security Council Missions, 446
Sierra Leone, statements by, 446
Singapore, statements by, 445
Tunisia, statements by, 445, 1069
Ukraine, statements by, 447
Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations
 briefings by, 446
 statements by, 1069
United Kingdom, statements by, 444, 447
United States, statements by, 445, 447

Guinea-Bissau

Guinea-Bissau situation
 briefings on, 439
 statements on, 443

Guinea-Bissau situation

Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa
 briefings by, 239
 statements by, 239
Argentina, statements by, 438, 439, 440
Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 442
Bangladesh, statements by, 438
Bulgaria, statements by, 441
Chile, statements by, 441, 443
Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries
 briefings by, 442
 statements by, 440
ECOSOC
 briefings by, 441
 letter dated 5 February 2003, 239
France, statements by, 438, 441, 442, 443
Gambia, statements by, 441
Germany, statements by, 441, 442
Guinea, statements by, 443
Guinea-Bissau
 briefings by, 439
 statements by, 443
invitations to participate in proceedings, 69, 87, 92, 110, 119, 124, 128, 129, 130, 132, 234
Jamaica, statements by, 439
Malaysia, statements by, 439, 440
Mali, statements by, 439
Mexico, statements by, 443
Namibia, statements by, 440

- Netherlands, statements by, 438, 439
 new Security Council action, 44
 pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
 regarding, 869, 885
 Pakistan, statements by, 441
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 144, 146,
 150
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 157,
 158, 159, 162
 statements by, 233, 240, 438, 440, 442, 869
 Representative of the Secretary-General for
 Guinea-Bissau, briefings by, 440
 Russian Federation, statements by, 441, 443
 Secretary-General
 briefings by, 438
 reports by, 437, 438, 440
 Security Council Missions, 239
 Spain, statements by, 441
 Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on
 Africa, statements by, 239
 Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs,
 briefings by, 438
 United Kingdom, statements by, 438
 United States, statements by, 439, 441
 World Bank, briefings by, 439
- Haiti situation**
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 68, 466
 new Security Council action, 41
 pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
 regarding, 890
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 144
 statements by, 41, 232, 466, 890
 Secretary-General, reports by, 466
- Heads of state**
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 61
- High Commissioner for Human Rights**
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 briefings on, 404, 407
 reports on, 405
- High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)**
 civilians in armed conflict, briefings on, 772, 906
 Guinea situation
 briefings on, 444
 statements on, 445
 refugees
 briefings on, 32, 37, 91, 114, 766, 840
 statements on, 768
- High Representative for the Implementation of the
 Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina**
 briefings by, 547, 549, 551, 552, 558, 559
 reports by, 544, 547, 551, 552, 557, 559
- HIV/AIDS**
 Canada, statements by, 716
 Chile, statements by, 720
 Costa Rica, statements by, 1049
 determinations of threats to the peace, 923, 931,
 932
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 715,
 717
 France, statements by, 719
 generally, 1049
 Germany, statements by, 719
 India, statements by, 717, 933
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 72,
 91, 92, 93, 100, 121, 127
 Ireland, statements by, 716
 Jamaica, statements by, 716
 Joint UN Programme on HIV/AIDS
 briefings by, 419, 714, 716, 718
 statements by, 715, 932
 matters of which Security Council seized, 32
 Mexico, statements by, 719
 Nigeria, statements by, 717
 Norway, statements by, 717
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 147
 letter dated 31 January 2000, 235
 statements by, 233, 235, 236, 717, 931
 Resolution 1308 (2000), 227, 232, 235, 715, 923,
 932, 1046, 1049
 Secretary-General, letter dated 5 July 2000, 714
 Sweden, statements by, 933
 Tunisia, statements by, 715
 Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping
 Operations, briefings by, 715, 718
 United Kingdom, statements by, 716, 719
 United States, statements by, 717, 931, 1049
 Zimbabwe, statements by, 715
- Holy See**
 permanent observer, invitations to participate in
 proceedings, 62
- Honduras**
 ICJ
 letter dated 22 January 2002, 244
 letter dated 17 September 2002, 244
 pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 908

Humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security

Belarus, statements by, 713, 933
Brazil, statements by, 933, 1048
Canada, statements by, 1047
China, statements by, 713, 1048
Colombia, statements by, 1048
determinations of threats to the peace, 933
domestic affairs, non-intervention in, 1044
Egypt, statements by, 713, 1048
European Union, statements on behalf of, 909
France, statements by, 712, 1044, 1048
generally, 1047
India, statements by, 713, 1044, 1048
invitations to participate in proceedings, 68, 92
Iran, statements by, 713, 933
matters of which Security Council seized, 32
Netherlands, statements by, 909
Norway, statements by, 712, 909, 933
Pakistan, statements by, 713, 933, 1044
Portugal, statements by, 712
President
 decisions announced in statements, 144
 statements by, 32, 713, 1047, 1049
Russian Federation, statements by, 713, 933, 1048
Secretary-General, statements by, 711
Tunisia, statements by, 1044, 1048

IAEA. *See* International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

Iceland

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 977

ICJ. *See* International Court of Justice (ICJ)

ICRC. *See* International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

IMF (International Monetary Fund)

Timor-Leste situation, briefings on, 484

Incoming Security Council Members

invitations to participate in proceedings, 61

India

Afghanistan situation, statements on, 526, 924
Africa situation, statements on, 1052, 1067
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 557
children and armed conflict, statements on, 728, 932
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 772, 773
HIV/AIDS, statements on, 717, 933

humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 713, 1044, 1048
invitations to participate in proceedings, letter dated 28 April 2003, 66
Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 letter dated 26 March 2002, 1005
 statements on, 653, 975, 978, 1002, 1005
Middle East situation, statements on, 1013
no exit without strategy, statements on, 809
pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 902, 1016
post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 820, 1050
Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339, 981, 989
small arms, statements on, 784
terrorism, statements on, 743, 753, 761, 763
troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with
 letter regarding, 812
 statements on, 251, 810, 992, 994
women and peace and security, statements on, 806

India-Pakistan dispute

Pakistan

 letter dated 23 January 2000, 1017

 letter dated 22 May 2002, 1018

 letter dated 19 August 2003, 855

President, decisions recorded in letters, 155, 157, 159

self-defence, invocation of right, 1017

UNMOGIP, 198

Indonesia

children and armed conflict, statements on, 967
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773, 906

prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 1063

Timor-Leste situation

 briefings on, 478, 480

 letter dated 27 November 2000, 480

 statements on, 473, 476, 478, 480, 485, 490, 492, 496, 499, 502, 505, 506, 1025

women and peace and security, statements on, 803, 906

Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, 182

Informal working groups. *See also specific entity or situation*
generally, 182

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 - briefings on, 659, 660, 664, 667, 927
 - reports on, 926, 927

International Civilian Support Mission in Haiti (MICAH)

- Secretary-General, reports by, 466

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

- civilians in armed conflict, briefings on, 769, 778
- Iraq humanitarian situation, briefings on, 689
- protection of UN personnel, briefings by, 795

International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries, 790**International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, 707****International Court of Justice (ICJ)**

- briefings by, 32, 91, 99, 114, 243
- Congo (Democratic Republic)-Uganda dispute, 244
- election of members, 46
- filling of vacancies, 46, 144
- Honduras
 - letter dated 22 January 2002, 244
 - letter dated 17 September 2002, 244
- letter dated 1 July 2000, 245
- peaceful settlement of disputes, statements on, 907
- President, statements by, 242, 243
- relations of Security Council with
 - consideration of, 243
 - election of members, 242
 - generally, 242
- Resolution 1361 (2001), 46, 144, 242

International Labour Organization Convention No. 182, 730**International Monetary Fund (IMF)**

- Timor-Leste situation, briefings on, 484

International Organization of la Francophonie

- Central African Republic situation, statements on, 414

International Tribunal for Rwanda

- annexes to statute, 209
- appointment of prosecutor, 210
- briefings by, 694, 696, 697, 699
- China, statements by, 697
- election of judges, 209
- generally, 209
- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
 - letter dated 12 May 2000, 701
 - letter dated 14 June 2000, 701

- invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 77, 82, 89, 95, 96, 109, 110, 123, 124

letter dated 26 July 2002, 704

letter dated 8 August 2002, 704

matters of which Security Council seized, 44

new Security Council action, 43, 44

obligations of Member States, 996

President

decisions announced in statements, 150, 151

decisions recorded in letters, 157, 159, 160, 161

letter dated 11 October 2002, 143

statements by, 44, 695, 697, 706

Prosecutor of the Tribunals

briefings by, 692, 694, 696, 697, 700

statements by, 698

reports by, 210, 699

Resolution 1329 (2000), 248, 695

Resolution 1347 (2001), 209, 704

Resolution 1411 (2002), 209, 697

Resolution 1431 (2002), 209, 248, 704

Resolution 1449 (2002), 209, 705

Resolution 1477 (2003), 210, 706

Resolution 1482 (2003), 706

Resolution 1503 (2003), 210, 698

Resolution 1504 (2003), 698

Resolution 1505 (2003), 210, 698

Resolution 1512 (2003), 44, 209, 706

Russian Federation, statements by, 693, 697

Rwanda

letter dated 26 July 2002, 704

letter dated 5 August 2003, 698

statements by, 693, 696, 700

Secretary-General

letter dated 7 September 2000, 695

letter dated 14 September 2001, 209

letter dated 26 September 2002, 705

letter dated 6 March 2003, 705

letter dated 16 April 2003, 706

letter dated 21 April 2003, 705

letter dated 28 July 2003, 698

letter dated 12 September 2003, 706

letter dated 29 September 2003, 210

letter dated 3 October 2003, 698

relations of Security Council with, 248

time frame for completion of trials, 210

Working Group on International Criminal Tribunals, 183

International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia

annexes to statute, 207

- appointment of prosecutor, 208
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, briefings on, 560
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina, statements by, 697, 700
 - briefings by, 693, 695, 697, 699, 701
 - Canada, statements by, 702
 - China, statements by, 693, 695, 697
 - Croatia, statements by, 701
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 52
 - election of judges, 208
 - Expert Group to Conduct a Review of the Effective Operation and Functioning of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Tribunal for Rwanda, reports by, 701
 - France, statements by, 702
 - generally, 207
 - Germany, statements by, 700
 - International Tribunal for Rwanda
 - letter dated 12 May 2000, 701
 - letter dated 14 June 2000, 701
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 76, 82, 88, 89, 95, 96, 109, 110, 123, 124
 - Jamaica, statements by, 702
 - letter dated 12 May 2000, 701
 - letter dated 14 June 2000, 701
 - letter dated 10 June 2002, 208
 - new Security Council action, 42, 43
 - obligations of Member States, 996
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 149
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 156, 161, 162
 - letter dated 19 January 2001, 143
 - statements by, 695, 697, 703
 - Prosecutor of the Tribunals
 - briefings by, 692, 694, 696, 697, 700
 - statements by, 698
 - reports by, 208, 699
 - Resolution 1329 (2000), 207, 248, 695
 - Resolution 1340 (2001), 208, 702
 - Resolution 1350 (2001), 208, 703
 - Resolution 1411 (2002), 208, 697
 - Resolution 1431 (2002), 208
 - Resolution 1481 (2003), 43, 208, 703
 - Resolution 1503 (2003), 698
 - Resolution 1504 (2003), 208, 698
 - Resolution 1505 (2003), 698
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 693, 694, 697, 702
 - Secretary-General
 - letter 7 May 2003, 703
 - letter dated 14 June 2000, 701
 - letter dated 7 September 2000, 695
 - letter dated 11 January 2001, 702
 - letter dated 19 April 2001, 703
 - letter dated 7 May 2003, 208
 - note dated 20 August 2003, 698
 - relations of Security Council with, 248
 - Serbia and Montenegro, statements by, 700
 - time frame for completion of trials, 208
 - Ukraine, statements by, 702
 - United States, statements by, 702
 - Working Group on International Criminal Tribunals, 183
 - Yugoslavia, statements by, 696
- Investigations and fact-finding.** *See also specific entity or situation*
- Burundi situation, 327
 - Côte d'Ivoire situation, 857, 859
 - ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, 857
 - generally, 856
 - Middle East situation, 857, 858
 - prevention of armed conflict, 858
 - Secretary-General, relations of Security Council with, 246
- Investigative bodies.** *See also specific entity or situation*
- generally, 183
- Invitations to participate in proceedings.** *See also specific entity or situation*
- Argentina, statements by, 65
 - basis of invitations
 - generally, 58
 - invitations not expressly extended under Rule 37 or Rule 39, 60
 - Rule 37, 58
 - Rule 39, 59
 - Brazil, statements by, 66
 - China, statements by, 64
 - Colombia, statements by, 66
 - France, statements by, 65
 - heads of state, 61
 - incoming Security Council Members, 61
 - India, letter dated 28 April 2003, 66
 - Mexico, letter dated 1 May 2003, 66
 - Palestine, statements by, 65

- participation without formal invitation, 62
 permanent observers, 62
 President
 note dated 28 February 2000, 61
 note dated 22 November 2002, 61
 statements by, 65, 66
 procedures relating to participation
 generally, 65
 limitations on participation, 66
 requests denied or not acted upon, 63
 Russian Federation, statements by, 64, 65
 stage at which participants heard, 65
 statements on behalf of other entities, 58
 transitional government representatives, 62
 Ukraine, statements by, 64
 United States, statements by, 64
- Iran, Islamic Republic of**
 Afghanistan situation, statements on, 515, 517,
 522, 524, 526, 532, 924, 972
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on,
 556, 1053, 1054
 humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and
 security, statements on, 713, 933
 Iran-Iraq dispute
 letter dated 15 February 2000, 1018
 letter dated 18 April 2001, 1018
 letter regarding, 1018
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 652, 1011,
 1012, 1038, 1056
 maintenance of peace and security, letter dated 3
 June 2003, 1057
 Middle East situation, statements on, 615
 peacekeeping operations, statements on, 814
 terrorism, statements on, 743, 751, 753
- Iran-Iraq dispute**
 deleted from matters of which Security Council
 seized, 52
 Iran
 letter dated 15 February 2000, 1018
 letter dated 18 April 2001, 1018
 letter regarding, 1018
 self-defence, invocation of right, 1018
- Iraq**
 children and armed conflict, statements on, 728,
 966, 967
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 967
 domestic affairs, non-intervention in, letter dated
 26 May 2001 and 20 December 2002, 1043
 force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, letters
 on, 1028
- Governing Council
 briefings by, 677
 letter dated 11 December 2003, 686
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 letter dated 10 July 2000, 928
 letter dated 17 February 2001, 1010
 letter dated 20 February 2001, 1010
 letter dated 18 June 2001, 644
 letter dated 16 August 2001, 1010
 letter dated 28 May 2002, 1010
 letter dated 11 June 2002, 1010
 letter dated 15 August 2002, 1010
 letter dated 16 September 2002, 1043
 letter dated 25 November 2002, 926
 letter dated 2 December 2002, 929
 letter dated 9 and 14 March 2003, 929
 letter dated 9 and 21 March 2003, 909
 letter dated 16 March 2003, 1011
 letter dated 21 March 2003, 929
 letter dated 24 March 2003, 1012, 1038, 1045
 letter on, 1047
 letter regarding, 1009
 statements on, 648, 654, 660, 661, 663, 665,
 666, 668, 670, 686, 908, 926, 929, 957, 958,
 974, 977, 1012, 1038, 1045, 1055, 1056
- Middle East situation
 letter dated 2 October 2000, 848, 851
 statements on, 608, 616, 1012
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 912,
 1050
 sanctions, statements on, 963, 964
 self-determination, statements on, 1024
 terrorism, letter dated 18 September 2001, 739
- Iraq humanitarian situation**
 China, statements by, 690
 Deputy Secretary-General, briefings by, 688
 Georgia, statements by, 968
 Germany, statements by, 689
 International Committee of the Red Cross,
 briefings by, 689
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 127,
 128, 129, 132
 matters of which Security Council seized, 39
 Mexico, statements by, 689
 President, decisions recorded in notes, 153
 Resolution 1483 (2003), 1042
 Russian Federation
 letter dated 15 June 2001, 848
 statements by, 689, 968
 Secretary-General, statements by, 968

- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 28, 689
UN Development Programme, briefings by, 688
UNICEF, briefings by, 688
United Kingdom, statements by, 689
United States, statements by, 689
World Food Programme, briefings by, 688
World Health Organization, briefings by, 688
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute**
abstention, 140, 141
Albania, statements by, 655, 663, 672
Algeria, statements by, 978, 1058, 1075
Angola, statements by, 664, 679, 976
Argentina, statements by, 643, 671, 975, 1038
assistance from Member States, 1041
Australia, statements by, 655, 663, 927, 1039
Belarus, statements by, 958
Brazil, statements by, 958
Bulgaria, statements by, 660, 664, 668, 958, 1003, 1004
Cameroon, statements by, 659, 664, 668, 678, 679, 958, 975
Canada, statements by, 643, 647, 663, 666, 978, 1003, 1055
Chile, statements by, 664, 667, 974
China, statements by, 638, 641, 642, 643, 647, 653, 657, 658, 667, 681, 976, 977, 979
Colombia, statements by, 974, 979
Cuba, statements by, 652, 672, 1011
deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 48
Deputy Secretary-General, statements by, 651, 1055
determinations of threats to the peace, 922, 925
domestic affairs, non-intervention in, 1045
Egypt
 letter dated 17 April 2000, 1003
 statements by, 957
El Salvador, statements by, 978
force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1038
France
 letter dated 24 February 2003, 927
 statements by, 638, 643, 646, 655, 657, 658, 660, 661, 664, 667, 668, 674, 675, 678, 679, 682, 683, 684, 685, 926, 957, 958, 959, 976, 977, 979, 1003, 1028
Gambia, statements by, 1011
Germany
 letter 24 February 2003, 927
 statements by, 667, 680, 683, 685, 959, 976, 979, 1028
Group of Arab States, letter dated 24 March 2003, 669
Guinea, statements by, 664, 958
Iceland, statements by, 977
India
 letter dated 26 March 2002, 1005
 statements by, 653, 975, 978, 1002, 1005
International Atomic Energy Agency
 briefings by, 659, 660, 664, 667, 927
 reports by, 926, 927
invitations to participate in proceedings, 75, 82, 83, 105, 106, 107, 115, 116, 121, 125, 128, 130, 131, 132, 687
Iran, statements by, 652, 1011, 1012, 1038, 1056
Iraq
 letter by, 1047
 letter dated 10 July 2000, 928
 letter dated 17 February 2001, 1010
 letter dated 20 February 2001, 1010
 letter dated 18 June 2001, 644
 letter dated 16 August 2001, 1010
 letter dated 28 May 2002, 1010
 letter dated 11 June 2002, 1010
 letter dated 15 August 2002, 1010
 letter dated 16 September 2002, 1043
 letter dated 25 November 2002, 926
 letter dated 2 December 2002, 929
 letter dated 9 and 14 March 2003, 929
 letter dated 9 and 21 March 2003, 909
 letter dated 16 March 2003, 1011
 letter dated 21 March 2003, 929
 letter dated 24 March 2003, 1012, 1038, 1045
 letter regarding, 1009
 statements by, 648, 654, 660, 661, 663, 665, 666, 668, 670, 686, 908, 926, 929, 957, 958, 974, 977, 1012, 1038, 1045, 1055, 1056
Ireland, statements by, 647, 976
Israel, statements by, 653, 1058
Jamaica, statements by, 957, 1004, 1055, 1056
Japan, statements by, 662
Jordan, statements by, 647, 926, 957, 1055, 1058
Kuwait
 letter dated 9 August 2000, 925
 letter dated 24 March 2003, 1038
 statements by, 647, 652, 673, 974
League of Arab States
 letter dated 24 March 2003, 669, 929, 1012
 statements on behalf of, 648, 654, 929, 957, 1056
Lebanon, statements by, 928, 1012

- Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, statements by, 647, 671, 957, 1038
- Liechtenstein, statements by, 974
- Macedonia, statements by, 978, 1003
- maintenance of peace and security, 1057
- Malaysia
- letter dated 17 July 2001, 1002
 - letter dated 7 March 2003, 665
 - letter dated 24 March 2003, 1012
 - statements by, 639, 642, 647, 662, 958, 976, 1003, 1038, 1045, 1056, 1058
- Mali, statements by, 957
- Marshall Islands, statements by, 663, 671
- matters of which Security Council seized, 38
- Mauritius, statements by, 663, 1058
- measures involving use of armed force, 971, 974, 986
- measures not involving use of armed force, 945, 956
- Mexico, statements by, 653, 655, 657, 664, 668, 675, 678, 679, 683, 685, 925, 975, 1027
- Morocco, statements by, 958, 974, 1038, 1055
- Namibia, statements by, 1003
- Netherlands, statements by, 637, 642
- new Security Council action, 41
- New Zealand, statements by, 653, 957, 975
- Nigeria, statements by, 655, 929, 977
- Non-Aligned Movement
- letter dated 10 October 2002, 650, 848
 - letter dated 6 February 2003, 661
 - letter dated 14 February 2003, 661
 - letter dated 7 March 2003, 850, 853
 - letter dated 24 March 2003, 669
 - statements on behalf of, 653, 654, 978, 979
- obligations of Member States, 997
- Office of the Iraq Programme, briefings by, 681
- peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 893
- Pakistan, statements by, 664, 674, 676, 678, 681, 927, 974, 1027, 1028, 1045, 1057
- Palestine, statements by, 1058
- Philippines, statements by, 666
- Poland, statements by, 1038
- Portugal, letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
- President
- decisions announced in statements, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162
 - letter dated 2 December 2003, 686
 - statements by, 41, 682, 687
- provisional measures, 941
- regional arrangements, 1075
- Resolution 1293 (2000), 639, 945
- Resolution 1302 (2000), 640, 945, 1010, 1041
- Resolution 1330 (2000), 206, 643
- Resolution 1352 (2001), 644, 945
- Resolution 1360 (2001), 143, 649
- Resolution 1382 (2001), 649, 945
- Resolution 1409 (2002), 168, 650, 945
- Resolution 1441 (2002), 143, 207, 656, 922, 925, 975, 1041, 1075
- Resolution 1443 (2002), 657
- Resolution 1447 (2002), 657
- Resolution 1454 (2002), 140, 658, 958
- Resolution 1472 (2003), 168, 673, 941, 946, 1027
- Resolution 1476 (2003), 168, 674, 946
- Resolution 1483 (2003), 142, 168, 206, 207, 675, 922, 946, 958, 1001, 1027
- Resolution 1490 (2003), 676
- Resolution 1500 (2003), 141, 678, 893, 1027
- Resolution 1511 (2003), 680, 922, 971, 986, 997, 1027
- Resolution 1518 (2003), 166, 169, 248, 685, 922, 946, 959, 1001
- Russian Federation
- letter 24 February 2003, 927
 - letter dated 15 June 2001, 644, 1055
 - statements by, 637, 641, 642, 643, 646, 654, 658, 659, 667, 673, 674, 675, 680, 682, 683, 684, 685, 926, 928, 957, 958, 976, 979, 980, 1028
- sanctions, 945, 946
- Saudi Arabia, statements by, 1058
- Secretary-General
- briefings by, 636, 677
 - letter dated 16 September 2002, 1043, 1075
 - note dated 28 February 2003, 663
 - note dated 10 May 2003, 676
 - reports by, 635, 639, 640, 642, 644, 648, 649, 657, 676, 678, 685, 687
 - statements by, 669, 680, 682, 686, 1026, 1045, 1056
- Security Council Committees
- briefings by, 1005
 - establishment, 168, 169
 - letter dated 22 March 2000, 636
 - letter dated 28 February 2002, 1005
 - mandate implementation, 168
 - monitoring and reporting, 168
 - termination of mandate, 168, 211

- self-defence, 1009
- self-determination, 1026
- Singapore, statements by, 671, 957, 1058
- South Africa, statements by, 666, 672, 927, 957, 974, 977, 978, 1057
- Spain
 - letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
 - statements by, 660, 661, 664, 668, 927, 976, 979
- special economic problems, 1001, 1002
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Iraq, briefings by, 677
- Sudan, statements by, 1011
- Sweden, statements by, 1004
- Switzerland, statements by, 655, 663, 666, 974
- Syrian Arab Republic
 - letter dated 22 May 2003, 142
 - statements by, 647, 650, 658, 668, 671, 674, 675, 678, 681, 684, 927, 957, 958, 976, 977, 979, 1010, 1027, 1058
- Tanzania, statements by, 929
- Tunisia
 - letter dated 24 June 2002, 1002, 1005
 - statements by, 641, 649, 975, 1003
- Turkey, statements by, 673, 957
- UN Compensation Commission
 - generally, 206
 - mandate implementation, 206
- Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, statements by, 1003
- UNICEF, statements by, 639
- United Arab Emirates, statements by, 1045
- United Kingdom
 - briefings by, 679, 683
 - letter dated 24 September 2002, 925
 - letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
 - letter dated 8 May 2003, 1027
 - statements by, 639, 641, 642, 645, 649, 655, 656, 660, 661, 664, 668, 672, 680, 682, 684, 956, 975, 976, 977, 979, 980, 1028, 1039
- United States
 - briefings by, 659, 679, 682
 - letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
 - letter dated 8 May 2003, 1027
 - statements by, 637, 643, 646, 649, 656, 661, 664, 668, 672, 678, 681, 682, 957, 958, 975, 976, 977, 980, 1010, 1011, 1027, 1028, 1039
- Venezuela, statements by, 1038
- Viet Nam, statements by, 1045
- voting, absence, 142
- Yemen, statements by, 647, 928, 929, 975, 980, 1012, 1038
- Zimbabwe, statements by, 958, 1011
- Iraq-Saudi Arabia dispute**
 - Saudi Arabia, letter dated 29 May 2001, 1018
 - self-defence, 1018
- Ireland (elected member of Security Council 2001-2002)**
 - Africa situation, statements on, 966
 - Angola situation, statements on, 309, 311
 - Burundi situation, statements on, 1071
 - civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 774, 776, 779
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 383, 393, 402, 954
 - food and security, statements on, 824
 - Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 356, 358
 - Guinea situation, statements on, 447
 - HIV/AIDS, statements on, 716
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 647, 976
 - Middle East situation, statements on, 630, 931
 - Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, statements on, 448, 962
 - Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 348, 349
 - small arms, statements on, 784
 - Somalia situation, statements on, 291
 - terrorism, statements on, 736, 746, 749, 751
 - Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 492
- Islamic Republic of Iran.** *See* Iran, Islamic Republic of
- Islamic Summit Conference**
 - Middle East situation
 - letter dated 29 March 2002, 620, 850, 853
 - letter dated 9 October 2003, 850, 853
- Israel**
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 653, 1058
 - Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 691, 1014, 1039
 - Middle East situation
 - letter dated 16 and 27 March 2001, 613
 - letter dated 6, 7, 8, 9 and 13 August 2001, 614
 - letter dated 8, 11, 19 and 20 February 2002, 618
 - letter dated 19 September 2002, 628
 - statements on, 606, 608, 609, 610, 612, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 620, 621, 623, 624, 625, 626, 628, 630, 631, 633, 634, 859, 930, 1013, 1014, 1054
 - small arms, statements on, 787

- terrorism, statements on, 743, 747, 752, 757, 1016
 UNIFIL, letter dated 2 June and 24 July 2003, 604
- Israel-Syria dispute**
 Egypt, statements by, 1015
 force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1039
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 88
 Israel, statements by, 691, 1014, 1039
 Jordan, statements by, 691, 1040
 League of Arab States, statements on behalf of, 1015
 Lebanon
 letter dated 5 October 2003, 39, 131, 690, 849, 852, 853, 1014
 statements by, 691, 1039
 matters of which Security Council seized, 39
 Morocco, statements by, 691, 1040
 Pakistan, statements by, 691, 1040
 President, statements by, 40
 referral of disputes to Security Council, 852
 self-defence, 1014
 Syrian Arab Republic
 letter dated 5 October 2003, 39, 88, 131, 690, 849, 852, 1014, 1039
 statements by, 690, 1039
 United States, statements by, 691, 1039
- Italy**
 Afghanistan situation, statements on, 517, 972
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, letter dated 14 July 2003, 408
 no exit without strategy, statements on, 900
- Jamaica (elected member of Security Council 2000-2001)**
 Angola situation, statements on, 299, 303
 Central African Republic situation, statements on, 416
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 770, 773, 774, 967
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 368, 393, 954
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 721, 724
 Georgia situation, statements on, 591
 Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 358
 Guinea situation, statements on, 444, 447
 Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 439
 HIV/AIDS, statements on, 716
- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 702
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 957, 1004, 1055, 1056
 post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 899
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 935
 refugees, statements on, 768
 Rwanda situation, statements on, 321
 sanctions, statements on, 962
 Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 348, 989
 small arms, statements on, 784, 968
 terrorism, statements on, 740
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 469, 496
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 8
 Western Sahara situation, statements on, 271
- Japan**
 Afghanistan situation
 briefings on, 529
 statements on, 529
 Agenda, statements on, 29
 Central African region, statements on, 452
 children and armed conflict, statements on, 733
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 782
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 410, 955, 973
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 725
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 662
 Kosovo situation, statements on, 582
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 899, 905
 Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 982
 small arms, statements on, 787
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 474, 484, 485, 496
- Joint UN Programme on HIV/AIDS**
 briefings by, 419, 714, 716, 718
 statements by, 715, 932
- Jordan**
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 556, 1053, 1054
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 647, 926, 957, 1055, 1058
 Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 691, 1040
 Middle East situation, letter dated 29 March 2003, 854

- peacekeeping operations, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339, 981, 990
- Somalia situation, statements on, 291
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, letter regarding, 812
- Justice and rule of law**
 - Cameroon, statements by, 837
 - Canada, statements by, 839
 - determinations of threats to the peace, 932
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 87, 122, 127
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 39
 - New Zealand, statements by, 838
 - Pakistan, statements by, 837
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 150
 - statements by, 837
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 837
 - Secretary-General, statements by, 836
 - Sweden, statements by, 839
 - Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 837
 - Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 838
 - United Kingdom, statements by, 837
 - United States, statements by, 837
 - Uruguay, statements by, 839
- Kazakhstan**
 - Afghanistan situation, statements on, 532, 972
- Kimberley Process Certification Scheme**
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 38
 - Resolution 1459 (2003), 826
- Korea, Republic of**
 - children and armed conflict, statements on, 967
 - civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 967
 - small arms, statements on, 784, 787
 - terrorism, statements on, 753
 - Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 490
 - troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 992
- Korean dispute**
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49, 51
- Kosovo situation**
 - Albania, statements by, 579, 1026
 - Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 566, 568, 576, 577, 580, 583, 584, 586
 - Bulgaria, statements by, 581, 584
 - China, statements by, 565, 566, 567, 570, 1026
 - European Union, statements on behalf of, 582
 - France, statements by, 571, 584
 - Germany, statements by, 584, 585
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 68, 72, 75, 76, 77, 85, 90, 92, 97, 101, 104, 111, 112, 118, 124, 125, 127, 565, 568, 573, 574, 575, 579, 581, 582, 587
 - Japan, statements by, 582
 - Macedonia
 - letter dated 8 June 2000, 565
 - statements by, 574
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 34
 - measures not involving use of armed force, 950
 - new Security Council action, 45
 - Norway, statements by, 569, 570
 - peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 878, 892
 - Pakistan, statements by, 582, 583, 584, 587, 1026
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161
 - statements by, 568, 569, 572, 575, 577, 579, 581, 583, 587, 878, 879, 892, 1026
 - Resolution 1244 (1999), 565, 830
 - Resolution 1367 (2001), 34, 173, 574, 950
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 574, 577, 579, 580, 581, 583, 584
 - sanctions, 950
 - Secretary-General
 - letter dated 6 September 2001, 172, 574
 - reports by, 565, 566, 568, 569, 571, 573, 575, 576, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 586, 1025
 - Security Council Committees
 - establishment, 172
 - mandate implementation, 172
 - monitoring and reporting, 172
 - termination of mandate, 172, 211
 - Security Council Missions, 10, 11, 830, 831, 857
 - self-determination, 1025
 - Serbia and Montenegro
 - letter dated 14 August 2003, 585, 849, 853, 854
 - statements by, 582, 585, 587
 - Singapore, statements by, 574, 576, 578
 - Spain, statements by, 584

- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Kosovo, briefings by, 565, 566, 567, 571, 575, 578, 580, 582, 585, 586
- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 581
- Tunisia, statements by, 572
- Ukraine, statements by, 566, 570
- Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 569, 570, 572, 573, 574, 576, 579, 581, 587
- United Kingdom, statements by, 1026
- United States, statements by, 567, 570, 574, 586
- Yugoslavia
 letter dated 13 February 2000, 848
 letter dated 13 February and 14 August 2000, 854
 letter dated 20 May 2000, 848
 letter dated 6 June, 19 July and 14 August 2000, 849
 letter dated 19 July 2000, 853
 letter dated 14 August 2000, 853
 letter dated 6 November 2001, 575
 letter dated 23 May 2002, 849
 statements by, 568, 569, 570, 571, 577, 580
- Kuwait**
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 letter dated 9 August 2000, 925
 letter dated 24 March 2003, 1038
 statements on, 647, 652, 673, 974
 Middle East situation, statements on, 607, 623
- Languages**
 provisional rules of procedure regarding application of Rules 41-47, 22
 generally, 22
- League of Arab States**
 force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, letter dated 24 March 2003, 1029
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 letter dated 24 March 2003, 669, 929, 1012
 statements on behalf of, 648, 654, 929, 957, 1056
 Israel-Syria dispute, statements on behalf of, 1015
 Middle East situation
 letter dated 2 October 2000, 605
 letter dated 13 March 2001, 854
 letter dated 13 December 2001, 616
 letter dated 20 February 2002, 850, 854
 letter dated 1, 6 and 17 April 2002, 854
 letter dated 2 May 2002, 850
 letter dated 11 June 2002, 850
 letter dated 23 July 2002, 850, 853, 854
 letter dated 20 September 2002, 854
 letter dated 12 September 2003, 854
 statements on behalf of, 616, 931
 regional arrangements, letters on, 1061, 1079
 regional organizations, statements on behalf of, 827, 1064
 Somalia situation, statements on behalf of, 286
- Lebanon**
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 928, 1012
 Israel-Syria dispute
 letter dated 5 October 2003, 39, 131, 690, 849, 852, 853, 1014
 statements on, 691, 1039
 terrorism, statements on, 751
- UNIFIL
 letter dated 28 December 1999, 601
 letter dated 6 April 2000, 601
 letter dated 15 and 22 May 2000, 602
 letter dated 11 July 2000, 603
 letter dated 2 and 9 July 2003, 604
- Letters.** *See specific entity or situation*
- Liberia**
 Liberia situation
 letter dated 23 February 2001, 275
 letter dated 11 May 2001, 1018
 letter dated 4 June 2001, 1018
 letter dated 6 September 2001, 1018
 letter dated 31 October 2001, 276, 1019
 letter dated 20 March 2002, 1019
 statements on, 278, 1019
 Sierra Leone situation
 letter dated 3 January 2001, 347
 letter dated 24 January 2001, 347
 statements on, 349, 961
 small arms, statements on, 790
- Liberia situation**
 abstention, 141
 assistance from Member States, 1041
 Bangladesh, statements by, 277
 Belgium, statements by, 278
 China, statements by, 277
 determinations of threats to the peace, 920
 ECOWAS
 briefings by, 283, 959
 statements by, 1070
 force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1031
 France, statements by, 277, 282
 Germany, statements by, 282
 Guinea

- letter dated 26 February 2001, 275
- statements by, 279
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 76, 87, 95, 105, 106, 107, 125, 130, 284
- Liberia**
 - letter dated 23 February 2001, 275
 - letter dated 11 May 2001, 1018
 - letter dated 4 June 2001, 1018
 - letter dated 6 September 2001, 1018
 - letter dated 31 October 2001, 276, 1019
 - letter dated 20 March 2002, 1019
 - statements by, 278, 1019
- Mali**, statements by, 277
- matters of which Security Council seized, 38
- Mauritius**, statements by, 277
- measures involving use of armed force, 971
- measures not involving use of armed force, 946, 959
- Mexico**, statements by, 282
- new Security Council action, 41
- obligations of Member States, 995, 996, 997, 998, 1000
- Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs**, briefings by, 276
- peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 869, 886
- Panel of Experts**
 - briefings by, 276
 - reports by, 176, 177, 275, 279, 280, 284, 1001
- President**
 - decisions announced in statements, 149, 150
 - decisions recorded in letters, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152
 - letters by, 281
 - statements by, 280, 283, 869, 886, 920, 940, 1070
- provisional measures, 940
- regional arrangements, 1070, 1076
- Resolution 1343 (2001), 38, 166, 175, 176, 211, 248, 275, 921, 946, 998, 1031, 1041, 1076, 1080
- Resolution 1395 (2002), 176, 279
- Resolution 1408 (2002), 176, 177, 279, 947
- Resolution 1458 (2003), 177, 280
- Resolution 1478 (2003), 176, 177, 281, 920, 947, 996, 1001, 1070, 1076
- Resolution 1497 (2003), 141, 282, 856, 920, 940, 971, 997, 1000, 1060, 1070, 1076
- Resolution 1509 (2003), 284, 869, 886, 920, 940, 1071, 1076
- Resolution 1521 (2003), 41, 166, 177, 248, 249, 285, 921, 940, 947, 1002
- Russian Federation**, statements by, 278
- sanctions, 946, 947
- Secretary-General**
 - letter dated 28 June 2003, 249, 281, 856
 - letter dated 8 July 2003, 281
 - letter dated 29 July 2003, 281
 - reports by, 276, 279, 284, 1001, 1076
- Security Council Committees**
 - briefings by, 276
 - establishment, 175, 176, 177
 - letter dated 26 October 2001, 275
 - letter dated 19 April 2002, 177, 279
 - letter dated 24 April 2003, 280
 - letter dated 7 August 2003, 1001
 - letter dated 28 October 2003, 284
 - mandate implementation, 175, 176, 177
 - monitoring and reporting, 175, 176, 177
 - termination of mandate, 175, 177, 211
- self-defence, 1018
- Sierra Leone**
 - letter dated 23 February 2001, 275
 - letter dated 27 February 2001, 275
- Sierra Leone**, statements by, 279
- Singapore**
 - letter dated 2 November 2001, 276
 - statements by, 278
- special economic problems, 1001
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Liberia**, briefings by, 284
- Tunisia**, statements by, 277
- United States**, statements by, 278, 282
- Libyan Arab Jamahiriya**
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 647, 671, 957, 1038
 - Lockerbie bombing, letter dated 15 August 2003, 332, 961
 - Middle East situation**
 - letter dated 21 November 2000, 608, 848, 852, 853, 854
 - statements on, 959, 1055
 - sanctions, statements on, 963
 - Somalia situation**, statements on, 289, 291
- Liechtenstein**
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation**, statements on, 1054
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 974

- peacekeeping operations, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813
- terrorism, statements on, 761
- Lockerbie bombing**
- abstention, 141
- Bulgaria, statements by, 334
- deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 53
- France
- letter dated 12 September 2003, 961
- statements by, 333, 334, 961
- Germany, statements by, 334, 962
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 87, 332
- Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, letter dated 15 August 2003, 332, 961
- measures not involving use of armed force, 949, 961
- Pakistan, statements by, 334, 962
- President, statements by, 30, 332
- Resolution 1506 (2003), 31, 141, 169, 333, 949, 961
- Russian Federation, statements by, 334
- sanctions, 949
- Security Council Committees
- mandate implementation, 169
- monitoring and reporting, 169
- termination of mandate, 169, 211
- Spain, statements by, 334
- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 334, 962
- United Kingdom
- letter dated 15 August 2003, 332, 961
- statements by, 334
- United States
- letter dated 15 August 2003, 332, 961
- statements by, 333, 961
- Macedonia situation**
- deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 50
- determinations of threats to the peace, 922
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 74, 76
- Macedonia
- briefings by, 563
- letter dated 4 March 2001, 34, 74, 146, 562, 849, 851, 855, 922, 1073, 1078
- letter dated 17 September 2001, 564
- letter dated 21 September 2001, 564
- matters of which Security Council seized, 34
- new Security Council action, 42
- President
- decisions announced in statements, 146, 147
- statements by, 563, 564, 922, 1074
- referral of disputes to Security Council, 851
- regional arrangements, 1073, 1077, 1078
- Resolution 1345 (2001), 34, 563, 922, 1073, 1077, 1078
- Resolution 1371 (2001), 42, 564, 1074, 1077
- Russian Federation, statements by, 563
- Yugoslavia, statements by, 563
- Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of**
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 978, 1003
- Kosovo situation
- letter dated 8 June 2000, 565
- statements on, 574
- Macedonia situation
- briefings on, 563
- letter dated 4 March 2001, 34, 74, 146, 562, 849, 851, 855, 922, 1073, 1078
- letter dated 17 September 2001, 564
- letter dated 21 September 2001, 564
- special economic problems, statements on, 1004
- Maintenance of peace and security**
- Egypt, statements by, 1005
- General Assembly, recommendations to Security Council, 218
- generally, 1046
- Iran, letter dated 3 June 2003, 1057
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1057
- meetings regarding, 6
- Mongolia, statements by, 1056
- obligations of Member States, 1056
- Palestine, letter dated 26 September 2002, 1057
- President, statements by, 6, 1057
- Somalia situation, 1057
- special economic problems, 1005
- Tunisia, statements by, 1005
- Malawi**
- Angola situation, statements on, 311, 953
- small arms, statements on, 787
- Malaysia (elected member of Security Council 2000)**
- Afghanistan situation, statements on, 513, 517, 951, 1008
- Angola situation, statements on, 298, 302
- Burundi situation, statements on, 323
- children and armed conflict, statements on, 966, 967
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 368
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 722

- Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 439, 440
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
letter dated 17 July 2001, 1002
letter dated 7 March 2003, 665
letter dated 24 March 2003, 1012
statements on, 639, 642, 647, 662, 958, 976,
1003, 1038, 1045, 1056, 1058
- Middle East situation
letter dated 2 October 2000, 848, 851, 853
statements on, 622, 959, 1055
- post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 710
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 896,
904, 910, 912
- refugees, statements on, 768
- responsibility of Security Council in maintenance
of peace and security, statements on, 708
- Rwanda situation, statements on, 321
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 337, 981,
988
- Somalia situation, statements on, 286
- terrorism, statements on, 747
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 469, 471,
474, 478, 480
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening
cooperation with, statements on, 992
- Western Sahara situation, statements on, 272
- Mali (elected member of Security Council
2000-2001)**
- Afghanistan situation, statements on, 952
- Angola situation, statements on, 307, 953
- conduct of business, statements on, 17
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 373, 375, 382
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in
maintenance of peace and security, statements
on, 724, 905, 1061
- force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, letter
dated 11 June 2002, 1028
- Guinea situation
letter dated 11 April 2001, 446
letter regarding, 443
statements on, 445, 447
- Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 439
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 957
- Liberia situation, statements on, 277
- Middle East situation, letter dated 15 August
2001, 848
- Rwanda situation, statements on, 320
- sanctions, statements on, 965
- Sierra Leone situation
letter dated 9 May 2000, 340
letter dated 11 May 2000, 338
statements on, 342
- small arms, statements on, 19, 784
- terrorism, letter dated 18 September 2001, 738
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening
cooperation with, statements on, 810, 990, 992
- Western Sahara situation, statements on, 271
- Marshall Islands**
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 663, 671
- Mauritius (elected member of Security Council
2001-2002)**
- Afghanistan situation, statements on, 952
- Africa situation
letter dated 10 January 2002, 420
statements on, 966
- Angola situation, statements on, 307, 311, 953,
954
- Central African region, statements on, 1065
- conduct of business, statements on, 17
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 375, 382, 394, 402
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in
maintenance of peace and security, statements
on, 725
- food and security, statements on, 824
- Guinea situation, statements on, 445
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 663, 1058
- Liberia situation, statements on, 277
- Middle East situation, statements on, 623, 628,
930, 959
- self-defence, statements on, 1013
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 349
- small arms, statements on, 784, 787, 935, 968
- terrorism, statements on, 736, 741, 746
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 487
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening
cooperation with, statements on, 251
- Measures involving use of armed force**
- Afghanistan situation, 969, 971, 984
- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 969, 984
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 970, 972,
985
- Côte d'Ivoire situation, 970, 984
- decisions relating to Article 42, 969
- decisions relating to Article 43, 984
- decisions relating to Article 44, 990
- decisions relating to Articles 46 and 47, 993
- discussion relating to Article 42, 971
- discussion relating to Article 43, 988

discussion relating to Article 44, 991
 discussion relating to Articles 46 and 47, 993
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in
 maintenance of peace and security, 987, 990,
 991, 993
 generally, 969
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 971, 974, 986
 Liberia situation, 971
 Military Staff Committee, 994
 no exit without strategy, 993
 Sierra Leone situation, 971, 980, 986, 988, 991
 Timor-Leste situation, 970, 985
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening
 cooperation with, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994

Measures not involving use of armed force

Afghanistan situation, 942, 951
 Africa situation, 966
 Angola situation, 944, 952
 children and armed conflict, 950, 966
 civilians in armed conflict, 967
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 944, 954
 decisions relating to Article 41, 942
 discussion relating to Article 41, 951
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in
 maintenance of peace and security, 967
 Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 944, 956
 generally, 942
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 945, 956
 Kosovo situation, 950
 Liberia situation, 946, 959
 Lockerbie bombing, 949, 961
 Middle East situation, 959
 Mubarak assassination attempt extradition
 request, 949, 962
 Sierra Leone situation, 948, 959
 small arms, 968
 Somalia situation, 949
 terrorism, 950
 women and peace and security, 951
 wrap-up discussions, 968

Meetings

maintenance of peace and security, regarding, 6
 provisional rules of procedure regarding
 application of Rules 1-5, 5
 generally, 5
 procedural developments, 7
 Security Council Missions, regarding, 9, 11
 United Kingdom, statements by, 7
 United States, statements by, 7

Mexico (elected member of Security Council 2002-2003)

Africa situation, statements on, 966, 1067
 Bougainville situation, statements on, 538
 Central African region
 briefings on, 834
 statements on, 1065
 children and armed conflict, statements on, 734
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 780,
 910
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
 statements on, 405, 973
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 458
 food and security, statements on, 822
 Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 443
 HIV/AIDS, statements on, 719
 invitations to participate in proceedings, letter
 dated 1 May 2003, 66
 Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 689
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 653, 655,
 657, 664, 668, 675, 678, 679, 683, 685, 925,
 975, 1027
 Liberia situation, statements on, 282
 Middle East situation, statements on, 619, 622,
 1013
 mine action, statements on, 818
 pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 907,
 908, 913
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 895
 protection of UN personnel, statements on, 796
 sanctions, statements on, 801, 966
 terrorism, statements on, 746, 760, 763, 1015
 Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 500, 508
 women and peace and security, statements on,
 807

Middle East situation. *See also specific country*

abstention, 139, 140, 141
 Algeria, statements by, 608, 612, 632
 Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs
 briefings by, 630
 statements by, 1014
 Australia, statements by, 632
 Bahrain
 letter dated 11 June 2002, 625, 852
 statements by, 930
 Bangladesh, statements by, 613, 616, 622
 Belgium, letter dated 8 and 10 August 2001, 614
 Brazil, statements by, 931, 1013
 Bulgaria, statements by, 630, 632, 633
 Cameroon, statements by, 622

- Canada, statements by, 1012
- Chile, statements by, 930
- China, statements by, 610, 633
- Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People
- letter dated 24 March 2000, 229
 - letter dated 2 October 2000, 229
 - letter dated 7 March 2001, 229
 - letter dated 24 March 2001, 229
 - letter dated 5 April 2001, 229
 - letter dated 19 April 2001, 230
 - letter dated 22 August 2001, 230
 - letter dated 28 September 2001, 230
 - letter dated 23 October 2001, 230
 - letter dated 4 December 2001, 230
 - letter dated 5 March 2002, 230
 - letter dated 23 April 2002, 230
 - letter dated 14 August 2002, 230
 - letter dated 21 April 2003, 231
 - letter dated 17 July 2003, 231
 - statements by, 627
- Cuba, statements by, 608, 616, 1012
- determinations of threats to the peace, 930
- draft resolutions, 142, 212, 222, 611, 613, 617, 630, 632, 634
- Egypt
- letter dated 13 December 2001, 854
- Egypt, statements by, 607, 609, 612, 617, 628, 858, 1055
- European Union, statements on behalf of, 628, 1014
- force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1030, 1031
- France, statements by, 613, 615, 623, 625, 630, 633, 858, 1014
- General Assembly
- practice in relation to Article 12 of Charter, 222
 - recommendations to Security Council, 221
- Germany, statements by, 632
- Group of Arab States
- letter dated 2 October 2000, 605
 - letter dated 13 March 2001, 611
 - letter dated 15 August 2001, 614
 - letter dated 20 February 2002, 618
 - letter dated 29 March 2002, 620
 - letter dated 1 April 2002, 621
 - letter dated 6 April 2002, 622
 - letter dated 17 April 2002, 623
 - letter dated 2 May 2002, 625, 852
 - letter dated 23 July 2002, 626
 - letter dated 12 September 2003, 631
 - letter dated 9 October 2003, 633, 634
 - statements on behalf of, 859
- India, statements by, 1013
- investigations and fact-finding, 857, 858
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 65, 70, 71, 74, 79, 87, 91, 93, 99, 101, 102, 111, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119, 124, 127, 130, 131
- Iran, statements by, 615
- Iraq
- letter dated 2 October 2000, 848, 851
 - statements by, 608, 616, 1012
- Ireland, statements by, 630, 931
- Islamic Summit Conference
- letter dated 29 March 2002, 620, 850, 853
 - letter dated 9 October 2003, 850, 853
- Israel
- letter dated 16 and 27 March 2001, 613
 - letter dated 6, 7, 8, 9 and 13 August 2001, 614
 - letter dated 8, 11, 19 and 20 February 2002, 618
 - letter dated 19 September 2002, 628
 - statements by, 606, 608, 609, 610, 612, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 620, 621, 623, 624, 625, 626, 628, 630, 631, 633, 634, 859, 930, 1013, 1014, 1054
- Jordan, letter dated 29 March 2003, 854
- Kuwait, statements by, 607, 623
- League of Arab States
- letter dated 2 October 2000, 605
 - letter dated 13 March 2001, 854
 - letter dated 13 December 2001, 616
 - letter dated 20 February 2002, 850, 854
 - letter dated 1, 6 and 17 April 2002, 854
 - letter dated 2 May 2002, 850
 - letter dated 11 June 2002, 850
 - letter dated 23 July 2002, 850, 853, 854
 - letter dated 20 September 2002, 854
 - letter dated 12 September 2003, 854
 - statements on behalf of, 616, 931
- Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
- letter dated 21 November 2000, 608, 848, 852, 853, 854
 - statements by, 959, 1055
- Malaysia
- letter dated 2 October 2000, 848, 851, 853
 - statements by, 622, 959, 1055
- Mali, letter dated 15 August 2001, 848
- matters of which Security Council seized, 32

- Mauritius, statements by, 623, 628, 930, 959
 measures not involving use of armed force, 959
 Mexico, statements by, 619, 622, 1013
 Morocco, statements by, 930, 941
 Namibia, statements by, 610
 Netherlands, statements by, 610
 new Security Council action, 40
 Non-Aligned Movement
 letter dated 2 October 2000, 605, 848
 letter dated 2 April 2002, 621
 letter dated 12 September 2003, 850
 letter dated 9 October 2003, 633, 850, 853
 statements on behalf of, 610
 Norway, statements by, 617, 630, 1014
 Oman, statements by, 930
 Organization of the Islamic Conference
 letter dated 9 October 2003, 633
 statements on behalf of, 930, 959
 pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
 regarding, 879, 893
 Palestine
 letter dated 29 September 2000, 606
 letter dated 2 October 2000 and 20 February
 2002, 850
 letter dated 2 October 2000, 605, 851, 854
 letter dated 20 November 2000, 609
 letter dated 18 December 2000, 610
 letter dated 9 and 12 March 2001, 611
 letter dated 31 July and 13, 14 and 16 August
 2001, 614
 letter dated 1, 5, 13 and 15 February 2002, 618
 letter dated 20 February 2002, 618, 850, 854
 letter dated 29 March 2002, 620
 letter dated 10 April 2002, 858
 letter dated 20 September 2002, 627, 628
 statements by, 6, 606, 608, 609, 611, 615, 616,
 617, 618, 620, 621, 623, 624, 625, 626, 628,
 630, 631, 633, 634, 859, 1054
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 144, 145,
 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156,
 157, 158, 161
 statements by, 40, 618, 623, 626, 880
 proposed but not established subsidiary organs,
 212
 Qatar
 letter dated 15 August 2001, 848
 statements by, 1012
 referral of disputes to Security Council, 851
 Resolution 1322 (2000), 139, 608, 614, 879
 Resolution 1397 (2002), 140, 619, 880, 893
 Resolution 1402 (2002), 142, 620, 880, 1031
 Resolution 1403 (2002), 622
 Resolution 1405 (2002), 250, 624, 625, 858
 Resolution 1435 (2002), 140, 629, 880, 1031
 Resolution 1515 (2003), 634, 880
 Resolution 1520 (2003), 40
 Russian Federation, statements by, 617, 633
 Saudi Arabia, statements by, 931, 1012, 1014
 Secretary-General
 briefings by, 618, 619, 931
 letter dated 22 April 2002, 858
 letter dated 1 May 2002, 625, 858
 statements by, 620, 628, 1013
 self-defence, 1012
 Singapore, statements by, 613, 623, 911, 1012
 South Africa
 letter dated 2 October 2000, 848, 851
 statements by, 612, 622, 1012
 Spain, statements by, 620, 625, 632
 Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace
 Process, briefings by, 627, 629, 630, 631, 635,
 1014
 Sudan, statements by, 930, 931, 1012
 Syrian Arab Republic
 letter dated 20 September 2002, 627
 letter dated 9 October 2003, 850, 853, 854
 note verbale dated 20 September 2002, 6
 statements by, 6, 619, 620, 621, 630, 631, 633,
 1013
 Tunisia
 letter dated 1 April 2002, 850
 letter dated 17 April 2002, 858
 statements by, 617, 930
 Ukraine, statements by, 142, 610, 615
 Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs
 briefings by, 629, 630, 634
 statements by, 1014
 United Arab Emirates, statements by, 1013
 United Kingdom, statements by, 610, 615, 617,
 623, 632, 859, 1013
 United States
 letter dated 17 October 2000, 609
 statements by, 607, 610, 611, 613, 614, 616,
 617, 619, 620, 622, 623, 624, 625, 627, 628,
 629, 630, 632, 633, 634, 859
 UNTSO, 203
 vetoes of draft resolutions, 222

voting

- non-participation, 142
- non-procedural matters, 137

Yemen, letter dated 20 February 2002, 854

Yugoslavia, letter dated 29 June 2000, 852

Military Staff Committee

measures involving use of armed force, 994

relations of Security Council with

- assessments of work of Security Council, 251

- ensuring effective role of Security Council in

 - maintenance of peace and security, 250

- generally, 250

- no exit without strategy, 251

- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, 251

Russian Federation

- letter dated 6 July 2001, 994

- statements by, 994

Mine action

Bulgaria, statements by, 817

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 51

France, statements by, 817, 818

Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining, briefings by, 816

Germany, statements by, 817

Guinea, statements by, 817

invitations to participate in proceedings, 127, 132

matters of which Security Council seized, 40

Mexico, statements by, 818

Pakistan, statements by, 817

President

- decisions announced in statements, 151

- statements by, 40, 818

Russian Federation, statements by, 817

Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 817

Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 816

United Kingdom, statements by, 817

MINUCI. *See* UN Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (MINUCI)

MINURCA. *See* UN Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA)

MINURSO. *See* UN Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO)

MIPONUH. *See* UN Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (MIPONUH)

Moldova

terrorism, letter dated 25 September 2001, 738

Mongolia

Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1053, 1081

maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 1056

post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 711

Montenegro. *See* Serbia and Montenegro

MONUC. *See* UN Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC)

Morocco

Angola situation, statements on, 299

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 958, 974, 1038, 1055

Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 691, 1040

Middle East situation, statements on, 930, 941

Western Sahara situation

- letter dated 24 February 2000, 270

- letters regarding, 273, 274

Mozambique

Angola situation, statements on, 307, 953

Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 388, 972

Mozambique situation

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49

Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request

abstention, 140

Algeria, letter dated 1 June 2000, 962

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 51

Gabon, letter dated 2 June 2000, 962

invitations to participate in proceedings, 76

Ireland, statements by, 448, 962

matters of which Security Council seized, 35

measures not involving use of armed force, 949, 962

Resolution 1372 (2001), 35, 140, 448, 949, 962

Russian Federation, statements by, 448

sanctions, 949

South Africa, letter dated 1 June 2000, 962

Sudan

- letter dated 1 June 2000, 962

- statements by, 448

United Kingdom, statements by, 448, 962

United States, statements by, 448, 962

Multinational forces

assistance from Member States, 1042

Myanmar

children and armed conflict, statements on, 734

Nagorny Karabakh situation

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 50

Namibia (elected member of Security Council 2000)

Angola situation, statements on, 297, 299, 311, 954

Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 365, 368, 373, 379, 380, 383, 386, 388, 394, 972, 1032

ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 722, 724, 967

Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 440

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1003

Middle East situation, statements on, 610

no exit without strategy, statements on, 808

prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 792, 902

protection of UN personnel, statements on, 795

Sierra Leone situation

letter dated 11 May 2000, 338, 848

statements on, 989

small arms, statements on, 787

Timor-Leste situation

briefings on, 480

statements on, 468, 476, 480

Western Sahara situation

letters regarding, 274

statements on, 271

women and peace and security, statements on, 906

Yugoslavia situation

letter dated 11 May 2000, 852

statements on, 588

Navigation on Danube River

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 48

Nepal

Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 974

terrorism, statements on, 754

troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 810

women and peace and security, statements on, 803

Netherlands (elected member of Security Council 2000)

Afghanistan situation

letter regarding, 1007

statements on, 951, 971

Angola situation, statements on, 297, 298, 302

Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 543, 548

Burundi situation, statements on, 323

civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 770

Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 365

ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 721

Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 438, 439

humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 909

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 637, 642

Middle East situation, statements on, 610

no exit without strategy, letter dated 6 November 2000, 807

prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 792, 896, 935

refugees, statements on, 767

responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 708

Rwanda situation, statements on, 320

sanctions, statements on, 962, 964

Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 341, 960

Somalia situation, statements on, 286

Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 471, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 480

troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, letter regarding, 812

Western Sahara situation, statements on, 271

New Zealand

Afghanistan situation

letter regarding, 1007

statements on, 522

Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1053, 1054

Bougainville situation, statements on, 538

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 653, 957, 975

justice and rule of law, statements on, 838

peacekeeping operations, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813

post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 711

sanctions, statements on, 962, 964

Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 505

troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with

letter regarding, 812

statements on, 811, 992

women and peace and security, statements on, 906

Nigeria

- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1054
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 393, 394, 954
- Côte d'Ivoire situation, statements on, 456
- HIV/AIDS, statements on, 717
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 655, 929, 977
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 908, 1050
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 993

No exit without strategy

- Argentina, statements by, 809
- Bangladesh, statements by, 808
- Canada, statements by, 808, 809
- China, statements by, 993
- Denmark, statements by, 809
- Egypt, statements by, 808, 809
- France, statements by, 809
- Germany, statements by, 809, 900
- India, statements by, 809
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 71
- Italy, statements by, 900
- matters of which Security Council seized, 33
- measures involving use of armed force, 993
- Military Staff Committee, relations of Security Council with other UN organs, 251
- Namibia, statements by, 808
- Netherlands, letter dated 6 November 2000, 807
- Pakistan, statements by, 808
- President
 - decisions recorded in letters, 156
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152
 - statements by, 808
- Thailand, statements by, 900
- Ukraine, statements by, 900
- United Kingdom, statements by, 808, 809
- United States, statements by, 900

Nobel Peace Prize

- matters of which Security Council seized, 35
- President
 - decisions announced in statements, 147
 - statements by, 35, 821
- Secretary-General, statements by, 821

Non-Aligned Movement

- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 - letter dated 10 October 2002, 650, 848
 - letter dated 6 February 2003, 661
 - letter dated 14 February 2003, 661

- letter dated 7 March 2003, 850, 853
- letter dated 24 March 2003, 669
- statements on behalf of, 653, 654, 978, 979
- Middle East situation
 - letter dated 2 October 2000, 605, 848
 - letter dated 2 April 2002, 621
 - letter dated 12 September 2003, 850
 - letter dated 9 October 2003, 633, 850, 853
 - statements on behalf of, 610

Non-Member States, purposes and principles of UN and, 1043

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

- Afghanistan situation, letter dated 2 and 6 October 2003, 533

Norway (elected member of Security Council 2001-2002)

- Afghanistan situation, statements on, 517, 971, 1007
- Africa situation, statements on, 966
- Angola situation, statements on, 307, 313
- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 774, 781
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 402
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 725
- Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 356
- HIV/AIDS, statements on, 717
- humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 712, 909, 933
- Kosovo situation, statements on, 569, 570
- Middle East situation, statements on, 617, 630, 1014
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 349
- small arms, statements on, 19, 784
- Somalia situation, statements on, 289
- terrorism, statements on, 737, 741, 746, 749, 751, 1015
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 489, 491, 493, 496

Notes verbales. See specific entity or situation

OAS (Organization of American States)

