

reaffirmed its intention to contribute, within its competence, to the attainment of the relevant objectives in the Declaration adopted at the twenty-sixth special session of the General Assembly in carrying out the Council's work, in particular in its follow-up to resolution 1308 (2000).

### **C. The maintenance of international peace and security: role of the Security Council in supporting security sector reform**

#### **Initial proceedings**

##### **Decision of 20 February 2007 (5632nd meeting): statement by the President**

At its 5632nd meeting, on 20 February 2007,<sup>34</sup> the Security Council included in its agenda a letter dated 8 February 2007 from the representative of Slovakia addressed to the Secretary-General, which contained a concept paper for the open debate on the role of the Council in supporting security sector reform.<sup>35</sup>

According to the paper, even though the United Nations system had been engaged in a wide range of security sector reform activities, it lacked a comprehensive, coherent and coordinated approach. The open debate was to provide the opportunity for the Council members and the wider membership of the United Nations to articulate their views and propose recommendations on the role of the Council in security sector reform. Defining the overarching objective as ensuring that the security institutions performed their statutory functions efficiently and effectively, the paper emphasized that security sector reform should guarantee national ownership; adopt a holistic approach that engaged non-military parts of the security sector and non-State actors; be context-specific and receive a long-term commitment that balanced institutional capacity, affordability and sustainability of programmes, sequencing, timing and flexibility. While the United Nations had a crucial role to play in security sector reform given its mandate, legitimacy, experience, and service on the ground, it required a common understanding and a

comprehensive policy framework. The immediate priorities for the United Nations were reaching consensus on a concept of security sector reform; determining an appropriate allocation of roles and responsibilities among the various United Nations entities; generating lessons learned, norms, standards, and best practices and establishing coordinating mechanisms within the United Nations system and with actors in partner countries.

Statements were made by all members of the Council<sup>36</sup> and the representatives of Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Canada, Cuba (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Egypt, Germany (on behalf of the European Union),<sup>37</sup> Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, the Republic of Korea, the Sudan, Switzerland and Uruguay.

The Council also heard briefings by the Secretary-General, the President of the General Assembly, the President of the Economic and Social Council, and the Chairman of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission.

The Secretary-General said that peacekeeping operations were making progress in ensuring that peace agreements and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration contributed to the restoration of sustainable security. The operations had developed mediation capacities to support peace negotiations and elaborated comprehensive, system-wide integrated standards and programmes for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. Emphasizing the importance of addressing the needs and perspectives of the State and the communities within it, the Secretary-General stated that United Nations efforts were focused on supporting national authorities in their efforts to establish sustainable security. Because of its universality and its legitimacy, the United Nations had a contribution to make, particularly coordinating many capacities within the system and engaging external

<sup>34</sup> For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. VI, part II, sect. B, case 11 (c), with regard to relations with the Economic and Social Council; chap. XII, part. I, sect. D, case 9, with regard to Article 2 (7) of the Charter; and chap. XII, part III, sect. A, with regard to Chapter VIII of the Charter.

<sup>35</sup> S/2007/72.

<sup>36</sup> China was represented by its Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs, Italy by its Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Qatar by its Assistant Foreign Minister for Follow-up and Head of the Working Group on United Nations Security Council Questions, and Belgium by the Special Envoy of its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

<sup>37</sup> Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Iceland, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

actors, such as Member States and regional organizations.<sup>38</sup>

The President of the General Assembly said that because the United Nations had a comparative multilateral advantage over other organizations, owing to its universal legitimacy, it was uniquely positioned to play a leading role in policy formation and capacity-building. She stressed that better coordination of the collective efforts at the international level and within the Organization was necessary. She underlined the need to adopt a common policy within the framework of the General Assembly to define such concepts and coordinate the efforts throughout the Organization and its departments and agencies in the field. She also noted the important coordinating and substantive role that the Peacebuilding Commission could play.<sup>39</sup>

The President of the Economic and Social Council asserted that the traditional division between security issues and development issues was both artificial and unsustainable, as recovery, reconstruction, and sustainable development were impossible without a secure environment.<sup>40</sup> The Chairman of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission noted that the Peacebuilding Commission had recognized that effective peacebuilding required meticulous reform of the security sector and had spared no effort to address the question in the countries on its agenda.<sup>41</sup>

Most speakers expressed support for the concept paper's emphasis on national ownership and an integrated, comprehensive, coordinated approach, acknowledging that a malfunctioning security sector posed a complex threat to lasting peace, development and human rights. A number of speakers also stressed the complementary roles of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Council.

