

## Americas

### 9. Central America: efforts towards peace

#### Initial proceedings

By a letter dated 24 February 1989 addressed to the Secretary-General,<sup>1</sup> the representatives of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua transmitted the text of the Joint Declaration of the Central American Presidents<sup>2</sup> adopted by their respective Heads of State on 14 February 1989 at their summit meeting held at Costa del Sol, El Salvador. The five Presidents noted that they had reviewed the status of the Central American peace process and adopted decisions required to put it into effect, on the understanding that the commitments entered into under the Esquipulas II Agreement of 7 August 1987<sup>3</sup> and the Alajuela Declaration of 16 January 1988<sup>4</sup> constituted a single, indivisible whole. The President of Nicaragua had informed them that he was prepared to undertake a process of democratization and national reconciliation in his country, in the context of the Esquipulas II Agreement, to hold elections by 25 February 1990 and to invite international observers, including representatives of the Secretary-General, to verify the electoral process. The Central American Presidents undertook to draw up, within 90 days, a joint plan for the voluntary demobilization, repatriation or relocation in Nicaragua or third countries of members of the Nicaraguan resistance and their families. To that end, they would request technical advice from specialized agencies of the United Nations. They also entrusted an Executive Commission with the task of establishing, in accordance with talks with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, an international mechanism to verify their security commitments.

On 26 June 1989, the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on the

situation in Central America,<sup>5</sup> pursuant to Security Council resolutions 530 (1983) and 562 (1985). He recalled that the Central American Presidents had, in their Joint Declaration of 14 February 1989, made several specific commitments with a view to implementing the Esquipulas II Agreement and had entrusted the United Nations with three important tasks: assistance in the establishment of an international mechanism for on-site verification of the security commitments; provision of international observers to verify the genuineness of the electoral process in Nicaragua; and provision of technical advice from specialized agencies of the United Nations on the voluntary demobilization, repatriation or relocation of members of the Nicaraguan resistance.

With regard to the establishment of a possible security verification mechanism, the Secretary-General reported that the Secretariat had prepared, with the Governments of the five Central American countries, a working paper providing for the creation of a United Nations Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA), to be deployed in their countries. On the basis of that working paper, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua had addressed to him a letter dated 31 March 1989,<sup>6</sup> asking him to take the necessary steps to establish the Observer Group. However, the Secretary-General explained that he was not in a position to take those steps because of a reservation formulated by one of the signatories. With regard to the electoral process in Nicaragua, the Secretary-General reported that he had received a formal request from the Government of Nicaragua to proceed with setting up a group of electoral observers and that he was in contact with the Government concerning the performance of that task. Noting that the performance of the observation task belonged in the context of the Central American peace plan, he said he had reported on it to the President of the General

<sup>1</sup> S/20491.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, annex. Also known as the "Costa del Sol Declaration" or "Tesoro Beach Agreement".

<sup>3</sup> Document entitled "Procedure for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America", signed at Guatemala City on 7 August 1987 by the Presidents of the five Central American republics (S/19085, annex). Also known as the "Guatemala Agreement".

<sup>4</sup> The Joint Declaration issued by the Central American Presidents on 16 January 1988 at Alajuela, Costa Rica (S/19447, annex).

<sup>5</sup> S/20699, and Add.1 of 9 October 1989. The report was also submitted to the General Assembly pursuant to its resolution 43/24 of 15 November 1988.

<sup>6</sup> S/20642.

Assembly. He had also been in contact with the Secretary General of the Organization of American States (OAS) with a view to performing the observation jointly. As to the prospective joint plan for demobilization, repatriation or relocation of members of the Nicaraguan resistance, the Secretary-General reported that the Central American Presidents had not yet approved such a plan.

The Secretary-General expressed concern that, since the last summit meeting of the Central American Presidents, the political climate had deteriorated and, in some cases, there had been a resurgence of violence. He emphasized his view that the means to address the problems afflicting the Central American countries and their people existed in the instruments that had been signed by their leaders. More specifically, it was essential, if the peace process were to be set on the right track again, to put into practice without delay the decisions referred to in his report which envisaged a role for the United Nations.

**Decision of 27 July 1989 (2871st meeting):  
resolution 637 (1989)**

At its 2871st meeting, held on 27 July 1989 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Central America: efforts towards peace".

Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Yugoslavia) drew the attention of the members of the Council to the report of the Secretary-General and to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.<sup>7</sup> He explained that the primary objective of the draft resolution was to extend the Council's full support to the five Central American countries and their Presidents to continue their efforts towards achieving a firm and lasting peace in the region. He noted that the draft resolution also lent the Council's full support to the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices in the region in consultation with it. The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 637 (1989), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolutions 530 (1983) of 19 May 1983 and 562 (1985) of 10 May 1985 and General Assembly resolutions

38/10 of 11 November 1983, 39/4 of 26 October 1984, 41/37 of 18 November 1986, 42/1 of 7 October 1987 and 43/24 of 15 November 1988, as well as the initiative that the Secretary-General of the United Nations undertook on 18 November 1986 together with the Secretary General of the Organization of American States,

*Convinced* that the peoples of Central America wish to achieve a peaceful settlement to their conflicts without outside interference, including support for irregular forces, with respect for the principles of self-determination and non-intervention while ensuring full respect for human rights,

*Taking note* of the report of the Secretary-General of 26 June 1989 submitted in pursuance of Security Council resolutions 530 (1983) and 562 (1985),

*Recognizing* the important contribution of the Contadora Group and its Support Group in favour of peace in Central America,

*Welcoming* the agreement on "Procedures for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America" signed at Guatemala City on 7 August 1987 by the Presidents of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua as the manifestation of the will of the peoples of Central America to achieve peace, democratization, reconciliation, development and justice, in accordance with their decision to meet the historical challenge of forging a peaceful destiny for the region,

*Welcoming also* the subsequent Joint Declarations issued by the Central American Presidents on 16 January 1988 at Alajuela, Costa Rica and on 14 February 1989 at Costa del Sol, El Salvador,

*Aware* of the importance which the Central American Presidents attach to the role of international verification as an essential component for the implementation of the above-mentioned instruments, including, in particular, their commitments relating to regional security, especially non-use of territory to support destabilization of neighbouring countries and democratization, especially free and fair elections, as well as to the voluntary demobilization, repatriation or relocation of irregular forces, as agreed in the Costa del Sol accord of 14 February 1989,

*Aware also* that the commitments enshrined in the Guatemala agreement form a harmonious and indivisible whole,

*Noting with appreciation* the efforts undertaken to date by the Secretary-General in support of the Central American peace process, including his assistance in the establishment of appropriate mechanisms to verify compliance with the provisions of the Guatemala agreement and of the Joint Declaration adopted by the Central American Presidents at their meeting held in El Salvador on 14 February 1989, and particularly the Secretary-General's agreement with Nicaragua to deploy a United Nations observer mission to verify the electoral process,

---

<sup>7</sup> S/20752.

1. *Commends* the desire for peace expressed by the Central American Presidents in signing on 7 August 1987 at Guatemala City the agreement on “Procedures for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America” and in the Joint Declarations subsequently signed in pursuance of it;

2. *Expresses its firmest support* for the Guatemala agreement and the Joint Declarations;

3. *Calls upon* the Presidents to continue their efforts to achieve a firm and lasting peace in Central America through the faithful implementation of the commitments entered into in the Guatemala agreement and in the expressions of good will contained in the Joint Declaration of 14 February 1989;

4. *Appeals* to all States, in particular to those which have links with the region and interests in it, to back the political will of the Central American countries to comply with the provisions of the Guatemala agreement and of the Joint Declaration, particularly that regional and extra-regional Governments which either openly or covertly supply aid to irregular forces or insurrectional movements in the area immediately halt such aid, with the exception of the humanitarian aid that contributes to the goals of the Costa del Sol accord;

5. *Lends* its full support to the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, in consultation with the Security Council, in support of the Central American Governments in their effort to achieve the goals set forth in the Guatemala agreement;

6. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council regularly on the implementation of the present resolution.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of the United States stated that the resolution reflected and supported three important elements in the Central American peace process: the centrality of the fulfilment of the principles and provisions of the Esquipulas II and Tesoro Beach<sup>8</sup> agreements to the achievement of peace and democracy in the region; the crucial need for a free and fair election and electoral process in Nicaragua to unlock regional movement towards peace, democracy and development; and the fact that States which continued to supply lethal assistance to insurgent forces in the region — namely, Nicaraguan and Cuban support to the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional (FMLN) — must cease that supply and publicly renounce such practices.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> See note 2.

<sup>9</sup> S/PV.2871, pp. 3-5.