- regional organizations, statements on, 827

OAU. See Organization of African Unity (OAU)

Obligations of Member States

- Afghanistan situation, 995, 996, 997, 999
- Angola situation, 995
- Article 48, under, 994
- Article 49, under, 998

- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 998, 1000, 1081
 calls for mutual assistance, 998, 999
 Charter, under, 1080
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 995, 997, 1000
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, 998
 Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 995, 996
 International Tribunal for Rwanda, 996
 International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, 996
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 997
 Liberia situation, 995, 996, 997, 998, 1000
 maintenance of peace and security, 1056
 pacific settlement of disputes, 901
 Security Council decisions under Article 41, under, 995
 Security Council decisions under Article 42, under, 997
 Sierra Leone situation, 995, 996, 999, 1000
 Somalia situation, 996, 999
- Occupied Arab territories.** *See specific country*
- Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs**
 Liberia situation, briefings on, 276
- Office of the Iraq Programme**
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, briefings on, 681
- OIC.** *See* Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC)
- Oman**
 Middle East situation, statements on, 930
- Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)**
 briefings by, 33, 73
 regional organizations, statements on, 827
- Organization of African Unity (OAU).** *See also* African Union
 Africa situation
 briefings on, 421
 statements on, 424
 Central African Republic situation, letter regarding, 412
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 362, 1033
- Organization of American States (OAS)**
 regional organizations, statements on, 827
- Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC)**
 Middle East situation
 letter dated 9 October 2003, 633
 statements on behalf of, 930, 959
 prevention of armed conflict, statements on behalf of, 1063
 terrorism
 letter dated 14 September 2001, 738
 statements on behalf of, 752, 754
- OSCE.** *See* Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)
- Pacific settlement of disputes**
 Afghanistan situation, 873, 888
 Africa situation, 888
 Angola situation, 861, 864, 882
 Armenia, statements by, 1016
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 875, 890
 Bougainville situation, 875, 890
 Bulgaria, statements by, 901, 907
 Burundi situation, 865, 883
 Cameroon, statements by, 907
 Central Africa region, 861
 Central African Republic situation, 883
 China, statements by, 901
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 861, 866, 884
 constitutional discussion bearing on generally, 893
 prevention of armed conflict, 894
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, 866, 884
 Croatia situation, 876
 Cyprus situation, 861, 876, 891
 efforts of Security Council, 880
 Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 862, 867, 885
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 907, 908
 general and thematic issues, 862
 generally, 860
 Georgia situation, 877, 891
 Germany, statements by, 901, 905
 Guinea situation, 869, 885
 Guinea, statements by, 1066
 Guinea-Bissau situation, 869, 885
 Haiti situation, 890
 Honduras, statements by, 908
 ICJ, statements by, 907
 India, statements by, 902, 1016
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 86, 128, 132
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 893
 Kosovo situation, 878, 892
 Liberia situation, 869, 886
 matters of which Security Council seized, 39
 Mexico, statements by, 907, 908, 913

- Middle East situation, 879, 893
- obligations of Member States, 901
- Pakistan, statements by, 901, 908
- Personal Representative of the Secretary-General for Timor-Leste, statements by, 829, 900
- President
 - decisions announced in statements, 150
 - statements by, 39, 829, 880
- recommendations, 864
- regional arrangements, 893, 1066, 1068
- role of Security Council, 862, 894, 900, 902, 907, 912
- Secretary-General, statements by, 829, 900, 907, 912, 1066
- self-defence, 1016
- Sierra Leone situation, 862, 869, 886
- Somalia situation, 861, 870, 886
- Spain, statements by, 902, 905
- Sudan situation, 872, 888
- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 901
- Tajikistan situation, 875, 890
- Timor-Leste situation, 874, 889
- Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, statements by, 829
- United States, statements by, 901, 913
- West Africa region, 888
- Western Sahara situation, 861, 872, 887
- Pakistan (elected member of Security Council 2003)**
 - Afghanistan situation, statements on, 515, 517, 522, 526, 952, 972
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1054
 - children and armed conflict, statements on, 734
 - civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773, 780, 967
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 368, 956, 973
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441
 - humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 713, 933, 1044
 - India-Pakistan dispute
 - letter dated 23 January 2000, 1017
 - letter dated 22 May 2002, 1018
 - letter dated 19 August 2003, 855
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 664, 674, 676, 678, 681, 927, 974, 1027, 1028, 1045, 1057
 - Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 691, 1040
 - justice and rule of law, statements on, 837
 - Kosovo situation, statements on, 582, 583, 584, 587, 1026
 - Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 334, 962
 - mine action, statements on, 817
 - no exit without strategy, statements on, 808
 - peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
 - prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 896, 898, 902, 909, 910, 912, 935, 1016
 - regional organizations, statements on, 828, 1064
 - sanctions, statements on, 800, 963
 - Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339, 982, 989
 - small arms, statements on, 784, 1051
 - terrorism
 - letter dated 13 September 2001, 738
 - statements on, 743, 744, 747, 753, 758, 759, 762
 - troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 810, 811
- Palestine.** *See also* Middle East situation
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 65
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1058
 - maintenance of peace and security, letter dated 26 September 2002, 1057
 - Middle East situation
 - letter dated 29 September 2000, 606
 - letter dated 2 October 2000 and 20 February 2002, 850
 - letter dated 2 October 2000, 605, 851, 854
 - letter dated 20 November 2000, 609
 - letter dated 18 December 2000, 610
 - letter dated 9 and 12 March 2001, 611
 - letter dated 31 July and 13, 14 and 16 August 2001, 614
 - letter dated 1, 5, 13 and 15 February 2002, 618
 - letter dated 20 February 2002, 618, 850, 854
 - letter dated 29 March 2002, 620
 - letter dated 10 April 2002, 858
 - letter dated 20 September 2002, 627, 628
 - statements on, 6, 606, 608, 609, 611, 615, 616, 617, 618, 620, 621, 623, 624, 625, 626, 628, 630, 631, 633, 634, 859, 1054
 - permanent observer, invitations to participate in proceedings, 62
 - self-determination, statements on, 1024
 - terrorism, statements on, 743

Papua New Guinea

Bougainville situation, statements on, 536, 538

Peacekeeping operations. *See also specific entity or situation*

abstention, 140

Angola, statements by, 815

assistance from Member States, 1042

Bulgaria, statements by, 815

Canada, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813

China, statements by, 815

determinations of threats to the peace, 936

France, statements by, 815

generally, 184

Greece, letter dated 10 June 2003, 813

Guinea, statements by, 815

invitations to participate in proceedings, 87

Iran, statements by, 814

Jordan, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813

Liechtenstein, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813

matters of which Security Council seized, 37

New Zealand, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813

Pakistan, statements by, 815

President

decisions recorded in letters, 160

letter dated 7 March 2003, 228

statements by, 8

Resolution 1422 (2002), 813, 1053, 1082

Resolution 1487 (2003), 37, 140, 815, 1054, 1082

Russian Federation, statements by, 815

Secretary-General

relations of Security Council with, 248

statements by, 813

Spain, statements by, 815

Switzerland, letter dated 6 June 2003, 813

United Kingdom, statements by, 815

United States, statements by, 815

Uruguay, statements by, 814

Pelindaba, Treaty of

deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 51

Permanent observers

invitations to participate in proceedings, 62

Personal Representative of the Secretary-General for Timor-Leste

pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 829, 900

Peru

small arms, statements on, 784, 785

terrorism, statements on, 743, 744, 747, 751, 754

Philippines

Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 973

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 666

Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 504

Poland

Afghanistan situation, letter regarding, 1007

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1038

Political Committee on the Implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement

briefings by, 377

statements by, 369, 370, 377, 390

Political missions. *See specific entity or situation***Portugal****Angola situation**

letter dated 26 April 2002, 315

letter regarding, 302

statements on, 313

Bosnia and Herzegovina situation

letter dated 23 May 2000, 544

letter dated 14 June 2000, 545

Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, letter dated 12 May 2000, 429

humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 712

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, letter dated 18 March 2003, 927

sanctions, statements on, 964

Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339

Timor-Leste situation

letter dated 25 January 2001, 483

statements on, 493, 502, 503, 1025

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Algeria, statements by, 710, 711, 1065

Canada, statements by, 711

Colombia, statements by, 1050, 1062

Croatia, statements by, 710

Egypt, statements by, 820, 1050

France, statements by, 710, 819

generally, 1049

India, statements by, 820, 1050

invitations to participate in proceedings, 69, 73

Jamaica, statements by, 899

Malaysia, statements by, 710

matters of which Security Council seized, 33

Mongolia, statements by, 711

new Security Council action, 45

New Zealand, statements by, 711

President

decisions announced in statements, 144, 146

- statements by, 33, 45, 232, 240, 711, 820, 864, 882, 899, 1050
- regional arrangements, 1062, 1065
- Secretary-General
 - briefings by, 709
 - reports by, 708, 711
 - statements by, 818, 899
- Tunisia, letter dated 25 January 2001, 818, 820, 1047
- Ukraine, statements by, 820
- United Kingdom, statements by, 1062
- United States, statements by, 710, 820, 1050
- Presidency**
 - Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa, decisions recorded in notes, 153, 154
 - admission of new Member States, decisions announced in statements, 144, 145, 148, 149
 - Afghanistan situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 145, 150
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 157, 158, 160, 161
 - decisions recorded in notes, 153
 - statements on, 512, 532, 873, 888, 921, 940, 1030
 - Africa Day, decisions recorded in notes, 153
 - Africa situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 148
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 156, 157, 158, 160, 162
 - decisions recorded in notes, 153
 - note dated 1 March 2002, 423
 - statements on, 233, 238, 419, 423, 425, 888, 1066
 - Agenda, statements on, 27
 - al-Qaida and Taliban, decisions recorded in notes, 153
 - Angola situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 147, 148
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152
 - notes regarding, 306, 308
 - statements on, 309, 311, 313, 864, 865, 882, 1041
 - anniversary of 11 September 2001
 - decisions announced in statements, 149
 - statements on, 37, 764
 - assessments of work of Security Council, 14
 - BONUCA, statements on, 195
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 146, 149
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 159
 - statements on, 544, 545, 546, 549, 559, 891
 - Bougainville situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 145
 - decisions recorded in letters, 157, 158, 160, 162
 - letter dated 23 December 2003, 890
 - statements on, 33, 539, 875
 - Burundi situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161
 - statements on, 42, 233, 324, 325, 327, 328, 329, 330, 332, 865, 866, 883, 1071
 - Central African region
 - decisions announced in statements, 149
 - statements on, 11, 37, 453, 835
 - Central African Republic situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 144, 146, 147, 149
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 159, 161
 - statements on, 413, 414, 415, 417, 418, 883
 - children and armed conflict
 - decisions announced in statements, 148
 - statements on, 731, 732
 - civilians in armed conflict
 - decisions announced in statements, 148, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 157
 - letter dated 14 February 2001, 227
 - letter dated 21 June 2001, 774
 - statements on, 771, 776, 779, 782, 1052
 - combating terrorism, statements on, 1079
 - conduct of business, statements on, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160
 - decisions recorded in notes, 153
 - letter dated 24 April 2000, 178
 - letter dated 12 July 2002, 179
 - statements on, 29, 43, 178, 179, 180, 364, 366, 368, 369, 371, 375, 376, 380, 385, 387, 389, 390, 394, 395, 396, 397, 399, 406, 412, 857, 867, 884, 1030, 1035, 1037, 1072

- Côte d'Ivoire situation
 decisions announced in statements, 150, 151
 decisions recorded in letters, 160, 161
 statements on, 38, 454, 455, 459, 462, 860, 884, 937, 1030, 1042, 1068, 1069
- Counter-Terrorism Committee, decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153, 154
- Croatia situation
 decisions announced in statements, 149
 decisions recorded in letters, 155
 statements on, 42, 562, 876
- Cyprus situation
 decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 162
 statements on, 540, 542
- documentation
 decisions recorded in letters, 159
 decisions recorded in notes, 152
- draft report of Security Council, decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153, 154
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security
 decisions announced in statements, 145, 146
 decisions recorded in notes, 152
 statements on, 32, 721, 725
- Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute
 decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 148, 150
 decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159
 letter dated 7 July 2000, 194
 statements on, 175, 250, 432, 434, 435, 868, 869, 885, 945
- Georgia situation
 decisions announced in statements, 145, 146
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 159
 statements on, 592, 594, 595, 596, 877, 891, 892
- Great Lakes region situation
 decisions announced in statements, 151
 decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161
 statements on, 43, 361
- Guinea situation
 decisions announced in statements, 146, 147
 decisions recorded in letters, 158
 statements on, 33, 36, 443, 869, 885, 1031, 1069
- Guinea-Bissau situation
 decisions announced in statements, 144, 146, 150
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 157, 158, 159, 162
 statements on, 233, 240, 438, 440, 442, 869
- Haiti situation
 decisions announced in statements, 144
 statements on, 41, 232, 466, 890
- HIV/AIDS
 decisions announced in statements, 147
 letter dated 31 January 2000, 235
 statements on, 233, 235, 236, 717, 931
- humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security
 decisions announced in statements, 144
 statements on, 32, 713, 1047, 1049
- ICJ, statements on, 242, 243
- India-Pakistan dispute, decisions recorded in letters, 155, 157, 159
- International Tribunal for Rwanda
 decisions announced in statements, 150, 151
 decisions recorded in letters, 157, 159, 160, 161
 letter dated 11 October 2002, 143
 statements on, 44, 695, 697, 706
- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
 decisions announced in statements, 149
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 156, 161, 162
 letter dated 19 January 2001, 143
 statements on, 695, 697, 703
- invitations to participate in proceedings
 note dated 28 February 2000, 61
 note dated 22 November 2002, 61
 statements on, 65, 66
- Iraq humanitarian situation, decisions recorded in notes, 153
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 decisions announced in statements, 151
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 18, 159, 160, 161, 162
 letter dated 2 December 2003, 686
 statements on, 41, 682, 687
- Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 40
- justice and rule of law
 decisions announced in statements, 150
 statements on, 837
- Kosovo situation
 decisions announced in statements, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161

- statements on, 568, 569, 572, 575, 577, 579, 581, 583, 587, 878, 879, 892, 1026
- letter dated 15 July 2002, 159
- Liberia situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 149, 150
 - decisions recorded in letters, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152
 - letters on, 281
 - statements on, 280, 283, 869, 886, 920, 940, 1070
- Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 30, 332
- Macedonia situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 146, 147
 - statements on, 563, 564, 922, 1074
- maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 6, 1057
- Middle East situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 161
 - statements on, 40, 618, 623, 626, 880
- mine action
 - decisions announced in statements, 151
 - statements on, 40, 818
- MIPONUH, statements on, 197
- no exit without strategy
 - decisions recorded in letters, 156
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152
 - statements on, 808
- Nobel Peace Prize
 - decisions announced in statements, 147
 - statements on, 35, 821
- note dated 31 March 2000, 23
- note dated 29 June 2001, 13, 23
- note dated 26 March 2002, 23
- note dated 12 June 1997, 13
- pacific settlement of disputes
 - decisions announced in statements, 150
 - statements on, 39, 829, 880
- peacekeeping operations
 - decisions recorded in letters, 160
 - letter dated 7 March 2003, 228
 - statements on, 8
- post-conflict peacebuilding
 - decisions announced in statements, 144, 146
 - statements on, 33, 45, 232, 240, 711, 820, 864, 882, 899, 1050
- prevention of armed conflict
 - decisions announced in statements, 145
 - statements on, 45, 232, 236, 792, 863, 895, 897, 1050, 1063
- protection of UN personnel
 - decisions announced in statements, 144
 - statements on, 795
- provisional rules of procedure regarding, 12
- refugees
 - decisions announced in statements, 144
 - statements on, 45, 768
- regional organizations, statements on, 1059
- reports by Secretary-General, note dated 22 May 2002, 225
- responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security
 - decisions announced in statements, 146
 - statements on, 44, 708
- Rwanda situation, decisions recorded in notes, 152
- sanctions
 - decisions recorded in notes, 151, 152, 153, 154
 - note dated 17 April 2000, 797, 1002
- Security Council Missions
 - decisions announced in statements, 150
 - decisions recorded in letters, 160
 - statements on, 9
- Sierra Leone situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 145, 148
 - decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 157, 162
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153
 - note dated 20 December 2000, 346
 - statements on, 10, 337, 338, 342, 345, 353, 870, 940, 1000
- small arms
 - decisions announced in statements, 147, 149
 - statements on, 45, 785, 787, 1006, 1051
- Somalia situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
 - decisions recorded in letters, 158, 161, 162
 - decisions recorded in notes, 152
 - statements on, 169, 286, 287, 289, 291, 293, 294, 295, 870, 871, 872, 886, 887, 999, 1073
- Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans, decisions recorded in letters, 156
- Sudan situation
 - decisions announced in statements, 150
 - statements on, 462, 872

- Tajikistan situation
 decisions announced in statements, 144, 145
 decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158, 160
 statements on, 42, 509, 510, 875, 890
- terrorism
 decisions announced in statements, 148, 149, 150, 151
 statements on, 748, 754, 755, 758, 761, 763
- Timor-Leste situation
 decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 147, 148
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 161
 statements on, 10, 476, 482, 494, 497, 504, 874, 875, 889
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with
 decisions announced in statements, 146
 decisions recorded in letters, 157, 158
 note dated 27 August 2002, 61
 statements on, 8, 809, 811, 983, 991
- UNDOF, statements on, 600
- UNIFIL, statements on, 601, 602, 603
- UNOB
 letter dated 7 December 2001, 185
 statements on, 186
- UNOL
 letter dated 29 November 2002, 187
 statements on, 187
- UNPOB, letter dated 23 December 2003, 199
- UNPOS, statements on, 186, 187
- UNTAET, statements on, 200
- UNTOP, statements on, 198
- voting, note dated 29 June 2001, 136
- West Africa region, statements on, 11, 449, 450, 888, 1079
- Western Sahara situation, decisions recorded in letters, 159, 160, 161
- women and peace and security
 decisions announced in statements, 147, 149
 decisions recorded in letters, 161
 statements on, 803, 806
- Working Group on UN Peacekeeping Operations
 decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153, 154
 notes on, 36
- working methods and procedures
 decisions recorded in letters, 154
 decisions recorded in notes, 151, 153
- Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 589
- Prevention of armed conflict**
 Argentina, statements by, 896, 898
 Belarus, statements by, 908
 Brazil, statements by, 910, 912
 Cameroon, statements by, 894
 Canada, statements by, 1063
 China, statements by, 792, 896, 898, 904
 constitutional discussion bearing on pacific settlement of disputes, 894
 Costa Rica, statements by, 904
 Deputy Secretary-General
 reports by, 237
 statements by, 793
 determinations of threats to the peace, 923, 935
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 896
 France, statements by, 909, 910
 General Assembly, recommendations to Security Council, 220
 Germany, statements by, 894
 Indonesia, statements by, 1063
 investigations and fact-finding, 858
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 75, 93
 Iraq, statements by, 912, 1050
 Jamaica, statements by, 935
 Japan, statements by, 899, 905
 Malaysia, statements by, 896, 904, 910, 912
 Mexico, statements by, 895
 Namibia, statements by, 792, 902
 Netherlands, statements by, 792, 896, 935
 new Security Council action, 45
 Nigeria, statements by, 908, 1050
 Organization of the Islamic Conference,
 statements on behalf of, 1063
 Pakistan, statements by, 896, 898, 902, 909, 910, 912, 935, 1016
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 145
 statements by, 45, 232, 236, 792, 863, 895, 897, 1050, 1063
 regional arrangements, 1062
 Resolution 1366 (2001), 45, 232, 237, 248, 794, 858, 863, 881, 923, 1046, 1051, 1063
 role of Security Council, 863, 895, 902, 904, 908, 909, 911, 1050
 Russian Federation, statements by, 896, 898, 904, 911
 Secretary-General
 relations of Security Council with, 246, 248

