

UN Sanctions



On 15 July 2013 Panama discovered fighter jets and other prohibited conventional arms on the ship *Chong Chon Gang* en route from Cuba to the DPRK. (AP Photo/Arnulfo Franco)

2013, No. 3
25 November 2013

This report is available online at securitycouncilreport.org.

For daily insights by SCR on evolving Security Council actions please subscribe to our "What's In Blue" series at [whatsinblue.org](https://twitter.com/whatsinblue) or follow [@SCRtweets](https://twitter.com/SCRtweets) on Twitter.

This report covers a wide range of topics in relation to UN sanctions: historical and legal background, objectives and strategies, targets and designation criteria, types of targeted sanctions, institutional framework and processes, and implementation. The report serves as an explanatory guide on the fundamentals of UN sanctions, provides a reference source (including an annex

covering the 13 sanctions regimes currently in force) and outlines notable trends in the evolution of UN sanctions. The intent is to make a constructive contribution to an ongoing dialogue regarding UN sanctions among a diverse set of stakeholders, including Council members. It is hoped that the analyses throughout this report may further stimulate this critical debate.

Introduction

2 Background on UN Sanctions

- UN Charter
- UN Sanctions since 1963

3 Objectives and Strategies

- Conflict Resolution
- Non-Proliferation
- Counter-Terrorism
- Democratisation
- Protection of Civilians

6 Institutional Framework

- Security Council Resolutions
- Sanctions Committees
- Panels/Groups of Experts and Monitoring Groups

8 Process, Targets and Criteria

- Listing and Delisting
- State and Non-State Designation Criteria

10 Types of Targeted Sanctions

- Diplomatic
- Travel Ban
- Asset Freeze
- Arms Embargo
- Commodity Interdiction

12 Implementation

- Compliance and Evasion
- Reform and Institutional Learning
- Legal Context

15 Evaluation, Options and Dynamics

- Concepts and Evaluation
- Possible Future Options
- Security Council and Wider Dynamics

17 UN Documents

18 Useful Additional Resources

19 Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables

This is Security Council Report's first *Special Research Report* on the general issue of UN sanctions (SCR previously published a *Special Research Report* on the Somalia sanctions regime on 16 September 2008). This report provides an overview of UN sanctions with four main purposes: first, to provide a concise explanatory guide to the fundamentals of UN sanctions regimes; second, to offer a reference source of accessible data regarding UN sanctions regimes currently in force; third, to outline some significant trends in the evolution of UN sanctions; and fourth, to offer analysis of current Council dynamics and policy options regarding sanctions.

This report is structured thematically. The first section provides background regarding the legal framework and broad historical trends of UN sanctions. The following section discusses the principal objectives—conflict resolution, non-proliferation, counter-terrorism, democratisation and protection of civilians (including human rights)—and implicit strategies of UN sanctions. The report then

outlines the main institutional framework for UN sanctions regimes, that is, the Security Council resolutions and sanctions committees, as well as the panels/groups of experts or monitoring groups assisting these committees. The following section outlines trends regarding who or what constitutes a target, under what criteria an individual or entity is designated as a target, and the processes for “listing” and “delisting” targeted individuals and entities. The report then discusses the five main types of UN targeted sanctions: diplomatic, travel bans, asset freezes, arms embargoes and commodity interdiction. The following section explores issues of implementation, such as compliance, evasion, reform and institutional learning. The report then offers brief analyses regarding concepts, evaluation, policy options and Council dynamics. An annex of tables summarising the 13 current UN sanctions regimes has been provided as a reference tool.

Background on UN Sanctions

This section notes the basis for sanctions under international law and sketches their evolution from the very rare, mainly comprehensive sanctions imposed during the Cold War to the targeted sanctions that emerged as of 1991.

UN Charter

The basis for UN sanctions under international law derives from Chapter VII of the UN Charter, and more specifically, Article 41, which covers enforcement measures not involving the use of armed force. While Article 41 does not specifically mention the word “sanctions”, it lists specific sanctions measures to be taken while at the same time making it clear that the list is not exhaustive:

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.

Article 41 has been used by the Council for a range of purposes and measures other than sanctions, such as the creation of international tribunals (e.g. the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda) or compensation funds (e.g., UN Compensation Commission).

The drafters of the UN Charter were careful to learn from the perceived failures of the League of Nations. In particular, Article 16 of the Covenant of the League of Nations had three weaknesses that were corrected in its successor, Article 41 of the UN Charter: Article 16 narrowly determined under what circumstances sanctions would be applied (i.e., interstate war), it specifically defined what form the sanctions would take (i.e., comprehensive diplomatic and economic), and it failed to centralise decision-making. In contrast, Article 41 does not delineate under which situations sanctions may be applied, and it merely provides guidelines as to the

Background on UN Sanctions (con't)

types of measures that may be implemented, while decision-making authority resides centrally within the Council (Charron 2011: 2-5). Article 41 has proven flexible with respect to the application of varying measures to address evolving threats to international peace and security.

UN Sanctions since 1963

The Security Council first imposed voluntary sanctions on the apartheid regimes of South Africa in 1963 and Southern Rhodesia in 1965, which subsequently became mandatory sanctions regimes on the unrecognised state of Rhodesia with resolution 253 (1968) and South Africa with resolution 418 (1977). Comprehensive sanctions on Rhodesia were a reaction to the Unilateral Declaration of Independence from the UK by the white minority regime, while targeted sanctions on South Africa were a response to its apartheid system and its regional military aggression and pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability. In the immediate aftermath of the Cold

War, comprehensive sanctions were applied to Iraq in reaction to its 1990 invasion of Kuwait and its programs to develop weapons of mass destruction (1990-2003) and during the break-up of the former Yugoslavia (1991-1996). In addition, comprehensive sanctions were imposed on Haiti (1993-1994) when President Jean-Bertrand Aristide was overthrown in a coup.

The 1990s witnessed a proliferation of UN sanctions regimes, most often in the form of targeted sanctions within the context of an intrastate conflict: 751 Somalia (1992-present), 788 Liberia (1992-2001), 820 Yugoslavia (1993-1996), 864 Angola (1993-2002), 918 Rwanda (1994-2008), 1132 Sierra Leone (1997-2010) and 1160 Kosovo (1998-2001) sanctions regimes. (UN sanctions regimes are conventionally known by the number of the Security Council resolution establishing the respective sanctions committee.) Targeted sanctions represented a significant tactical innovation for the Security Council and were prompted at least in

part by the perceived drawbacks of comprehensive sanctions, particularly with respect to their adverse humanitarian impact and a lack of precision in targeting those who had most threatened international peace and security. Although the Security Council first recognised in resolution 326 (1973) “the special economic hardships” confronting a member state (Zambia) as a result of the comprehensive sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia, it was only in 1995 that all permanent members definitively recognised that “further collective actions in the Security Council within the context of any future sanctions regime should be directed to minimize unintended adverse side-effects of sanctions on the most vulnerable segments of targeted countries” (S/1995/300). While resolving intrastate conflict remains a common objective, there has also been a trend toward using targeted sanctions for other purposes: non-proliferation, counter-terrorism, democratisation and protection of civilians (and human rights).

Objectives and Strategies

In terms of principal objectives sought by the Security Council, the use of sanctions can be grouped into five main categories: conflict resolution, non-proliferation, counter-terrorism, democratisation and the protection of civilians (including human rights). As will be covered later in the report under the sub-section on evaluation, the Council could also be pursuing more general purposes in coercing, constraining or signalling targets. This section discusses Council objectives and strategies in relation to the 13 UN sanctions regimes currently in force.

Conflict Resolution

Although the categories utilised in this section are not absolute, at least six of the current sanctions regimes could be categorised as having a stated principal objective of resolving conflict: Somalia and Eritrea 751/1907, Liberia 1521, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) 1533, Côte d’Ivoire 1572, Sudan 1591 and Taliban 1988 sanctions regimes. Considering the mandate of the Security Council to maintain international

peace and security, this should not be surprising, but it is interesting that these sanctions regimes are responding to intrastate conflict rather than interstate conflict. Given the contemporary prevalence of regional war economies—economic networks linking different conflicts in adjacent or nearby states—it is also true that the distinction between war within states and war between states has become increasingly blurred. Each of these conflicts exhibits trans-border dimensions, such as support for rebel groups by adjacent states and the trading of primary commodities used to finance conflict, some of which the Council has targeted with sanctions. It is also worth noting the Council may not have a single objective. For example, the DRC and Sudan sanctions regimes also include significant components on the protection of civilians, the Côte d’Ivoire and Liberia regimes have important elements of democratisation, and the Taliban and the Somalia/Eritrea regimes could also be interpreted within the context of counter-terrorism.

As for Council strategy in applying

sanctions for the purpose of conflict resolution, three basic approaches can be inferred: weakening the target(s), enabling their military defeat; facilitating a negotiated settlement by inducing the target(s) to engage in mediation (e.g., DRC and Sudan regimes); or reinforcing implementation of a peace agreement (e.g., Liberia regime). Of course, as the trajectory of a conflict changes over time, the implicit strategy of UN sanctions may also evolve. For example, a sanctions regime may be imposed initially with the objective of facilitating mediation but then shift toward enabling the military defeat of one party to the conflict (e.g., Côte d’Ivoire and Somalia regimes). The inverse could also happen, with an initial strategy of coercively terminating a war apparently shifting toward facilitation of a negotiated settlement (e.g., Taliban regime). Admittedly, these distinctions can be somewhat ambiguous in practice. Inferring Council strategy is not an exact science, partly because the Council may not publicly communicate its approach and partly because the Council may actually lack a coherent conflict resolution strategy.

Objectives and Strategies (con't)

Non-Proliferation

Two current UN sanctions regimes concern non-proliferation: the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) 1718 and Iran 1737 regimes. (Previous non-proliferation sanctions regimes include the South Africa 418 and Iraq 661 regimes.) Mandatory sanctions were first imposed on the DPRK with resolution 1718 of 14 October 2006, following its 9 October 2006 nuclear weapons test. Five demands were made of the DPRK:

- cease all launches and tests of nuclear and ballistic missiles;
- retract its announced withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT);
- return to the NPT and adherence with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, such as monitoring and inspection;
- provide the IAEA with transparency measures beyond the safeguard agreement; and
- abandon all other existing weapons and ballistic programmes in a complete, verifiable and irreversible manner.

Mandatory sanctions were imposed on Iran shortly thereafter in resolution 1737 of 23 December 2006. In the case of Iran, the impetus for resolution 1737 was a lack of compliance with the IAEA, particularly as outlined in resolution 1696 four months earlier. Resolution 1696, which had imposed limited voluntary measures, had been authorised in response to an IAEA report stating it was “unable to make progress in its efforts to provide assurances about the absence of undeclared nuclear material in Iran”. The dual objectives of the Council with respect to the DPRK and Iran have been clear: constrain their ability to develop nuclear weapons and ballistic missile technologies and compel them to return to the international non-proliferation framework.

In terms of Council strategy regarding the DPRK and Iran, there has been a two-track approach of incrementally strengthening sanctions while encouraging dialogue. The DPRK sanctions regime was strengthened three times, expanding the arms embargo and tightening financial restrictions (among other measures), with resolutions 1874, 2087 and 2094, in each case in response to further nuclear tests by the DPRK. The Council also repeatedly urged the DPRK at each stage

to return to the “six-party” talks with China, Japan, Republic of Korea, Russia and the US. The Iran regime has been strengthened three times, with resolutions 1747, 1803 and 1929, in response to successive IAEA reports stating that Iran had failed to adhere to its obligations. As with the DPRK, Iran was also frequently urged to return to talks with China, France, Germany, Russia, the UK and the US, commonly known as the “P5+1”. At a tactical level, the measures include a prohibition on importing materials and technologies related to developing nuclear weapons and delivery systems, as well as asset freezes and travel bans intended to constrict financing and technology transfers. Both sanctions regimes also include a “reverse” arms embargo, which prohibits exports from both countries of all types of weapons, in order to further restrict nuclear proliferation, as well as government financing from weapons sales. The DPRK sanctions regime also contains a unique provision targeting the military and political elite: a prohibition on exporting luxury goods to the country.

Counter-Terrorism

The first two counter-terrorism UN sanctions regimes were Libya 748 (1992-2003), in response to the bombing of Pan Am flight 103 in 1988 and UTA flight 772 in 1989, and Sudan 1054 (1996-2001), for alleged complicity in an attempted assassination of President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt in 1995. Currently, there are two UN counter-terrorism sanctions regimes in effect: the Al-Qaida 1267 and Lebanon 1636 regimes. The Al-Qaida sanctions were established in conjunction with the sanctions imposed on the Taliban and were also at first territorially linked to Afghanistan. The principal objective of the 1267 regime, authorised on 15 October 1999, was to compel the Taliban to extradite Osama bin Laden, who had been indicted for the bombing of US embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, in 1998. Following the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks on the US, the objectives of the 1267 regime were significantly expanded and its design revised to assume a broader range of counter-terrorism priorities, particularly in relation to the global reach of Al-Qaida. As for the 1636 sanctions regarding Lebanon, they were authorised in response to the assassination in Beirut of former Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri of

Lebanon and 22 others on 14 February 2005. The objective of the 1636 sanctions regime was to ensure compliance with the International Independent Investigation Commission, which had been created by the Security Council in resolution 1595 to assist Lebanon in bringing the perpetrators to justice.

While the initial objectives of the Al-Qaida 1267 and Lebanon 1636 regimes are quite similar, in terms of implementation they are at opposite ends of the spectrum. The 1267 regime became notorious for the number of individuals and entities designated for sanctions following its expansion on 16 January 2002 through resolution 1390, while the 1636 regime has to date not designated any targets. While resolution 1636 did not designate specific individuals for sanctions, the preamble left little doubt who the Council suspected was responsible: “there is probable cause to believe that the decision to assassinate former Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri could not have been taken without the approval of top-ranking Syrian security officials.” Apparently, with the implementation of the 1636 regime, the Council has had to balance justice and accountability with the risk that Syria would further destabilise Lebanon if its officials were threatened with prosecution. As for the 1267 regime, there were several modifications in terms of scope and implementation. Resolution 1390 extended globally the sanctions imposed on Al-Qaida and the Taliban in Afghanistan. As developments in Afghanistan and elsewhere have unfolded, the joint Taliban/Al-Qaida sanctions regime was ultimately separated into the 1988 Taliban and 1989 Al-Qaida sanctions regimes through the adoption of resolutions 1988 and 1989 on 17 June 2011. This was done perhaps in recognition of the changing relations among the government of Afghanistan, the Taliban and Al-Qaida (i.e., a perceived opportunity for mediation between the Taliban and the government of Afghanistan combined with acknowledgement of the differing interests of the Taliban and Al-Qaida).

Democratisation

Although the first two UN sanctions regimes, on Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, were not framed in terms of democratisation *per se* at the time, the right to political participation for the majority of the population was the central issue at stake. In that sense, there are some basic similarities between these two

Objectives and Strategies (con't)

early UN sanctions regimes and the Iraq 1518 sanctions and Guinea-Bissau 2048 sanctions regimes. Following the removal from power of Saddam Hussein by the US-led invasion of Iraq in May 2003, the Council modified the Iraq 661 sanctions regime with resolution 1483, which terminated most of the 661 measures but also imposed new sanctions targeting the financial assets of Saddam Hussein and other former senior regime officials. Funds frozen under resolution 1483 would be deposited into the Development Fund for Iraq. On 24 November 2003, the Council created a new sanctions committee with resolution 1518. The 1518 regime can be categorised under democratisation, as its main objective was evidently to facilitate a democratic transition in Iraq. As for Guinea-Bissau, in response to the 12 April 2012 military coup, the Council imposed sanctions with resolution 2048 on 18 May 2012. Resolution 2048 listed five people for a travel ban, including General Antonio Indjai, Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces, who was seen as principally responsible for the coup. The objective of the 2048 regime has been the restoration of constitutional order in Guinea-Bissau.

In terms of strategy, the approach seems reasonably clear with respect to Iraq but fairly ambiguous in the case of Guinea-Bissau. The 1518 regime was likely intended to work in two main ways: constrain the ability of former officials and loyalists of Saddam Hussein to disrupt the functioning of the interim administration by limiting their access to financial resources (in practice, this also ran the risk of increasing armed opposition, as former regime officials perceived little incentive for cooperation with either the new government or the UN) and increase the financing for a future democratic government through asset-recovery processes. However, the underlying strategy for the 2048 regime remains less clear; particularly regarding how merely a travel ban (and one that has not been rigorously enforced) could be expected to compel the military-backed transitional government in Guinea-Bissau to cede power. Multiple aspects of the 2048 regime point toward it being largely symbolic in intent and effect: the relative inactivity of the 2048 Committee signals that Guinea-Bissau has not been a high priority for the Council (although

certain members have taken an active interest); the regime lacks a panel/group of experts or a monitoring group to assist with monitoring and reporting; other measures such as an asset freeze have not been included; and the designation criteria have not been extended to include sources of illicit finance (i.e., transnational organised crime and the drug trade).

Protection of Civilians

Several current sanctions regimes—such as Somalia 751, DRC 1533, Côte d'Ivoire 1572 and Sudan 1591—have in their designation criteria language regarding human rights and humanitarian law violations (please see the sub-section on designation criteria below). The protection of civilians from human rights and humanitarian law violations can thus be seen as an additional objective of the Council in these cases. More recently, the Libya 1970 regime seems to be the first UN sanctions regime where at the outset the protection of civilians was explicitly stated as the principal objective. Adopted on 26 February 2011, the preambular paragraphs of resolution 1970 make reference to “violence and use of force against civilians”, “gross and systematic violation of human rights”, “widespread and systematic attacks” that may constitute crimes against humanity, “the Libyan authorities responsibility to protect its population” and the need to “hold to account those responsible for attacks, including by forces under their control, on civilians”. Resolution 1970 imposed an arms embargo, travel ban and asset freeze while also referring the situation to the International Criminal Court (ICC). Initially, 16 individuals were listed, including Muammar Qaddafi, ten family members and five other senior officials (ten individuals were designated for the travel ban only and six individuals were designated for both the travel ban and asset freeze). While the initial objective of the 1970 regime was the protection of civilians, the regime has evolved during the post-Qaddafi era to include a secondary purpose similar to the Iraq 1518 regime, in which issues regarding the status of frozen state assets have become interrelated with statebuilding and democratisation processes.

In retrospect, the initial strategy with resolution 1970 was straightforward: constrain the ability of the Qaddafi regime to commit

human rights violations against civilian populations with the arms embargo, use the referral to the ICC as pressure toward improved compliance with international human rights and humanitarian law, and compel a change of approach toward civilian populations through a travel ban and asset freeze on Qaddafi and his family. Less than one month later, the Council noted a lack of compliance with resolution 1970 and adopted resolution 1973 authorising the use of force to protect civilians. Operative paragraph four states:

Authorizes Member States that have notified the Secretary-General, acting nationally or through regional organizations or arrangements, and acting in cooperation with the Secretary-General, to take all necessary measures, notwithstanding paragraph 9 of resolution 1970 (2011), to protect civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack ...

Resolution 1973 also imposed a no-fly zone, tightened the arms embargo, expanded the asset freeze to state entities (financial and oil), introduced a flight ban and established a panel of experts. As delineated in resolution 1973, the Council modified its strategy for the 1970 regime in order to coerce improved compliance. This could be interpreted as an appropriate tactical adjustment by the Council, but resolution 1973 has been controversial because critics have asserted the intervening states exceeded their mandate of civilian protection to implement regime change.

More recently, the Council continued to use targeted sanctions against individuals or groups found to have committed violations of international humanitarian or human rights law, but the practice has been inconsistent. In 2012, the DRC 1533 Committee listed an additional four individuals and two entities under the DRC sanctions regime based on violations against civilians. These were the only such designations made in 2012, however, despite widespread reports of violations against civilians in other situations where the Council has also imposed sanctions targeting violations against civilians, most notably in Darfur. No such designations have been made so far in 2013.

Institutional Framework

This section outlines the institutional framework for UN sanctions: the Security Council resolutions and sanctions committees, as well as the panels/groups of experts or monitoring groups assisting these committees.

Security Council Resolutions

With respect to the language of resolutions authorising or modifying sanctions, there has been some variation in terms of specific references to the UN Charter. All 14 resolutions authorising active sanctions regimes (including 1907 on Eritrea) implicitly reference Article 39, with none doing so explicitly. The resolutions either state that the situations constitute a threat to international peace and security, or note that the Council is mindful of its obligation to maintain international peace and security. All 14 authorising resolutions also explicitly state that the Council is acting under Chapter VII, but only four resolutions also specifically mention the Council is acting under Article 41: 1718 on DPRK, 1737 on Iran, 1970 on Libya and 2048 on Guinea-Bissau. Explicit mention of Article 41 was in some cases inserted to avoid any inference that the use of force under Article 42 has been authorised. Examples include the four authorising resolutions listed above, as well as the following resolutions modifying sanctions: 1874, 1928 and 2094 on DPRK; 1747, 1803 and 1929 on Iran; and 2009 on Libya. Additionally, in multiple resolutions on DPRK (1718 and 1874) and Iran (1737, 1747, 1803 and 1929), the Council has also included direct language stating that “further decisions will be required, should additional measures be necessary”.

There are several fundamental issues that arise in relation to the design of UN targeted sanctions. At the risk of oversimplification, the following are a few of the core issues to be considered by the Council when drafting a resolution:

- the reasons for imposing sanctions, alongside their purposes in the near term and objectives in the long-term;
- the targets of the sanctions and under what criteria designations should be made and exemptions considered;
- the types of sanctions to be imposed, and the combination and sequencing of measures most likely to be effective;
- the institutional mechanisms needed for implementation (e.g., sanctions

committee, panel/group of experts or monitoring group); and

- the longevity of the sanctions, (fixed term or open-ended) and under what criteria they should be terminated.