### **Decision of 20 September 1989: letter from the President of the Security Council to the Secretary-General**

By a letter dated 28 August 1989 addressed to the President of the Security Council,<sup>10</sup> the Secretary-General recalled that the Council had examined the agreement reached on 7 August 1989 by the five Central American Presidents at their meeting at Tela, Honduras,<sup>11</sup> regarding a Joint Plan for the voluntary demobilization, repatriation or relocation in Nicaragua or third countries of the members of the Nicaraguan resistance and their families. He had since received a request dated 14 August 1989 from the representatives of the five Central American countries,<sup>12</sup> for the establishment, with the Secretary-General of OAS, of an International Support and Verification Commission to execute and implement the Joint Plan. The Secretary-General stated that he and the Secretary General of OAS had agreed to establish the International Commission, with effect from 6 September, and had defined its terms of reference. He observed that the tasks entrusted to the Commission comprised components of interest to various programmes of the United Nations and other agencies of the system. However, the question of demobilization concerned the Security Council in particular, since it was an operation of a clearly military nature. The Commission was asked to collect the weapons, materiel and military equipment of members of the Nicaraguan resistance and to keep them in its custody until the five Presidents decided where they should be sent. In the Secretary-General’s opinion, that was not a task which could be taken on by civilian personnel of the United Nations, but one which should be entrusted to military units equipped with defensive weapons. The launching of such an operation was clearly within the competence of the Security Council.

Stressing the voluntary aspect of the demobilization, the Secretary-General stated that, prior to undertaking that task, every necessary precaution would have to be taken to obtain the assurance that the Nicaraguan resistance was indeed determined to agree to being demobilized. To that end, he had agreed with the Secretary General of OAS to contact the resistance as soon as possible to explain how the Secretaries-General interpreted the Plan and the role of the

---

<sup>10</sup> S/20856.

<sup>11</sup> The Tela Declaration (S/20778).

<sup>12</sup> S/20791.

International Commission, and to hear what the position of the resistance was on the issue. In light of those considerations, the Secretary-General considered it premature to ask the Security Council to take steps to establish the military component of the International Commission, particularly since an assessment of its needs could only be made after a technical reconnaissance in the resistance camps and he was not yet assured of having access to them. He proposed, therefore, to revert to the Council later, once those conditions had been met.

By a letter dated 20 September 1989 addressed to the Secretary-General,<sup>13</sup> the President of the Council informed him that the members of the Council had noted with approval the steps he had taken to set up the International Commission and put it into operation and welcomed his intention to ask the Council to adopt in due course the measures needed to establish its military component. They had also reiterated their support for the Central American peace process as envisaged in the various instruments signed by the five Central American Presidents and, recalling resolution 637 (1989), had welcomed the Secretary-General's intention to consult the Council and keep it fully and regularly informed of action taken in support of that process.

**Decisions of 7 November 1989 (2890th meeting):  
resolution 644 (1989) and statement by the  
President**

On 11 October 1989, in accordance with resolution 637 (1989), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report concerning the request of the five Central American Governments for the establishment of ONUCA to verify their security commitments.<sup>14</sup> The report reflected the operational concept of ONUCA set out in the working paper that had been agreed earlier with those Governments and took into account the findings and recommendations of a reconnaissance mission which had visited the region in September 1989. As requested by the Central American Governments, the mandate of ONUCA would be to conduct on-site verification of (a) the cessation of aid to irregular forces and insurrectionist movements; and (b) the non-use of the territory of one State for attacks on other States. It was proposed that

the monitoring and investigative functions of ONUCA would be performed by mobile teams of unarmed military observers. The Observer Group would be under the command of the United Nations, vested in the Secretary-General, under the authority of the Council. It was also envisaged that, in addition to its functions as observer and monitor, ONUCA would by its very presence perform a preventive function — and, as appropriate, a deterrent function — with regard to possible non-fulfilment of the parties' commitments. Its commander would have the authority, on his own initiative or at the request of a party, to suggest follow-up action to the Secretary-General, who in turn might recommend it to the Council so as to assist the parties in properly fulfilling their commitments. On the basis of the report of the reconnaissance mission, the Secretary-General recommended that the Council should accept the request of the five Central American Presidents and decide to establish forthwith an observer group on the above lines, to be deployed in four phases. He further recommended that, in accordance with the Council's recent practice, ONUCA should be established for an initial period of six months.

At its 2890th meeting, held on 7 November 1989 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (China) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.<sup>15</sup> The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 644 (1989), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling its resolution 637 (1989) of 27 July 1989,*

1. *Approves* the report of the Secretary-General of 11 October 1989;

2. *Decides* to set up immediately, under its authority, a United Nations Observer Group in Central America and requests the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps to this effect, in accordance with his above-mentioned report, bearing in mind the need to continue to monitor expenditures carefully during this period of increasing demands on peacekeeping resources;

3. *Also decides* that the United Nations Observer Group in Central America shall be established for a period of six months, unless the Security Council decides otherwise;

---

<sup>13</sup> S/20857.

<sup>14</sup> S/20895.

---

<sup>15</sup> S/20951.

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council fully informed of further developments.