- reports by, 237, 894, 897, 904, 908, 910, 912, 935, 1063
- statements by, 236, 791, 792, 895
- self-defence, 1016
- Singapore, statements by, 910, 912
- South Africa, statements by, 898, 905
- Spain, statements by, 895
- Sweden, statements by, 910
- Tanzania, statements by, 1063
- Tunisia, statements by, 896, 910, 912
- Ukraine, statements by, 910, 912
- United Kingdom, statements by, 895, 908, 909
- United States, statements by, 895, 908, 911, 935
- Programme for Coordination and Assistance for Security and Development**
 - small arms, briefings on, 788
- Protection of UN personnel**
 - China, statements by, 795
 - Deputy Secretary-General, briefings by, 794
 - Egypt, statements by, 795
 - France, statements by, 795
 - International Committee of the Red Cross, briefings by, 795
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 68, 92, 93
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 32
 - Mexico, statements by, 796
 - Namibia, statements by, 795
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 144
 - statements by, 795
 - Resolution 1502 (2003), 32, 796, 1046
 - Secretary-General, statements by, 796
 - United States, statements by, 796
 - World Food Programme, briefings by, 794
- Provisional measures**
 - Afghanistan situation, 940
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 941
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 938
 - Côte d'Ivoire situation, 937
 - decisions relating to Article 40, 937
 - discussion relating to Article 40, 941
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 939
 - generally, 937
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 941
 - Liberia situation, 940
 - Sierra Leone situation, 940
- Provisional rules of procedure**
 - conduct of business, regarding
 - application of Rules 27-36, 16
 - generally, 15
 - languages, regarding
 - application of Rules 41-47, 22
 - generally, 22
 - meetings, regarding
 - application of Rules 1-5, 5
 - generally, 5
 - procedural developments, 7
 - Presidency, regarding, 12
 - publicity of meetings and records, regarding, 23
 - representation and credentials, regarding, 12
 - Secretariat, regarding, 15
- Publicity of meetings and records**
 - provisional rules of procedure regarding, 23
- Purposes and principles of UN**
 - non-Member States and, 1043
- Qatar**
 - Middle East situation
 - letter dated 15 August 2001, 848
 - statements on, 1012
 - terrorism, statements on, 743
- Referral of disputes to Security Council**
 - action requested, 854
 - Article 34, under, 904
 - Article 35, under, 906
 - Article 36, under, 907
 - Article 99, under, 908
 - by General Assembly, 856
 - by Member States, 848
 - by Secretary-General, 855
 - Central African region, 852
 - generally, 848
 - Israel-Syria dispute, 852
 - Macedonia situation, 851
 - Middle East situation, 851
 - nature of matters referred, 852
- Refugees**
 - Canada, statements by, 768
 - High Commissioner for Refugees
 - briefings by, 32, 37, 91, 114, 766, 840
 - statements by, 768
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 91
 - Jamaica, statements by, 768
 - Malaysia, statements by, 768
 - Netherlands, statements by, 767
 - new Security Council action, 45
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 144
 - statements by, 45, 768
 - Ukraine, statements by, 768

- United Kingdom, statements by, 767
 United States, statements by, 767
- Regional arrangements**
- Afghanistan situation, 1077, 1078
 Africa situation, 1066
 assistance from Member States, 1042
 Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 1074
 Burundi situation, 1071
 Central African region, 1065
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 1072
 consultation, briefing and reporting, 1079
 Côte d'Ivoire situation, 1068, 1078
 Cyprus, letter dated 14 February 2001, 1061
 enforcement action, 1077
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in
 maintenance of peace and security, 1061
 Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 1073
 Fiji, letter dated 2 July 2003, 1061, 1079
 generally, 1059
 Georgia situation, 1074
 Guinea situation, 1069
 involvement in implementation of measures, 1075
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1075
 League of Arab States, letters by, 1061, 1079
 Liberia situation, 1070, 1076
 Macedonia situation, 1073, 1077, 1078
 pacific settlement of disputes, 893, 1066, 1068
 post-conflict peacebuilding, 1062, 1065
 prevention of armed conflict, 1062
 Resolution 1353 (2001), 1079
 Sierra Leone situation, 1069, 1075, 1077
 Somalia situation, 1072, 1076
 Sudan situation, 1073
- Regional Bureau for Africa**
- Central African Republic situation, briefings on,
 414
- Regional organizations**
- African Union, statements by, 827
 Angola, statements by, 1064
 Cameroon, statements by, 1064
 Chile, statements by, 828, 1064
 China, statements by, 828
 ECOWAS, statements by, 827
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 827,
 1065
 France, statements by, 828, 1064
 Germany, statements by, 1064
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 86, 129,
 130, 131
- League of Arab States, statements on behalf of,
 827, 1064
 matters of which Security Council seized, 39
 Organization for Security and Cooperation in
 Europe, statements by, 827
 Organization of American States, statements by,
 827
 Pakistan, statements by, 828, 1064
 President, statements on, 1059
 Russian Federation, statements by, 1064
 Secretary-General
 letter dated 22 October 2003, 1059
 statements by, 826
 United States, statements by, 1064
- Regional Peace Initiative for Burundi**
- briefings by, 327
- Relations of Security Council with other UN organs**
- Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable
 Rights of the Palestinian People, 227
- ECOSOC
 constitutional discussion, 233
 generally, 231
 requests or references, 231
- General Assembly
 election of non-permanent members, 217
 generally, 216
 maintenance of peace and security,
 recommendations to Security Council, 218
 practice in relation to Article 12 of Charter,
 221
 practice in relation to recommendations by
 Security Council, 223
 reports by Security Council, 224
 subsidiary organs, 226
- ICJ
 consideration of, 243
 election of members, 242
 generally, 242
- Military Staff Committee
 assessments of work of Security Council, 251
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in
 maintenance of peace and security, 250
 generally, 250
 no exit without strategy, 251
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening
 cooperation with, 251
- Secretariat
 generally, 245
 good offices, 246
 international tribunals, support of, 248

- investigations and fact-finding, 246
- joint efforts to promote political settlement, 247
- matters brought to attention of Security Council, 249
- non-administrative functions, 245
- peacekeeping operations, 248
- sanctions, 248
- Trusteeship Council, 241
- Reports.** *See specific entity or situation*
- Representation and credentials**
 - provisional rules of procedure regarding, 12
- Representative of the Secretary-General for Guinea-Bissau**
 - briefings by, 440
- Representative of the Secretary-General for Somalia**
 - briefings by, 288, 292
- Resolutions.** *See specific entity or situation*
- Responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security**
 - Canada, statements by, 708
 - China, statements by, 708
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 90
 - Malaysia, statements by, 708
 - Netherlands, statements by, 708
 - new Security Council action, 44
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 146
 - statements by, 44, 708
 - Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs, briefings by, 707
 - United Kingdom, statements by, 708
 - United States, statements by, 708
- Rio Group**
 - terrorism, statements on behalf of, 744, 747, 750
- Rules of procedure.** *See Provisional rules of procedure*
- Russian Federation (permanent member of Security Council)**
 - Afghanistan situation
 - letter regarding, 521
 - statements on, 512, 514, 515, 517, 522, 524, 526, 532, 952
 - Africa situation, statements on, 1067
 - Angola situation, letter dated 26 April 2002, 315
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 543, 545, 546, 547, 551, 552, 558, 560, 1074
 - Burundi situation, statements on, 323
 - Central African region, statements on, 465, 903, 936, 1065
 - Central African Republic situation, statements on, 417
 - children and armed conflict, statements on, 734, 735
 - civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 782, 911, 934, 935, 1052
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 362, 365, 368, 373, 376, 383, 384, 389, 394, 402, 955, 973, 1033
 - Cyprus situation, statements on, 542
 - ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 251, 725, 993
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, statements on, 434, 956
 - food and security, statements on, 241, 822, 823
 - Georgia situation
 - letter dated 26 January 2000, 591
 - letter dated 26 June 2000, 593
 - letter dated 25 July 2000, 594
 - letter dated 11 September 2002, 1017
 - Guinea situation, statements on, 447
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441, 443
 - humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 713, 933, 1048
 - International Tribunal for Rwanda, statements on, 693, 697
 - International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 693, 694, 697, 702
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 64, 65
 - Iraq humanitarian situation
 - letter dated 15 June 2001, 848
 - statements on, 689, 968
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 - letter 24 February 2003, 927
 - letter dated 15 June 2001, 644, 1055
 - statements on, 637, 641, 642, 643, 646, 654, 658, 659, 667, 673, 674, 675, 680, 682, 683, 684, 685, 926, 928, 957, 958, 976, 979, 980, 1028
 - justice and rule of law, statements on, 837
 - Kosovo situation, statements on, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 574, 577, 579, 580, 581, 583, 584
 - Liberia situation, statements on, 278
 - Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 334
 - Macedonia situation, statements on, 563
 - Middle East situation, statements on, 617, 633

- Military Staff Committee
 letter dated 6 July 2001, 994
 statements on, 994
- mine action, statements on, 817
- Mubarak assassination attempt extradition
 request, statements on, 448
- peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 896,
 898, 904, 911
- regional organizations, statements on, 1064
- Rwanda situation, statements on, 320
- sanctions, statements on, 800, 963, 964, 965
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 339, 341,
 347, 348, 349, 960, 981, 989
- small arms, statements on, 786, 935, 1015
- Tajikistan situation, statements on, 510
- terrorism, statements on, 737, 741, 746, 748, 753,
 759, 760, 766
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 479, 487,
 489, 496, 499, 500
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening
 cooperation with, statements on, 251, 994
- Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 588, 589
- Rwanda**
- Angola situation
 letter regarding, 302
 statements on, 300, 304, 308
- Central African region, statements on, 833
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
 letter dated 13 December 2000, 374
 letter dated 18 February 2001, 376
 letter dated 24 April 2001, 378
 letter dated 1 May 2001, 378
 letter dated 19 July 2001, 1035
 letter dated 1 August 2001, 386
 letter dated 8 August 2001, 386
 letter dated 23 November and 7 December
 2001, 392
 letter dated 10 December 2001, 392
 letter dated 18 March 2002, 395
 letter dated 15 April 2002, 1009
 letter dated 23 October 2002, 401
 letter dated 28 October 2002, 401
 statements on, 379, 382, 398, 401, 402, 405,
 1033, 1036
- Great Lakes region situation
 briefings on, 356
 statements on, 358, 359
- International Tribunal for Rwanda
 letter dated 26 July 2002, 704
 letter dated 5 August 2003, 698
 statements on, 693, 696, 700
- Rwanda situation, statements on, 321
- Rwanda situation**
- Argentina, statements by, 320
- Canada, statements by, 321
- Chairman of the Independent Inquiry, briefings
 by, 319
- France, statements by, 321
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 69
- Jamaica, statements by, 321
- Malaysia, statements by, 321
- Mali, statements by, 320
- Netherlands, statements by, 320
- new Security Council action, 41
- President, decisions recorded in notes, 152
- Russian Federation, statements by, 320
- Rwanda, statements by, 321
- Secretariat
 letter dated 15 December 1999, 319
 reports by, 319
- Security Council Committees
 establishment, 171
 mandate implementation, 171
 monitoring and reporting, 171
- self-defence, invocation of right, 1019
- United Kingdom, statements by, 320
- United States, statements by, 320
- Zimbabwe, letter dated 8 November 2000, 1019
- Rwanda-Uganda dispute**
- self-defence, invocation of right, 1019
- Uganda, letter dated 15 June 2000, 1019
- Sanctions**
- Afghanistan situation, 943
- al-Qaida and Taliban, 943
- Angola situation, 944
- Argentina, statements by, 963
- Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs,
 statements by, 799, 800, 965
- Australia, statements by, 963, 964
- Bulgaria, statements by, 800, 801
- Canada, statements by, 963, 964
- Chile, statements by, 801, 965
- China, statements by, 800, 801, 963
- criteria for imposition and termination, 963
- Cuba, statements by, 963
- France, statements by, 799, 800, 801, 962, 965
- General Assembly, recommendations to Security
 Council, 219
- generally, 962

- Germany
 - briefings by, 798
 - statements by, 800, 965
 - Guinea, statements by, 801
 - humanitarian impact of, 964
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 69, 76, 85, 94, 119
 - Iraq, statements by, 963, 964
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 945, 946
 - Jamaica, statements by, 962
 - Kosovo situation, 950
 - Liberia situation, 946, 947
 - Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, statements by, 963
 - Lockerbie bombing, 949
 - Mali, statements by, 965
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 32
 - Mexico, statements by, 801, 966
 - monitoring of, 965
 - Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, 949
 - Netherlands, statements by, 962, 964
 - New Zealand, statements by, 962, 964
 - Pakistan, statements by, 800, 963
 - Portugal, statements by, 964
 - President
 - decisions recorded in notes, 151, 152, 153, 154
 - note dated 17 April 2000, 797, 1002
 - purpose, 962
 - Russian Federation, statements by, 800, 963, 964, 965
 - Secretary-General, relations of Security Council with, 248
 - Security Council Committees, 166
 - Sierra Leone situation, 948
 - Somalia situation, 949
 - special economic problems, 1002
 - Sweden
 - briefings by, 799
 - statements by, 799, 965
 - Switzerland
 - briefings by, 798
 - statements by, 965
 - Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 800, 965
 - targeted sanctions, 964
 - Tunisia, statements by, 964, 965
 - Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, statements by, 797
 - United Kingdom, statements by, 800, 964
 - United States, statements by, 798, 800, 801, 963, 965
 - Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions, 182
 - Yugoslavia, letter dated 31 July 2001, 1060
- Saudi Arabia**
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1058
 - Iraq-Saudi Arabia dispute, letter dated 29 May 2001, 1018
 - Middle East situation, statements on, 931, 1012, 1014
- Secretariat**
- Afghanistan situation
 - briefings on, 516, 520
 - letter dated 21 May 2001, 514, 516
 - letter dated 5 December 2001, 518
 - letter dated 25 November 2002, 527
 - letter dated 7 October 2003, 533, 1078
 - letter dated 13 October 2003, 533
 - relations of Security Council with, 247
 - reports on, 511, 512, 520, 521, 522, 525, 529, 530, 889
 - Africa situation, briefings on, 419, 425
 - Angola situation
 - relations of Security Council with, 247
 - reports on, 296, 301, 304, 316, 318
 - anniversary of 11 September 2001, statements on, 764
 - appointment, 46
 - adoption of resolutions or decisions without vote, 144
 - practice in relation to recommendations by Security Council, 224
 - BONUCA, reports on, 196, 413, 415
 - Bosnia and Herzegovina situation
 - briefings on, 558
 - letter dated 4 May 2000, 544
 - letter dated 18 October 2000, 547
 - letter dated 14 September 2001, 551
 - letter dated 26 February 2002, 552
 - letter dated 18 October 2002, 557
 - letter dated 25 September 2003, 559
 - reports on, 543, 544, 545, 548, 550, 551, 553, 554, 555, 558
 - statements on, 552, 554
 - Bougainville situation, reports on, 536
 - briefings by, 33
 - Burundi situation
 - briefings on, 322, 324
 - reports on, 327, 329, 332
 - Central African region
 - letter dated 10 November 2003, 463

- reports on, 463
- Central African Republic situation, reports on, 412, 413, 414, 415
- children and armed conflict
- briefings on, 730, 731, 733
 - relations of Security Council with, 250
 - reports on, 125, 128, 726, 728, 729, 731, 732, 735, 911, 932
- civilians in armed conflict
- briefings on, 769, 777
 - reports on, 768, 771, 776, 779, 905, 906, 910
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
- briefings on, 361, 375, 376, 384, 390, 398, 409, 1032
 - letter dated 31 January 2000, 178
 - letter dated 18 April 2000, 178
 - letter dated 14 August 2000, 371
 - letter dated 12 April 2001, 178, 378, 380
 - letter dated 24 April 2001, 380
 - letter dated 25 June 2001, 179
 - letter dated 10 November 2001, 179, 391, 394
 - letter dated 15 May 2002, 855
 - letter dated 9 July 2002, 179
 - letter dated 15 October 2002, 179, 399, 401, 403, 411
 - letter dated 26 February 2003, 180
 - letter dated 25 June 2003, 407
 - letter dated 14 August 2003, 411
 - letter dated 23 October 2003, 411
 - relations of Security Council with, 246, 247
 - reports on, 364, 366, 371, 374, 376, 377, 380, 383, 387, 389, 395, 396, 403, 405, 406, 410, 985
 - statements on, 410, 1034
- Côte d'Ivoire situation
- relations of Security Council with, 246
 - reports on, 456, 459
 - statements on, 455, 460
- Croatia situation, reports on, 561, 562
- Cyprus situation
- relations of Security Council with, 246
 - reports on, 540, 542, 891
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security
- briefings on, 721, 724
 - relations of Security Council with, 246
- Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute
- briefings on, 431
 - letter dated 5 and 29 July 2002, 436
 - relations of Security Council with, 247
 - reports on, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 436, 437
- Georgia situation
- relations of Security Council with, 247
 - reports on, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599
- Great Lakes region situation
- briefings on, 356, 357
 - reports on, 356, 358, 360, 903
- Guinea situation, letter dated 30 April 2001, 36, 77, 99, 147, 158, 446
- Guinea-Bissau situation
- briefings on, 438
 - reports on, 437, 438, 440
- Haiti situation, reports on, 466
- HIV/AIDS, letter dated 5 July 2000, 714
- humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 711
- International Tribunal for Rwanda
- letter dated 7 September 2000, 695
 - letter dated 14 September 2001, 209
 - letter dated 26 September 2002, 705
 - letter dated 6 March 2003, 705
 - letter dated 16 April 2003, 706
 - letter dated 21 April 2003, 705
 - letter dated 28 July 2003, 698
 - letter dated 12 September 2003, 706
 - letter dated 29 September 2003, 210
 - letter dated 3 October 2003, 698
 - relations of Security Council with, 248
- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
- letter 7 May 2003, 703
 - letter dated 14 June 2000, 701
 - letter dated 7 September 2000, 695
 - letter dated 11 January 2001, 702
 - letter dated 19 April 2001, 703
 - letter dated 7 May 2003, 208
 - note dated 20 August 2003, 698
 - relations of Security Council with, 248
- investigations and fact-finding, relations of Security Council and, 246
- Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 968
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
- briefings on, 636, 677
 - letter dated 16 September 2002, 1043, 1075
 - note dated 28 February 2003, 663
 - note dated 10 May 2003, 676
 - reports on, 635, 639, 640, 642, 644, 648, 649, 657, 676, 678, 685, 687

- statements on, 669, 680, 682, 686, 1026, 1045, 1056
- justice and rule of law, statements on, 836
- Kosovo situation
 - letter dated 6 September 2001, 172, 574
 - reports on, 565, 566, 568, 569, 571, 573, 575, 576, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 586, 1025
- Liberia situation
 - letter dated 28 June 2003, 249, 281, 856
 - letter dated 8 July 2003, 281
 - letter dated 29 July 2003, 281
 - reports on, 276, 279, 284, 1001, 1076
- MICAH, reports on, 466
- Middle East situation
 - briefings on, 618, 619, 931
 - letter dated 22 April 2002, 858
 - letter dated 1 May 2002, 625, 858
 - statements on, 620, 628, 1013
- MINURCA, reports on, 412
- MINURSO, letter dated 12 November 2001, 185
- MIPONUH, reports on, 196, 466
- MONUC
 - letter dated 15 May 2003, 193
 - letter dated 14 August 2003, 193
 - reports on, 192, 364, 371, 380, 387, 395, 396, 403, 406
- Nobel Peace Prize, statements on, 821
- pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 829, 900, 907, 912, 1066
- peacekeeping operations
 - relations of Security Council with, 248
 - statements on, 813
- post-conflict peacebuilding
 - briefings on, 709
 - reports on, 708, 711
 - statements on, 818, 899
- prevention of armed conflict
 - relations of Security Council with, 246, 248
 - reports on, 237, 894, 897, 904, 908, 910, 912, 935, 1063
 - statements on, 236, 791, 792, 895
- protection of UN personnel, statements on, 796
- provisional rules of procedure regarding, 15
- referral of disputes to Security Council by, 855
- regional organizations
 - letter dated 22 October 2003, 1059
 - statements on, 826
- relations of Security Council with
 - generally, 245
 - good offices, 246
 - international tribunals, support of, 248
 - investigations and fact-finding, 246
 - joint efforts to promote political settlement, 247
 - matters brought to attention of Security Council, 249
 - non-administrative functions, 245
 - peacekeeping operations, 248
 - sanctions, 248
- Resolution 1358 (2001), 46, 144
- Rwanda situation
 - letter dated 15 December 1999, 319
 - reports on, 319
- sanctions, relations of Security Council and, 248
- Sierra Leone situation
 - briefings on, 338
 - letter dated 23 December 1999, 335
 - letter dated 17 May 2000, 339
 - letter dated 2 August 2000, 343
 - reports on, 335, 336, 340, 343, 344, 345, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 1069
- small arms
 - briefings on, 783
 - reports on, 785, 787, 1015
 - statements on, 788
- Somalia situation, reports on, 286, 288, 289, 290, 292, 293, 294, 295, 886, 1072
- Tajikistan situation, reports on, 509
- terrorism
 - reports on, 756
 - statements on, 736, 739, 742, 750, 764
- Timor-Leste situation
 - briefings on, 501
 - letter dated 30 October 2001, 494
 - reports on, 467, 474, 476, 483, 485, 488, 490, 494, 497, 500, 502, 503, 504, 506
- UNAMA, reports on, 197
- UNAMI, reports on, 205, 206
- UNAMSIL
 - letter dated 28 December 1999, 190
 - letter dated 17 May 2000, 191
 - reports on, 190, 335, 336, 337, 340, 343, 344, 345, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355
- UNDOF, reports on, 203, 600
- UNFICYP, reports on, 540
- UNIFIL
 - letter dated 6 April 2000, 601
 - letter dated 17 April 2000, 601
 - letter dated 24 July 2000, 603