Of course, there are often trade-offs in considering these issues, and recent Council practice has not always been entirely consistent. Authorising resolutions do not always explicitly state the principal objective(s), but these can usually be inferred by the context of Council action. Likewise, as noted in the section above, sanctions regimes can also have multiple objectives and these may be adjusted and updated over time by reauthorising and modifying resolutions. In terms of designation criteria and exemptions, these are typically present in authorising resolutions, and while the listing of specific individuals may be included it is more commonly added later by the committee (see following section on processes, targets and criteria). Nearly all authorising resolutions now include a sanctions committee and a panel/group of experts or monitoring group, but this has not always been the case (see subsection below). This has become common practice to such an extent that the absence of either would signal a conspicuous lack of intent toward implementation by the Council. Lastly, there are pros and cons associated with open-ended and time-limited sanctions. Some scholars and practitioners have argued the former are preferable because it can be difficult to mobilise political will for reauthorisation, while others have argued that sanctions are most effective shortly after authorisation and that time-limited sanctions improve accountability. Either way, specification in the authorising resolution of the criteria for how targets may become delisted improves Council signalling and the potential for compliance.

At a strategic level, a high degree of clarity is required regarding precisely how each sanctions regime is intended to complement Council action on the relevant situation. The strategic and operational linkages of sanctions regimes with existing UN operations (e.g. peacekeeping, humanitarian, mediation, peacebuilding and development) and relevant UN agencies deployed in the field should be specified. Likewise, the potential (or lack thereof) for coordinating sanctions implementation with other international, regional

and subregional organisations should be fully assessed. Coordination has implications for the overall feasibility of sanctions, which ideally should also be pragmatically assessed prior to authorisation. This would include examination of such issues as the probability of compliance, whether or not the type of sanctions imposed is likely to have a significant impact on their intended target, potential methods of sanctions evasion and possible countermeasures the Council could draw upon if required. Lastly, the Council should anticipate what unintended consequences might result from the imposition of sanctions (e.g., adverse humanitarian impact, criminality and corruption, impeding democratisation) and plan for how these could be prevented or mitigated.

There have been several initiatives oriented toward improving UN sanctions design. Much of the early work was state-led, involving the governments of Germany, Switzerland and Sweden: the Bonn-Berlin Process resulting in the 2001 report, *Design and Implementation of Arms Embargoes and Travel and Aviation Related Sanctions*; the Interlaken Process resulting in the 2001 report, *Targeted Financial Sanctions: A Manual for Design and Implementation*; and the Stockholm Process resulting in the 2003 report, *Making Targeted Sanctions Effective: Guidelines for the Implementation of UN Policy Options*. Building on these efforts, the Informal Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions, a subsidiary body of the Security Council, transmitted its final report on 18 December 2006 (S/2006/997), as well as earlier reports (S/2003/1197, S/2004/979 and S/2005/842). Other studies have been undertaken by civil society actors, such as the white paper by the Watson Institute of Brown University, *Strengthening Targeted Sanctions through Fair and Clear Procedures*, transmitted to the General Assembly and the Security Council on 19 May 2006 (A/60/887-S/2006/331). Most recently, the Targeted Sanctions Consortium, an international group of scholars and practitioners backed by the government of Switzerland, has been conducting a multi-year study which will result in the publication of an extensive edited volume on UN sanctions regimes.

Sanctions Committees

Sanctions committees are subsidiary organs of the Security Council for the purpose of administering sanctions regimes. They are created under Article 29 of the UN Charter

Institutional Framework (con't)

or Rule 28 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council which state the Council may establish subsidiary organs (Article 29) and appoint commissions, committees and rapporteurs (Rule 28). Dating back to the Southern Rhodesia 253 Sanctions Committee, the vast majority of UN sanctions regimes have had committees. (All UN sanctions regimes currently in force have a sanctions committee, although the Somalia 751, Iraq 1518, DRC 1533 and DPRK 1718 initially did not.) While they do not have formal authority to make binding decisions, in practice sanctions committees have been delegated substantial tasks, including monitoring, reporting, managing exemptions and managing designation lists. Their membership mirrors the composition of the Council, with the chair traditionally being a permanent representative from one of the 10 elected member states. Unlike the Council, decision-making within sanctions committees has been on a consensus basis. (A committee member may take an issue to the Council which has been blocked at the committee level, such as when the US advocated the listing of four individuals to the Sudan 1591 regime, eventually authorised with resolution 1672.) The specific form decision-making takes can vary from one committee

to another. Currently, the most common form is a five-day, no objection procedure, which is used by nine out of the 13 sanctions committees. Reporting to the Council by the sanctions committee chair also varies, with common options being either a 90-day cycle, a 120-day cycle or on an as-needed basis. Some of the committee chairs brief the Council publicly and some in consultations. Submission of a public annual report has also become standard practice for sanctions committees.

The level of activity by sanctions committees varies considerably as reflected in the table below. During 2012, one could categorise the 13 committees as follows: four were highly active (Somalia/Eritrea 751/1907, Al-Qaida 1267/1989, DPRK 1718 and Libya 1970), six were reasonably active (Liberia 1521, DRC 1533, Côte d'Ivoire 1572, Sudan 1591, Iran 1737 and Taliban 1988) and three were either mostly inactive or entirely dormant (Iraq 1518, Lebanon 1636 and Guinea-Bissau 2048). There are a few possible explanations for these differences. The most significant variable is likely the strategic importance of the sanctions regime to Council members, particularly the P5. Another factor may be time, as new regimes have not yet had an opportunity to mobilise and older

regimes may have become functionally obsolete even though they are still in effect. Of course, some committees are also likely to be more active due to the number of individuals and entities that have been designated for listing, although the Iraq 1518 regime has clearly become an exception in this regard. Finally, the committee chair can potentially play an important leadership role, but the degree of autonomy and the parameters for the work of the committee chair are to a certain extent also delineated by the penholder for Council resolutions authorising and modifying sanctions regimes.

Panels/Groups of Experts and Monitoring Groups

To assist sanctions committees, particularly with respect to monitoring and reporting, panels/groups of experts or monitoring groups have been established for most sanctions regimes. The Commission of Inquiry established by resolution 1013 on 7 September 1995 regarding the arms embargo on Rwanda was the first such expert group established by the Security Council. Panels/groups of experts and monitoring groups are appointed from a list of experts via the Secretariat and are intended to be independent from the influence of Council members. However, Council

ACTIVITY OF SANCTIONS COMMITTEES IN 2012

	Consolidated Number of Listings	Committee Meetings	Notes by Chair*	Communications by Chair*	Communications Received*
Somalia/Eritrea 751/1907	14	10	114	72	135
Al-Qaida 1267/1989	284	16	124	126	207
Iraq 1518	297	0	0	0	1
Liberia 1521	64	3	25	31	68
DRC 1533	40	4	29	50	68
Côte d'Ivoire 1572	8	4	20	27	33
Sudan 1591	4	7	38	18	20
Lebanon 1636	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
DPRK 1718	31	5	116	27	154
Iran 1737	121	4	49	44	88
Libya 1970	22	7	129	197	157
Taliban 1988	134	8	73	47	74
Guinea-Bissau 2048	11	2	2	18	2

Data for 2012. * = as of 30 November 2012.

Sources: Annual reports of sanctions committees and Security Council Affairs Division

Institutional Framework (con't)

members may sometimes discreetly lobby the Secretariat for the appointment of their own nationals to the panels and groups. Likewise, as most of the panels/groups report to the relevant sanctions committee, and the release of their reports requires consensus among committee members, this *de facto* veto power has been used to delay or suppress reports—thus potentially compromising the integrity of the process. For example, the release of the 2010 report of the Panel of Experts assisting the DPRK 1718 Committee (S/2010/571) was delayed four months, while its 2011 report was never released; similarly, the release of the 2010 report of the Panel of Experts assisting the Sudan 1591 Committee was delayed six months (S/2011/111), while the 2011 report has not been released. In each instance, either China or Russia was reportedly responsible for either the delay or the suppression of the reports. In June 2012, Rwanda, at the time not yet a Council member, objected to the content of an addendum to the mid-term report of the Group of Experts assisting the DRC 1533

Committee (S/2012/348/Add.1), refuting allegations of connections with the *Mouvement du 23 Mars* (M23) rebel group in the DRC, but was unable to delay or suppress public release of the addendum. Most recently, the 2013 final report on Eritrea by the Monitoring Group assisting the Somalia/Eritrea 751/1907 Committee (S/2013/440) was delayed two weeks due to objections by Russia.

Ten of the 13 current sanctions committees are assisted by a panel/group of experts or monitoring group. The panels/groups vary in size: those assisting the Somalia/Eritrea 751/1907, Al-Qaida 1267, DPRK 1718, Iran 1737 and Taliban 1988 sanctions committees have eight members, while the group assisting the DRC 1533 Committee has six members; the Côte d'Ivoire 1572, Sudan 1591 and Libya 1970 committees have five members; and the Liberia 1521 Committee has three members. The mandate of each panel/group of experts or monitoring group is renewed by the Council annually and most report to the Council indirectly through their committee;

exceptions include the Al-Qaida and Taliban reports, which are submitted just to the committees, and the Libya reports which are submitted directly to the Council (until 2011, the DPRK 1718 Panel of Experts also reported to the Council). This has implications for the potential for delaying or suppressing reports as—unlike the Council, where a vote may be requested—the committees operate by consensus and there is no record of their decision making processes. The three sanctions committees without a panel/group are Iraq 1518, Lebanon 1636 and Guinea-Bissau 2048. An earlier Iraq regime, however, had a group of experts and ad hoc panels, and there was an International Independent Investigation Commission for the Lebanon sanctions regime, whose mandate lapsed in 2009. Expert and monitoring bodies have in the last decade become a standard component of sanctions committees to such an extent that one might interpret their absence as indicative of a lack of commitment by the Security Council toward implementation.

Processes, Targets and Criteria

UN sanctions have evolved from comprehensive sanctions against states to targeted sanctions on states and non-state entities, including individuals. Interrelated with changes in the targets of sanctions have been changes in the criteria under which they are designated for listing. Institutional processes for “listing” and “delisting” targets have also evolved over time.

Listing and Delisting

Although the specifics vary from one sanctions regime to another, there are two main routes by which individuals and entities can become designated for sanctions listing: via a resolution or through a sanctions committee. The listing could be specified within a resolution authorising or modifying the sanctions regime. Alternatively, the relevant sanctions committee may create the list later using the appropriate designation criteria. Typically, member states propose candidates to the sanctions committees that are then included if there are no objections within the committee within a specified timeframe. However, the guidelines for some sanctions committees,

such as the DRC 1533 and Sudan 1591 committees, specifically mention a broader range of sources for nominating targets, such as the Secretary-General, the High Commissioner for Human Rights and panels/groups of experts. Whether through a subsequent resolution or through the sanctions committee, there is often a substantial time lag between the determination of listing criteria and the designation of targets. Examples include: Côte d'Ivoire 1572, November 2004 to January 2006; Sudan 1591, March 2005 to April 2006; and Somalia 751, November 2008 to April 2010. Targets are then supposed to be notified of their listing indirectly via the permanent mission to the UN of the country of their citizenship (or location, for entities).

The process for removal from the lists, or delisting, has been a source of considerable controversy and an area to which the Council has recently devoted a substantial amount of attention. Currently, petitions for delisting may be addressed as follows: to the committee by member states, to the committee via the state of nationality or residency of the petitioner, or to

the Focal Point for Delisting by the individual or entity directly. The Focal Point for Delisting, which is essentially a dedicated staff member in the Secretariat, was created through resolution 1730 of 19 December 2006 in order to facilitate communication during the delisting process. The annex of resolution 1730 also establishes basic procedures for the operation of the delisting process. The establishment of the first procedure for removal from the sanctions lists happened, however, only after several years of intense advocacy by several member states, the Secretary-General, the High Commissioner for Human Rights and a number of civil society actors, prompted by due process concerns related primarily to the Al-Qaida 1267 sanctions regime. In terms of delisting, the Al-Qaida 1267 regime is unique as resolution 1904 of 17 December 2009 created the Office of the Ombudsperson to review delisting requests for the Al-Qaida regime only. (Before the Al-Qaida 1267/1989 and Taliban 1988 regimes were split, its mandate also included the latter.) With resolution 1989 of 17 June 2011, the powers of the Ombudsperson were significantly expanded:

Processes, Targets and Criteria (con't)

recommendations to the Al-Qaida 1267/1989 Committee for removal from listing became final and automatic unless overturned by a unanimous vote of the committee or referred to the Council by a committee member.

State and Non-State

From the perspective of the drafters of the UN Charter, who perceived interstate conflict as the principal threat to international peace and security, Article 41 was undoubtedly initially intended to be used to impose measures against states. With respect to state targets, it is perhaps useful to differentiate four categories: single state, multiple states, *de facto* or unrecognised states and “failed states” (Farrall 2007:128-130). Single-state sanctions are applied against a functioning government and cover the entire territory. Multiple-state sanctions have occurred by default in the case of the dissolution of Yugoslavia and with respect to the war between Ethiopia and Eritrea. The expanding of a long existing sanctions regime to include another state, such as when Eritrea was added to the Somalia regime with resolution 1907, is another example. Sanctions against *de facto* or unrecognised states have occurred in the cases of Rhodesia, Serbia-Montenegro, the Taliban in Afghanistan and following coups in Haiti, Sierra Leone and Guinea-Bissau. Past cases of sanctions imposed on so-called “failed states” include Somalia and Liberia. While by definition all comprehensive sanctions regimes have been applied to state targets, not all sanctions applied to state targets have been comprehensive.

As the Security Council has increasingly moved away from the use of comprehensive sanctions—each of the current 13 sanctions regimes are targeted in one form or another—there has been a related trend toward refining the objects of the sanctions regimes. Non-state actors targeted by UN sanctions could be categorised as the following: sub-state actors, such as rebel groups; extra-state actors, such as terrorist groups; individuals in decision-making positions; individual arms dealers; and private-sector actors, such as corporations. The imposition of sanctions against Bosnian Serbs with resolution 820 in April 1993 represented the first time the UN targeted a sub-state

actor. Current sub-state actors targeted by UN sanctions include *Al-Shabaab* in Somalia, M23 and *Forces Démocratiques de Liberation du Rwanda* (FDLR) in the DRC and the Taliban in Afghanistan. Al-Qaida represents the first extra-state actor targeted with UN sanctions (initially under the joint Taliban/Al-Qaida 1267 regime and then de-linked from the Taliban as of 2011). In the wake of the terrorist attacks on the US of 11 September 2001, the Council greatly expanded its use of sanctions against individuals, particularly in the context of counter-terrorism. As of 31 March 2008, there were 482 listings (142 individuals for Taliban, 228 individuals for Al-Qaida and 112 entities for Al-Qaida). On 30 June 2008, with resolution 1822, the Council directed the Taliban/Al-Qaida Sanctions Committee to review the consolidated list in response to numerous legal challenges. Lastly, corporations and other private actors have also been targeted in eight current sanctions regimes: Al-Qaida 1267/1989, Iraq 1518, Liberia 1521, DRC 1533, DPRK 1718, Iran 1737, Libya 1970 and Taliban 1988.

Designation Criteria

The range of designation criteria across all 13 UN sanctions regimes is fairly expansive and continues to evolve. The following points summarise the criteria currently used to designate states and non-state actors for sanctions:

- threatening peace, security or stability;
- violating an arms embargo;
- supporting armed groups through illegal commodity trade;
- impeding disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration;
- violating international human rights or humanitarian law;
- obstructing access to humanitarian assistance;
- targeting of civilians for human rights violations;
- recruiting of child soldiers;
- committing rape and gender-based violence;
- misappropriating public assets;
- obstructing or attacking peacekeepers;
- inciting public hatred and violence;
- supporting proliferation of nuclear weapons;

- being associated with or supporting a terrorist group;
- engaging in terrorist bombings or political assassinations; and
- preventing the restoration of constitutional order.

In some cases designation criteria are nearly synonymous with the objective, but in other cases designation criteria are both more specific and more varied. (The precise designation criteria for each sanctions regime are listed in the annex to this report.) Likewise, the application of designation criteria has not been equally weighted in practice by the Council and sanctions committees as counter-terrorism related designation criteria have resulted in a higher number of listings than all other designation criteria combined.

One notable trend recently has been the increasing use of designation criteria related to human rights and the protection of civilians in armed conflict, including women and children. For example, resolution 1572 of 15 November 2004 imposed sanctions on those “responsible for serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law” in Côte d’Ivoire. Children were first mentioned in relation to designation criteria in resolution 1698 of 31 July 2006 on the DRC, which imposed sanctions on “individuals committing serious violations of international law involving the targeting of children in situations of armed conflict, including killing and maiming, sexual violence, abduction and forced displacement”. Individuals committing violations against women were first mentioned in the context of designation criteria with resolution 1807 of 31 March 2008, which further revised the DRC 1533 sanctions regime. Among the current regimes, similar human rights-related designation criteria have also been included with respect to Sudan with resolution 1591, Libya with resolution 1970 and Somalia with resolution 2002 (in other words, most contemporary sanctions regimes outside the contexts of non-proliferation and counter-terrorism). However, as explained at the outset of this section, the inclusion of particular criteria in a Council resolution in most cases is separate (and in some quite distant) from applying those criteria to actual individuals or entities.

Types of Targeted Sanctions

Functionally, there are five main types of targeted UN sanctions: diplomatic, travel ban, asset freeze, arms embargo and commodity interdiction. This section briefly evaluates each of these, including in relation to the 13 active sanctions regimes.

Diplomatic

The “severance of diplomatic relations” is one of the possible measures specifically mentioned in Article 41 of the UN Charter. While historically diplomatic sanctions have been one of the more frequently used forms, no UN diplomatic sanctions are currently in effect. Diplomatic sanctions have been previously applied in the following regimes: Southern Rhodesia 253, Libya 748, Yugoslavia 757, Angola 864, Sudan 1054 and Afghanistan/Taliban/Al-Qaida 1267. In the cases of Libya and Sudan, diplomatic sanctions were imposed on recognised states; in the cases of Southern Rhodesia and Yugoslavia, diplomatic sanctions were imposed on unrecognised states; and in the case of Angola and the initial 1267 regime, diplomatic sanctions were imposed on non-state actors—the rebel group *União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola* (UNITA) and the Taliban. Notably, the diplomatic sanctions against UNITA authorised in resolution 1173, which modified the 864 regime, contained an exemption for contact with the government of Angola, the UN and the observer states of the Lusaka Protocol peace process. As for the Taliban, the Council decided that member states would “close immediately and completely all Taliban offices in their territories” with resolution 1333. When the 1267 regime was subsequently split into two regimes with resolutions 1988 and 1989, these diplomatic sanctions were not retained.

Recourse to diplomatic sanctions has declined alongside the decline of comprehensive sanctions against state actors. Yet this is only part of the explanation as the cases above indicate diplomatic sanctions can also be targeted and applied in relation to non-state actors. Notably, the travel ban imposed under the current Taliban 1988 regime specifically exempts travel that the committee determines “directly relates to supporting efforts by the government of Afghanistan to promote reconciliation”, which implies a change in Council intent compared to the diplomatic sanctions imposed one decade earlier. In other contexts, such as with the DPRK and Iran, it

would seem that the Council has determined that the benefits of signalling illegitimacy with diplomatic sanctions would be outweighed by the cost in terms of lost opportunities for further multi-party negotiations. Similarly, in the case of Guinea-Bissau, where one might have expected the imposition of diplomatic sanctions in response to the 12 April 2012 coup, the Council has apparently decided that limited political engagement would be more effective in restoring constitutional order.

Travel Ban

Travel bans are a common form of targeted sanctions: they are a feature of all but one (Iraq 1518) of the UN sanctions regimes currently in effect. The institutional predecessors to the individual travel ban have taken numerous forms: a comprehensive ban on travel by all nationals of a country, a ban on travel to an entire country, a ban on travel to rebel-held territory within a country, an aviation ban on all flights into or out of a country and a ban on the operation of a national airline. Most recently, the Libya 1970 regime added an aviation ban with resolution 1973, which was terminated six months later with resolution 2009 in September 2011. Previously, the Taliban/Al-Qaida 1267 regime also had an air embargo on Ariana Afghan Airlines (imposed with resolution 1267, terminated with resolution 1388)

and a ban on flights over Taliban controlled territory (imposed with resolution 1333, terminated with resolution 1390). Exemptions for various reasons, usually at the discretion of the committee, have become standard for individual travel bans: humanitarian (10 regimes); religious (10 regimes); participation in peace, national reconciliation and stability processes (nine regimes); and justice or judicial process (five regimes). One of the more significant examples of the Council’s ability to be flexible and act quickly was the removal of former President Laurent Gbagbo of Côte d’Ivoire from the 1572 regime travel ban list to enable his transfer to The Hague in November 2011 to face charges at the ICC. As the table above indicates, travel bans are rarely imposed in isolation from other measures: the most common combination is a travel ban with an asset freeze and an arms embargo, which has been applied in 11 of the 13 active sanctions regimes.

While individual travel bans are among the most commonly imposed form of sanctions, they may also quite possibly be the most widely violated. A few reasons may account for a lack of compliance with UN travel bans. First, the scale of listings has become of such a magnitude that the committees and Secretariat find it increasingly difficult to manage the process effectively. Currently, 517 individuals

APPLICATION OF TARGETED UN SANCTIONS

	Travel Ban	Asset Freeze	Arms Embargo	Commodity Interdiction
Somalia/Eritrea 751/1907	•	•	•	•
Al-Qaida 1267	•	•	•	
Iraq 1518		•	•	
Liberia 1521	•	•	•	
DRC 1533	•	•	•	
Côte d’Ivoire 1572	•	•	•	•
Sudan 1591	•	•	•	
Lebanon 1636	•	•		
DPRK 1718	•	•	•	•
Iran 1737	•	•	•	
Libya 1970	•	•	•	
Taliban 1988	•	•	•	
Guinea-Bissau 2048	•			

Types of Targeted Sanctions (con't)

have been designated for a travel ban by the UN; more than two-thirds of these have been listed under the Al-Qaida 1267/1989 and Taliban 1988 regimes. Second, as with other types of sanctions, the burden of implementation primarily falls on member states that often lack institutional capacity. To put this regulatory challenge in concrete terms, the International Air Transportation Association estimates there were 1.11 billion international air travellers during 2011. It also remains unclear in what context and to what extent travel bans have induced an intended response from targeted individuals (Cosgrove 2005: 207-228). In other words, even when they are enforced, little is known about their effectiveness. Finally, when travel bans are imposed on such a scale as to be virtually unenforceable, there is a risk that a widespread lack of compliance could damage UN institutional credibility.