The representative of South Africa pointed out that the fact that the Security Council included security sector reform elements when authorizing peacekeeping missions should not be misunderstood to imply that the Council had precedence over other United Nations organs. He added that the various contexts in which security sector reform was carried out would not

always be in line with the mandate of the Council.<sup>42</sup> The representative of the Sudan stated that, although all Member States should carry out an in-depth study on security sector reform, such a study should neither prejudice other organs of the United Nations with a stake in the matter nor fuel the impression that the Council was increasingly interfering in legislative matters that fell within the mandates of other United Nations bodies.<sup>43</sup>

The representative of Cuba asserted that the lack of clarity in how to assess the ineffectiveness of the security sector could lead to arbitrary implementation and infringement upon the concept of sovereignty. He added that it was not the prerogative of the international community to prescribe the road that countries emerging from conflict should follow. The Security Council, with its limited membership, was not the appropriate framework to plan or direct inter-agency coordination. The Peacebuilding Commission was a better agency for coordinating the works of the United Nations bodies, as the rehabilitation of the security sector was a matter of capacity-building, not reform. He warned that the Council should not repeat the past mistake of attempting to impose reforms on the judicial and security sectors without the prior consent of the concerned State.<sup>44</sup>

The representative of Egypt claimed that the debate on security sector reform was an attempt by the Council to strengthen its control of an issue that fell primarily within the prerogatives of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. He warned that controversial ideas linked to security sector reform, such as the "responsibility to protect" and "human security", sought to utilize humanitarian concepts to codify interference in the internal affairs of States. Echoed by the representative of Honduras, the representative of Egypt called for a comprehensive debate in the General Assembly to reach consensus on the objective of security sector reform and the scope of its application. The Security Council could then discuss its limited role in supporting the national will of States to reform their own security sectors, only in areas affecting the maintenance of international peace and security. He added that the adoption of a presidential statement by the Council before a debate

<sup>38</sup> S/PV.5632, pp. 3-4.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>43</sup> S/PV.5632 (Resumption 1), p. 25.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

by the general membership of the United Nations would not send a positive signal.<sup>45</sup>

The President (Slovakia) made a statement on behalf of the Council,<sup>46</sup> by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Underlined that it was the sovereign right and the primary responsibility of the country concerned to determine the national approach and priorities of security sector reform;

Recognized the need, when mandating a United Nations operation, to consider the national security sector reform priorities, while laying the foundation for peace consolidation, which could, *inter alia*, subsequently enable timely withdrawal of international peacekeepers;

Emphasized the important role that the Peacebuilding Commission could play in ensuring continuous international support to countries emerging from conflict;

Emphasized that security sector reform must be context-driven and that the needs would vary from situation to situation; encouraged States to formulate their security sector reform programmes in a holistic way that encompassed strategic planning, institutional structures, resource management, operational capacity, civilian oversight and good governance;

Acknowledged the need for a comprehensive report of the Secretary-General on United Nations approaches to security sector reform, to foster its implementation in post-conflict environments, and expressed its readiness to consider such a report within the scope of its prerogatives under the Charter.

## **D. Maintenance of international peace and security**

### **Initial proceedings**

#### **Decision of 25 June 2007 (5705th meeting): statement by the President**

At its 5705th meeting, on 25 June 2007,<sup>47</sup> the Security Council included in its agenda a letter dated 6 June 2007 from the representative of Belgium addressed to the Secretary-General on natural resources

and conflict, transmitting a concept paper for an open debate.<sup>48</sup>

It was recognized in the paper that the Council was already dealing with conflict situations linked to natural resources through its peacekeeping operations and sanctions. The representative of Belgium, in the paper, stated that the debate at the Council, *inter alia*, aimed to explore how the effectiveness of the Council's action in the area could be strengthened. The paper also provided information on the Kimberley Process, a joint effort by States, the private sector and civil society to put in place a global system of certificates of origin for rough diamonds. The questions to be considered included the role of the Council in encouraging existing initiatives and in early identification, given that improving the governance of natural resources in the absence of conflict was not the primary responsibility of the Council; lessons learned from peacekeeping operations and ways to give their mandates adequate capacity to deal with sanctions; and the transition from a sanctions-driven approach to a reconstruction-oriented one for the natural resources sector in post-conflict situations, during which the Council should hand over its responsibilities to other bodies.

Statements were made by all members of the Council<sup>49</sup> and the representatives of Argentina, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Canada (on behalf also of Australia and New Zealand), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Germany (on behalf of the European Union),<sup>50</sup> Iceland, India, Japan, Liechtenstein, Norway, Pakistan, Senegal, Switzerland and Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of African States).<sup>51</sup>

The Council was briefed by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Economic and Social Council.

The Under-Secretary-General drew attention to resolution 1625 (2005), in which the Council

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14 (Egypt); and p. 16 (Honduras).

<sup>46</sup> S/PRST/2007/3.

<sup>47</sup> For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. VI, part II, sect. B, case 11 (d), with regard to relations with the Economic and Social Council; chap. XI, part III, sect. B, with regard to Article 41 of the Charter; chap. XII, part I, sect. D, case 10, with regard to Article 2 (7) of the Charter; and chap. XII, part II, sect. A, case 17, with regard to Article 24 of the Charter.

<sup>48</sup> S/2007/334.

<sup>49</sup> Indonesia was represented by its Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs.

<sup>50</sup> Albania, Armenia, Croatia, Georgia, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine aligned themselves with the statement.

<sup>51</sup> The representative of Angola was invited to participate but did not make a statement.