- reports on, 204, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604
- UNIKOM, reports on, 205
- UNMA, reports on, 189, 190
- UNMEE, reports on, 195, 430, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437
- UNMIBH, reports on, 201, 202, 543, 550, 553
- UNMIK, reports on, 203, 565, 568, 571, 575, 581, 582, 583
- UNMOP, reports on, 202, 561
- UNMOT, reports on, 198, 509
- UNOA, reports on, 189
- UNOB
 - letter dated 15 November 2000, 185
 - reports by, 185
 - reports on, 186
- UNOGBIS, reports on, 440
- UNOL
 - letter dated 15 January 2003, 187
 - letter dated 11 April 2003, 187
 - letter dated 29 July 2003, 188
 - letter dated 16 September 2003, 188
 - reports on, 188
- UNOMIG, reports on, 201
- UNPOB
 - letter dated 22 October 2001, 199
 - letter dated 19 December 2003, 199
- UNPOS
 - letter dated 16 November 2001, 186
 - reports on, 186, 187
- UNTAET, reports on, 200, 467, 483, 494, 497, 500, 503, 504, 506
- UNTOP, reports on, 198
- West Africa region
 - letter dated 30 April 2001, 449
 - relations of Security Council with, 247
- Western Sahara situation, reports on, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 872, 873, 887
- women and peace and security
 - briefings on, 801, 805
 - relations of Security Council with, 246
 - reports on, 805, 806
- Security assurances**
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 50
- Security Council Committees**
 - Afghanistan situation
 - briefings by, 515
 - letter dated 4 April 2000, 511
 - reports by, 514, 952
 - statements by, 516
 - Africa situation, statements on, 426
 - al-Qaida and Taliban
 - establishment, 173
 - mandate implementation, 173
 - monitoring and reporting, 173
 - reports by, 174
 - Angola situation
 - briefings by, 296, 298, 306
 - establishment, 170
 - letter dated 10 March 2000, 297, 301
 - letter dated 21 December 2000, 306
 - letter dated 12 October 2001, 310
 - letter dated 14 October 2002, 317
 - mandate implementation, 170
 - monitoring and reporting, 170
 - statements by, 301, 302
 - termination of mandate, 171, 211
 - briefings by, 40, 119, 120
 - combating terrorism
 - composition, 181
 - establishment, 180
 - letter dated 14 February 2003, 181
 - mandate implementation, 181
 - reports on, 181
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute
 - establishment, 174
 - mandate implementation, 175
 - monitoring and reporting, 175
 - termination of mandate, 175, 211
 - generally, 166
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute
 - briefings on, 1004
 - establishment, 168, 169
 - letter dated 22 March 2000, 636
 - letter dated 28 February 2002, 1005
 - mandate implementation, 168
 - monitoring and reporting, 168
 - termination of mandate, 168, 211
 - Kosovo situation
 - establishment, 172
 - mandate implementation, 172
 - monitoring and reporting, 172
 - termination of mandate, 172, 211
 - Liberia situation
 - briefings by, 276
 - establishment, 175, 176, 177
 - letter dated 26 October 2001, 275
 - letter dated 19 April 2002, 177, 279
 - letter dated 24 April 2003, 280
 - letter dated 7 August 2003, 1001

- letter dated 28 October 2003, 284
- mandate implementation, 175, 176, 177
- monitoring and reporting, 175, 176, 177
- termination of mandate, 175, 177, 211
- Lockerbie bombing
 - mandate implementation, 169
 - monitoring and reporting, 169
 - termination of mandate, 169, 211
- Rwanda situation
 - establishment, 171
 - mandate implementation, 171
 - monitoring and reporting, 171
- sanctions, 166
- Sierra Leone situation
 - briefings by, 347
 - establishment, 171
 - letter dated 30 March 2001, 172
 - mandate implementation, 171
 - monitoring and reporting, 172
- Somalia situation
 - establishment, 169
 - letter dated 25 March 2003, 170
 - letter dated 4 November 2003, 295
 - mandate implementation, 169
 - monitoring and reporting, 169
- terrorism
 - briefings on, 760
 - letter dated 7 July 2003, 760
- Security Council Missions**
 - Afghanistan situation, 11, 122, 832, 835, 857
 - Central African region, 11, 122, 831, 832, 857, 902
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 10, 830, 857
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, 10, 11, 428, 435, 830, 831, 857
 - Great Lakes region situation, 10, 11, 381, 383, 831, 848, 857
 - Guinea situation, 446
 - Guinea-Bissau situation, 239
 - invitations to participate in proceedings, 87
 - Kosovo situation, 10, 11, 830, 831, 857
 - matters of which Security Council seized, 39
 - meetings regarding, 9, 11
 - President
 - decisions announced in statements, 150
 - decisions recorded in letters, 160
 - statements by, 9
 - Resolution 1297 (2000), 9
 - Resolution 1355 (2001), 9
 - Sierra Leone situation, 10, 345, 830, 857
 - Timor-Leste situation, 10, 480, 482, 831, 857
 - West Africa region, 11, 120, 122, 239, 449, 831, 857
- Security of operations**
 - deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 52
- Self-defence**
 - Afghanistan situation, 1007
 - Burundi situation, invocation of right, 1016
 - Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, 1008
 - Côte d'Ivoire situation, invocation of right, 1016
 - decisions relating to Article 51, 1006
 - discussion relating to Article 51, 1007
 - Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, invocation of right, 1017
 - Eritrea-Sudan dispute, invocation of right, 1019
 - generally, 1006
 - Georgia situation, invocation of right, 1017
 - India-Pakistan dispute, invocation of right, 1017
 - invocation of right, 1016
 - Iran-Iraq dispute, invocation of right, 1018
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1009
 - Iraq-Saudi Arabia dispute, 1018
 - Israel-Syria dispute, 1014
 - Liberia situation, 1018
 - Mauritius, statements by, 1013
 - Middle East situation, 1012
 - peaceful settlement of disputes, 1016
 - prevention of armed conflict, 1016
 - Rwanda situation, invocation of right, 1019
 - Rwanda-Uganda dispute, invocation of right, 1019
 - small arms, 1006, 1015
 - Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process, statements by, 1014
 - terrorism, 1007, 1015
 - Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, statements by, 1014
 - wrap-up discussions, 1016
- Self-determination**
 - generally, 1024
 - Iraq, statements by, 1024
 - Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1026
 - Kosovo situation, 1025
 - Palestine, statements by, 1024
 - Timor-Leste situation, 1025
- Serbia and Montenegro.** *See also* Yugoslavia, Federal Republic of
 - International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 700

- Kosovo situation
 letter dated 14 August 2003, 585, 849, 853, 854
 statements on, 582, 585, 587
- Sierra Leone**
 Africa situation, statements on, 425
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 782, 967
 Guinea situation, statements on, 446
 Liberia situation
 letter dated 23 February 2001, 275
 letter dated 27 February 2001, 275
 statements on, 279
 Sierra Leone situation
 letter dated 17 January 2000, 335
 letter dated 2 and 4 May 2000, 338
 letter dated 15 May 2000, 340
 letter dated 24 July 2000, 343
 letter dated 9 August 2000, 343
 statements on, 336, 339, 341, 349, 961
 small arms, statements on, 785
- Sierra Leone situation**
 abstention, 139
 Algeria, statements by, 980, 988
 Argentina, statements by, 337, 339, 960, 982, 989
 Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 337
 Bangladesh, statements by, 981, 988
 Burkina Faso, statements by, 347
 Canada, statements by, 341, 348, 349, 960, 980, 988
 China, statements by, 339, 341, 349, 981
 Colombia, statements by, 348
 determinations of threats to the peace, 921
 Eritrea, letter dated 10 May 2000, 338, 848, 852
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 981, 989
 force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1031
 France, statements by, 339, 342, 349, 960, 961, 982, 989
 Gambia
 letter dated 28 December 2000 and 23 January 2001, 347
 statements by, 347
 Guinea, statements by, 349
 India, statements by, 339, 981, 989
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 67, 72, 86, 92, 95, 97, 113, 338, 339, 343, 344, 345, 346, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355
 Ireland, statements by, 348, 349
 Jamaica, statements by, 348, 989
 Japan, statements by, 982
 Jordan, statements by, 339, 981, 990
 Liberia
 letter dated 3 January 2001, 347
 letter dated 24 January 2001, 347
 statements by, 349, 961
 Malaysia, statements by, 337, 981, 988
 Mali
 letter dated 9 May 2000, 340
 letter dated 11 May 2000, 338
 statements by, 342
 Mauritius, statements by, 349
 measures involving use of armed force, 971, 980, 986, 988, 991
 measures not involving use of armed force, 948, 959
 Namibia
 letter dated 11 May 2000, 338, 848
 statements by, 989
 Netherlands, statements by, 341
 new Security Council action, 42
 Norway, statements by, 349
 obligations of Member States, 995, 996, 999, 1000
 pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 862, 869, 886
 Pakistan, statements by, 339, 982, 989
 Panel of Experts, reports by, 172, 346, 960
 Portugal, statements by, 339
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 145, 148
 decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 157, 162
 decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153
 note dated 20 December 2000, 346
 statements by, 10, 337, 338, 342, 345, 353, 870, 940, 1000
 provisional measures, 940
 regional arrangements, 1069, 1075, 1077
 Resolution 1289 (2000), 336, 869, 921, 940, 971, 980, 986, 1070
 Resolution 1299 (2000), 340, 948, 987, 1000
 Resolution 1306 (2000), 139, 166, 171, 172, 342, 948, 999, 1002, 1075, 1080
 Resolution 1313 (2000), 343, 987
 Resolution 1315 (2000), 344
 Resolution 1317 (2000), 344
 Resolution 1321 (2000), 344
 Resolution 1334 (2000), 346, 869, 987

- Resolution 1346 (2001), 350, 870, 987
Resolution 1370 (2001), 351, 1070
Resolution 1385 (2001), 352, 948
Resolution 1389 (2001), 352
Resolution 1400 (2002), 353, 870
Resolution 1436 (2002), 353, 886
Resolution 1446 (2002), 354, 921, 948
Resolution 1470 (2003), 354, 1031
Resolution 1478 (2003), 999
Resolution 1492 (2003), 355
Resolution 1508 (2003), 42, 355
Resolution 1521 (2003), 999
Russian Federation, statements by, 339, 341, 347, 348, 349, 960, 981, 989
sanctions, 948
Secretary-General
 briefings by, 338
 letter dated 23 December 1999, 335
 letter dated 17 May 2000, 339
 letter dated 2 August 2000, 343
 reports by, 335, 336, 340, 343, 344, 345, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 1069
Security Council Committees
 briefings by, 347
 establishment, 171
 letter dated 30 March 2001, 172
 mandate implementation, 171
 monitoring and reporting, 172
Security Council Missions, 10, 345, 830, 857
Sierra Leone
 letter dated 17 January 2000, 335
 letter dated 2 and 4 May 2000, 338
 letter dated 15 May 2000, 340
 letter dated 24 July 2000, 343
 letter dated 9 August 2000, 343
 statements by, 336, 339, 341, 349, 961
Singapore, statements by, 349
special economic problems, 1002
Special Representative of the Secretary-General
 for Sierra Leone, briefings by, 351
Sweden, statements by, 347, 348, 349
Switzerland
 letter dated 21 December 2000, 347
 statements by, 347
Tunisia, statements by, 348, 989
Ukraine, statements by, 347, 982, 989
Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 335, 353
United Kingdom, statements by, 336, 337, 339, 348, 959, 960, 961, 980, 981, 988
United States, statements by, 341, 349, 960, 961, 980, 988
Singapore (elected member of Security Council 2001-2002)
Afghanistan situation, statements on, 524, 952, 968, 1016
Angola situation, statements on, 311
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1081
Bougainville situation, statements on, 536
Central African Republic situation, statements on, 417
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 773, 774, 775, 776, 779
conduct of business, statements on, 16, 17, 18
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 383, 385, 386, 388, 402
ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 725
food and security, statements on, 824
Guinea situation, statements on, 445
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 671, 957, 1058
Kosovo situation, statements on, 574, 576, 578
Liberia situation
 letter dated 2 November 2001, 276
 statements on, 278
Middle East situation, statements on, 613, 623, 911, 1012
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 910, 912
reports by Secretary-General, statements on, 224
Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 349
terrorism, statements on, 736, 746, 749, 752
Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 487, 489, 491, 505
troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with
 letter dated 8 January 2001, 809, 811
 statements on, 811
Slovenia
Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 590
Small arms
African Union, briefings by, 788
Benin, statements by, 790
Brazil, statements by, 968, 1051
Burkina Faso, statements by, 790
Cameroon, statements by, 934
Canada, statements by, 787

- Chile, statements by, 785
 China, statements by, 784, 787
 Colombia, letter dated 25 July 2001, 783, 785, 935
 Costa Rica, statements by, 784, 936, 968
 Côte d'Ivoire, statements by, 790
 determinations of threats to the peace, 934, 935
 ECOWAS, briefings by, 788
 Egypt, statements by, 786, 787
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 787
 France, statements by, 790
 generally, 1051
 Group of Arab States, statements on behalf of, 1051
 in Africa, 788
 India, statements by, 784
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 76, 81, 86, 112, 129, 130, 131
 Ireland, statements by, 784
 Israel, statements by, 787
 Jamaica, statements by, 784, 968
 Japan, statements by, 787
 Korea, Republic of, statements by, 784, 787
 Liberia, statements by, 790
 Malawi, statements by, 787
 Mali, statements by, 19, 784
 matters of which Security Council seized, 38
 Mauritius, statements by, 784, 787, 935, 968
 measures not involving use of armed force, 968
 Namibia, statements by, 787
 new Security Council action, 45
 Norway, statements by, 19, 784
 Pakistan, statements by, 784, 1051
 Peru, statements by, 784, 785
 President
 decisions announced in statements, 147, 149
 statements by, 45, 785, 787, 1006, 1051
 Programme for Coordination and Assistance for Security and Development, briefings by, 788
 Resolution 1467 (2003), 790, 934
 Russian Federation, statements by, 786, 935, 1015
 Secretary-General
 briefings by, 783
 reports by, 785, 787, 1015
 statements by, 788
 self-defence, 1006, 1015
 Sierra Leone, statements by, 785
 South Africa, statements by, 784, 787, 1051
 Sudan, statements by, 784, 935
 Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 790, 934, 1015
 Thailand, statements by, 936
 Togo, statements by, 789
 Tunisia, statements by, 1015
 Ukraine, statements by, 785, 968
 Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, briefings by, 786, 936
 United Kingdom, statements by, 784
 United States, statements by, 784, 1051
- Solomon Islands**
 Bougainville situation, letter dated 10 November 2000, 33, 71, 145, 539, 875
- Somalia**
 Somalia situation
 briefings on, 281
 statements on, 288
- Somalia situation**
 assistance from Member States, 1041
 China, statements by, 286
 Colombia, statements by, 291
 determinations of threats to the peace, 921
 Djibouti
 briefings by, 281
 statements by, 285
 domestic affairs, non-intervention in, 1030
 Egypt, statements by, 289
 Ethiopia, statements by, 286
 European Union, statements on behalf of, 291
 force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, 1031
 France, statements by, 290, 291
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 70, 76, 81, 86, 93, 97, 102, 110, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295
 Ireland, statements by, 291
 Jordan, statements by, 291
 League of Arab States, statements on behalf of, 286
 Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, statements by, 289, 291
 maintenance of peace and security, 1057
 Malaysia, statements by, 286
 measures not involving use of armed force, 949
 Netherlands, statements by, 286
 new Security Council action, 41
 Norway, statements by, 289
 obligations of Member States, 996, 999
 pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 861, 870, 886
 Panel of Experts, reports by, 170, 295

- President
decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151
decisions recorded in letters, 158, 161, 162
decisions recorded in notes, 152
statements by, 169, 286, 287, 289, 291, 293, 294, 295, 870, 871, 872, 886, 887, 999, 1073
- regional arrangements, 1072, 1076
- Representative of the Secretary-General for Somalia, briefings by, 288
- Resolution 1356 (2001), 169, 287, 949
- Resolution 1407 (2002), 292, 949, 1041
- Resolution 1425 (2002), 170, 292, 871, 949
- Resolution 1474 (2003), 169, 170, 294, 921, 1057, 1076
- Resolution 1519 (2003), 41, 170, 295, 949, 1041, 1057, 1077
- sanctions, 949
- Secretary-General, reports by, 286, 288, 289, 290, 292, 293, 294, 295, 886, 1072
- Security Council Committees
establishment, 169
letter dated 25 March 2003, 170
letter dated 4 November 2003, 295
mandate implementation, 169
monitoring and reporting, 169
- Somalia
briefings by, 281
statements by, 288
- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 291
- Tunisia, statements by, 286, 289
- Ukraine, statements by, 286
- Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 285
- United Kingdom, statements by, 289
- United States, statements by, 286, 289
- Yemen, statements by, 286
- South Africa**
Africa situation, statements on, 1067
Angola situation, statements on, 299
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1053, 1054
Burundi situation
briefings on, 329, 330
letter dated 25 October 2001, 325
children and armed conflict, statements on, 730
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
letter dated 9 August 2000, 193
letter dated 25 October 2002, 401
note verbale dated 31 January 2000, 364
statements on, 362, 398, 401, 973
- Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 359
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 666, 672, 927, 957, 974, 977, 978, 1057
- Middle East situation
letter dated 2 October 2000, 848, 851
statements on, 612, 622, 1012
- Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, letter dated 1 June 2000, 962
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 898, 905
- small arms, statements on, 784, 787, 1051
- terrorism, statements on, 757, 763
- women and peace and security, statements on, 807
- South Korea.** *See* Korea, Republic of
- Southern African Development Community**
terrorism, statements on behalf of, 746
- Spain (elected member of Security Council 2003)**
Afghanistan situation, statements on, 522
Central African region, statements on, 464, 903
Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 441
Iraq-Kuwait dispute
letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
statements on, 660, 661, 664, 668, 927, 976, 979
- Kosovo situation, statements on, 584
- Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 334
- Middle East situation, statements on, 620, 625, 632
- pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 902, 905
- peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 895
- terrorism, statements on, 758, 759, 766
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 508
- Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Cyprus**
briefings by, 541
- Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process**
briefings by, 627, 629, 630, 631, 635, 1014
self-defence, statements on, 1014
- Special economic problems**
al-Qaida and Taliban, 1006
Angola situation, 1001
decisions relating to Article 50, 1001
discussion relating to Article 50, 1002
generally, 1000
instances arising in subsidiary bodies, 1005
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, 1001, 1002

- Liberia situation, 1001
Macedonia, statements by, 1004
maintenance of peace and security, 1005
sanctions, 1002
Sierra Leone situation, 1002
- Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Balkans**
briefings by, 32, 90, 92, 588, 589, 1004
invitations to participate in proceedings, 68
President, decisions recorded in letters, 156
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of UN Operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina**
briefings by, 544, 548, 550, 553, 558
statements by, 550, 1074
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Transitional Administrator in East Timor**
briefings by, 468, 472, 478, 481, 483, 491, 494, 498, 505, 507
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan**
briefings by, 516, 520, 525, 526, 527, 528, 530
statements by, 971
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Angola**
briefings by, 318
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Central African Republic**
briefings by, 413, 416
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children in Armed Conflict**
briefings by, 727, 730, 731, 733, 747
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, briefings on, 381
statements by, 966
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Iraq**
briefings by, 677
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Kosovo**
briefings by, 565, 566, 567, 571, 575, 578, 580, 582, 585, 586
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Liberia**
briefings by, 284
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Sierra Leone**
briefings by, 351
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Tajikistan**
briefings by, 510
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes region**
appointment, 881
Burundi situation, briefings on, 326
statements by, 361
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General for West Africa**
appointment, 888
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Democratic Republic of the Congo**
briefings by, 384, 388, 409
- Standing committees.** *See specific entity or situation*
- Statements.** *See specific entity or situation*
- Subsidiary organs of the Security Council.** *See also specific entity or situation*
ad hoc committees, 166
ad hoc working groups, 182
Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, 182
informal working groups, 182
investigative bodies, 183
proposed but not established, 212
special economic problems, 1005
standing committees, 166
Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions, 182
Working Group on International Criminal Tribunals, 183
- Sudan**
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, letter dated 20 November 2001, 392
Eritrea-Sudan dispute, letter dated 7 October 2002, 1019
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1011
Middle East situation, statements on, 930, 931, 1012
Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request letter dated 1 June 2000, 962
statements on, 448
small arms, statements on, 784, 935
Sudan situation, letter dated 2 October 2003, 40, 88, 150, 462, 872, 888, 1073
- Sudan situation**
Djibouti, letter dated 5 April 2000, 1060
invitations to participate in proceedings, 88, 462
matters of which Security Council seized, 40
peaceful settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 872, 888
President
decisions announced in statements, 150

statements by, 462, 872
regional arrangements, 1073
Sudan, letter dated 2 October 2003, 40, 88, 150,
462, 872, 888, 1073