Asset Freeze

The predecessor of asset freezes targeting individuals and entities was general financial sanctions, which had been imposed in the following contexts: Southern Rhodesia 253, Iraq 661, Libya 748, Yugoslavia 757, Yugoslavia 820 and Haiti 841. Similar to individual travel bans, asset freezes have also been included in all but one (Guinea-Bissau 2048) of the current sanctions regimes. Cumulatively, there are 575 individuals and 414 entities currently designated for asset freezes by the Security Council. In terms of the targeting of entities, the Iraq 1518 (208 entities), Iran 1737 (78 entities) and Al-Qaida 1267/1989 (63 entities) regimes are perhaps most notable. Presumably, the respective purposes are asset recovery, non-proliferation and counter-terrorism. With the exception of the Iraq 1518 regime, each of the sanctions regimes have exemptions to asset freezes, which in the majority of cases use standard language regarding humanitarian assistance, basic and extraordinary expenses and legal costs. Interestingly, the Iran 1737 regime specifically allows for the sale or transfer of equipment for light-water reactors and low-enriched uranium, while the Libya 1970 regime includes language on financing for public purposes by state banks and investment funds.

Targeted asset freezes are undoubtedly an improvement over their predecessor, general financial sanctions, as they are more likely to be implemented and have diminished side

effects. Nonetheless, numerous challenges to effective implementation remain, particularly within the context of international enforcement. Some of the problems facing implementation of UN targeted asset freezes are basically the same obstacles that anti-money laundering initiatives face more generally. Global money laundering remains endemic, despite considerable effort on the part of the international community, such as the launch of the World Bank Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative in 2007. According to economists at Global Financial Integrity, the developing world lost \$859 billion in illicit outflows in 2010 (Kar and Freitas 2012). This does not mean that UN targeted asset freezes cannot be enforced, but given the sophistication of money-laundering methods and a chronic lack of transparency in international banking, effective implementation will be difficult.

Arms Embargo

Historically, nearly all UN sanctions regimes have included an arms embargo, with the exception of the now-terminated Sudan 1054 regime and the currently active Lebanon 1636 and Guinea-Bissau 2048 regimes. Arms embargos have taken both general and targeted forms. Among the current regimes, the DPRK 1718 and Iran 1737 regimes are distinctive due to the inclusion of specific non-proliferation measures. The DPRK sanctions include a ban on heavy conventional weapons and materials, equipment, goods and technology related to nuclear programmes, ballistic missile programmes and other WMD programmes. The Iran sanctions include a ban on items related to the enrichment or reprocessing of nuclear materials as well as the development of delivery systems for nuclear weapons. In both sanctions regimes, there is also a prohibition on the export of arms, including conventional, from each country. This is an innovative measure, which theoretically serves the dual purposes of non-proliferation and constraining government financing from weapons sales. Two-way arms embargos have also been applied in the cases of the Eritrea 1907 and Libya 1970 regimes. As with travel bans and asset freezes, most current arms embargoes include exemptions of one form or another, with the exception of three sanctions regimes: Al-Qaida 1267/1989, Iran 1737 and Taliban 1988.

The most recent report of the Panel of

Experts assisting the Libya 1970 Committee illustrates some of the difficulties in implementing a two-way arms embargo within the context of an intrastate conflict and its aftermath (S/2013/99). The panel found that:

- the delivery of arms during the uprising against Qaddafi was undertaken without any controls on the ground, so many of these arms are now in the possession of non-state actors or are being trafficked out of the country;
- there has been a collapse in state control over weapons stockpiles and an absence of any border controls, leading to the spread of conventional weapons to West Africa, the Middle East and possibly the Horn of Africa; and
- UN member states have transferred weapons to the authorities in Libya under an exemption to the arms embargo, but in numerous cases the ostensible end users have been inadequately specified.

The panel concluded that the “lack of an effective security system remains one of the primary obstacles to securing military materiel” and therefore “the proliferation of weapons from Libya continues at an alarming rate”. While Libya may not be representative of the UN track record on arms embargoes, these are not encouraging observations for a sanctions regime that had already been in effect for two years.

Commodity Interdiction

The imposition of commodity sanctions in a UN context dates back to the first comprehensive regime on Southern Rhodesia. However, the two most significant cases in terms of setting a precedent for the current use of targeted commodity sanctions were Angola (1998-2002) and Sierra Leone (2000-2003), in which sanctions were imposed on rough diamond exports in order to reduce the financing available to two rebel groups, UNITA and the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), respectively. There are currently commodity sanctions imposed within three sanctions regimes: the export of diamonds from Côte d'Ivoire (resolution 1643 of 15 December 2005), the export of luxury goods to the DPRK (resolution 1718 of 14 October 2006) and the export of charcoal from Somalia (resolution 2036 of 22 February 2012). There is also voluntary language regarding mining-industry financing in Eritrea and natural resource supply chain

Types of Targeted Sanctions (con't)

due-diligence in the DRC. The DRC 1533 sanctions regime also includes designation criteria regarding support for armed groups through the illicit trade of natural resources. Among other countries currently under UN sanctions, previous commodity measures included the Oil for Food Programme in Iraq (1995-2003) and sanctions on diamond (2001-2007) and timber (2003-2006) exports from Liberia.

The most recent report of the Monitoring Group assisting the Somalia/Eritrea 751/1907 Committee highlights some of the difficulties in implementing primary commodity interdiction sanctions (S/2013/413). Among the

findings of the Monitoring Group are the following:

- although sanctions were imposed in February 2012, the amount of charcoal exports has increased from a rate of 9 million sacks per year in 2011 to a rate of 24 million sacks per year in 2013;
- the Kenyan Defence Forces (KDF), which operate in Somalia under mandates from the AU and UN, and the allied Ras Kamboni militia have been actively involved in the charcoal trade in the port city of Kismayo;
- the *Al Shabaab* insurgency continues to export as many as 600,000 to 1 million

sacks of charcoal per month, with an international market value of \$9 million to \$16 million; and

- transit routes for charcoal exports from Somalia to Dubai, as well as specific individuals and firms trading charcoal in violation of the sanctions regime, have been identified (no action has yet been taken).

These types of obstacles to effective implementation—i.e., complicity in sanctions-busting by peacekeepers, chronic evasion of interdiction by rebel groups and impunity for local and regional businesses that violate sanctions—are not unique to Somalia.

Implementation

This section explores two key issues related to the implementation of UN sanctions: compliance and evasion. It also explores institutional learning and reform with regard to unintended consequences, Council innovation, due process and transparency.

Compliance and Evasion

Reliable data on the extent of contemporary sanctions evasion is of course difficult to find, as these activities are for quite understandable reasons not that well publicised. Those who violate UN sanctions regimes do not issue press releases to advertise the fact. In some ways, sanctions busting seems to have much in common with what is generally understood as transnational organised crime—relying on methods such as the use of front companies, black-market trading, re-flagging and renumbering of cargo ships and cross-border smuggling. On an individual level, possible tactics include relying on personal networks, assuming a false identity or relocating to a state with a government that is allied, corrupt or lacks enforcement capacity.

Perhaps a historical example—such as the widespread lack of compliance with the first UN mandatory sanctions regime on Rhodesia—may offer insight. This case reinforces the idea that neighbouring states are critical, as Rhodesia relied on continued trade with apartheid South Africa, the Portuguese colony of Mozambique and Zambia. A lack of secondary sanctions for non-compliance also

likely exacerbated the complicity of Western states and firms in sanctions busting. Furthermore, Rhodesia used other tactics, such as false certificates of origin for exported goods and illicit cash transfers from abroad, to sustain the regime economically. These trends have much in common with contemporary sanctions busting, which anecdotal evidence suggests is widespread and routine. Nonetheless, there have been a few recent success stories, perhaps most notably the discovery by Panama on 15 July 2013 of fighter jets and other prohibited conventional arms on the ship *Chong Chon Gang* en route from Cuba to the DPRK.

However, it seems that some of what might conventionally be termed sanctions busting could perhaps be described more accurately as simply an absence of enforcement. The recent case of Ibrahim Bah, listed under the Liberia 1521 regime as an arms and diamond trader during the civil war in Sierra Leone, offers an illustrative example. The 23 May 2013 report of the Panel of Experts assisting the Liberia 1521 Committee (S/2013/316) clearly indicated that Bah was residing in Freetown, Sierra Leone, yet despite the legal obligation of the government to implement the UN travel ban, Sierra Leone secretly “deported” him unescorted to Senegal in July 2013. In other cases, a lack of compliance may be by default rather than by deliberate methods of evasion. Individuals subjected to UN sanctions may not even be aware that they have been listed

(Eriksson 2011: 127). Under the current system, targets are supposed to be notified via their permanent mission to the UN, but in practice this does not always happen. Presumably, target awareness of sanctions imposition should be a minimum prerequisite for effective implementation.

Improved coordination and cooperation within the UN system could lead to enhanced implementation of sanctions regimes and higher levels of compliance. For example, one study has highlighted the potential synergies of greater cooperation between panels/groups of experts and UN peacekeeping operations: information from panels/groups could more usefully feed into the ongoing multidimensional work of peace operations, while peace operations could facilitate implementation of the recommendations emanating from the panels/groups (Boucher 2010). Of course, this would also require continued Council engagement in order to incorporate the findings and recommendations made by the panels/groups and update the mandates of peacekeeping operations. Other possibilities for improved UN coordination and cooperation on sanctions implementation include: linkages with Special Representatives of the Secretary-General in the field; coordination among sanctions committee chairs; communication between the Council and UN country teams; cooperation among departments in the Secretariat and information-sharing among panels/groups (Cortright *et al* 2010).

Implementation (con't)

Sanctions enforcement and compliance might also be affected by the level of cooperation between the UN and other intergovernmental organisations, such as INTERPOL and the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), an intergovernmental organisation established at the G-7 Summit at Paris in 1989 in response to mounting concern over money laundering.

Another important factor affecting the implementation of sanctions regimes is the role played by neighbouring states and regional organisations. UN member states have the primary obligation to enforce UN sanctions. This requires two basic components—state capacity and political will—and implementation typically fails in the absence of either. For obvious reasons, if states within a region fail to enforce a UN sanctions regime, then the impact of measures such as a travel ban, arms embargo or commodity interdiction will be considerably reduced. Regional states may lack capacity for a fairly self-evident reason: UN sanctions regimes are imposed in the context of threats to international peace and security, which have been principally located in the developing world (at least as determined by the Council as 54 percent of sanctions regimes concern Africa and 38 percent of regimes concern the Middle East or Asia, plus extra-state Al-Qaida). A lack of state capacity to implement sanctions is an important factor. A further possible element may be a lack of intent to implement UN sanctions which in turn could be explained by a number of factors, such as regional solidarity, economic cost or perceptions of Council illegitimacy. Compliance is perhaps more likely where UN measures are compatible with regional and subregional measures. Greater harmonisation between UN sanctions and AU sanctions, for example, could be a way to increase compliance in certain cases (Carisch and Rickard-Martin 2011).

Lastly, compliance and political will among the P5 is a critical (and too often overlooked) variable affecting the implementation of UN sanctions. For example, the 27 October 2005 report of the Independent Inquiry Committee into the UN Oil-for-Food Programme uncovered corruption by corporations from P5 states, among others. In another example, the widely-documented availability in Darfur of Chinese-manufactured arms suggests that some arms sales by China to Sudan may have been in violation of the partial arms embargo

as stipulated in resolution 1591. According to a study by the Stockholm Institute for International Peace Research Institute and Uppsala University, the credibility of about three quarters of arms embargoes threatened by the Council from 1990 to 2006 was undermined by the actions of a P5 member through subsequent arms transfers or public statements against the embargo (Fruchart *et al.*, 2007). It is perhaps not realistic to expect compliance and enforcement among UN member states in the absence of a positive precedent of consistent implementation being established on the part of the P5.

Reform and Institutional Learning

Sanctions regimes—even those that are “smart” or “targeted”—often have unintended consequences: an adverse humanitarian impact on civilian populations, high economic costs for neighbouring countries, the criminalisation of basic economic activities and reinforcing authoritarianism and corruption in target governments. Following the immense humanitarian cost of comprehensive sanctions in Iraq and Haiti, the UN has refined sanctions targeting and widely implemented humanitarian exemptions (10 out of 13 current sanctions regimes have humanitarian exemptions for travel bans or asset freezes). However, there is no easy solution for the fundamental reality that imposing sanctions often has substantial economic costs—not only for the target country but also for its neighbours, who may lose preferred trade routes and market access. High economic costs for adjacent states, which are only partially offset (if at all) by ad hoc contributions from the international community (e.g., through bilateral donors), at least partly explain low sanctions compliance. As for primary commodity sanctions, there is a risk of criminalising the main source of income for marginalised populations, such as alluvial miners or agricultural labourers, leaving few alternative sources of livelihood. This needs to be more systematically assessed by the Council prior to sanctions authorisation. Finally, sanctions imposed to promote democratisation after a coup may have the opposite effect, as international isolation can instead strengthen the position of military elites. The symbolic purpose (i.e., signalling illegitimacy) should be weighed against the potential impact (i.e., corruption and authoritarianism).

While ample room for improvement

remains, during the last two decades the Council and sanctions committees have actually exhibited a reasonable degree of innovation in improving the effectiveness of UN sanctions regimes. First and foremost, there has been the transition from comprehensive to targeted sanctions. The Council also seems to be increasingly aware of issues related to the timing and sequencing of sanctions regimes, including their revision and termination. The use of secondary sanctions—such as when then President Charles Taylor of Liberia was targeted for violating the Sierra Leone sanctions regime—are a useful but very rarely resorted to tool. Past activist sanctions committee chairs, such as Ambassador Robert Fowler (Canada) who chaired the Angola sanctions committee in 1999-2000, have injected momentum into sanctions reform at critical junctures, and field visits are one useful mechanism that sanctions committees have used to improve effectiveness. Panels/groups of experts and monitoring groups, which have become a virtually standard component of sanctions committees, represent another area of institutional innovation. Overall, this track record might suggest the Council and its subsidiary bodies are more capable of adaptation than has been conventionally assumed.

Transparency (i.e. enhanced availability of information) is perhaps the area of sanctions practice where the costs of reform are low and the benefits high, and yet there have been few changes. Nor is transparency in sanctions regimes a new issue: notes by the President of the Security Council have been issued on the matter in 1995 (S/1995/234) and 1999 (S/1999/92), while the final report of the Informal Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions (S/2006/997) made additional recommendations in 2006. It is also perhaps worth noting that management of the first UN sanctions regime on Rhodesia was actually more transparent than current practice as the committee issued transcripts of some meetings and also released numerous reports. Recently, there have been modest steps toward greater transparency such as a website for the sanctions committees (<http://www.un.org/sc/committees/>) and regular annual reports by sanctions committees, but substantial room for further openness remains, particularly regarding Council decision-making and the meetings of sanctions committees. Measures for increasing transparency could include:

Implementation (con't)

more effective communication of Council objectives and purposes, regular consultations with non-Council member states affected by the specific sanctions regimes, more frequent public briefings by all of the chairs of sanctions committees, more deliberate outreach efforts to the global media, the inclusion of more specific information in the annual reports of sanctions committees, more consistent public notification regarding the holding of sanctions committee meetings, and issuing transcripts or summary records of sanctions committee meetings. While of course some proceedings should remain confidential due to their sensitivity, a critical benefit of transparency could be higher levels of compliance through increasing public awareness and changing perceptions of sanctions legitimacy.

In response to criticism regarding due-process issues—particularly in the context of the Al-Qaida 1267/1989 and Taliban 1988 sanctions regimes, which have a high number of individual listings—the Council has instituted a number of reforms, such as the creation of the Focal Point for Delisting in 2006 as well as the creation of the Office of the Ombudsman in 2009 and the subsequent procedural strengthening of its mandate in 2011. Efforts by the Security Council to implement due process-related reforms were largely the result of a number of legal challenges in national and regional courts. Nonetheless, the Human Rights Council's Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms while Countering Terrorism concluded in a 2012 report that the Al-Qaida sanctions regime “continues to fall short of international minimum standards of due process.” He recommended that the decisions of the Ombudsman be made binding, that the mandate of the Ombudsman be extended for a longer period, that the option of a “sunset clause” imposing a time limit on individual listings be reconsidered and that procedural transparency be increased (A/67/396). Addressing the Security Council on 10 May 2013 following a briefing by the chairs of the counter-terrorism subsidiary bodies, a group of like-minded states on targeted sanctions – which includes Austria, Belgium, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland – proposed extending the mandate and safeguards of the Ombudsman to the other sanctions regimes

(S/PV.6964). Other countries, particularly the US, have emphasised the *political* nature of UN sanctions and suggested that it would be premature to extend the authority of the Ombudsman.

Legal Context

The due-process reforms of UN sanctions regimes outlined above were prompted in part by recognition that mounting legal challenges in national and regional courts had the potential to undermine the implementation of UN sanctions regimes and possibly unravel the system of UN sanctions. While not questioning the authority of the Security Council to impose sanctions, these challenges based on human rights and due process grounds have led to implementation difficulties and generated concerns about the legitimacy of targeted sanctions and their effectiveness (Lopez *et al* 2009). Although the bulk of legal challenges have been in relation to the Al-Qaida 1267/1989 and Taliban 1988 sanctions regimes, the controversy over implementation and due process rights could also have implications for other sanctions regimes. At a regional level, the *Kadi* case was the most significant legal challenge to the 1267 regime so far. The European Court of Justice ruled in 2010 in the *Kadi II* case that EU regulations enacted to implement UN sanctions violated the right to a defence and effective judicial protection guaranteed under EU law, thus requiring the delisting of the defendant by the EU. Upon appeal, the Grand Chamber ruled on 18 July 2013 that despite improvements to the delisting procedure, including the Ombudsman, these nonetheless do not guarantee effective judicial protection (see Table B, note 21 in the Annex). At a national level, the most recent report of the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team lists cases challenging individual listings under the Al-Qaida 1267/1989 sanctions regime: two in Pakistan, two in the UK and one in the US (S/2013/467, Annex I). It is worth keeping in mind (and perhaps too often overlooked) that implementation of UN sanctions is dependent upon compatible national legislation and enforcement.

Another area of interest is the level of overlap between UN sanctions regimes and international justice mechanisms, particularly the ICC. As of press time, there were 616 individuals listed under the thirteen UN sanctions

regimes. Of these 616 targeted individuals, the ICC has indicted 12 individuals: six in relation to the DRC, three in relation to Côte d'Ivoire and three in relation to Libya. Furthermore, the Special Court for Sierra Leone indicted and found guilty former president Charles Taylor, who is listed under the Liberia 1521 regime. Conversely, there are also individuals who have not been designated for listing under UN sanctions regimes but that have been indicted by the ICC. For example, the ICC has indicted seven individuals in the context of Sudan, including President Omar Al-Bashir, none of whom have been listed under the Sudan 1591 sanctions regime (see Table G in the Annex). Likewise, the Special Tribunal for Lebanon has indicted four individuals, none of which are currently listed under the Lebanon 1636 sanctions regime (see Table H in the Annex).

These discrepancies between UN sanctions regimes and international justice mechanisms raise interesting questions regarding their relationship with one another. On the one hand, different listings between UN sanctions regimes and international justice mechanisms might suggest the need for better harmonisation. For example, sanctions committees could update designation criteria for listed individuals by including any relevant charges from subsequent indictments by international justice mechanisms. On the other hand, full harmonisation may be difficult and undesirable for various reasons. The primary functions of the ICC and UN sanctions regimes are inherently different. The ICC indicts individuals who are alleged to have committed the gravest international crimes whereas the Security Council imposes sanctions upon threats to international peace and security and aims at changing target behaviour. The ICC is required to operate as an independent and impartial body following strict rules of procedure and evidence, particularly including the presumption of innocence, which could be compromised with harmonisation and information sharing. Another factor to take into account is the political nature of UN sanctions regimes. For example, the Panel of Experts for the Sudan 1591 Committee has recommended that Bashir be added to the travel ban list several times without success—ultimately attributing this to the presence of complex political factors and dynamics in the listing process.

Evaluation, Options and Dynamics

This section focuses on the following: concepts and evaluation, policy options for consideration by the Security Council and dynamics within and beyond the Security Council.

Concepts and Evaluation

Sanctions research has often been conceptually framed around determining the supposed efficacy of sanctions rather than examining sanctions within a broader historical context as one of several factors that might explain a particular outcome. In other words, most research on sanctions is based on the principal assumption that they matter in determining outcomes. Explanations are given for why sanctions succeeded or failed based on various combinations of variables that are presumed to influence implementation, while the effectiveness of sanctions is usually inferred by comparing the objective of the sanctions regime with the outcome. For example, if the objective was conflict resolution and the conflict ends, then sanctions are deemed to have been effective. Conversely, if the conflict continues, then sanctions are deemed ineffective. But in the absence of historically contingent analysis of the dynamics of each case, all that can be determined accurately are correlations, not causal relationships. Factors other than sanctions may actually be more consequential for determining an outcome, and yet these remain outside the scope of conventional sanctions studies.

Similarly, in the interest of improving the efficiency of sanctions implementation, there has been a tendency within the UN system, and to a certain extent among scholars as well, to take an overly procedural approach to thinking about sanctions. This preoccupation with figuring out how to make UN sanctions work better, which has largely focused on processes related to institutional components such as the sanctions committees, has occasionally led practitioners and researchers to lose sight of the bigger picture regarding what UN sanctions are supposed to achieve in each case. At a strategic level, there is often considerable ambiguity regarding how sanctions are meant to reinforce other aspects of UN engagement—such as peacekeeping, mediation or peacebuilding. There may also be insufficient consideration of the opportunity cost (i.e. alternative options that are no longer available) of

imposing sanctions in certain circumstances. For example, authorising sanctions in order to assist a state in defeating an insurgency militarily may mean that other options—such as peacekeeping and mediation—have essentially been taken off the table because the UN will no longer be perceived as neutral by parties to the conflict. Ultimately, analyses of sanctions should not only consider narrow measures of efficiency and compliance, but also how sanctions did or did not contribute to attaining strategic objectives.

One conceptual innovation in the evaluation of sanctions has been the recognition that the targets, objectives, types of sanctions and context of sanctions regimes often change over time. Thus, rather than the subject of analysis being an entire sanctions regime, it can instead be broken down into distinct episodes or phases—understood as periods where the targets, objectives, types of sanctions and context remain essentially unchanged (Eriksson 2011). For example, rather than evaluating the Somalia 751 sanctions regime from 1992 to the present as one case, it could be differentiated into six periods corresponding to developments in the sanctions regime:

- January 1992 (comprehensive arms embargo) to July 2002 (panel of experts);
- July 2002 (panel of experts) to November 2008 (targeted sanctions);
- November 2008 (targeted sanctions) to December 2009 (Eritrea sanctions);
- December 2009 (Eritrea sanctions) to February 2012 (charcoal ban);
- February 2012 (charcoal ban) to March 2013 (revised arms embargo); and
- March 2013 (revised arms embargo) to the present.

Breaking down sanctions regimes into these distinct episodes might allow for a more nuanced analysis of effectiveness as well as a better understanding of how a regime has evolved over time.

Whether sanctions work has been a recurrent question. According to a widely cited study of bilateral, regional and international sanctions based on 174 cases from 1914 to 2000, the answer is that sanctions are “at least partially successful” 34 percent of the time (Hufbauer *et al* 2009: 158). Of course, the answer also depends on what criteria and benchmarks are used. A few recent studies have used a basic typology regarding the multiple (and often co-existing) purposes of UN sanctions: coercing, constraining and signalling target behaviour. To a certain extent, the degree of Council intent (and resolve) can be deduced from examining the authorising resolution. For example, particular aspects – such as the specificity of designation criteria and the listing of specific individuals, the establishment of a committee and a panel/group of experts, and the accuracy of the targeted measures – perhaps suggest the intent of the Council is closer to coercing/constraining than signalling. Preliminary data from a multi-year project by the Targeted Sanctions Consortium indicate that UN targeted sanctions have been effective on average 31 percent of the time during the last two decades (Biersteker, Eckert and Tourinho 2012). As the table below indicates, degrees of effectiveness vary in relation to the different purposes of UN sanctions. Perhaps unsurprisingly, UN targeted sanctions were found to be most effective in terms of signalling targets and least effective in terms of coercing targets.

Possible Future Options

While a lot of work has been done improving and sharpening UN sanctions, there remains significant room for further improvement. Options regarding sanctions that the Security Council and its sanctions committees may wish to consider include:

- enhancing pre-authorisation evaluation processes, particularly the assessment

EFFECTIVENESS OF UN TARGETED SANCTIONS

	Effective	Mixed	Not Effective
In Coercing	13%	26%	62%
In Constraining	42%	15%	43%
In Signalling	43%	32%	25%

Source: Biersteker, Eckert and Tourinho 2012

Evaluation, Options and Dynamics (con't)

of strategic objectives and unintended consequences;

- specifying strategic objectives of sanctions in authorising resolutions, including intended linkages with peacekeeping, mediation or peacebuilding;
- exploring options for the imposition of secondary sanctions to improve effectiveness in situations of repeated non-compliance;
- reinstating the Informal Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions, which was discontinued through resolution 1732 of 21 December 2006;
- considering due process-related recommendations proposed by the Special Rapporteurs of the Human Rights Council and other actors within the UN system;
- consulting regularly with states adversely affected by sanctions regimes;
- implementing concrete steps toward improving sanctions communication and coordination with regional and subregional organisations;
- examining the possibilities, in conjunction with the Secretary-General, for increasing the resources available for sanctions management within the Secretariat;
- reviewing procedures for the appointment of experts to panels and monitoring groups, including with regard to national representation and competency;
- incorporating the findings of expert panels/monitoring groups into sanctions policymaking more consistently, perhaps through the creation of a formal periodic follow-up mechanism;
- increasing the transparency of the meetings of sanctions committees and improving public and media outreach regarding sanctions regimes;
- undertaking more frequent field visits by sanctions committees in order to assess implementation of (and compliance with) sanctions regimes; and
- holding periodic meetings of the chairs of all sanctions committees in order to facilitate improved coordination and information sharing.

These proposed options have been deliberately limited to those that may be practicable in the short-to-medium term. Of course, this list is far from exhaustive; it is at best

indicative of the types of options the Security Council could potentially explore.

Security Council and Wider Dynamics

The current situation in the Security Council seems to reflect neither the prevalent institutional preference toward creating sanctions regimes that characterised “the sanctions decade” of the 1990s nor the intermittent institutional momentum toward reforming sanctions regimes that characterised the first decade of the new millennium. Rather, there now seems to be a conspicuous reticence toward authorising sanctions regimes combined with a lack of consensus among Council members regarding what, if any, changes should be made in terms of institutional structure and management processes. (Although, as demonstrated with resolution 2046 on Sudan and South Sudan and resolution 2051 on Yemen, the Council evidently still perceives the *threat* of sanctions as a useful conflict management tool). One prominent divide appears to be between UN member states that would like to deepen sanctions-reform processes (i.e., the 11 member states comprising the group of like-minded states on targeted sanctions) and P5 members, such as the US and Russia, which currently appear to be opposed to fundamental changes. Presumably, the position of the US is interrelated with underlying national interests in counter-terrorism and non-proliferation, while Russia’s position could reflect its generally conservative approach toward Security Council working methods.

In some circumstances it may be the case that not authorising a sanctions regime is actually better than authorising one. Sanctions, as a measure not involving the use of force, can definitely be a useful tool for the Security Council, and they have made positive contributions in several instances during the last two decades. However, in other situations it seems that sanctions may have been imposed because the Council wanted to be seen to be doing *something*, but it apparently did not want to commit a substantial amount of institutional resources (e.g., Guinea-Bissau 2048 regime). From the perspective of the UN, sanctions are a relatively low cost option, particularly compared to the

resources required for deploying a peacekeeping operation or addressing the root causes of conflict through large-scale statebuilding and peacebuilding projects. However, if a poorly conceived sanctions regime is then insufficiently backed during implementation and ultimately leads to a widespread lack of compliance, then there could be a high cost for the Council in another sense—credibility. According to this line of reasoning, some caution on the part of the Council is warranted, as damage to institutional credibility is easy to incur but hard to reverse.

One challenge for UN sanctions regimes could be termed a perception of institutional illegitimacy. In other words, there is usually a fundamental disjuncture between the composition and interests of the states that impose sanctions (i.e., the “senders”) and the states that are affected by sanctions (i.e., the “receivers”). The costs and benefits are not distributed equally; the former typically derive the benefits, while the latter usually absorb the costs. To put this analysis in more concrete terms, regions that are relatively under-represented in the Council and are more likely to be the subject of UN sanctions regimes may be less likely to actively support implementation. These states may perceive they had less ownership over the creation of sanctions and that they are negatively affected to a disproportionate degree by its implementation. On the other hand, only two resolutions authorising active sanctions regimes were not adopted unanimously: Sudan 1591, where Algeria, China and Russia abstained; and Eritrea 1907 (added to the Somalia 751 regime), where Libya voted against and China abstained. To the extent that resources are inadequately allocated toward economic compensation of adjacent and nearby countries affected by sanctions, which in most cases are developing countries, there may nonetheless be perceptions of a legitimacy gap despite frequent unanimity in the Council on sanctions authorisation. In addition to issues of state capacity, these international political and economic dynamics may help explain regional differences in the implementation of UN sanctions regimes.

UN Documents

Security Council Resolutions

[S/RES/2094](#) (7 March 2013) strengthened the sanctions regime on DPRK.

[S/RES/2087](#) (22 January 2013) condemned the 12 December 2012 nuclear test by DPRK and added individuals and entities to the list of targets.

[S/RES/2051](#) (12 June 2012) threatened to impose sanctions for undermining the Government of National Unity and the political transition in Yemen.

[S/RES/2048](#) (18 May 2012) imposed a travel ban in response to the 12 April 2012 *coup d'état* in Guinea-Bissau.

[S/RES/2046](#) (2 May 2012) threatened to impose sanctions on Sudan and South Sudan in the absence of compliance.

[S/RES/2036](#) (22 February 2012) imposed a ban on the export of charcoal from Somalia and the import of charcoal from Somalia.

[S/RES/2009](#) (16 September 2011) modified the sanctions regime on Libya regarding the arms embargo, asset freeze and aviation restrictions.

[S/RES/2002](#) (29 July 2011) added human rights-related designation criteria to the sanctions regime on Somalia.

[S/RES/1973](#) (17 March 2011) authorised the use of force to protect civilians in Libya, strengthened the sanctions regime and added a Panel of Experts.

[S/RES/1970](#) (26 February 2011) authorised targeted sanctions on Libya and created the Committee.

[S/RES/1929](#) (9 June 2010) strengthened the sanctions regime on Iran.

[S/RES/1907](#) (23 December 2009) imposed secondary sanctions on Eritrea and merged the new measures with the Somalia 751 regime.

[S/RES/1904](#) (17 December 2009) created the Office of the Ombudsperson.

[S/RES/1989](#) (17 June 2011) strengthened the authority of the Ombudsperson and created an Al Qaida sanctions regime separate from the Taliban regime.

[S/RES/1988](#) (17 June 2011) established a new sanctions regime on the Taliban separate from the Al Qaida regime.

[S/RES/1874](#) (12 June 2009) strengthened the sanctions regime on the DPRK.

[S/RES/1822](#) (30 June 2008) directed the Taliban/Al Qaida Committee to release summaries of the reasons for listing and periodically review the names on the list.

[S/RES/1807](#) (31 March 2008) was the first resolution to mention women in designation criteria.

[S/RES/1803](#) (3 March 2008) added a travel ban to the sanctions regime on Iran.

[S/RES/1747](#) (24 March 2007) strengthened the sanctions regime on Iran with a general arms embargo and a ban on proliferation-related financial services.

[S/RES/1737](#) (23 December 2006) authorised targeted sanctions on Iran and created the Committee.

[S/RES/1732](#) (21 December 2006) terminated the Informal Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions.

[S/RES/1730](#) (19 December 2006) created the focal point for delisting.

[S/RES/1718](#) (14 October 2006) authorised targeted sanctions on the DPRK and established the Committee.

[S/RES/1698](#) (31 July 2006) was the first resolution to mention children in designation criteria.

[S/RES/1696](#) (31 July 2006) imposed voluntary measures on Iran related to non-proliferation.

[S/RES/1672](#) (25 April 2006) listed four individuals to the Sudan 1591 sanctions regime.

[S/RES/1643](#) (15 December 2005) added sanctions on diamond exports to the measures imposed on Côte d'Ivoire.

[S/RES/1636](#) (31 October 2005) imposed targeted sanctions in response to the assassination of Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri and created the Committee.

[S/RES/1591](#) (29 March 2005) strengthened the sanctions regime on Sudan regarding Darfur and created the Committee.

[S/RES/1572](#) (15 November 2004) imposed targeted sanctions regarding Côte d'Ivoire and established the Committee.

[S/RES/1533](#) (12 March 2004) established the Committee and group of experts for the DRC regime.

[S/RES/1521](#) (22 December 2003) established the Committee and added a ban on timber exports to the Liberia sanctions regime.

[S/RES/1518](#) (24 November 2003) established the Committee for the current Iraq sanctions regime.

[S/RES/1483](#) (22 May 2003) authorised a general arms embargo and targeted asset freeze regarding Iraq.

[S/RES/1390](#) (16 January 2002) modified the sanctions regime on Al Qaida and the Taliban, adding a travel ban and extending the scope of the asset freeze.

[S/RES/1388](#) (15 January 2002) removed the financial and aviation bans on Ariana Afghan Airlines which had been imposed with resolution 1267.

[S/RES/1333](#) (19 December 2000) imposed an arms embargo on Afghanistan and extended the asset freeze to Usama Bin Laden and associates.

[S/RES/1298](#) (17 May 2000) imposed an arms embargo on Eritrea and Ethiopia in response to their interstate conflict.

[S/RES/1267](#) (15 October 1999) established the Committee and imposed a limited air embargo and assets freeze on the Taliban.

[S/RES/1173](#) (12 June 1998) modified sanctions against UNITA, including the imposition of diplomatic sanctions.

[S/RES/1160](#) (31 March 1998) imposed a general arms embargo on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia regarding Kosovo and established the Committee.

[S/RES/1132](#) (8 October 1997) imposed sanctions on the military junta in Sierra Leone and established the Committee.

[S/RES/1054](#) (26 April 1996) imposed sanctions on Sudan in response to alleged involvement in an attempted assassination of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak.

[S/RES/1013](#) (7 September 1995) established a Commission of Inquiry to investigate violations of the arms embargo on Rwanda.

[S/RES/918](#) (17 May 1994) imposed a general arms embargo in response to the large-scale violence in Rwanda.

[S/RES/864](#) (15 September 1993) imposed sanctions on the UNITA rebel group in Angola in order to compel it to comply with the peace agreement.

[S/RES/841](#) (16 June 1993) imposed comprehensive sanctions on Haiti to reinstate the democratically elected president, Jean-Bertrand Aristide.

[S/RES/820](#) (17 April 1993) sanctioned a sub-state actor, Bosnian Serbs, for the first time.

[S/RES/788](#) (19 November 1992) established an arms embargo on Liberia.

[S/RES/757](#) (30 May 1992) imposed sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for its involvement in the conflict in Bosnia.

[S/RES/751](#) (24 April 1992) established a Committee for sanctions on Somalia.

[S/RES/748](#) (31 March 1992) sanctioned Libya for involvement in the terrorist bombing of two commercial flights.

[S/RES/713](#) (25 September 1991) imposed an arms embargo in response to conflict leading to the dissolution of Yugoslavia.

[S/RES/687](#) (3 April 1991) imposed an arms embargo on Iraq, including conventional weapons, nuclear weapons and other WMDs.

[S/RES/661](#) (6 August 1990) imposed comprehensive economic and financial sanctions on Iraq in response to the invasion of Kuwait.

[S/RES/418](#) (4 November 1977) imposed mandatory sanctions on South Africa, their second usage by the UN.

[S/RES/253](#) (29 May 1968) imposed mandatory sanctions on Southern Rhodesia, their first usage by the UN.

Security Council Letter

[S/2006/331](#) (19 May 2006) transmitted the Watson White Paper, *Strengthening Targeted Sanctions Through Fair and Clear Procedures*.

Security Council Meeting Record

[S/PV.6964](#) (10 May 2013) was a Council briefing on subsidiary organs.

Notes by the President of the Council

[S/1999/92](#) (29 January 1999) concerned proposals to improve the work of sanctions committees.

[S/1995/234](#) (29 March 1995) concerned procedures for transparency of sanctions committees.

UN Documents (con't)

Sanctions Committee Related Documents

[S/2013/467](#) (2 August 2013) transmitted the most recent report on Al-Qaida by the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team.

[S/2013/440](#) (24 July 2013) was the most recent report on Eritrea by the Somalia and Eritrea Monitoring Group.

[S/2013/413](#) (12 July 2013) was the most recent report on Somalia by the Somalia and Eritrea Monitoring Group.

[S/2013/316](#) (23 May 2013) was the most recent report of the Liberia Panel of Experts.

[S/2013/99](#) (15 February 2013) was the most recent report of the Libya Panel of Experts.

[S/2012/348/Add.1](#) (26 June 2012) was the addendum of the interim report of the Group of Experts on the DRC, discussing Rwanda's support for the M23.

[S/2011/111](#) (12 November 2010) was a report by the Sudan Panel of Experts, the release of which had been delayed by four months.

[S/2010/571](#) (12 May 2010) was a report by the DPRK Panel of Experts, the release of which had been delayed by six months.

Working Group Documents

[S/2006/997](#) (18 December 2006) transmitted the final report of the Informal Working Group of the Security Council on General Issues of Sanctions.

[S/2005/842](#) (22 December 2005) transmitted the report of the Informal Working Group of the Security Council in General Issues of Sanctions for 2005.

[S/2004/979](#) (17 December 2004) transmitted the report of the Informal Working Group of the Security Council in General Issues of Sanctions for 2004.

[S/2003/1197](#) (19 December 2003) transmitted the report of the Informal Working Group of the Security Council in General Issues of Sanctions for 2002 and 2003.

General Assembly Document

[A/67/396](#) (26 September 2012) was a report on due process by a Human Rights Council's Special Rapporteur.

Useful Additional Resources

Thomas Biersteker, Sue E Eckert, and Marcos Tourinho, *Designing United Nations Targeted Sanctions*, The Graduate Institute/Targeted Sanctions Consortium/Watson Institute, August 2012.

Thomas Biersteker *et al*, *Targeted Financial Sanctions: A manual for design and implementation*, Watson Institute, 2001.

Bonn International Center for Conversion, *Design and Implementation of Arms Embargoes and Travel and Aviation Related Sanctions* (Bonn: BICC, 2001).

Alix J. Boucher, *UN Panel of Experts and UN Peace Operations: Exploiting Synergies for Peacebuilding*, Stimson Center, September 2010.

Enrico Carisch and Loraine Rickard-Martin, *Sanctions and the Effort to Globalize Natural Resources Governance*, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, January 2013.

Enrico Carisch and Loraine Rickard-Martin, *Global Threats and the role of United Nations Sanctions*, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, December 2011.

Andrea Charron, *UN Sanctions and Conflict: Responding to peace and security threats* (New York: Routledge, 2011).

David Cortright *et al*, *Integrating UN Sanctions for Peace and Security*, Sanctions and Security Research Program, October 2010.

David Cortright and George Lopez, *Sanctions and the Search for Security* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002).

David Cortright and George Lopez, *The Sanctions Decade* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2000).

Erica Cosgrove, "Examining Targeted Sanctions: Are travel bans effective?", in Peter Wallensteen and Carina Staibano (eds.), *International Sanctions: Between Words and Wars in the Global System* (New York: Frank Cass, 2005), 207-228.

Daniel Drezner, "Sanctions Sometimes Smart: Targeted Sanctions in Theory and Practice", *International Studies Review*, 13:96-108, 2011.

Sue Eckert and Thomas Biersteker, *Due Process and Targeted Sanctions*, Watson Institute/the Graduate Institute, December 2012.

Mikael Eriksson, *Targeting Peace: Understanding UN and EU Targeted Sanctions* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

Jeremy Farrall and Kim Rubenstein (eds.), *Sanctions, Accountability and Governance in a Globalised World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Jeremy Farrall, *United Nations Sanctions and the Rule of Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Damien Fruchart *et al*, *United Nations Arms Embargoes: Their Impact on Arms Flows and Target Behaviour* (Stockholm: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2007).

Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Jeffrey Schott and Kimberley Ann Elliot and Barbara Oegg, *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered* (Washington DC: Peterson Institute, 2009, 3rd edition).

Independent Inquiry Committee into the United Nations Oil-for-Food Programme, *Manipulation of the Oil-for-Food Programme by the Iraqi Regime*, 27 October 2005.

International Journal, UN Sanctions: new dilemmas and unintended consequences, Winter 2009-2010.

Dev Kar and Sarah Freitas, *Illicit Financial Flows From Developing Countries: 2001-2010*, Global Financial Integrity, December 2012.

George Lopez *et al*, *Overdue Process: Protecting Human Rights while Sanctioning Alleged Terrorists*, Fourth Freedom Forum/Kroc Institute, April 2009.

Peter Wallensteen and Helena Grusell, "Targeting the Right Targets? The UN Use of Individual Sanctions", *Global Governance*, 18:207-230, 2012.

Peter Wallensteen, Carina Staibano and Mikael Eriksson (eds.), *Making Targeted Sanctions Effective: Guidelines for the implementation of UN Policy Options* (Uppsala: Department of Peace and Conflict Research, 2003).