Sweden

Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, letter dated
26 February and 8 March 2001, 549
ensuring effective role of Security Council in
maintenance of peace and security, statements
on, 967
HIV/AIDS, statements on, 933
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1004
justice and rule of law, statements on, 839
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 910
sanctions
briefings on, 799
statements on, 799, 965
Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 347, 348,
349

Switzerland

admission of new Member States, 45, 256, 259
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 967
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 655, 663,
666, 974
peacekeeping operations, letter dated 6 June
2003, 813
permanent observer, invitations to participate in
proceedings, 62
sanctions
briefings on, 798
statements on, 965
Sierra Leone situation
letter dated 21 December 2000, 347
statements on, 347

Syrian Arab Republic (elected member of Security Council 2002-2003)

Bougainville situation, statements on, 537
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 1052
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 401
food and security, statements on, 822, 825
Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 28,
689
Iraq-Kuwait dispute
letter dated 22 May 2003, 142
statements on, 647, 650, 658, 668, 671, 674,
675, 678, 681, 684, 927, 957, 958, 976, 977,
979, 1010, 1027, 1058
Israel-Syria dispute
letter dated 5 October 2003, 39, 88, 131, 690,
849, 852, 1014, 1039

statements on, 690, 1039
justice and rule of law, statements on, 837
Kosovo situation, statements on, 581
Lockerbie bombing, statements on, 334, 962
Middle East situation
letter dated 20 September 2002, 627
letter dated 9 October 2003, 850, 853, 854
note verbale dated 20 September 2002, 6
statements on, 6, 619, 620, 621, 630, 631, 633,
1013
mine action, statements on, 817
pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 901
sanctions, statements on, 800, 965
small arms, statements on, 790, 934, 1015
Somalia situation, statements on, 291
terrorism, statements on, 743, 747, 752, 755, 757,
766

Tajikistan

Tajikistan situation, statements on, 510

Tajikistan situation

Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping
Operations, briefings by, 509
Canada, statements by, 510
European Union, statements on behalf of, 510
invitations to participate in proceedings, 69, 90
new Security Council action, 42
pacific settlement of disputes, decisions
regarding, 875, 890
President
decisions announced in statements, 144, 145
decisions recorded in letters, 155, 156, 158,
160
statements by, 42, 509, 510, 875, 890
Russian Federation, statements by, 510
Secretary-General, reports by, 509
Special Representative of the Secretary-General
for Tajikistan, briefings by, 510
Tajikistan, statements by, 510
United Kingdom, statements by, 510

Taliban. See Al-Qaida and Taliban

Tanzania, United Republic of

Central African region, statements on, 833
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation,
statements on, 379
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 929
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 1063

Terrorism

Afghanistan, letter dated 14 September 2001, 738
Australia, statements by, 746
Azerbaijan, letter dated 25 September 2001, 738

- Bahrain, statements by, 757
- Bulgaria, statements by, 751, 761
- Burkina Faso, statements by, 754
- Cameroon, statements by, 760, 762
- Canada, statements by, 744
- Chile, statements by, 747, 760, 765
- China
 letter dated 27 September 2001, 738
 statements by, 737, 740, 749, 761
- Colombia, statements by, 737, 741, 744, 749, 752, 760, 761
- Congo, Democratic Republic of, statements by, 754
- Counter-Terrorism Committee
 briefings by, 742, 745, 748, 750, 756, 758, 760, 762
 letter dated 15 July 2003, 759
 President, decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153, 154
 statements by, 746, 749, 751, 753, 765
- Cuba, statements by, 757
- determinations of threats to the peace, 923
- Egypt, statements by, 753, 1016
- European Union
 letter dated 12 and 25 September 2001, 738
 statements on behalf of, 744, 746, 749, 761
- France, statements by, 737, 741, 762, 766, 1015
- Georgia
 letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
 statements by, 753
- Germany, statements by, 761, 762
- Group of Arab States, statements on behalf of, 743, 744
- Guinea, statements by, 760, 761
- India, statements by, 743, 753, 761, 763
- International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, 707
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 85, 108, 116, 119, 120, 756
- Iran, statements by, 743, 751, 753
- Iraq, letter dated 18 September 2001, 739
- Ireland, statements by, 736, 746, 749, 751
- Israel, statements by, 743, 747, 752, 757, 1016
- Jamaica, statements by, 740
- Korea, Republic of, statements by, 753
- Lebanon, statements by, 751
- Liechtenstein, statements by, 761
- Malaysia, statements by, 747
- Mali, letter dated 18 September 2001, 738
 matters of which Security Council seized, 34
- Mauritius, statements by, 736, 741, 746
 measures not involving use of armed force, 950
- Mexico, statements by, 746, 760, 763, 1015
- Moldova, letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
- Nepal, statements by, 754
- Norway, statements by, 737, 741, 746, 749, 751, 1015
- Organization of the Islamic Conference
 letter dated 14 September 2001, 738
 statements on behalf of, 752, 754
- Pakistan
 letter dated 13 September 2001, 738
 statements by, 743, 744, 747, 753, 758, 759, 762
- Palestine, statements by, 743
- Peru, statements by, 743, 744, 747, 751, 754
- President
 decisions announced in statements, 148, 149, 150, 151
 statements by, 748, 754, 755, 758, 761, 763
- Qatar, statements by, 743
- Resolution 1368 (2001), 737, 923, 1007
- Resolution 1373 (2001), 739, 923, 950, 1007, 1042
- Resolution 1377 (2001), 741, 923
- Resolution 1438 (2002), 754
- Resolution 1440 (2002), 754
- Resolution 1450 (2002), 755
- Resolution 1452 (2002), 755
- Resolution 1455 (2002), 756
- Resolution 1456 (2003), 766
- Resolution 1465 (2002), 756
- Resolution 1516 (2003), 34, 763
- Rio Group, statements on behalf of, 744, 747, 750
- Russian Federation, statements by, 737, 741, 746, 748, 753, 759, 760, 766
- Secretary-General
 reports by, 756
 statements by, 736, 739, 742, 750, 764
- Security Council Committees
 briefings by, 760
 letter dated 7 July 2003, 760
- self-defence, 1007, 1015
- Singapore, statements by, 736, 746, 749, 752
- South Africa, statements by, 757, 763
- Southern African Development Community,
 statements on behalf of, 746
- Spain, statements by, 758, 759, 766
- Syrian Arab Republic, statements by, 743, 747, 752, 755, 757, 766

- Tunisia, statements by, 736
Turkey, statements by, 747, 757, 763
Ukraine
 letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
 statements by, 761
United Arab Emirates, letter dated 25 September 2001, 739
United Kingdom, statements by, 736, 741, 759, 766
United States, statements by, 737, 741, 749, 751, 752, 758, 761, 766
Uzbekistan, letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
Yemen, statements by, 752
Yugoslavia, statements by, 753
Zambia, statements by, 752
- Thailand**
no exit without strategy, statements on, 900
small arms, statements on, 936
- Timor-Leste**
admission of new Member States, 45, 256, 259, 1025, 1163
Timor-Leste situation
 briefings on, 495, 501
 statements on, 506, 509
- Timor-Leste situation**
Angola, statements by, 508
Argentina, statements by, 471, 475
Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations
 briefings by, 469, 470, 471, 474, 476, 486, 488, 492, 501, 504
 statements by, 472, 487
Australia, statements by, 473, 474, 477, 490, 502, 504, 505, 508
Bangladesh, statements by, 469, 476, 487
Brazil, statements by, 477
Cameroon, statements by, 499
Canada, statements by, 468, 471, 473, 480, 489, 490, 492
China, statements by, 468, 471, 481, 485
Colombia, statements by, 484, 491, 493
Costa Rica, statements by, 503
Deputy Secretary-General
 briefings by, 503
 statements by, 1025
determinations of threats to the peace, 922
European Union, statements on behalf of, 473, 477, 479, 490, 496, 499
France, statements by, 469, 470, 471, 473, 476, 485, 487, 489, 490, 492, 500, 508
General Assembly, briefings by, 484
Guinea, statements by, 508
Indonesia
 briefings by, 478, 480
 letter dated 27 November 2000, 480
 statements by, 473, 476, 478, 480, 485, 490, 492, 496, 499, 502, 505, 506, 1025
International Monetary Fund, briefings by, 484
invitations to participate in proceedings, 17, 66, 69, 72, 78, 86, 90, 97, 99, 100, 102, 104, 111, 112, 117, 126, 127
Ireland, statements by, 492
Jamaica, statements by, 469, 496
Japan, statements by, 474, 484, 485, 496
Korea, Republic of, statements by, 490
Malaysia, statements by, 469, 471, 474, 478, 480
matters of which Security Council seized, 42
Mauritius, statements by, 487
measures involving use of armed force, 970, 985
Mexico, statements by, 500, 508
Namibia
 briefings by, 480
 statements by, 468, 476, 480
Netherlands, statements by, 471, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 480
new Security Council action, 41
New Zealand, statements by, 505
Norway, statements by, 489, 491, 493, 496
pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 874, 889
Philippines, statements by, 504
Portugal
 letter dated 25 January 2001, 483
 statements by, 493, 502, 503, 1025
President
 decisions announced in statements, 145, 146, 147, 148
 decisions recorded in letters, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 161
 statements by, 10, 476, 482, 494, 497, 504, 874, 875, 889
Resolution 1319 (2000), 478, 874
Resolution 1338 (2001), 485, 874, 889
Resolution 1392 (2002), 500, 889
Resolution 1410 (2002), 502, 874, 889, 922, 970, 985
Resolution 1473 (2003), 986
Resolution 1480 (2003), 506, 970, 986
Russian Federation, statements by, 479, 487, 489, 496, 499, 500

- Secretary-General
 briefings by, 501
 letter dated 30 October 2001, 494
 reports by, 467, 474, 476, 483, 485, 488, 490,
 494, 497, 500, 502, 503, 504, 506
- Security Council Missions, 10, 480, 482, 831,
 857
- self-determination, 1025
- Singapore, statements by, 487, 489, 491, 505
- Spain, statements by, 508
- Special Representative of the Secretary-General
 and Transitional Administrator in East Timor,
 briefings by, 468, 472, 478, 481, 483, 491,
 494, 498, 505, 507
- Timor-Leste
 briefings by, 495, 501
 statements by, 506, 509
- Ukraine, statements by, 475, 493
- UN Development Programme, briefings by, 484,
 495
- Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping
 Operations
 briefings by, 493
 letter dated 28 March 2003, 986
- United Kingdom
 letter dated 3 April 2003, 200
 statements by, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 475,
 477, 478, 480, 481, 482, 485, 487, 490, 493,
 496, 497, 499, 508
- United States, statements by, 469, 470, 471, 473,
 474, 475, 481, 482, 487, 493, 497, 500, 505
- World Bank, briefings by, 484, 495
- Togo**
 Angola situation
 letter regarding, 302
 statements on, 300, 303, 308, 953
 small arms, statements on, 789
- Transitional government representatives**
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 62
- Treaty of Pelindaba**
 deleted from matters of which Security Council
 seized, 51
- Troop-contributing countries, strengthening
 cooperation with**
- Argentina
 letter regarding, 812
 statements by, 810, 993
- Bangladesh, statements by, 992
- Canada
 letter regarding, 812
- statements by, 811, 993
- China, statements by, 811
- Colombia, statements by, 251, 994
- Deputy Secretary-General, briefings by, 810
- Egypt, statements by, 992
- France, statements by, 811
- generally, 983
- Ghana, letter regarding, 812
- India
 letter regarding, 812
 statements by, 251, 810, 992, 994
- invitations to participate in proceedings, 60, 71,
 95, 98, 103, 104, 105, 108, 112, 117, 118, 119,
 120, 121, 122, 125, 126
- Jamaica, statements by, 8
- Jordan, letter regarding, 812
- Korea, Republic of, statements by, 992
- Malaysia, statements by, 992
- Mali, statements by, 810, 990, 992
- matters of which Security Council seized, 33, 34,
 35, 36, 37, 39, 40
- Mauritius, statements by, 251
- measures involving use of armed force, 990, 991,
 992, 993, 994
- Military Staff Committee, relations of Security
 Council with other UN organs, 251
- Nepal, statements by, 810
- Netherlands, letter regarding, 812
- New Zealand
 letter regarding, 812
 statements by, 811, 992
- Nigeria, statements by, 993
- Pakistan, statements by, 810, 811
- President
 decisions announced in statements, 146
 decisions recorded in letters, 157, 158
 note dated 27 August 2002, 61
 statements by, 8, 809, 811, 983, 991
- Resolution 1327 (2000), 8, 983
- Resolution 1353 (2001), 8, 29, 33, 60, 251, 812,
 983, 991, 993, 1046
- Russian Federation, statements by, 251, 994
- Singapore
 letter dated 8 January 2001, 809, 811
 statements by, 811
- United Kingdom, statements by, 811
- United States, statements by, 810, 811
- Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations,
 letter dated 31 May 2001, 812
- Zambia, statements by, 990, 992

Trusteeship Council

relations of Security Council with, 241

Tunisia (elected member of Security Council 2000-2001)

Afghanistan situation, statements on, 952
Africa situation, statements on, 1067
Angola situation, statements on, 299, 954
children and armed conflict, statements on, 966
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 1044
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 365, 370, 380, 386, 389
ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 723
Guinea situation, statements on, 445, 1069
HIV/AIDS, statements on, 715
humanitarian issues in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 1044, 1048
Iraq-Kuwait dispute
letter dated 24 June 2002, 1002, 1005
statements on, 641, 649, 975, 1003
Kosovo situation, statements on, 572
Liberia situation, statements on, 277
maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 1005
Middle East situation
letter dated 1 April 2002, 850
letter dated 17 April 2002, 858
statements on, 617, 930
post-conflict peacebuilding, letter dated 25 January 2001, 818, 820, 1047
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 896, 910, 912
sanctions, statements on, 964, 965
Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 348, 989
small arms, statements on, 1015
Somalia situation, statements on, 286, 289
terrorism, statements on, 736

Turkey

Afghanistan situation
letter dated 21 October 2002, 527
statements on, 524
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 673, 957
letter dated 2 April 1991, deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 48
terrorism, statements on, 747, 757, 763

Tuvalu

admission of new Member States, 45, 256, 257, 258, 261

Uganda

Angola situation
letter regarding, 298, 302
statements on, 300
Burundi situation, briefings on, 327
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
letter dated 26 January and 3 February 2000, 364
letter dated 20 February 2001, 376
letter dated 16 April 2001, 378
letter dated 14 November 2001, 392
letter dated 21 November and 10 December 2001, 392
letter dated 25 October 2002, 401
letter dated 4 November 2002, 401
statements on, 363, 379, 383, 393, 394, 401, 955, 972, 1033
Rwanda-Uganda dispute, letter dated 15 June 2000, 1019

Ukraine (elected member of Security Council 2000-2001)

Afghanistan situation, statements on, 513, 952
Angola situation, statements on, 303, 311, 953, 954, 1082
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 1081
children and armed conflict, statements on, 966
civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 906
conduct of business, statements on, 17
Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 368, 1034
ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, letter dated 28 February 2001, 724, 725
Georgia situation
briefings on, 595
letter dated 17 March 2001, 595
Guinea situation, statements on, 447
International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 702
invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 64
Kosovo situation, statements on, 566, 570
Middle East situation, statements on, 142, 610, 615
no exit without strategy, statements on, 900
post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 820
prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 910, 912
refugees, statements on, 768

- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 347, 982, 989
- small arms, statements on, 785, 968
- Somalia situation, statements on, 286
- terrorism
letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
statements on, 761
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 475, 493
- Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 589, 590
- UN Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI).** *See also* Iraq humanitarian situation
establishment, 205
mandate implementation, 205
Resolution 1483 (2003), 205
Resolution 1500 (2003), 205
Secretary-General, reports by, 205, 206
- UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA)**
establishment, 197
mandate implementation, 197
Resolution 1383 (2001), 197
Resolution 1401 (2002), 197
Resolution 1471 (2003), 197
Secretary-General, reports by, 197
- UN Children's Fund (UNICEF)**
children and armed conflict, briefings on, 727, 730, 732, 733, 741
Iraq humanitarian situation, briefings on, 688
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 639
- UN Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (MIPONUH).** *See also* Haiti situation
generally, 196
mandate implementation, 196
President, statements by, 197
Secretary-General, reports by, 196, 466
termination of mandate, 196, 210
- UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM).** *See also* Women and peace and security
briefings by, 802, 804
statements by, 936
- UN Development Programme**
Africa situation, briefings on, 419, 427
Iraq humanitarian situation, briefings on, 688
Timor-Leste situation, briefings on, 484, 495
- UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF).** *See also* Middle East situation
generally, 203
President, statements by, 600
Resolution 1300 (2000), 600
Resolution 1328 (2000), 600
Resolution 1351 (2001), 600
Resolution 1381 (2001), 600
Resolution 1415 (2002), 600
Resolution 1451 (2002), 600
Resolution 1488 (2003), 600
Resolution 1520 (2003), 600
Secretary-General, reports by, 203, 600
- UN Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK).** *See also* Kosovo situation
generally, 203
mandate implementation, 203
Secretary-General, reports by, 203, 565, 568, 571, 575, 581, 582, 583
- UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL).** *See also* Middle East situation
generally, 204
Israel, letter dated 2 June and 24 July 2003, 604
Lebanon
letter dated 28 December 1999, 601
letter dated 6 April 2000, 601
letter dated 15 and 22 May 2000, 602
letter dated 11 July 2000, 603
letter dated 2 and 9 July 2003, 604
mandate implementation, 204
President, statements by, 601, 602, 603
Resolution 1288 (2000), 601
Resolution 1310 (2000), 603
Resolution 1337 (2001), 204, 604
Resolution 1365 (2001), 204, 604
Resolution 1391 (2002), 604
Resolution 1428 (2002), 604
Resolution 1461 (2003), 204, 604
Resolution 1496 (2003), 605
Secretary-General
letter dated 6 April 2000, 601
letter dated 17 April 2000, 601
letter dated 24 July 2000, 603
reports by, 204, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604
- UN Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM).** *See also* Iraq-Kuwait dispute
generally, 204
mandate implementation, 204
Resolution 1490 (2003), 205
Secretary-General, reports by, 205
termination of mandate, 205, 211
- UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP).** *See also* India-Pakistan dispute
generally, 198
- UN Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO).** *See also* Western Sahara situation
generally, 184

- Secretary-General, letter dated 12 November 2001, 185
- UN Mission in Angola (UNMA)**
establishment, 189
mandate implementation, 190
Resolution 1433 (2002), 189
Secretary-General, reports by, 189, 190
termination of mandate, 190
- UN Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH).**
See also Bosnia and Herzegovina situation
generally, 201
mandate implementation, 201
Resolution 1396 (2002), 202
Resolution 1423 (2002), 202
Secretary-General, reports by, 201, 202, 543, 550, 553
termination of mandate, 202, 211
- UN Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (MINUCI)**
establishment, 196
mandate implementation, 196
Resolution 1479 (2003), 196
Resolution 1514 (2003), 196
- UN Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE)**
generally, 194
mandate implementation, 194
Resolution 1312 (2000), 194
Resolution 1320 (2000), 195
Resolution 1430 (2002), 195
Secretary-General, reports by, 195, 430, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437
- UN Mission in Liberia (UNMIL)**
generally, 188
Resolution 1497 (2003), 188
Resolution 1509 (2003), 188
- UN Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL).** *See also* Sierra Leone situation
generally, 190
mandate implementation, 190
Resolution 1289 (2000), 191
Resolution 1299 (2000), 191
Resolution 1313 (2000), 191
Resolution 1346 (2001), 191
Resolution 1436 (2002), 191
Secretary-General
letter dated 28 December 1999, 190
letter dated 17 May 2000, 191
reports by, 190, 335, 336, 337, 340, 343, 344, 345, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355
- UN Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA).** *See also* Central African Republic situation
generally, 195
Secretary-General, reports by, 412
termination of mandate, 195, 210
- UN Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (UNMOP)**
generally, 202
mandate implementation, 202
Resolution 1437 (2002), 202
Secretary-General, reports by, 202, 561
termination of mandate, 202, 211
- UN Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT).**
See also Tajikistan situation
generally, 198
Secretary-General, reports by, 198, 509
termination of mandate, 198, 211
- UN Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISET)**
establishment, 200
mandate implementation, 200
Resolution 1410 (2002), 200
Resolution 1473 (2003), 200
Resolution 1480 (2003), 200
Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, letter dated 28 March 2003, 200
- UN Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC).** *See also* Iraq-Kuwait dispute
briefings by, 658, 660, 663, 667, 927, 976
generally, 206
mandate implementation, 207
reports by, 676, 926, 927, 977
- UN Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG).** *See also* Georgia situation
briefings by, 595, 596, 597, 599
generally, 201
mandate implementation, 201
Resolution 1494 (2003), 201
Secretary-General, reports by, 201
- UN Office in Angola (UNOA).** *See also* Angola situation
generally, 189
mandate implementation, 189
Resolution 1294 (2000), 189
Secretary-General, reports by, 189
termination of mandate, 189, 211
- UN Office in Burundi (UNOB).** *See also* Burundi situation
generally, 185
mandate implementation, 185