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables

Table **A** Somalia 751 (1992) and Eritrea 1907 (2009) Committee
 Table **B** Al-Qaida 1267 (1999) and 1989 (2011) Committee
 Table **C** Iraq 1518 (2003) Committee
 Table **D** Liberia 1521 (2003) Committee
 Table **E** DRC 1533 (2004) Committee
 Table **F** Côte d'Ivoire 1572 (2004) Committee
 Table **G** Sudan 1591 (2005) Committee
 Table **H** Lebanon 1636 (2005) Committee
 Table **I** Democratic People's Republic of Korea 1718 (2006) Committee
 Table **J** Iran 1737 (2006) Committee
 Table **K** Libya 1970 (2011) Committee
 Table **L** Taliban 1988 (2011) Committee
 Table **M** Guinea-Bissau 2048 (2012) Committee

TABLE A: SOMALIA 751 (1992) AND ERITREA 1907 (2009) COMMITTEE

Chair 2013	Ambassador Oh Joon (Republic of Korea)
Mandate	Monitor the implementation of the sanctions regimes, designate individuals and entities for targeted measures, consider exemption requests and report to the Council. ¹
Types of Sanctions	Somalia: Targeted Arms Embargo; ² Travel Ban; ³ Assets Freeze; ⁴ and Charcoal Ban. ⁵ Eritrea: General Arms Embargo (two-way); ⁶ Targeted Arms Embargo, Travel Ban and Assets Freeze. ⁷
Listed Individuals/Entities	13/ ¹⁸
Listing Criteria	Engaging in/supporting threats to peace, security or stability; violations of the arms embargo; obstructing humanitarian aid; ⁹ rape and sexual violence against children; ¹⁰ recruiting or using children in armed conflicts; targeting of civilians including killing and maiming, sexual and gender-based violence, attacks on schools, hospitals, abduction and forced displacement. ¹¹
Exemptions	<p>Somalia Targeted Arms Embargo: Weapons or military equipment or the provision of advice, assistance or training for the development of the Security Forces of the Federal Government of Somalia (excluding items set out in the annex, which require advance Committee approval); use by UN personnel, UNSOM, AMISOM and EUTM; to suppress acts of piracy and armed robbery at sea off the coast of Somalia (requires request by the Federal Government of Somalia and notification to the Secretary-General); protective clothing temporarily exported to Somalia by UN personnel, representatives of the media and humanitarian and development workers and associated personnel; non-lethal military equipment for humanitarian or protective use (requires notification to the Committee) and weapons or military equipment and technical assistance or training for the purposes of helping develop Somali security sector institutions (in the absence of a negative decision by the Committee).¹²</p> <p>Eritrea General Arms Embargo: Non-lethal military equipment for humanitarian or protective use (requires Committee approval) and protective clothing temporarily exported to Eritrea by UN personnel, representatives of the media and humanitarian and development workers and associated personnel.¹³</p> <p>Somalia & Eritrea Assets Freeze: Humanitarian assistance;¹⁴ basic expenses, extraordinary expenses or judicial, administrative or lien or judgment.¹⁵</p> <p>Somalia & Eritrea Travel Ban: Humanitarian or religious grounds or to further the objectives of peace and national reconciliation in and stability (determined by the Committee on a case-by-case basis).¹⁶</p>

KEY UN DOCUMENTS ON SOMALIA AND ERITREA (751/1907) SANCTIONS COMMITTEE Security Council Resolutions S/RES/2111 (24 July 2013) consolidated the arms embargo exemptions for Somalia and Eritrea and extended the mandate of the Monitoring Group to 25 November 2014. S/RES/2093 (6 March 2013) partially lifted the arms embargo on Somalia for a period of 12 months. S/RES/2036 (22 February 2012) imposed a ban on importing charcoal from Somalia. S/RES/2002 (29 July 2011) added obstructing humanitarian assistance, the recruitment and use of children in armed conflicts and targeting of civilians including women and children to the designation criteria. S/RES/1907 (23 December 2009) imposed a two-way arms embargo on Eritrea and targeted sanctions on individuals including a targeted arms embargo, travel ban and assets freeze, expanded the mandate of the Monitoring Group to include Eritrea and changed its name to the Monitoring Group on Somalia and Eritrea. S/RES/1844 (20 November 2008) expanded the Somalia sanctions regime and imposed targeted sanctions on individuals including a targeted arms embargo, travel ban and assets freeze. S/RES/1519 (16 December 2003) established the Monitoring Group on Somalia, which replaced the Panel of Experts. S/RES/1425 (22 July 2002) established a Panel of Experts on Somalia. S/RES/751 (24 April 1992) established and set out the mandate of the Somalia 751 Committee. S/RES/733 (23 January 1992) established a general arms embargo on Somalia. **Most Recent Annual Committee Report S/2012/976** (31 December 2012). **Most Recent Monitoring Group Reports S/2013/440** (24 July 2013) on Eritrea and **S/2013/413** (12 July 2013) on Somalia. **Other SC/11020** (30 May 2013) consolidated and revised guidelines of the Committee for the conduct of its work available at <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/751/comguide.shtml>.

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE A: SOMALIA 751 (1992) AND ERITREA 1907 (2009) COMMITTEE

Delisting	<p>Petitions for delisting addressed to Committee by Member States or state of nationality/residency of petitioner or to Focal Point for Delisting by individuals/entities directly and a State can decide that its nationals or residents should address their delisting requests directly to the Focal Point.¹⁷</p> <p>Request made to Focal Point: 1 individual Status: Remains listed¹⁸</p>
Decision Making	By consensus of members, decision deemed adopted if no objection within five working days (three days for exemptions to asset freeze) and referred to the Council if consensus not reached after consultations. ¹⁹
Committee Reporting	<p>Chairman to report at least every 120 days to the Council.²⁰</p> <p>Most recent annual public report: S/2012/976 of 31 December 2012</p>
Summary of Committee's Activities (1 January to 31 December 2012)	Held 10 informal meetings; approved 18 requests for exemptions to the arms embargo for non-lethal military equipment ²¹ and 19 requests for exemptions to the arms embargo for helping develop security sector institutions. ²² No visiting missions took place. ²³
Documentation in 2012 (as of 30 November 2012)	<p>Notes by the Chair: 114 Official communications by the Chair: 72 Communications received by the Committee: 135</p>
Monitoring Mechanism	<p>Monitoring Group: 8 experts²⁴</p> <p>Mr. Jarat Chopra, coordinator/regional (Canada)</p> <p>Somalia: Ms. Déirdre Clancy, humanitarian (Ireland) Mr. Dinesh Mahtani, finance (UK) Mr. Jörg Roofthoof, transport/maritime (Belgium) Mr. Babatunde Taiwo, arms (Nigeria)</p> <p>Eritrea: Mr. Nicholas Argeros, finance (US) Ms. Zeina Awad, transport (Lebanon) Mr. Cornelis Steenken, arms (Netherlands)</p> <p>Mandate most recently extended to 25 November 2014²⁵</p>
Monitoring Mechanism Reporting	<p>Monthly progress reports to the Committee; oral midterm briefing and two public final reports (one on Somalia and one on Eritrea) submitted to the Council through the Committee, no later than 30 days before termination of mandate.²⁶</p> <p>Most recent annual public reports: S/2013/440 (24 July 2013) on Eritrea and S/2013/413 (12 July 2013) on Somalia, next reports due by 25 October 2014.</p>
International Justice Mechanisms	N/A

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE B: AL-QAIDA 1267 (1999) AND 1989 (2011) COMMITTEE

Chair 2013	Ambassador Gary Quinlan (Australia)
Mandate	Oversee the implementation of the sanctions regimes, maintain lists of individuals/entities for targeted measures, consider exemption requests and report to the Council. ²⁷
Types of Sanctions	Targeted Arms Embargo, Travel Ban and Assets Freeze. ²⁸
Listed Individuals/ Entities	221/63 ²⁹
Listing Criteria	Participating in the financing or support of acts or activities of Al-Qaida, and other individuals, groups, undertakings and entities associated with them. ³⁰
Exemptions	Targeted Arms Embargo: None Travel Ban: Own nationals, fulfilment of judicial process or as determined by the Committee on a case-by-case basis. ³¹ Assets Freeze: Basic expenses (requires notification and the absence of a negative Committee decision) and extraordinary expenses (requires Committee approval) or judicial, administrative or lien or judgment (requires notification to Committee). ³²
Delisting	Petitions for delisting addressed to Committee by Member States or by petitioners through the Office of the Ombudsperson ³³ As of 17 December 2009, the Office of the Ombudsperson receives all delisting requests. ³⁴ Requests made through Focal Point (prior to the establishment of the Office of the Ombudsperson): 25 (total of 18 individuals and 22 entities) ³⁵ Requests made to Ombudsperson: 49 (total of 44 individuals and 29 entities) ³⁶ Status: 3 individuals, 17 entities delisted through Focal Point procedure. ³⁷ 25 individuals and 24 entities delisted by Committee based on recommendations of Ombudsperson. ³⁸
Decision Making	By consensus of members, decision deemed adopted if no objection within five working days (10 working days for listing and delisting requests) and referred to the Council if consensus not reached after consultations. ³⁹
Committee Reporting	Chairman to report orally at least once per year to the Council. ⁴⁰ Most recent annual public report: S/2012/930 of 19 December 2012
Summary of Committee's Activities (1 January to 31 December 2012)	Held one formal meeting and 15 informal meetings, delisted 38 individuals and 30 entities, of which 16 individuals and 18 entities were delisted following review by the Ombudsperson, received five notifications for exemptions to assets freeze necessary for basic expenses, ⁴¹ no negative decision was taken by the Committee with regard to four of the notifications and the fifth notification was still under consideration by the Committee. ⁴²
Documentation in 2012 (as of 30 November 2012)	Notes by the Chair: 124 Official communications by the Chair: 126 Communications received by the Committee: 207

KEY UN DOCUMENTS ON AL-QAIDA (1267/1989) SANCTIONS COMMITTEE Security Council Resolutions S/RES/2083 (17 December 2012) modified the listing criteria to exclude reference to the Taliban, extended the mandate of the Ombudsperson and Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team for a further period of 30 months and allowed listed individuals and entities to apply through the Focal Point for exemptions to the travel ban and assets freeze. S/RES/1904 (17 December 2009) established the Office of the Ombudsperson to assist the Committee when it considers delisting requests. S/RES/1822 (30 June 2008) directed the Committee to conduct a review of all the names on the consolidated list by 30 June 2010 and an annual review of names not reviewed in three or more years. S/RES/1526 (30 January 2004) established the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team. S/RES/1390 (16 January 2002) modified the sanctions regime and terminated the air embargo, extended the assets freeze to include members of Al-Qaida as designated by the Committee and introduced the travel ban. S/RES/1388 (15 January 2002) removed financial and aviation bans on Ariana Afghan Airlines imposed by S/RES/1267. S/RES/1333 (19 December 2000) expanded the assets freeze to include Usama Bin Laden and associates and imposed a general arms embargo on the territory of Afghanistan. S/RES/1267 (15 October 1999) established the Committee and imposed a limited air embargo and assets freeze on the Taliban. **Most Recent Annual Committee Report S/2012/930** (19 December 2012). **Most Recent Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team Report S/2013/467** (2 August 2013). **Other** Consolidated and revised guidelines of the Committee for the conduct of its work (15 April 2013) available at http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/pdf/1267_guidelines.pdf.

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE B: AL-QAIDA 1267 (1999) AND 1989 (2011) COMMITTEE

Monitoring Mechanism	Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team: 8 experts ⁴³ Mr. Richard Barrett, coordinator (UK) Mr. Abdulmajeed A. Ababtain (Saudi Arabia) Mr. Franck Kasbarian (France) Ms. Christine Lee (Singapore) Mr. Victor Shtoyunda (Russia) Mr. Yu Xu (China) Mr. Brian C. Wilson (US) Ms. Yotsna Lalji-Venketasawmy (Mauritius) (Expertise not specified.) Mandate most recently extended to 30 June 2015 ⁴⁴
Monitoring Mechanism Reporting	Bi-annual public reports to the Committee. ⁴⁵ Most recent public report: S/2013/467 of 2 August 2013, next report due by 31 December 2013.
International Justice Mechanisms	Grand Chamber European Court of Human Rights: <i>Nada v Switzerland</i> (2012) ⁴⁶ European Court of Justice: <i>Kadi v Council of the EU</i> (2008); General Court of the EU: <i>Kadi v European Commission</i> (2010); Grand Chamber of the European Court of Justice: <i>European Commission v Kadi (Appeal)</i> (2013) ⁴⁷ (See also Annex I of S/2013/467 most recent report of monitoring group listing pending or recently concluded domestic legal challenges in the Pakistan, the UK, US and EU.)

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE C: IRAQ 1518 (2003) COMMITTEE

Chair 2013	Ambassador Kodjo Menan (Togo)
Mandate	Identify and update lists of individuals and entities (observing fulfilment of arms embargo still under review). ⁴⁸
Types of Sanctions	General Arms Embargo ⁴⁹ and Assets Freeze. ⁵⁰
Listed Individuals/ Entities	89 ⁵¹ /208 ⁵²
Listing Criteria	Assets removed or acquired by Saddam Hussein, senior officials of former regime, immediate family and entities owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by them. ⁵³
Exemptions	General Arms Embargo: Arms or related materiel required by the Government of Iraq or the multinational force to serve the purposes of S/RES/1546 (2004). ⁵⁴ Assets Freeze: None
Delisting	Petitions for delisting addressed to the Committee by state of nationality/residency of petitioner or to Focal Point for Delisting by individuals/entities directly. ⁵⁵ Requests made to Focal Point: 2 (3 individuals, 1 entity) Status: 2 individuals delisted, 1 individual and 1 entity remain listed. ⁵⁶
Decision Making	By consensus of members, decision deemed adopted if no objection within three working days and referred to the Council if consensus not reached after consultations. ⁵⁷
Committee Reporting	No time frame specified in resolutions or guidelines, required "to report on its work to the Council". ⁵⁸ Most recent annual public report: S/2011/806 of 30 December 2011 ⁵⁹
Summary of Committee's Activities (1 January to 31 December 2011)	No meetings held in 2011, delisted 3 individuals. No visiting missions took place. ⁶⁰
Documentation in 2012 (as of 30 November 2012)	Notes by the Chair: 0 Official communications by the Chair: 0 Communications received by the Committee: 1
Monitoring Mechanism	N/A
International Justice Mechanisms	N/A

KEY UN DOCUMENTS ON IRAQ (1518) SANCTIONS COMMITTEE Security Council Resolutions S/RES/1546 (8 June 2004) endorsed the formation of the interim Iraqi government and set out exemptions to the sanctions regime. S/RES/1518 (24 November 2003) established the Committee. S/RES/1483 (22 May 2003) recognised the occupying powers, established the general arms embargo and assets freeze against 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 and recalled S/RES/1325. S/RES/687 (3 April 1991) required Iraq to destroy all chemical and biological weapons and ballistic missiles and banned the acquisition and development of nuclear weapons, together with related items and production facilities. S/RES/661 (6 August 1990) imposed economic sanctions and a trade embargo on Iraq after it invaded Kuwait. **Most Recent Annual Committee Report S/2011/806** (30 December 2011). **Other Committee Guidelines for application of paragraphs 19 and 23 of S/RES/1483** (22 May 2003) <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1518/pdf/1483guide.pdf>.

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE D: LIBERIA 1521 (2003) COMMITTEE

Chair 2013	Ambassador Masood Khan (Pakistan)
Mandate	Monitor implementation of regime, designate listed individuals, consider requests for exemption and report to the Council ⁶¹
Types of Sanctions	Targeted Arms Embargo, ⁶² Travel Ban ⁶³ and Assets Freeze. ⁶⁴
Listed Individuals/ Entities	Travel Ban: 25 ⁶⁵ Assets Freeze: 9/30 ⁶⁶
Listing Criteria	<p>Travel Ban: Individuals that constitute a threat to the peace process, or are engaged in activities aimed at undermining peace and stability, including those senior members of former President Charles Taylor's government and their spouses and members of Liberia's former armed forces who retain links to former President Charles Taylor, individuals that violate the arms embargo and 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.⁶⁷</p> <p>Assets Freeze: Funds and other financial assets and economic resources owned or controlled directly or indirectly or held by entities owned or controlled directly or indirectly by Charles Taylor, Jewell Howard Taylor, Charles Taylor Jr. and/or those other individuals designated by the Committee, to prevent the misappropriation of such funds and assets from interfering in the restoration of peace and stability.⁶⁸</p>
Exemptions	<p>Targeted Arms Embargo: Arms, related material, technical training and assistance intended solely for support of or use by the UNMIL, protective clothing temporarily exported by UN Personnel, representatives of the media and humanitarian and development workers and non-lethal military equipment intended for humanitarian or protective (requires advance notification to Committee).⁶⁹</p> <p>Travel Ban: Humanitarian or religious grounds (determined by the Committee on a case-by-case basis) or where the Committee concludes it would further the objectives of peace, national reconciliation and stability.⁷⁰</p> <p>Assets Freeze: Basic expenses (requires notification and the absence of a negative Committee decision), extraordinary expenses (requires Committee approval) or judicial, administrative or lien or judgment (requires notification to Committee).⁷¹</p>
Delisting	<p>Petitions for delisting addressed to Committee by member states or state of nationality/residency of petitioner or to Focal Point for Delisting by individuals/entities directly and a state can decide that its nationals or residents should address their delisting requests directly to the Focal Point.⁷²</p> <p>Requests made to Focal Point: 30 (20 individuals, 9 entities). One application returned. Status: 7 individuals delisted, 9 individuals and 9 entities remain listed.⁷³</p>
Decision Making	By consensus of members, decision deemed adopted if no objection within five working days and referred to the Council if consensus not reached after consultations. ⁷⁴
Committee Reporting	<p>No timeframe specified in resolutions or guidelines, required "to report to the Council with its observations and recommendations".⁷⁵</p> <p>Most recent annual public report: S/2012/980 of 31 December 2012</p>
Summary of Committee's Activities (1 January to 31 December 2012)	Held three informal consultations, considered and approved eight requests for travel-ban waivers ⁷⁶ and delisted 20 individuals. The Chair undertook a visit to Liberia from 13 to 18 May 2012 (the first such visit since April 2006). ⁷⁷
Documentation in 2012 (as of 30 November 2012)	<p>Notes by the Chair: 25</p> <p>Official communications by the Chair: 31</p> <p>Communications received by the Committee: 68</p>

KEY UN DOCUMENTS ON LIBERIA (1521) SANCTIONS COMMITTEE Security Council Resolutions S/RES/2079 (12 December 2012) renewed the arms embargo and travel ban for a period of 12 months and extended the mandate of the Panel of Experts until 12 December 2013. S/RES/1903 (17 December 2009) terminated the general arms embargo with regard to the government of Liberia and imposed a targeted arms embargo on non-governmental entities and individuals. S/RES/1753 (27 April 2007) terminated the diamond embargo. S/RES/1689 (20 June 2006) terminated the timber embargo. S/RES/1688 (16 June 2006) modified former Liberian President Charles Taylor's travel ban to appear before the Special Court for Sierra Leone. S/RES/1532 (12 March 2004) imposed an assets freeze on Charles Taylor, Jewell Howard Taylor, and Charles Taylor Jr. and/or those other individuals designated by the Committee. S/RES/1521 (22 December 2003) dissolved the 1343 Committee and established the current Committee, imposed revised prohibitions on arms, diamonds and travel of designated individuals, imposed a timber ban and established the Panel of Experts. S/RES/1343 (7 March 2001) dissolved the 788 Committee, established the 1343 Committee, revised the arms embargo, banned the import of rough diamonds from Liberia and imposed a travel ban. S/RES/1315 (14 August 2000) established the Special Court for Sierra Leone. S/RES/788 (19 November 1992) established the 788 Committee and imposed a general and complete arms embargo on Liberia. **Most Recent Annual Committee Report S/2012/980** (31 December 2012). **Most Recent Panel of Experts Report S/2013/316** (23 May 2013). **Other Guidelines of the Committee for the conduct of its work** (30 March 2010) available at http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1521/pdf/1521_Committee_Guidelines.pdf.

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE D: LIBERIA 1521 (2003) COMMITTEE

Monitoring Mechanism	Panel of Experts: 3 experts ⁷⁸ Mr. Christian Dietrich, coordinator/arms (US) Mr. Caspar Fithen, natural resources (UK) Mr. Lansana Gberie, finance (Canada) Mandate most recently extended to 12 December 2013. ⁷⁹
Monitoring Mechanism Reporting	Bi-annual public reports to the Council through the Committee. ⁸⁰ Most recent public report: S/2013/316 of 23 May 2013, next report due by 1 December 2013. ⁸¹
International Justice Mechanisms	Charles Taylor's travel ban was modified so that he could appear before the Special Court for Sierra Leone as well as any witnesses required at the trial. ⁸²

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE E: DRC 1533 (2004) COMMITTEE

Chair 2013	Ambassador Agshin Mehdiyev (Azerbaijan)
Mandate	Monitor the implementation of the sanctions regimes, designate individuals and entities for targeted measures, consider exemption requests, report to the Council and review flight registries maintained by each State in the region. ⁸³
Types of Sanctions	Targeted Arms Embargo, ⁸⁴ Travel Ban ⁸⁵ and Assets Freeze. ⁸⁶
Listed Individuals/ Entities	31/ ⁸⁷
Listing Criteria	Violating the arms embargo; impeding the process of disarmament, demobilisation, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration; recruiting or using of child soldiers, targeting of children or women in situations of armed conflict (including killing and maiming, sexual violence, abduction and forced displacement); obstructing the access to or the distribution of humanitarian assistance; supporting the illegal armed groups in the eastern part of the DRC through the illicit trade of natural resources and planning, sponsoring or participating in attacks against MONUSCO peacekeepers. ⁸⁸
Exemptions	<p>Targeted Arms Embargo: Arms, related materiel, technical training and assistance intended solely for support of or use by the UN Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; protective clothing temporarily exported by UN Personnel, representatives of the media and humanitarian and development workers and non-lethal military equipment intended for humanitarian or protective use (requires notification to Committee).⁸⁹</p> <p>Travel Ban: Humanitarian or religious grounds (determined by the Committee on a case-by-case basis); where the Committee concludes it would further objectives of peace, stability and democracy and bring to justice perpetrators of grave violations of human rights or international humanitarian law.⁹⁰</p> <p>Assets Freeze: Basic expenses (requires notification and the absence of a negative Committee decision), extraordinary expenses (requires Committee approval) or judicial, administrative or lien or judgment (requires notification to the Committee).⁹¹</p>
Delisting	<p>Petitions for delisting addressed to Committee by member states or state of nationality/residency of petitioner or to Focal Point for Delisting by individuals/entities directly and a state can decide that its nationals or residents should address their delisting requests directly to the Focal Point.⁹²</p> <p>Requests made to Focal Point: 7 (5 individuals, 4 entities) Status: 1 individual delisted, 4 individuals and 4 entities remain listed.⁹³</p>
Decision Making	By consensus of members, decision deemed adopted if no objection within five working days and referred to the Council if consensus not reached after consultations. ⁹⁴
Committee Reporting	<p>No time frame specified in resolutions or guidelines, required "to present regular reports".⁹⁵</p> <p>Most recent annual public report: S/2012/979 of 16 January 2013</p>
Summary of Committee's Activities (1 January to 31 December 2012)	Held four informal consultations, listed an additional five individuals and two entities subject to the travel ban and assets freeze. ⁹⁶ No visiting missions took place. ⁹⁷
Documentation in 2012 (as of 30 November 2012)	<p>Notes by the Chair: 29</p> <p>Official communications by the Chair: 50</p> <p>Communications received by the Committee: 68</p>

KEY UN DOCUMENTS ON DRC (1533) SANCTIONS COMMITTEE [Security Council Resolutions S/RES/2078](#) (28 November 2012) amended and expanded the targeted arms embargo, travel ban and assets freeze and renewed the sanctions regime until 1 February 2014 and extended the mandate of the Group of Experts until 1 February 2014. [S/RES/1807](#) (31 March 2008) terminated the general arms embargo with regard to the Government of the DRC and imposed a targeted arms embargo on non-governmental entities and individuals. [S/RES/1596](#) (18 April 2005) amended and expanded the arms embargo and imposed targeted measures including a travel ban and assets freeze. [S/RES/1533](#) (12 March 2004) established the Committee and the Group of Experts. [S/RES/1493](#) (28 July 2003) imposed an arms embargo on all foreign and Congolese armed groups and militia operating in North and South Kivu and Ituri. **Most Recent Annual Committee Report** S/2012/979 (16 January 2013). **Most Recent Group of Experts Report** S/2013/433 (19 July 2013). **Other Guidelines of the Committee for the conduct of its work** (6 August 2010) available at [http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1533/pdf/S%20AC.43%202010%20Guidelines%20FINAL%20\(6%20August%202010\).pdf](http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1533/pdf/S%20AC.43%202010%20Guidelines%20FINAL%20(6%20August%202010).pdf).

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE E: DRC 1533 (2004) COMMITTEE

Monitoring Mechanism	Group of Experts: 6 experts ⁹⁸ Ms. Emilie Serralta, coordinator/natural resources (France) Mr. Nelson Alusala, arms (Kenya) Mr. Henry Fomba, customs and aviation (Cameroon) Mr. Bernard Leloup, regional issues (Belgium) Ms. Marie Plamadiala, armed groups (Moldova) Mr. Daniel Fahey, finance (US) Mandate most recently extended to 1 February 2014. ⁹⁹
Monitoring Mechanism Reporting	Bi-annual public reports to the Council, through the Committee. ¹⁰⁰ Most recent public report: S/2013/433 of 19 July 2013, next report due by 13 December 2013. ¹⁰¹
International Justice Mechanisms	The ICC has indicted six listed individuals: Thomas Lubanga Dyilo, ¹⁰² Germain Katanga, ¹⁰³ Bosco Ntanga, ¹⁰⁴ Callixte Mbarushimana, ¹⁰⁵ Sylvestre Mudacumura ¹⁰⁶ and Mathieu Ngudjolo Chui ¹⁰⁷ (two have been acquitted)

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE F: CÔTE D'IVOIRE 1572 (2004) COMMITTEE

Chair 2013	Ambassador Gert Rosenthal (Guatemala)
Mandate	Designate individuals and entities for targeted measures, consider exemption requests and report to the Council ¹⁰⁸
Types of Sanctions	General Arms Embargo, ¹⁰⁹ Travel Ban, ¹¹⁰ Assets Freeze ¹¹¹ and Diamond Sanctions. ¹¹²
Listed Individuals/ Entities	8/0 ¹¹³
Listing Criteria	Threatening the peace and national reconciliation process, violating human rights and international humanitarian law, obstructing UN and French forces and inciting public hatred and violence. ¹¹⁴
Exemptions	<p>General Arms Embargo: Supplies intended solely for the support of or use by UNOCI and the French forces who support them, supplies of non-lethal military equipment intended solely for humanitarian or protective use (requires notification to the Committee); protective clothing temporarily exported by UN Personnel, representatives of the media and humanitarian and development workers, supplies temporarily exported to Côte d'Ivoire to the forces of a state which is taking action, in accordance with international law, solely and directly to facilitate the evacuation of its nationals and those for whom it has consular responsibility (requires notification to the Committee); non-lethal law enforcement equipment intended to enable the Ivorian security forces to use only appropriate and proportionate force while maintaining public order (requires notification to the Committee) and arms and other related lethal equipment intended solely for support of or use in the Ivorian process of Security Sector Reform (requires Committee approval).¹¹⁵</p> <p>Travel Ban: Humanitarian or religious grounds (determined by the Committee on a case-by-case basis) or where the Committee concludes it would further the objectives of peace, national reconciliation and stability.¹¹⁶</p> <p>Assets Freeze: Basic expenses (requires notification and the absence of a negative Committee decision), extraordinary expenses (requires Committee approval) or judicial, administrative or lien or judgment (requires notification to the Committee).¹¹⁷</p> <p>Diamond Sanctions: Import solely for the purposes of scientific research and analysis to facilitate the development of specific technical information concerning Ivorian diamond production, provided the research is coordinated by the Kimberley Process, and approved on a case-by-case basis by the Committee.¹¹⁸</p>
Delisting	<p>Petitions for delisting addressed to the Committee by state of nationality/residency of petitioner or to Focal Point for Delisting by individuals/entities directly and a State can decide that its nationals or residents should address their delisting requests directly to the Focal Point.¹¹⁹</p> <p>Requests made to Focal Point: 2 individuals¹²⁰</p>
Decision Making	By consensus of members, decision deemed adopted if no objection within five working days and referred to the Council if consensus not reached after consultations. ¹²¹
Committee Reporting	<p>No timeframe specified in resolutions or guidelines, required "to present regular reports".¹²²</p> <p>Most recent annual public report: S/2012/981 of 31 December 2012</p>
Summary of Committee's Activities (1 January to 31 December 2012)	Held four informal consultations, approved five exemption requests for the shipment of materiel and provision of military assistance for use in the Ivorian process of Security Sector Reform. ¹²³ No visiting missions took place. ¹²⁴
Documentation in 2012 (as of 30 November 2012)	<p>Notes by the Chair: 20</p> <p>Official communications by the Chair: 27</p> <p>Communications received by the Committee: 33</p>

KEY UN DOCUMENTS ON CÔTE D'IVOIRE (1572) SANCTIONS COMMITTEE Security Council Resolutions S/RES/2101 (25 April 2013) renewed the sanctions regime and extended the mandate of the Group of Experts until 30 April 2014. S/RES/2045 (26 April 2012) modified the general arms embargo. S/RES/1975 (30 March 2011) imposed targeted measures on former President Laurent Gbagbo and four of his inner circle. S/RES/1643 (15 December 2005) widened the sanctions regime to include a diamonds embargo. S/RES/1584 (1 February 2005) established the Group of Experts. S/RES/1572 (15 November 2004) imposed a general arms embargo and targeted measures including a travel ban and assets freeze and established the Committee. **Most Recent Annual Committee Report S/2012/981** (31 December 2012). **Most Recent Group of Experts Report S/2013/228** (12 April 2013). **Other Guidelines of the Committee for the conduct of its work** (24 May 2013) available at http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1572/pdf/guidelines_ci_eng.pdf.

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE F: CÔTE D'IVOIRE 1572 (2004) COMMITTEE

Monitoring Mechanism	Group of Experts: 5 experts ¹²⁵ Mr. Manuel Vazquez-Boidard, coordinator/regional (Spain) Mr. Raymond Debelle, arms (Belgium) Mr. Eugene Rutabingwa Fatakanwa, customs/transport (Rwanda) Mr. Roberto Sollazzo, diamonds (Italy) Mr. Joel Salek, finance (Colombia) Mandate most recently extended to 30 April 2014. ¹²⁶
Monitoring Mechanism Reporting	A midterm public report to the Committee and a final public report to the Security Council through the Committee 30 days before the end of its mandate. ¹²⁷ Most recent public report: S/2013/605 of 11 October 2013, final report due by 31 March 2014. ¹²⁸
International Justice Mechanisms	The ICC has indicted three listed individuals: Laurent Gbagbo, ¹²⁹ Simone Gbagbo ¹³⁰ and Charles Blé Goudé ¹³¹

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE G: SUDAN 1591 (2005) COMMITTEE

Chair 2013	Ambassador Maria Cristina Perceval (Argentina)
Mandate	Monitor the implementation of the sanctions regimes, designate individuals for targeted measures, consider exemption requests, report to the Council at least every 90 days and consider requests from and provide approval for the movement of military equipment and supplies into the Darfur region. ¹³²
Types of Sanctions	Targeted Arms Embargo, ¹³³ Travel Ban ¹³⁴ and Assets Freeze. ¹³⁵
Listed Individuals/ Entities	4/0 ¹³⁶
Listing Criteria	Impeding the peace process, constituting a threat to stability in Darfur and the region, committing violations of international humanitarian or human rights law, violating the arms embargo and offensive military overflights. ¹³⁷
Exemptions	<p>Targeted Arms Embargo: Supplies and related technical training and assistance to monitoring, verification or peace support operations, including such operations led by regional organisations, that are authorised by the UN or are operating with the consent of the relevant parties; non-lethal military equipment intended solely for humanitarian, human rights monitoring or protective use and related technical training and assistance; movements of military equipment and supplies into the Darfur region (requires advance approval by Committee upon request of the government of Sudan); protective clothing for use by UN personnel, human rights monitors, representatives of the media and humanitarian and development workers.¹³⁸</p> <p>Travel Ban: Humanitarian or religious grounds (determined by the Committee on a case-by-case basis) or where the Committee concludes it would further the objectives of peace and stability.¹³⁹</p> <p>Assets Freeze: Basic expenses (requires notification and the absence of a negative Committee decision), extraordinary expenses (requires Committee approval) or judicial, administrative or lien or judgment (requires notification to Committee).¹⁴⁰</p>
Delisting	<p>Petitions for delisting addressed to Committee by state of citizenship/residency of petitioner or to Focal Point for Delisting by individuals/entities directly.¹⁴¹</p> <p>Requests made to Focal Point: 0¹⁴²</p>
Decision Making	By consensus of members, decision deemed adopted if no objection within two working days and referred to Council if consensus not reached after consultations. ¹⁴³
Committee Reporting	<p>To report to the Council at least every 90 days.¹⁴⁴</p> <p>Most recent annual public report: S/2012/978 of 31 December 2012</p>
Summary of Committee's Activities (1 January to 31 December 2012)	Held seven informal meetings and the Chair delivered five 90-day reports to the Council. No visiting missions took place. ¹⁴⁵
Documentation in 2012 (as of 30 November 2012)	<p>Notes by the Chair: 38</p> <p>Official communications by the Chair: 18</p> <p>Communications received by the Committee: 20</p>
Monitoring Mechanism	<p>Panel of Experts: 5 experts¹⁴⁶</p> <p>Mr. Issa Maraut, coordinator/regional (France)</p> <p>Mr. Ghassan Schbley, finance (US)</p> <p>Mr. Adrian Wilkinson, arms (UK)</p> <p>Mr. Guido Potters, aviation (Netherlands)</p> <p>Mr. Luis Ángel Benavides Hernández, international humanitarian law (Mexico)</p> <p>Mandate most recently extended to 17 February 2014.¹⁴⁷</p>

KEY UN DOCUMENTS ON SUDAN (1591) SANCTIONS COMMITTEE Security Council Resolutions S/RES/2091 (14 February 2013) extended the mandate of the Panel of Experts until 17 February 2014. S/RES/1672 (25 April 2006) listed four individuals for sanctions. S/RES/1593 (31 March 2005) referred the situation in Darfur to the ICC. S/RES/1591 (29 March 2005) widened the arms embargo and imposed targeted measures including a travel ban and assets freeze and established the Committee and the Panel of Experts. S/RES/1556 (30 July 2004) imposed an arms embargo on non-state actors in Darfur. **Most Recent Annual Committee Report S/2012/978** (31 December 2012). **Most Recent Panel of Experts Report S/2013/79** (5 February 2013). **Other Guidelines of the Committee for the conduct of its work** (27 December 2007) available at http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1591/pdf/Sudan_guide_E.pdf.

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE G: SUDAN 1591 (2005) COMMITTEE

Monitoring Mechanism Reporting	Monthly non-public reports to the Committee. ¹⁴⁸ Mid-term briefing to the Committee and an interim non-public report no later than 90 days after adoption of the resolution and a final report no later than 30 days prior to termination of its mandate to the Council through the Committee. ¹⁴⁹ Most recent public report: S/2013/79 of 5 February 2013, next report due by 17 January 2014.
International Justice Mechanisms	The Council referred the situation in Darfur to the ICC. ¹⁵⁰ The ICC has indicted seven individuals, none are currently listed: President Omar Al-Bashir, ¹⁵¹ Defence Minister Abdel Raheem Muhammad Hussein, ¹⁵² Governor of South Kordofan Ahmad Harun, ¹⁵³ Bahar Idriss Abu Garda, ¹⁵⁴ Ali Kushayb, ¹⁵⁵ Abdallah Banda Abakaer Nourain ¹⁵⁶ and Saleh Mohammad Jerbo Jamus ¹⁵⁷

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE H: LEBANON 1636 (2005) COMMITTEE

Chair 2013	Ambassador Kodjo Menan (Togo)
Mandate	Designate individuals for targeted measures, approve exceptions and register removals from list. ¹⁵⁸
Types of Sanctions	Travel Ban and Assets Freeze. ¹⁵⁹
Listed Individuals/ Entities	0/0
Listing Criteria	Designated by the International Independent Investigation Commission (IIIC) or the government of Lebanon as suspected of involvement in the 14 February 2005 terrorist bombing in Beirut, Lebanon that killed former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri and 22 others. ¹⁶⁰
Exemptions	Travel Ban: Humanitarian or religious grounds (determined by the Committee on a case-by-case basis) or where the Committee concludes it would further the objectives of peace and stability. ¹⁶¹ Assets Freeze: 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. ¹⁶²
Delisting	Petitions for delisting addressed to Committee by the IIIC or the government of Lebanon. ¹⁶³ Requests made to Focal Point: 0 ¹⁶⁴
Decision Making	By consensus of members and referred to the Council where no consensus is reached. ¹⁶⁵
Committee Reporting	No time frame specified in resolutions or guidelines. No annual public reports.
Summary of Committee's Activities (1 January to 31 December 2012)	N/A
Documentation in 2012 (as of 30 November 2012)	N/A
Monitoring Mechanism	International Independent Investigation Commission (IIIC) The IIIC's mandate lapsed after 28 February 2009 ¹⁶⁶ and was replaced by the Special Tribunal for Lebanon. ¹⁶⁷
Monitoring Mechanism Reporting	To the Council on the progress of the investigation every four months, or at any other time as it deems appropriate. ¹⁶⁸ Final public report: S/2008/752 of 2 December 2008.
International Justice Mechanisms	The Special Tribunal for Lebanon has indicted four individuals, none are currently listed: Salim Jamil Ayyash, Mustafa Amine Badreddine, Hussein Hassan Oneissi, Assad Hassan Sabra

KEY UN DOCUMENTS ON LEBANON (1636) SANCTIONS COMMITTEE Security Council Resolutions S/RES/1852 (16 December 2008) extended the mandate of the IIIC until 28 February 2009. S/RES/1757 (30 May 2007) set out guidelines for the establishment of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon (which began operating on 1 March 2009). S/RES/1636 (31 October 2005) imposed targeted measures including a travel ban and assets freeze and established the Committee. S/RES/1595 (7 April 2005) established the IIIC. Other S/2008/752 (2 December 2008) was the final report of the IIIC.

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE I: DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA 1718 (2006) COMMITTEE

Chair 2013	Ambassador Sylvie Lucas (Luxembourg)
Mandate	Monitor the implementation of the sanctions regimes, designate individuals/entities and determine additional items for targeted measures, consider exemption requests and report to the Council at least every 90 days. ¹⁶⁹
Types of Sanctions	General Arms Embargo (two-way), ¹⁷⁰ Travel Ban, ¹⁷¹ Assets Freeze, ¹⁷² Embargo on Items, Materials, Equipment, Goods and Technology related to Nuclear, Ballistic Missile and other Weapon of Mass Destruction Programmes ¹⁷³ and a Ban on the Export of Luxury Goods to the DPRK. ¹⁷⁴
Listed Individuals/ Entities	12/19 ¹⁷⁵
Listing Criteria	Travel Ban, Assets Freeze: Engaged in or providing support for nuclear, weapons of mass destruction and/or ballistic missile programmes and policies. ¹⁷⁶
Exemptions	General Arms Embargo: Small arms and light weapons and their related material (requires notification to the Committee). ¹⁷⁷ Travel Ban: Humanitarian or religious grounds (determined by the Committee on a case-by-case basis). ¹⁷⁸ Assets Freeze: Basic expenses (requires notification and the absence of a negative Committee decision), extraordinary expenses (requires Committee approval) or judicial, administrative or lien or judgment (requires notification to the Committee). ¹⁷⁹
Delisting	Petitions for delisting addressed to the Committee by state of residence or citizenship or to Focal Point for Delisting by individuals/entities directly. ¹⁸⁰ Requests made to Focal Point: 0 ¹⁸¹
Decision Making	By consensus of members and decision deemed adopted if no objection within five working days. ¹⁸²
Committee Reporting	To report to the Council at least every 90 days. ¹⁸³ Most recent annual public report: S/2012/982 of 31 December 2012
Summary of Committee's Activities (1 January to 31 December 2012)	Held five informal consultations, received six reports of alleged violations, designated three additional entities subject to the assets freeze and the Chair briefed the Council four times. ¹⁸⁴ No visiting missions took place. ¹⁸⁵
Documentation in 2012 (as of 30 November 2012)	Notes by the Chair: 116 Official communications by the Chair: 27 Communications received by the Committee: 154
Monitoring Mechanism	Panel of Experts: 8 experts ¹⁸⁶ Mr. Martin Uden, coordinator/regional issues (UK) Mr. Katsuhisa Furukawa, nuclear issues (Japan) Mr. Chang Guo, export control and nuclear items (China) Mr. Jang-keun Lee, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (Republic of Korea) Mr. Erik Marzolf, missile technology (France) Mr. William J. Newcomb, finance (US) Mr. Alexander Vilnin, customs (Russia) Mr. Neil Watts, maritime transportation (South Africa) Mandate most recently extended to 7 April 2014 ¹⁸⁷

KEY UN DOCUMENTS ON DPRK (1718) COMMITTEE [Security Council Resolutions S/RES/2094](#) (7 March 2013) imposed additional sanctions against the DPRK in response to a 12 February 2013 nuclear test and extended the mandate of the Panel of Experts until 7 April 2014. [S/RES/2087](#) (22 January 2013) condemned the DPRK's 12 December 2012 violation of the arms embargo and added listed individuals. [S/RES/1874](#) (12 June 2009) imposed additional measures, including an expansion of the embargo on arms and related materiel and technology, as well as financial measures to include a ban on financial transactions, technical training, advice, services or assistance related to such arms and materiel and established the Panel of Experts. [S/RES/1718](#) (14 October 2006) imposed a general arms embargo; nuclear, ballistic missiles and other weapons of mass destruction programs-related embargo; a ban on the export of luxury goods; targeted measures including a travel ban and assets freeze and established the Committee. **Most Recent Annual Committee Report S/2012/982** (31 December 2012). **Most Recent Panel of Experts Report S/2013/337** (11 June 2013). **Other Guidelines of the Committee for the conduct of its work** (20 June 2007) available at http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1718/pdf/guidelines_20_jun_07.pdf. **Implementation Assistance Notice No. 3** (25 June 2013) available at http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1718/pdf/implementation_assistance_notice_3.pdf.

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE I: DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA 1718 (2006) COMMITTEE

Monitoring Mechanism Reporting	Midterm report to the Committee and one month later to the Council and final report to the Committee and one month later to the Council. ¹⁸⁸ Most recent public report: S/2013/337 of 11 June 2013, next midterim report due by 7 October 2013 to the Committee (not public) and 7 November 2013 to the Council, next final report due by 7 February 2014 to the Committee and 7 March 2014 to the Council. ¹⁸⁹
International Justice Mechanisms	N/A

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE J: IRAN 1737 (2006) COMMITTEE

Chair 2013	Ambassador Gary Quinlan (Australia)
Mandate	Monitor the implementation of the sanctions regimes, designate individuals/entities, determine additional items for targeted measures, consider exemption requests and report to the Council at least every 90 days. ¹⁹⁰
Types of Sanctions	General Arms Embargo (two-way), ¹⁹¹ Travel Ban, ¹⁹² Assets Freeze, ¹⁹³ Items which could contribute to enrichment-related, reprocessing or heavy water-related activities, or to development of nuclear weapons delivery systems, ¹⁹⁴ Bunkering services of vessels believed to carry prohibited items ¹⁹⁵ and Financial services believed to contribute to proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities or development of nuclear-weapon delivery systems. ¹⁹⁶
Listed Individuals/Entities	43/78 ¹⁹⁷
Listing Criteria	Engaged in, directly associated with or providing support for Iran's proliferation sensitive nuclear activities or the development of nuclear weapon delivery systems. ¹⁹⁸
Exemptions	<p>General Arms Embargo: None</p> <p>Travel Ban: Humanitarian or religious grounds (determined by the Committee on a case-by-case basis).¹⁹⁹</p> <p>Assets Freeze: Basic expenses (requires notification and the absence of a negative Committee decision); extraordinary expenses (requires Committee approval); judicial, administrative or lien or judgment (requires notification to the Committee); funds related to the supply, sale or transfer of equipment for light water reactors and low-enriched uranium (requires notification to the Committee) and payments due under a contract entered into prior to listing of individual/entity (requires notification to the Committee).²⁰⁰</p> <p>Proliferation/nuclear: Items and assistance determined on a case-by-case basis that would clearly not contribute to technologies in support of its proliferation sensitive nuclear activities and of development of nuclear weapon delivery systems, including where such items or assistance are for food, agricultural, medical or other humanitarian purposes, under certain conditions specified.²⁰¹</p>
Delisting	<p>Petitions for delisting addressed to the Committee by member states, state of citizenship/residency of petitioner or to Focal Point for Delisting by individuals/entities directly and a state can decide that its nationals or residents should address their delisting requests directly to the Focal Point.²⁰²</p> <p>Requests made to Focal Point: 2 (2 entities)²⁰³ Status: 1 remains listed, 1 still being processed.</p>
Decision Making	By consensus of members and decision deemed adopted if no objection within 10 working days. ²⁰⁴
Committee Reporting	To report to the Council at least every 90 days. ²⁰⁵ Most recent annual public report: S/2013/53 of 25 January 2013
Summary of Committee's Activities (1 January to 31 December 2012)	Held four informal consultations, designated two individuals and three entities subject to travel ban and assets freeze, authorised three exemptions in response to the requests submitted by member states, the Chair briefed the Council four times. No visiting missions took place. ²⁰⁶
Documentation in 2012 (as of 30 November 2012)	Notes by the Chair: 49 Official communications by the Chair: 44 Communications received by the Committee: 88

KEY UN DOCUMENTS ON IRAN (1737) COMMITTEE [Security Council Resolutions S/RES/2105](#) (5 June 2013) extended the mandate of the Panel of Experts until 9 July 2014. [S/RES/1929](#) (9 June 2010) most recently modified the arms embargo, travel ban, assets freeze, nuclear proliferation ban and provision of financial services ban; imposed a ban on the provision of bunkering services of vessels believed to carry prohibited items and established the Panel of Experts. [S/RES/1803](#) (3 March 2008) imposed a travel ban. [S/RES/1747](#) (24 March 2007) imposed a general arms embargo and ban on financial services believed to contribute to proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities or development of nuclear-weapon delivery systems. [S/RES/1737](#) (23 December 2006) imposed a ban on trade with Iran of certain nuclear proliferation sensitive items, imposed an assets freeze on individuals and entities involved in proliferation-sensitive activities and established the Committee. [S/RES/1696](#) (31 July 2006) demanded the suspension of all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities, including research and development. [Most Recent Annual Committee Report S/2013/53](#) (25 January 2013). [Most Recent Panel of Experts Report S/2013/331](#) (5 June 2013). [Other Guidelines of the Committee for the conduct of its work](#) (19 August 2011) available at <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1737/pdf/revisedguidelinesfinal.pdf>. [Implementation Assistance Notice: Financial and Business Measures](#) (27 February 2013) available at <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1737/pdf/1737%20Committee%20website%20-%20IAN%20on%20finance.pdf>.