- President
letter dated 7 December 2001, 185
statements by, 186
- Secretary-General
letter dated 15 November 2000, 185
reports by, 185, 186
- UN Office on Drugs and Crime**
Afghanistan situation, briefings on, 531
- UN Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC)**. *See also* Congo (Democratic Republic) situation
generally, 192
mandate implementation, 192
reports by, 367
Resolution 1291 (2000), 192
Resolution 1355 (2001), 192
Resolution 1445 (2002), 193
Resolution 1484 (2003), 193
Resolution 1493 (2003), 193
Secretary-General
letter dated 15 May 2003, 193
letter dated 14 August 2003, 193
reports by, 192, 364, 371, 380, 387, 395, 396, 403, 406
women and peace and security, briefings on, 807
- UN Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNOGBIS)**. *See also* Guinea-Bissau situation
briefings by, 440
generally, 193
mandate implementation, 194
Secretary-General, reports by, 440
- UN Peacebuilding Support Office in Liberia (UNOL)**. *See also* Liberia situation
generally, 187
mandate implementation, 187
- President
letter dated 29 November 2002, 187
statements by, 187
Resolution 1478 (2003), 188
Resolution 1509 (2003), 188
Secretary-General
letter dated 15 January 2003, 187
letter dated 11 April 2003, 187
letter dated 29 July 2003, 188
letter dated 16 September 2003, 188
reports by, 188
termination of mandate, 188, 211
- UN Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic (BONUCA)**. *See also* Central African Republic situation
briefings by, 413
establishment, 195
mandate implementation, 196
President, statements by, 195
Secretary-General, reports by, 196, 413, 415
- UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP)**. *See also* Cyprus situation
generally, 201
Secretary-General, reports by, 540
- UN Political Office for Somalia (UNPOS)**. *See also* Somalia situation
generally, 186
mandate implementation, 186
President, statements by, 186, 187
Secretary-General
letter dated 16 November 2001, 186
reports by, 186, 187
- UN Political Office in Bougainville (UNPOB)**. *See also* Bougainville situation
briefings by, 537
generally, 199
mandate implementation, 199
President, letter dated 23 December 2003, 199
Secretary-General
letter dated 22 October 2001, 199
letter dated 19 December 2003, 199
termination of mandate, 199, 211
- UN Protection Force**
deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 50
- UN Tajikistan Office of Peacebuilding (UNTOP)**. *See also* Tajikistan situation
establishment, 198
mandate implementation, 199
President, statements by, 198
Secretary-General, reports by, 198
- UN Transitional Administration in Timor-Leste (UNTAET)**. *See also* Timor-Leste situation
generally, 199
mandate implementation, 200
matters of which Security Council seized, 36
President, statements by, 200
Resolution 1392 (2002), 200
Secretary-General, reports by, 200, 467, 483, 494, 497, 500, 503, 504, 506
termination of mandate, 211
- UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO)**. *See also* Middle East situation
generally, 203

UNAMI. *See* UN Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI)

UNAMSIL. *See* UN Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL)

Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa

Angola situation
briefings on, 310, 312, 314, 953, 954
statements on, 305

Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 239

Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs

small arms, briefings on, 786, 936

Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator

Angola situation, briefings on, 315
civilians in armed conflict
briefings on, 772, 774, 775, 777, 780, 781
statements on, 776

Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs

responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, briefings on, 707

Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations

Afghanistan situation
briefings on, 529, 531, 533
statements on, 529

Africa situation, statements on, 426

Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, briefings on, 546, 547

Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, briefings on, 381, 404, 407, 408

Croatia situation, briefings on, 562

Eritrea-Ethiopia dispute, briefings on, 430, 433

Guinea situation
briefings on, 446
statements on, 1069

HIV/AIDS, briefings on, 715, 718

justice and rule of law, briefings on, 838

Kosovo situation, briefings on, 569, 570, 572, 573, 574, 576, 579, 581, 587

mine action, briefings on, 816

Sierra Leone situation, briefings on, 335, 353

Timor-Leste situation
briefings on, 493
letter dated 28 March 2003, 986

UNMISSET, letter dated 28 March 2003, 200
women and peace and security, briefings on, 804, 806

Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs

Afghanistan situation, briefings on, 520, 523, 524

Africa situation, briefings on, 427

Angola situation, briefings on, 296

Bougainville situation, briefings on, 534

Guinea-Bissau situation, briefings on, 438

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1003

Middle East situation
briefings on, 629, 630, 634
statements on, 1014

pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 829

sanctions, statements on, 797

self-defence, statements on, 1014

Somalia situation, briefings on, 285

UNDOF. *See* UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF)

UNFICYP. *See* UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP)

UNHCR. *See* High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

UNICEF. *See* UN Children's Fund (UNICEF)

UNIFEM. *See* UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM)

UNIFIL. *See* UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL)

UNIKOM. *See* UN Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM)

UNITA. *See* Angola situation

United Arab Emirates

Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1045

Middle East situation, statements on, 1013

terrorism, letter dated 25 September 2001, 739

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (permanent member of Security Council)

Afghanistan situation
letter dated 19 December 2001, 518
letter dated 14 March 2002, 521
letter regarding, 1007

statements on, 512, 513, 517, 522, 526, 532

Africa situation, letter dated 15 July 2002, 426

Agenda, statements on, 28

Angola situation, statements on, 297, 298, 302

Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 546, 560, 1074

Bougainville situation, statements on, 536

Burundi situation, statements on, 323, 326, 331

Central African region

briefings on, 834
statements on, 464, 903

Central African Republic situation, statements on, 417

- children and armed conflict, statements on, 730, 733, 734
- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 770, 776, 779, 780, 906, 911
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 363, 372, 376, 377, 386, 402, 973
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 723, 725
- food and security, statements on, 241, 822, 823, 824, 825
- Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 356, 358, 360
- Guinea situation, statements on, 444, 447
- Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 438
- HIV/AIDS, statements on, 716, 719
- Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 689
- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
- briefings on, 679, 683
 - letter dated 24 September 2002, 925
 - letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
 - letter dated 8 May 2003, 1027
 - statements on, 639, 641, 642, 645, 649, 655, 656, 660, 661, 664, 668, 672, 680, 682, 684, 956, 975, 976, 977, 979, 980, 1028, 1039
- justice and rule of law, statements on, 837
- Kosovo situation, statements on, 1026
- Lockerbie bombing
- letter dated 15 August 2003, 332, 961
 - statements on, 334
- meetings, statements on, 7
- Middle East situation, statements on, 610, 615, 617, 623, 632, 859, 1013
- mine action, statements on, 817
- Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, statements on, 448, 962
- no exit without strategy, statements on, 808, 809
- peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
- post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 1062
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 895, 908, 909
- refugees, statements on, 767
- responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 708
- Rwanda situation, statements on, 320
- sanctions, statements on, 800, 964
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 336, 337, 339, 348, 959, 960, 961, 980, 981, 988
- small arms, statements on, 784
- Somalia situation, statements on, 289
- Tajikistan situation, statements on, 510
- terrorism, statements on, 736, 741, 759, 766
- Timor-Leste situation
- letter dated 3 April 2003, 200
 - statements on, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 475, 477, 478, 480, 481, 482, 485, 487, 490, 493, 496, 497, 499, 508
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 811
- women and peace and security, statements on, 805
- United States of America (permanent member of Security Council)**
- Afghanistan situation
- letter dated 7 October 2001, 1007
 - statements on, 512, 513, 515, 517, 521, 524, 526, 532, 924, 952, 971
- Africa situation, statements on, 426
- Angola situation
- letter dated 26 April 2002, 315
 - statements on, 306, 312
- anniversary of 11 September 2001, statements on, 764
- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 546, 548, 554, 556, 924, 1053, 1081, 1082
- Bougainville situation, statements on, 535, 537
- Burundi situation, statements on, 329
- Central African region, statements on, 452, 465, 903
- Central African Republic situation, statements on, 417
- civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 770, 776, 1052
- Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 365, 369, 372, 373, 375, 384, 385, 387, 393, 394, 955, 1008, 1034
- ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 722
- food and security, statements on, 824
- Great Lakes region situation, statements on, 356
- Guinea situation, statements on, 445, 447
- Guinea-Bissau situation, statements on, 439, 441
- HIV/AIDS, statements on, 717, 931, 1049
- International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 702
- invitations to participate in proceedings, statements on, 64
- Iraq humanitarian situation, statements on, 689

- Iraq-Kuwait dispute
briefings on, 659, 679, 682
letter dated 18 March 2003, 927
letter dated 8 May 2003, 1027
statements on, 637, 643, 646, 649, 656, 661, 664, 668, 672, 678, 681, 682, 957, 958, 975, 976, 977, 980, 1010, 1011, 1027, 1028, 1039
- Israel-Syria dispute, statements on, 691, 1039
- justice and rule of law, statements on, 837
- Kosovo situation, statements on, 567, 570, 574, 586
- Liberia situation, statements on, 278, 282
- Lockerbie bombing
letter dated 15 August 2003, 332, 961
statements on, 333, 961
- meetings, statements on, 7
- Middle East situation
letter dated 17 October 2000, 609
statements on, 607, 610, 611, 613, 614, 616, 617, 619, 620, 622, 623, 624, 625, 627, 628, 629, 630, 632, 633, 634, 859
- Mubarak assassination attempt extradition request, statements on, 448, 962
- no exit without strategy, statements on, 900
- pacific settlement of disputes, statements on, 901, 913
- peacekeeping operations, statements on, 815
- post-conflict peacebuilding, statements on, 710, 820, 1050
- prevention of armed conflict, statements on, 895, 908, 911, 935
- protection of UN personnel, statements on, 796
- refugees, statements on, 767
- regional organizations, statements on, 1064
- responsibility of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security, statements on, 708
- Rwanda situation, statements on, 320
- sanctions, statements on, 798, 800, 801, 963, 965
- Sierra Leone situation, statements on, 341, 349, 960, 961, 980, 988
- small arms, statements on, 784, 1051
- Somalia situation, statements on, 286, 289
- terrorism, statements on, 737, 741, 749, 751, 752, 758, 761, 766
- Timor-Leste situation, statements on, 469, 470, 471, 473, 474, 475, 481, 482, 487, 493, 497, 500, 505
- troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 810, 811
- West Africa region, statements on, 450
- Western Sahara situation, statements on, 272
- women and peace and security, statements on, 803, 906
- Yugoslavia situation, statements on, 589
- UNMA.** *See* UN Mission in Angola (UNMA)
- UNMEE.** *See* UN Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE)
- UNMIBH.** *See* UN Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH)
- UNMIK.** *See* UN Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK)
- UNMIL.** *See* UN Mission in Liberia (UNMIL)
- UNMISSET.** *See* UN Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISSET)
- UNMOGIP (UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan).** *See also* India-Pakistan dispute generally, 198
- UNMOP.** *See* UN Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (UNMOP)
- UNMOT.** *See* UN Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT)
- UNMOVIC.** *See* UN Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC)
- UNOA.** *See* UN Office in Angola (UNOA)
- UNOB.** *See* UN Office in Burundi (UNOB)
- UNOGBIS.** *See* UN Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNOGBIS)
- UNOL.** *See* UN Peacebuilding Support Office in Liberia (UNOL)
- UNOMIG.** *See* UN Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG)
- UNPOB.** *See* UN Political Office in Bougainville (UNPOB)
- UNPOS.** *See* UN Political Office for Somalia (UNPOS)
- UNTAET.** *See* UN Transitional Administration in Timor-Leste (UNTAET)
- UNTOP.** *See* UN Tajikistan Office of Peacebuilding (UNTOP)
- UNTSO (UN Truce Supervision Organization).** *See also* Middle East situation generally, 203
- Uruguay**
justice and rule of law, statements on, 839
peacekeeping operations, statements on, 814
- Uzbekistan**
Afghanistan situation, statements on, 952
terrorism, letter dated 25 September 2001, 738
- Venezuela**
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1038

- women and peace and security, statements on, 806
- Vetoes of draft resolutions**
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, 554
Middle East situation, 222
- Viet Nam**
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 1045
- Voting**
absence, 139, 142
adoption of resolutions or decisions without vote, 143
Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, non-procedural matters, 137
Georgia situation, absence, 142
Iraq-Kuwait dispute, absence, 142
Middle East situation
non-participation, 142
non-procedural matters, 137
non-participation, 139, 142
President, note dated 29 June 2001, 135
procedural and non-procedural matters, 136, 138
procedures relating to, 135
- West Africa region**
Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, briefings by, 449
invitations to participate in proceedings, 120, 122
pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 888
President, statements by, 11, 449, 450, 888, 1079
Secretary-General
letter dated 30 April 2001, 449
relations of Security Council with, 247
Security Council Missions, 11, 120, 122, 239, 449, 831, 857
United States, statements by, 450
- Western Sahara situation**
abstention, 139
Algeria, letters regarding, 273, 274
Argentina, statements by, 272
China, statements by, 271
Jamaica, statements by, 271
Malaysia, statements by, 272
Mali, statements by, 271
Morocco
letter dated 24 February 2000, 270
letters regarding, 273, 274
Namibia
letters regarding, 274
statements by, 271
Netherlands, statements by, 271
new Security Council action, 41
pacific settlement of disputes, decisions regarding, 861, 872, 887
President, decisions recorded in letters, 159, 160, 161
Resolution 1292 (2000), 270, 872, 887
Resolution 1301 (2000), 139, 272, 872
Resolution 1309 (2000), 272
Resolution 1324 (2000), 272
Resolution 1342 (2001), 272
Resolution 1349 (2001), 272
Resolution 1359 (2001), 273, 872, 887
Resolution 1380 (2001), 273
Resolution 1394 (2002), 273
Resolution 1406 (2002), 273
Resolution 1429 (2002), 273, 873, 887
Resolution 1463 (2003), 273
Resolution 1469 (2003), 273
Resolution 1485 (2003), 273
Resolution 1495 (2003), 274, 873, 887
Resolution 1513 (2003), 41, 275
Secretary-General, reports by, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 873, 887
United States, statements by, 272
- WFP.** *See* World Food Programme (WFP)
- WHO.** *See* World Health Organization (WHO)
- Women and peace and security**
Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, briefings by, 802, 804
Australia, statements by, 936
Bangladesh, statements by, 803
determinations of threats to the peace, 936
Egypt, statements by, 936
European Union, statements on behalf of, 806
India, statements by, 806
Indonesia, statements by, 803, 906
invitations to participate in proceedings, 71, 81, 88, 89, 91, 103, 109, 113, 114, 124, 127, 234
matters of which Security Council seized, 32
measures not involving use of armed force, 951
Mexico, statements by, 807
MONUC, briefings by, 807
Namibia, statements by, 906
Nepal, statements by, 803
New Zealand, statements by, 906
President
decisions announced in statements, 147, 149
decisions recorded in letters, 161
statements by, 803, 806

- Resolution 1325 (2000), 803, 951, 1046
Resolution 1379, 951
Secretary-General
 briefings by, 801, 805
 relations of Security Council with, 246
 reports by, 805, 806
South Africa, statements by, 807
Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, briefings by, 804, 806
UNIFEM
 briefings by, 802, 804
 statements by, 936
United Kingdom, statements by, 805
United States, statements by, 803, 906
Venezuela, statements by, 806
- Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions**, 182
Working Group on International Criminal Tribunals, 183
Working Group on the Brahimi Report
 ensuring effective role of Security Council in maintenance of peace and security
 letter dated 10 November 2000, 722
 reports on, 722
 establishment, 983
 letter dated 10 November 2000, 8
 reports by, 990
Working Group on UN Peacekeeping Operations
 creation, 8
 establishment, 8, 183, 227
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 105, 106, 107, 109
 letter dated 31 December 2001, 812
 matters of which Security Council seized, 36, 38
 President
 decisions recorded in notes, 152, 153, 154
 notes by, 36
 reports by, 228, 812
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, letter dated 31 May 2001, 812
- Working methods and procedures**
 deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 50
 President
 decisions recorded in letters, 154
 decisions recorded in notes, 151, 153
- World Bank**
 Africa situation, briefings on, 419
 Central African region, briefings on, 451
 Central African Republic situation, briefings on, 414, 416
 Guinea-Bissau situation, briefings on, 439
 Timor-Leste situation, briefings on, 484, 495
- World Food Programme (WFP)**
 food and security
 briefings on, 128, 241, 822, 823, 825, 932
 statements on, 824
 Iraq humanitarian situation, briefings on, 688
 protection of UN personnel, briefings on, 794
- World Health Organization (WHO)**
 Iraq humanitarian situation, briefings on, 688
- Wrap-up discussions**
 invitations to participate in proceedings, 80, 86, 128
 matters of which Security Council seized, 34
 measures not involving use of armed force, 968
 self-defence, 1016
- Yemen**
 civilians in armed conflict, statements on, 934
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 647, 928, 929, 975, 980, 1012, 1038
 Middle East situation, letter dated 20 February 2002, 854
 Somalia situation, statements on, 286
 terrorism, statements on, 752
- Yemen situation**
 deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49
- Yugoslavia situation.** *See also* Bosnia and Herzegovina situation; Croatia situation; Kosovo situation; Macedonia situation
 Belarus, statements by, 590
 China, statements by, 588, 590
 deleted from matters of which Security Council seized, 49, 51
 European Union, briefings by, 590
 France, statements by, 588
 Namibia
 letter dated 11 May 2000, 852
 statements by, 588
 President, statements by, 589
 Russian Federation, statements by, 588, 589
 Slovenia, statements by, 590
 Ukraine, statements by, 589, 590
 United States, statements by, 589
- Yugoslavia, Federal Republic of.** *See also* Serbia and Montenegro
 admission of new Member States, 45, 256, 258
 Agenda, statements on, 28

- Bosnia and Herzegovina situation, statements on, 547, 550
briefings by, 35, 76, 97
Croatia situation
 letter dated 24 December 1999, 561
 letter dated 22 December 2000, 561
 letter dated 3 July 2001, 561
 letter dated 28 December 2001, 561
 letter dated 10 April 2002, 561
domestic affairs, non-intervention in, letter dated 5 October 2000, 1043
force, duty to refrain from threat or use of, letter dated 5 October 2000, 1028
International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, statements on, 696
Kosovo situation
 letter dated 13 February 2000, 848
 letter dated 13 February and 14 August 2000, 854
 letter dated 20 May 2000, 848
 letter dated 6 June, 19 July and 14 August 2000, 849
 letter dated 19 July 2000, 853
 letter dated 14 August 2000, 853
 letter dated 6 November 2001, 575
 letter dated 23 May 2002, 849
 statements on, 568, 569, 570, 571, 577, 580
Macedonia situation, statements on, 563
Middle East situation, letter dated 29 June 2000, 852
sanctions, letter dated 31 July 2001, 1060
terrorism, statements on, 753
Zaire. *See* Congo, Democratic Republic of
Zambia
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 362, 393
 Great Lakes region situation, letter dated 24 May 2001, 357
 terrorism, statements on, 752
 troop-contributing countries, strengthening cooperation with, statements on, 990, 992
Zimbabwe
 Angola situation, statements on, 304, 311
 Congo (Democratic Republic) situation, statements on, 362, 379, 384, 393, 394, 401, 402, 955, 972, 1008, 1032
 HIV/AIDS, statements on, 715
 Iraq-Kuwait dispute, statements on, 958, 1011
 Rwanda situation, letter dated 8 November 2000, 1019