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE J: IRAN 1737 (2006) COMMITTEE

Monitoring Mechanism	Panel of Experts: 8 experts ²⁰⁷ Ms. Salomé Zourabichvili, coordinator/non-proliferation and disarmament (France) Mr. Jonathan Brewer, finance and private sector (UK) Mr. Chunjie Li, export control (China) Mr. Kazuto Suzuki, international security and export control (Japan) Mr. Thomas Mazet, customs enforcement, export control and transport (Germany) Ms. Jacqueline W. Shire, nuclear issues (US) Ms. Elena G. Vodopolova, missile technology (Russia) Mr. Olasehinde Ishola Williams, conventional arms/related material and financing of illicit arms transfers (Nigeria) Mandate most recently extended to 9 July 2014. ²⁰⁸
Monitoring Mechanism Reporting	Midterm and final report to the Committee and after discussion with the Committee, to the Council. ²⁰⁹ Most recent public report: S/2013/331 of 5 June 2013, next mid-term report due by 9 December 2013 and final report by 9 June 2014. ²¹⁰
International Justice Mechanisms	N/A

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE K: LIBYA 1970 (2011) COMMITTEE

Chair 2013	Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana (Rwanda)
Mandate	Monitor the implementation of the sanctions regimes, designate individuals/entities for targeted measures, consider exemption requests and report to the Council. ²¹¹
Types of Sanctions	General Arms Embargo (two-way), ²¹² Travel Ban ²¹³ and Assets Freeze. ²¹⁴
Listed Individuals/ Entities	Travel ban: 5, Travel Ban and Assets Freeze: 15, Entities: 2. ²¹⁵
Listing Criteria	Individuals/entities involved or complicit in ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against persons in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, including ordering or conducting attacks, in violation of international law ²¹⁶ and for violations of the arms embargo. ²¹⁷
Exemptions	<p>General Arms Embargo: Non-lethal military equipment intended solely for humanitarian or protective use; protective clothing for the personal use of UN personnel, human rights monitors, representatives of the media and humanitarian and development workers; arms and related materiel of all types, including technical assistance, training, financial and other assistance, intended solely for security or disarmament and small arms, light weapons and related materiel, temporarily exported to Libya for the sole use of UN personnel, representatives of the media and humanitarian and development workers (requires notification and the absence of a negative Committee decision); and other sales or supply of arms and related material, or provision of assistance (requires Committee approval).²¹⁸</p> <p>Travel Ban: Humanitarian or religious grounds (determined by the Committee on a case-by-case basis); fulfilment of a judicial process; where the Committee concludes it would further the objectives of peace and national reconciliation or where a state determines it would advance peace and stability (requires notification to the Committee within 48 hours)²¹⁹</p> <p>Assets Freeze: Basic expenses (requires notification and the absence of a negative Committee decision); extraordinary expenses (requires Committee approval); judicial, administrative or lien or judgment (requires notification to the Committee); payments due to third parties under contracts entered into prior to listing (requires notification to the Committee) and funds of the Libyan Investment Authority and the Libyan Africa Investment Portfolio for humanitarian needs, fuel, electricity and water for strictly civilian uses, resuming Libyan production and sale of hydrocarbons, establishing, operating, or strengthening institutions of civilian government and civilian public infrastructure, or facilitating the resumption of banking sector operations, including to support or facilitate international trade with Libya (requires notification to the Committee and absence of negative decision).²²⁰</p>
Delisting	<p>Petitions for delisting addressed to the Committee by member states, state of citizenship/residency of petitioner or to Focal Point for Delisting by individuals/entities directly and a state can decide that its nationals or residents should address their delisting requests directly to the Focal Point.²²¹</p> <p>Requests made to Focal Point: 1 individual²²² Status: 1 individual remains listed</p>
Decision Making	By consensus of members or decision deemed adopted if no objection within five working days and referred to Council if consensus not reached after consultations. ²²³
Committee Reporting	No timeframe specified in resolutions or guidelines, "as deemed necessary by the Committee". ²²⁴ In practice every 90 days. Most recent annual public report: S/2012/983 of 31 December 2012
Summary of Committee's Activities (1 January to 31 December 2012)	Held seven informal consultations, took action on three cases of alleged proliferation of arms from Libya into the region, responded to 14 queries or requests for guidance submitted by member states, received nine notifications for exemptions to the assets freeze with no negative decisions taken (amounting to at least \$6 million unfrozen) and the Chair briefed the Council four times. No visiting missions took place. ²²⁵
Documentation in 2012 (as of 30 November 2012)	Notes by the Chair: 129 Official communications by the Chair: 197 Communications received by the Committee: 157

KEY UN DOCUMENTS ON LIBYA (1970) COMMITTEE [Security Council Resolutions S/RES/2095](#) (14 March 2013) further eased the arms embargo and renewed the mandate of the Panel of Experts for thirteen months. [S/RES/2040](#) (12 March 2012) amended the arms embargo and extended and modified the mandate of a slimmed-down Panel of Experts. [S/RES/2017](#) (31 October 2011) requested the Committee to assess arms proliferation from Libya to the region and to submit a report to the Council. [S/RES/2016](#) (27 October 2011) lifted the no-fly zone and the provision for all necessary measures for the protection of civilians. [S/RES/2009](#) (16 September 2011) modified the arms embargo, partially lifted the assets freeze and lifted the ban on flights. [S/RES/1973](#) (17 March 2011) authorised all necessary measures to protect civilians in Libya and enforce the arms embargo, imposed a no-fly zone, imposed a ban on flights, strengthened the sanctions regime and established the Panel of Experts. [S/RES/1970](#) (26 February 2011) referred the situation in Libya to the ICC, imposed an arms embargo and targeted sanctions including a travel ban and assets freeze and established the Committee. **Most Recent Annual Committee Report S/2012/983** (31 December 2012). **Most Recent Panel of Experts Report S/2013/99** (15 February 2013). **Other Guidelines of the Committee for the conduct of its work** (25 October 2011) available at <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1970/pdf/Provisional%20Guidelines.pdf>.

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE K: LIBYA 1970 (2011) COMMITTEE

Monitoring Mechanism	Panel of Experts: 5 experts ²²⁶ Mr. Khalil Msan, coordinator/arms (Lebanon) Mr. Simon Dilloway, finance (UK) Ms. Giovanna Perri, finance (Italy) Ms. Savannah de Tessières, arms (France) Mr. Brian Katulis, regional (US) Mandate most recently extended to: 14 April 2014 ²²⁷
Monitoring Mechanism Reporting	Interim report to the Council no later than 90 days after resolution renewing mandate (not public) and final report to the Council no later than 60 days before termination of mandate (public). ²²⁸ Most recent public report: S/2013/99 of 15 February 2013, next final report due by 14 February 2014.
International Justice Mechanisms	The Council referred the situation in Libya to the ICC. ²²⁹ The ICC has indicted three listed individuals: Muammar Gaddafi, ²³⁰ Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi ²³¹ and Abdullah Al-Senussi ²³²

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE L: TALIBAN 1988 (2011) COMMITTEE

Chair 2013	Ambassador Gary Quinlan (Australia)
Mandate	Monitor the implementation of the sanctions regimes, designate individuals/entities for targeted measures, consider exemption and delisting requests, make accessible on the Committee's website narrative summaries of reasons for listing and report periodically to the Council. ²³³
Types of Sanctions	Targeted Arms Embargo, ²³⁴ Travel Ban ²³⁵ and Assets Freeze. ²³⁶
Listed Individuals/ Entities	130/4 ²³⁷
Listing Criteria	Associated with/supporting the Taliban in constituting a threat to the peace, stability and security of Afghanistan. ²³⁸
Exemptions	Targeted Arms Embargo: None Travel Ban: Fulfilment of judicial process or where entry or transit is justified, including where this directly relates to supporting efforts by the Government of Afghanistan to promote reconciliation (determined by the Committee on a case-by-case basis). ²³⁹ Assets Freeze: Basic expenses (requires notification and the absence of a negative Committee decision) and extraordinary expenses (requires Committee approval). ²⁴⁰
Delisting	Petitions for delisting addressed to the Committee by member states, state of citizenship/residency of petitioner or to Focal Point for Delisting by individuals/entities directly and a state can decide that its nationals or residents should address their delisting requests directly to the Focal Point. ²⁴¹ Requests made to Focal Point: 3 requests (3 individuals) ²⁴² Status: 1 delisted, 2 remain listed
Decision Making	By consensus of members, decision deemed adopted if no objection within five working days (10 working days for listing and de-listing) and may be referred to Council if consensus not reached after consultations. ²⁴³
Committee Reporting	No timeframe specified in resolutions or guidelines, required "to make periodic reports to the Council". ²⁴⁴ Most recent annual public report: S/2012/970 of 31 December 2012
Summary of Committee's Activities (1 January to 31 December 2012)	Held eight informal consultations; approved 16 updates of entries and narrative summaries of reasons for listing; received one notification for exemption to the assets freeze, two exemptions to the travel ban and one request for an extension of the exemption to the travel ban and the Chair gave one briefing to the Council. No visiting missions took place. ²⁴⁵
Documentation in 2012 (as of 30 November 2012)	Notes by the Chair: 73 Official communications by the Chair: 47 Communications received by the Committee: 74
Monitoring Mechanism	Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team: 8 experts ²⁴⁶ Mr. Abdulmajeed A. Ababtain (Saudi Arabia) Mr. Alexander Evans (UK) Mr. Frederique Gautier (France) Ms. Yotsna Lalji (Mauritius) Mr. Hans-Jakob Schindler (Germany) Mr. Abdelaziz Haouaria (Morocco) Mr. Yu Xu (China) Ms. Justyna Gudzowska (US) (Expertise not specified.) Mandate most recently extended to: 30 June 2015 ²⁴⁷
Monitoring Mechanism Reporting	Bi-annual public reports to the Committee. ²⁴⁸ Most recent public report: S/2013/656 of 10 November 2013, next report due by 30 April 2014. ²⁵⁰
International Justice Mechanisms	N/A (Not discussed in the Committee or monitoring team's report).

KEY UN DOCUMENTS ON TALIBAN (1988) COMMITTEE [Security Council Resolutions S/RES/2082](#) (17 December 2012) extended the mandate of the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team for a further period of 30 months. [S/RES/1988](#) (17 June 2011) imposed an assets freeze, travel ban and targeted arms embargo on individuals, groups, undertakings and entities associated with the Taliban in constituting a threat to the peace, stability and security of Afghanistan; established the Committee and decided that the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team established pursuant to [S/RES/1526](#) (30 January 2004) shall also support the Committee. [Most Recent Annual Committee Report S/2012/970](#) (31 December 2012). [Most Recent Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team Report S/2012/971](#) (31 December 2012). [Other Guidelines of the Committee for the conduct of its work](#) (29 July 2013) available at http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1988/pdf/1988_committee_guidelines.pdf.

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

TABLE M: GUINEA-BISSAU 2048 (2012) COMMITTEE

Chair 2013	Ambassador Mohammed Loulichki (Morocco)
Mandate	Monitor the implementation of the sanctions regimes, designate individuals for targeted measures, consider exemptions, report to the Council as deemed necessary. ²⁵¹
Types of Sanctions	Travel Ban ²⁵²
Listed Individuals/ Entities	11/0 ²⁵³
Listing Criteria	Preventing the restoration of the constitutional order, undermining stability and the rule of law in particular those who played a role in the coup d'état of 12 April 2012. ²⁵⁴
Exemptions	Humanitarian need, including religious obligation, fulfilment of a judicial process and furtherance of peace and national reconciliation and stability. ²⁵⁵
Delisting	<p>Petitions for delisting addressed to Committee by member states, state of citizenship/residency of petitioner or to Focal Point for Delisting by individuals/entities directly and a state can decide that its nationals or residents should address their delisting requests directly to the Focal Point.²⁵⁶</p> <p>Requests made to Focal Point: 0²⁵⁷</p>
Decision Making	By consensus of members, decision deemed adopted if no objection within five working days and referred to the Council if consensus not reached after consultations. ²⁵⁸
Committee Reporting	<p>No timeframe specified in resolutions or guidelines, required "to report to the Council as deemed necessary".²⁵⁹</p> <p>Most recent annual public report: S/2012/975 of 31 December 2012</p>
Summary of Committee's Activities (18 May to 31 December 2012)	Held two informal consultations, approved the designation of six additional individuals as subject to the travel ban. No visiting missions took place. ²⁶⁰
Documentation in 2012 (as of 30 November 2012)	<p>Notes by the Chair: 2</p> <p>Official communications by the Chair: 18</p> <p>Communications received by the Committee: 2</p>
Monitoring Mechanism	N/A
International Justice Mechanisms	N/A

KEY UN DOCUMENTS ON GUINEA-BISSAU (2048) COMMITTEE [Security Council Resolution S/RES/2048](#) (18 May 2012) imposed a travel ban and established the Committee. [Most Recent Annual Committee Report S/2012/975](#) (31 December 2012). **Other** [Guidelines of the Committee for the conduct of its work](#) (19 July 2012) available at http://www.un.org/sc/committees/2048/pdf/2048_guidelines.pdf.

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

Endnotes

- 1 Paragraph 11 of S/RES/751 (24 April 1992), paragraph 4 of S/RES/1356 (19 June 2001), paragraph 11 of S/RES/1844 (20 November 2008) and paragraph 18 of S/RES/1907 (23 December 2009). On the basis of the measures imposed by paragraph 5 of S/RES/733 (23 January 1992), paragraphs 1, 3 and 7 of S/RES/1844 (20 November 2008), paragraphs 5, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 13 of S/RES/1907 (23 December 2009), and as elaborated and amended by paragraph 2 of S/RES/1425 (2002), paragraph 22 of S/RES/2036 (22 February 2012), and paragraph 38 of S/RES/2093 (6 March 2013).
- 2 Paragraph 5 of S/RES/733 (23 January 1992) established a general and complete arms embargo on Somalia which was modified and partially lifted for a period of 12 months by paragraph 33 of S/RES/2093 (6 March 2013).
- 3 Paragraph 1 of S/RES/1844 (20 November 2008).
- 4 Paragraph 3 of S/RES/1844 (20 November 2008).
- 5 Paragraph 22 of S/RES/2036 (22 February 2012) imposed a ban on the direct or indirect import of charcoal from Somalia, whether or not such charcoal originated in Somalia and directed Somali authorities to take the necessary measures to prevent the export of charcoal from Somalia.
- 6 Paragraphs 5, 6 and 8 of S/RES/1907 (23 December 2009).
- 7 Paragraphs 10, 12 and 13 of S/RES/1907 (23 December 2009).
- 8 Last updated on 23 August 2012.
- 9 Paragraph 8 of S/RES/1844 (20 November 2008).
- 10 S/RES/2002 (29 July 2011).
- 11 S/RES/2002 (29 July 2011).
- 12 Consolidated list of current exemptions contained in paragraphs 6, 7, 10 and 11 of S/RES/2111 (24 July 2013).
- 13 Consolidated list of current exemptions contained in paragraphs 12-13 of S/RES/2111 (24 July 2013).
- 14 Paragraph 5 of S/RES/1916 (19 March 2010), paragraph 4 of S/RES/1972 (17 March 2011) and paragraph 9 of S/RES/2002 (29 July 2011).
- 15 Paragraph 4 of S/RES/1844 (20 November 2008) and paragraph 14 of S/RES/1907 (23 December 2009).
- 16 Paragraph 2 of S/RES/1844 (20 November 2008) and paragraph 11 of S/RES/1907 (23 December 2009).
- 17 Committee Guidelines on delisting.
- 18 As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 19 Committee Guidelines. Paragraph 4(a) of S/RES/1844 (20 November 2008) and 14(a) of S/RES/1907 (23 December 2009).
- 20 Paragraph 11(g) of S/RES/1844 (20 November 2008)
- 21 Paragraph 3 of S/RES/1356 (19 June 2001)
- 22 Paragraph 11(b) of S/RES/1772 (20 August 2007)
- 23 S/2012/976 (31 December 2012).
- 24 The Panel of Experts was succeeded by the Monitoring Group on Somalia established pursuant to S/RES/1519 (16 December 2003). After the adoption of S/RES/1907 (23 December 2009) the Monitoring Group changed its name to Monitoring Group on Somalia and Eritrea. The mandate of the Monitoring Group currently in existence is contained in paragraph 16 of S/RES/2023 (5 December 2011), paragraph 23 of S/RES/2036 (22 February 2012) and paragraph 13 of S/RES/2060 (25 July 2012). For composition see S/2013/495 (16 August 2013).
- 25 Paragraph 27 of S/RES/2111 (24 July 2013).
- 26 Paragraph 28 of S/RES/2111 (24 July 2013).
- 27 Paragraph 4 (b) of S/RES/1267 (15 October 1999), paragraph 8 (c) of S/RES/1333 (19 December 2000), and paragraphs 1 and 2 of S/RES/1390 (16 January 2002) as reiterated in paragraph 1 of S/RES/1526 (2004), S/RES/1617 (29 July 2005), S/RES/1735 (22 December 2006), S/RES/1822 (30 June 2008), S/RES/1904 (17 December 2009), S/RES/1989 (17 June 2011) and S/RES/2083 (17 December 2012).
- 28 Paragraph 4(b) of S/RES/1267 (15 October 1999) established financial embargo, modified by S/RES/1333 (19 December 2000) which introduced arms embargo, modified by S/RES/1390 (16 January 2002) which introduced the travel ban, reiterated in S/RES/1455 (17 January 2003), S/RES/1526 (30 January 2004), S/RES/1617 (29 July 2005), S/RES/1735 (22 December 2006), S/RES/1822 (30 June 2008), S/RES/1904 (17 December 2009), S/RES/1989 (17 June 2011) and S/RES/2083 (17 December 2012).
- 29 Last updated on 24 October 2013.
- 30 Paragraph 2 of S/RES/2083 (17 December 2012). Paragraph 2 of S/RES/1617 (29 July 2005) defines "associated with".
- 31 Paragraph 2(b) of S/RES/1390 (16 January 2002).
- 32 Paragraph 1 of S/RES/1452 (20 December 2002), procedure and timeframes modified by S/RES/1735 (22 December 2006).
- 33 The Office of the Ombudsperson was created by S/RES/1904 (17 December 2009) and its mandate extended by S/RES/1989 (17 June 2011) and S/RES/2083 (17 December 2012). Where the Ombudsperson recommends that the Committee consider delisting, the individual or entity will be delisted unless, within 60 days, the Committee decides by consensus to maintain the listing. However, if there is no such consensus, during that 60 day period a Committee member may request that the matter be referred to the Council for a decision on the question of whether to delist.
- 34 Paragraph 21, S/RES/1904 (17 December 2009).
- 35 As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 36 S/2013/452 (31 July 2013).
- 37 As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 38 Paragraph 6 of S/2013/452 (31 July 2013).
- 39 Committee Guidelines
- 40 Paragraph 59 of S/RES/2083 (17 December 2012)
- 41 Paragraph 1(a) of S/RES/1452 (20 December 2002).
- 42 S/2012/930 (19 December 2012).
- 43 Paragraphs 6 and 7 of and Annex to S/RES/1526 (30 January 2004). For composition see S/2011/403, S/2011/789 with 2012 members renewed for a period of 30 months in paragraph 60 of S/RES/2083 (17 December 2012). See also S/2013/676 (15 November 2013).
- 44 Paragraph 60 of S/RES/2083 (17 December 2012). See also S/2013/676 (15 November 2013).
- 45 Annex to S/RES/2083 (17 December 2012).
- 46 The Grand Chamber ruled that in enforcing the travel ban against the applicant under the sanctions regime, Switzerland had violated the applicant's rights under the European Convention on Human Rights to a private and family life (Article 8) and effective remedy (Article 13) as the restrictions imposed on the applicant's freedom of movement did not strike a fair balance between his right to the protection of his private and family life, on the one hand, and the legitimate aims of the prevention of crime and the protection of Switzerland's national security and public safety, on the other and that the applicant did not have any effective means of obtaining the removal of his name from the list.
- 47 The 2010 decision of the General Court upheld the 2008 decision of the European Court of Justice and struck down the applicant's re-listing by the EU. Both courts ruled that the assets freeze imposed against the applicant under the EU sanctions regime was enforced without sufficient disclosure of the evidence used against the applicant or to his being properly heard, which therefore violated his right to a defence and effective judicial protection. The applicant (who was also listed by the Committee in October 2001) was delisted by the Committee on 5 October 2012, following review of a delisting request submitted through the Office of the Ombudsperson. Despite this, the European Commission, the UK, the Council of the EU and others appealed the 2010 decision of the General Court to the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Justice, which dismissed the appeal on 18 July 2013 and upheld the decision of the General Court striking down the regulation relisting the applicant.
- 48 Paragraph 1 of S/RES/1518 (24 November 2003).
- 49 Paragraph 10 of S/RES/1483 (22 May 2003).
- 50 Paragraph 19 and 23 of S/RES/1483 (22 May 2003).
- 51 Last updated on 7 December 2011.
- 52 Last updated on 12 May 2006.
- 53 Paragraph 23(b) of S/RES/1483 (22 May 2003).
- 54 Paragraph 21 of S/RES/1546 (8 June 2004).
- 55 Committee Guidelines.
- 56 As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 57 Committee Guidelines for application of paragraphs 19 and 23 of S/RES/1483 (22 May 2003).
- 58 Paragraph 1 of S/RES/1518 (24 November 2003).
- 59 No report for 2012.
- 60 S/2011/806 (30 December 2011).
- 61 Paragraph 21 of S/RES/1521 (22 December 2003) and paragraph 4 of S/RES/1532 (12 March 2004).
- 62 Paragraph 4 of S/RES/1903 (17 December 2009) terminated the general arms embargo with regard to the government of Liberia and imposed a targeted arms embargo on non-governmental entities and individuals.
- 63 Paragraph 4(a) of S/RES/1521 (22 December 2003).
- 64 Paragraph 1 of S/RES/1532 (12 March 2004).
- 65 Last updated on 30 October 2013.
- 66 Last updated on 21 January 2013.
- 67 Paragraph 4 (a) of S/RES/1521 (22 December 2003).
- 68 Paragraph 1 of S/RES/1532 (12 March 2004).
- 69 Paragraph 5 of S/RES/1903 (17 December 2009).
- 70 Paragraph 4 (c) of S/RES/1521 (22 December 2003).
- 71 Paragraph 2 of S/RES/1532 (12 March 2004).
- 72 Committee Guidelines.
- 73 As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 74 Committee Guidelines.
- 75 Paragraph 21(g) of S/RES/1521 (22 December 2003).
- 76 Paragraph 4(c) of S/RES/1521 (22 December 2003).
- 77 S/2012/980 (31 December 2012).
- 78 Paragraph 22 of S/RES/1521 (22 December 2003). For composition see S/2013/12 (10 January 2013)
- 79 Paragraph 5 of S/RES/2079 (12 December 2012).
- 80 Paragraph 5(f) of S/RES/2079 (12 December 2012).
- 81 Paragraph 5(f) of S/RES/2079 (12 December 2012).

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

- 82** Paragraph 9 of S/RES/1688 (16 June 2006). On 26 September 2013, the Appeals Chamber for the Special Court for Sierra Leone upheld the Trial Chamber's convictions of Charles Taylor for war crimes and crimes against humanity and the sentence of 50 years in prison.
- 83** Paragraph 8 of S/RES/1533 (12 March 2004) and paragraph 18 of S/RES/1596 (18 April 2005), and expanded in paragraph 4 of S/RES/1649 (21 December 2005) and paragraph 14 of S/RES/1698 (31 July 2006), as reaffirmed in paragraph 15 of S/RES/1807 (31 March 2008) and further expanded in paragraphs 6, 18 and 25 of S/RES/1857 (22 December 2008) and subparagraphs 4 (a), (b) and (c) of S/RES/1896 (30 November 2009).
- 84** Paragraph 1 of S/RES/1807 (31 March 2008) terminated the general arms embargo with regard to the Government of the DRC and imposed a targeted arms embargo on non-governmental entities and individuals. Paragraph 5 requires states to notify the Committee in advance of any shipment of arms, provision of assistance, advice or training related to military activities in the DRC.
- 85** Paragraph 13 of S/RES/1596 (18 April 2005).
- 86** Paragraph 15 of S/RES/1596 (18 April 2005).
- 87** Last updated on 12 April 2013.
- 88** Consolidated list of current listing criteria contained in paragraph 4 of S/RES/2078 (28 November 2012).
- 89** Paragraph 3 of S/RES/1807 (31 March 2008).
- 90** Paragraph 14 of S/RES/1596 (18 April 2005) and paragraph 10 of S/RES/1807 (31 March 2008).
- 91** Paragraph 16 of S/RES/1596 (18 April 2005) and paragraph 12 of S/RES/1807 (31 March 2008).
- 92** Committee Guidelines.
- 93** As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 94** Committee Guidelines.
- 95** Committee Guidelines and paragraph 8(c) of S/RES/1533 (12 March 2004).
- 96** Paragraphs 13 and 15 of S/RES/1596 (18 April 2005).
- 97** S/2012/979 (16 January 2013).
- 98** Paragraph 10 of S/RES/1533 (12 March 2004). For composition see S/2012/967 (31 December 2012) and S/2013/1 (2 January 2013).
- 99** Paragraph 5 of S/RES/2078 (28 November 2012).
- 100** Paragraph 5 of S/RES/2078 (28 November 2012).
- 101** Paragraph 5 of S/RES/2078 (28 November 2012).
- 102** Found guilty on 14 March 2012, of war crimes including enlisting and conscripting children under the age of 15 years and using them to participate actively in hostilities and sentenced on 10 July 2012, to 14 years of imprisonment subject to appeal.
- 103** Charged with three counts of crimes against humanity and seven war crimes, charges confirmed on 26 September 2008, the trial is ongoing.
- 104** Charged with three counts of crimes against humanity and four war crimes, confirmation of charges hearing scheduled for 10 February 2014, currently in ICC custody.
- 105** On 16 December 2011, the Pre-Trial Chamber decided by majority to decline to confirm the charges against him and released Mbarushimana from the ICC's custody on 23 December 2011.
- 106** Arrest warrant issued on 13 July 2012, for allegedly committing nine war crimes, currently at large.
- 107** Acquitted of all charges by the ICC on 18 December 2012.
- 108** Paragraph 14 of S/RES/1572 (15 November 2004) and modified by S/RES/1643 (15 December 2005).
- 109** Paragraph 7 of S/RES/1572 (15 November 2004), modified by paragraphs 2 and 4 of S/RES/2045 (26 April 2012).
- 110** Paragraphs 9 of S/RES/1572 (15 November 2004).
- 111** Paragraphs 11 of S/RES/1572 (15 November 2004).
- 112** Paragraph 6 of S/RES/1643 (15 December 2005).
- 113** Last updated 28 October 2011.
- 114** Paragraphs 9 and 11 of S/RES/1572 (15 November 2004) and paragraph 4 of S/RES/1643 (15 December 2005)
- 115** Paragraphs 8 of S/RES/1572 (15 November 2004), paragraph 9 of S/RES/1980 (28 April 2011), consolidated list of exemptions contained in paragraph 3 of S/RES/2045 (26 April 2012).
- 116** Paragraphs 10 of S/RES/1572 (15 November 2004).
- 117** Paragraph 12 of S/RES/1572 (15 November 2004).
- 118** Paragraphs 16 and 17 of S/RES/1893 (29 October 2009).
- 119** Committee Guidelines.
- 120** As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 121** Committee Guidelines.
- 122** Paragraph 14(f) of S/RES/1572 (15 November 2004).
- 123** Paragraph 9 of S/RES/1980 (28 April 2011) and paragraph 4 of S/RES/2045 (26 April 2012). Status not specified.
- 124** S/2012/981 (31 December 2012).
- 125** Paragraph 7 of S/RES/1584 (1 February 2005). For composition see S/2013/416 (11 July 2013).
- 126** Paragraph 18 of S/RES/2101 (25 April 2013).
- 127** Paragraph 19 of S/RES/2101 (25 April 2013).
- 128** Paragraph 19 of S/RES/2101 (25 April 2013).
- 129** Transferred to the ICC's custody on 30 November 2011, for allegedly committing four counts of crimes against humanity, confirmation of charges hearing still ongoing.
- 130** Warrant of arrest unsealed on 22 November 2012, for allegedly committing four counts of crimes against humanity, Côte d'Ivoire has refused to transfer her to the court's custody, still at large.
- 131** Warrant of arrest unsealed on 30 September 2013 (initially issued on 21 December 2011), for allegedly committing four counts of crimes against humanity, currently still at large.
- 132** Paragraph 3(a) of S/RES/1591 (29 March 2005).
- 133** Paragraphs 7 and 8 of S/RES/1556 (30 July 2004), modified by paragraph 7 of S/RES/1591 (29 March 2005) to include all the parties to the N'djamena Ceasefire Agreement and any other belligerents in the states of North Darfur, South Darfur and West Darfur.
- 134** Paragraph 3(d) of S/RES/1591 (29 March 2005).
- 135** Paragraph 3(e) of S/RES/1591 (29 March 2005).
- 136** Last updated 4 September 2013.
- 137** Paragraph 3(c) of S/RES/1591 (29 March 2005).
- 138** Paragraph 9 of S/RES/1556 (30 July 2004) and paragraph 7 of S/RES/1591 (29 March 2005), modified in paragraph 9 of S/RES/1945 (14 October 2010) and 4 of S/RES/2035 (17 February 2012).
- 139** Paragraph 3(f) of S/RES/1591 (29 March 2005).
- 140** Paragraph 3(g) of S/RES/1591 (29 March 2005).
- 141** Committee Guidelines.
- 142** As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 143** Committee Guidelines.
- 144** Paragraph 3(a) of S/RES/1591 (29 March 2005).
- 145** S/2012/978 (31 December 2012).
- 146** Paragraph 3(b) of S/RES/1591 (2005), S/RES/1713 (29 September 2006) added an additional expert. For composition see S/2013/203 (28 March 2013).
- 147** Paragraph 1 of S/RES/2091 (14 February 2013).
- 148** Paragraph 4 of S/RES/2091 (14 February 2013).
- 149** Paragraph 3 of S/RES/2091 (14 February 2013).
- 150** Paragraph 1 of S/RES/1593 (31 March 2005)
- 151** Arrest warrant issued on 12 July 2010, for allegedly committing five counts of crimes against humanity, two war crimes and three counts of genocide, currently at large.
- 152** Arrest warrant issued on 1 March 2012, for allegedly committing seven counts of crimes against humanity and six war crimes, execution of arrest warrant is still pending.
- 153** Arrest warrant issued on 27 April 2007, for allegedly committing 20 counts of crimes against humanity and 20 war crimes, currently at large.
- 154** On 8 February 2010, the Pre-Trial Chamber refused to confirm the charges of three war crimes against Abu Garda. On 23 April 2010, the Pre-Trial Chamber issued a decision rejecting the Prosecutor's application to appeal the decision declining to confirm the charges. The decision does not preclude the Prosecution from subsequently requesting confirmation of the charges if such a request is supported by additional evidence.
- 155** Arrest warrant issued on 27 April 2007, for 22 counts of crimes against humanity and 28 war crimes, currently at large.
- 156** Opening of the trial is scheduled for 5 May 2014, on charges of violence to life, directing attacks and pillaging.
- 157** Opening of the trial was scheduled for 5 May 2014, on charges of violence to life, directing attacks and pillaging but proceedings were terminated on 4 October 2013, based on evidence of Jerbo's death on 19 April 2013.
- 158** Paragraph 3(a) and Annex of S/RES/1636 (31 October 2005).
- 159** Paragraph 3(a) of S/RES/1636 (31 October 2005)
- 160** Paragraph 3(a) of S/RES/1636 (31 October 2005)
- 161** Paragraph 2 (i) of Annex of S/RES/1636 (31 October 2005).
- 162** Paragraph 2 (ii) of Annex of S/RES/1636 (31 October 2005).
- 163** Paragraph 3 of Annex of S/RES/1636 (31 October 2005).
- 164** As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 165** Committee Guidelines.
- 166** S/RES/1852 (16 December 2008).
- 167** S/RES/1757 (30 May 2007).
- 168** Paragraph 3 of S/RES/1748 (27 March 2007).
- 169** Paragraph 12 of S/RES/1718 (14 October 2006).
- 170** Paragraphs 8(a)(i), (b) and (c) of S/RES/1718 (14 October 2006). Paragraph 10 of S/RES/1874 (12 June 2009) also extends the arms embargo to include a ban on related financial transactions, technical training, advice, services or assistance related to the provision, manufacture, maintenance or use of such arms.
- 171** Paragraph 8 (e) of S/RES/1718 (14 October 2006).
- 172** Paragraph 8(d) of S/RES/1718 (14 October 2006). S/RES/2087 (22 January 2013) and paragraphs 11-13 of S/RES/2094 (7 March 2013).
- 173** Paragraphs 8(a)(ii), (b) and (c) of S/RES/1718 (14 October 2006)
- 174** Paragraphs 8 (a)(iii) of S/RES/1718 (14 October 2006).
- 175** Last updated 28 August 2013.

Annex: Security Council Sanctions Committees Tables (con't)

- 176 Paragraphs 8 (d) and (e) of S/RES/1718 (14 October 2006), S/RES/2087 (22 January 2013) paragraphs 11-13 of S/RES/2094 (7 March 2013).
- 177 Paragraph 10 of S/RES/1874 (12 June 2009).
- 178 Paragraph 10 of S/RES/1718 (14 October 2006).
- 179 Paragraph 9 of S/RES/1718 (14 October 2006).
- 180 Committee Guidelines.
- 181 As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 182 Committee Guidelines.
- 183 Paragraph 12 of S/RES/1718 (14 October 2006).
- 184 Paragraph 8(d) of S/RES/1718 (14 October 2006).
- 185 S/2012/982 (31 December 2012).
- 186 Paragraph 29 of S/RES/2094 (7 March 2013). For composition see S/2013/199 (28 March 2013) and S/2013/369 (21 June 2013).
- 187 Paragraph 29 of S/RES/2094 (7 March 2013).
- 188 Paragraph 29 of S/RES/2094 (7 March 2013) and S/2013/186 (21 March 2013).
- 189 S/2013/186 (21 March 2013).
- 190 Paragraph 18 of S/RES/1737 (23 December 2006) as amended by paragraph 14 of S/RES/1803 (3 March 2008) and paragraph 28 of S/RES/1929 (9 June 2010).
- 191 Paragraph 5 of S/RES/1747 (24 March 2007) and paragraph 8 of S/RES/1929 (9 June 2010).
- 192 Paragraph 5 of S/RES/1803 (3 March 2008) and paragraph 10 of S/RES/1929 (9 June 2010).
- 193 Paragraph 12 of S/RES/1737 (23 December 2006), paragraph 4 of S/RES/1747 (24 March 2007), paragraph 7 of S/RES/1803 (3 March 2008) and paragraphs 11, 12 and 19 of S/RES/1929 (9 June 2010).
- 194 Paragraphs 3-7 of S/RES/1737 (23 December 2006), paragraph 8 of S/RES/1803 (3 March 2008) and paragraphs 7, 9 and 13 of S/RES/1929 (9 June 2010).
- 195 Paragraph 18 of S/RES/1929 (9 June 2010).
- 196 Paragraph 7 of S/RES/1747 (24 March 2007), paragraphs 9 and 10 of S/RES/1803 (3 March 2008) and paragraphs 21, 23 and 24 of S/RES/1929 (9 June 2010).
- 197 Last updated on 20 December 2012.
- 198 Paragraph 12 of S/RES/1737 (23 December 2006) and paragraph 5 of S/RES/1803 (3 March 2008) and.
- 199 Paragraph 6 of S/RES/1803 (3 March 2008) and paragraph 10 of S/RES/1929 (9 June 2010).
- 200 Paragraphs 13-15 of S/RES/1737 (23 December 2006).
- 201 Paragraph 9 of S/RES/1737 (23 December 2006).
- 202 Committee Guidelines.
- 203 As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 204 Committee Guidelines.
- 205 Paragraph 18 of S/RES/1737 (23 December 2006).
- 206 S/2013/53 (25 January 2013).
- 207 Paragraph 29 of S/RES/1929 (9 June 2010). For composition see S/2013/375 (25 June 2013) and S/2013/615 (17 October 2013).
- 208 Paragraph 1 of S/RES/2105 (5 June 2013).
- 209 Paragraph 2 of S/RES/2105 (5 June 2013).
- 210 Paragraph 2 of S/RES/2105 (5 June 2013).
- 211 Paragraph 24 of S/RES/1970 (26 February 2011) and paragraph 26 of S/RES/1973 (17 March 2011).
- 212 Paragraphs 9-10 of S/RES/1970 (26 February 2011).
- 213 Paragraph 15 of S/RES/1970 (26 February 2011).
- 214 Paragraph 17 of S/RES/1970 (26 February 2011) and paragraphs 19 of S/RES/1973 (17 March 2011).
- 215 Last updated on 4 September 2013.
- 216 Paragraph 22 of S/RES/1970 (26 February 2011).
- 217 Paragraph 23 of S/RES/1973 (17 March 2011).
- 218 Paragraph 9 of S/RES/1970 (26 February 2011), paragraph 13 of S/RES/2009 (16 September 2011), paragraphs 9 and 10 of S/RES/2095 (14 March 2013),
- 219 Paragraph 16 of S/RES/1970 (26 February 2011).
- 220 Paragraph 19-21 of S/RES/1970 (26 February 2011), paragraphs 14-16 of S/RES/2009 (16 September 2011)
- 221 Committee Guidelines.
- 222 As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 223 Committee Guidelines.
- 224 Paragraph 24 of S/RES/1970 (26 February 2011).
- 225 S/2012/983 (31 December 2012).
- 226 Paragraph 24 of S/RES/1973 (17 March 2011), modified by paragraph 10 of S/RES/2040 (12 March 2012). For composition see S/2013/212 (3 April 2013), S/2013/256 (30 April 2013) and S/2013/602.
- 227 Paragraph 14 of S/RES/2095 (14 March 2013).
- 228 Paragraph 14 of S/RES/2095 (14 March 2013).
- 229 Paragraph 4 of S/RES/1970 (26 February 2011).
- 230 Termination of the case on 22 November 2011, following his death.
- 231 Arrest warrant issued on 27 June 2011.
- 232 Arrest warrant issued on 27 June 2011, for allegedly committing two counts of crimes against humanity. On 11 October 2013, the Pre-Trial Chamber decided that since Al-Senussi is currently subject to domestic proceedings conducted by the Libyan competent authorities and that Libya is willing and able genuinely to carry out such investigation, the case is inadmissible before the ICC, in accordance with the principle of complementarity enshrined in the Rome Statute, the founding treaty of the ICC.
- 233 Paragraph 30 of S/RES/1988 (17 June 2011).
- 234 Paragraph 1(c) of S/RES/1988 (17 June 2011).
- 235 Paragraph 1(b) of S/RES/1988 (17 June 2011).
- 236 Paragraph 1(a) of S/RES/1988 (17 June 2011).
- 237 Last updated 18 October 2013.
- 238 Paragraph 2 of S/RES/2082 (17 December 2012).
- 239 Paragraph 1(b) of S/RES/1988 (17 June 2011).
- 240 Paragraph 8 of S/RES/2082 (17 December 2012), paragraphs 1 and 2 of S/RES/1452 (20 December 2002) as amended by paragraph 15 of S/RES/1735 (22 December 2006).
- 241 Committee Guidelines and paragraph 20 of S/RES/2082 (17 December 2012).
- 242 As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 243 Committee Guidelines.
- 244 Paragraph 30 (f) of S/RES/1988 (17 June 2011).
- 245 S/2012/970 (31 December 2012).
- 246 Paragraph 31 and Annex I of S/RES/1988 (17 June 2011) and paragraph 35 and Annex of S/RES/2082 (17 December 2012). See also S/2013/676 (15 November 2013).
- 247 Paragraph 35 of S/RES/2082 (17 December 2012). See also S/2013/676 (15 November 2013).
- 248 Annex of S/RES/2082 (17 December 2012).
- 249 Annex of S/RES/2082 (17 December 2012).
- 250 Paragraph 9 of S/RES/2048 (18 May 2012).
- 251 Paragraph 4 of S/RES/2048 (18 May 2012).
- 252 Last updated on 19 March 2013.
- 253 Paragraph 6 of S/RES/2048 (18 May 2012).
- 254 Paragraph 5 of S/RES/2048 (18 May 2012).
- 255 Committee Guidelines.
- 256 As of 17 October 2013 update.
- 257 Committee Guidelines.
- 258 Paragraph 9 of S/RES/2048 (18 May 2012).
- 259 S/2012/975 (31 December 2012).

The material in this publication is subject to copyright ownership. Material in this publication may be freely used as in the public domain. You are free to copy, distribute, or make derivative works of the work under the following conditions: you must attribute the work to Security Council Report, Inc.; you may not use this work for commercial purposes; if you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under a license identical to this one.

Security Council Report Staff

Bruno Stagno
Executive Director

Joanna Weschler
Deputy Executive Director &
Director of Research

Amanda Roberts
Coordinating Editor &
Senior Research Analyst

Shamala Kandiah Thompson
What's in Blue Editor & Senior
Research Analyst

Astrid Forberg Ryan
Senior Research Analyst &
Development Officer

Victor Casanova Abos
Research Analyst

Charles Cater
Research Analyst

Paul Romita
Research Analyst

Eran Sthoeger
Research Analyst

Benjamin Villanti
Research Analyst

Robbin VanNewkirk
Publications Coordinator

Laura Coquard-Wallace
Research Associate

Dahlia Morched
Research Assistant

Vladimir Sesar
Research Associate

Maritza Tenerelli
Administrative Assistant

Lindiwe Knutson
Research Intern

Stevenson Swanson
Editorial Consultant

Security Council Report is a non-profit organisation supported by the Governments of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey, the Ford Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, International Development Research Centre and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.

Design Point Five, NY

Security Council Report
One Dag Hammarskjöld Plaza
885 2nd Ave at 48th St, 21st Floor
New York NY 10017

Telephone +1 212 759 6394

Fax +1 212 759 4038

Web securitycouncilreport.org
whatsinblue.org



Independent.
Impartial.
Informative.