At the same meeting, the President stated that, following consultations among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:<sup>16</sup>

The members of the Security Council reaffirm their full support for the Secretary-General's efforts to assist the Central American Governments in their efforts to achieve the goals set forth in the Guatemala agreement of 7 August 1987 and in the Joint Declarations subsequently signed in pursuance of it. In any consideration of the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America, they will wish to assure themselves that the presence of the Observer Group is continuing to contribute actively to the achievement of a firm and lasting peace in Central America.

Following the statement by the President, the Secretary-General addressed the Council. He expressed his conviction that, by approving the establishment of ONUCA, the Council had taken an important step towards the impartial verification of compliance with the parties' undertakings in the security area. The Observer Group could also play a significant political role, since its establishment in itself constituted a confidence-building measure which could contribute to restoring and strengthening stability in the region. The Secretary-General hoped, moreover, that the Council's decision would help in recovering the momentum of the peace process. He observed, further, that ONUCA was a complex and innovative operation being set in motion in a volatile region, a circumstance which justified his proposal that its deployment be carried out incrementally. Although it was proposed to remain within the terms of his report, he noted that, as the operation proceeded, the personnel and material resource needs originally foreseen might require adjustment or reconfiguration in order to carry out effectively the mandate of ONUCA. He therefore intended to monitor carefully each stage of the implementation of ONUCA in cooperation with the Council.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> S/20952.

<sup>17</sup> S/PV.2890, pp. 6-7. For details on the composition and operation of ONUCA, see chapter V.

**Decision of 27 March 1990 (2913th meeting):  
resolution 650 (1990)**

On 15 March 1990, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on ONUCA.<sup>18</sup> He sought the Council's urgent approval, on a contingency basis, of an enlargement of the mandate of ONUCA and the addition of armed personnel to enable it to play a part in the voluntary demobilization of the members of the Nicaraguan resistance. He recalled, *inter alia*, that in the Declaration signed at San Isidro de Coronado, Costa Rica, on 12 December 1989,<sup>19</sup> the five Central American Presidents had requested that the ONUCA mandate be expanded to include verification of any cessation of hostilities and demobilization of irregular forces that might be agreed upon in the region. He reported that, following the elections in Nicaragua on 25 February 1990, he had been asked by the Government of Nicaragua and the Nicaraguan Opposition National Union to consult with them about how ONUCA could assist with regard to the transition process in that country. Agreement in principle had been reached on the modalities, subject to the approval of the Council. It was envisaged that ONUCA would be responsible for implementing the military aspects of the Joint Plan agreed at Tela, Honduras, on 7 August 1989<sup>20</sup> (i.e., for taking delivery of the weapons, materiel and military equipment of the Nicaraguan resistance), while the International Support and Verification Commission, set up pursuant to the Tela Accord, would be responsible for implementing the civilian aspects (i.e., for the repatriation, or relocation elsewhere, of the members of the Nicaraguan resistance and for their resettlement). The Secretary-General noted that the role thus envisaged for ONUCA went beyond its existing mandate, which was to verify, on the ground, compliance by the five Central American Governments with their security commitments, and that it would require the addition of armed personnel, as all existing ONUCA personnel were unarmed. He believed, moreover, that, as considerable additional responsibilities would fall on ONUCA in connection with this expanded role, the final phase of its deployment should begin as soon as possible. In recommending such an expanded role for the mission, the Secretary-General underlined that the voluntary demobilization of the Nicaraguan resistance

---

<sup>18</sup> S/21194.

<sup>19</sup> S/21019, annex.

<sup>20</sup> S/20778, annex I.

was an essential element in the Central American peace process to which both the existing Government and the Government-elect in Nicaragua attached importance as part of the process of transferring power following the elections in that country. However, he stressed that the additional armed personnel would not be deployed until the necessary political conditions were fulfilled, namely, an agreement by all concerned for the voluntary demobilization of the members of the Nicaraguan resistance.

At its 2913th meeting, held on 27 March 1990 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (Democratic Yemen) drew the attention of the Council members to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.<sup>21</sup> The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 650 (1990), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolutions 637 (1989) of 27 July 1989 and 644 (1989) of 7 November 1989,

*Reiterating* its support for the Central American peace process and commending the efforts made by the Central American Presidents, represented by the agreements they have concluded,

*Urging* all parties to comply with their undertakings under those agreements, including in particular the commitments relating to regional security, and reiterating its full support of the Secretary-General's mission of good offices in the region,

*Noting with appreciation* the efforts undertaken to date by the Secretary-General in support of the Central American peace process, including his continuing efforts to promote voluntary demobilization, resettlement and repatriation as reflected in his report of 15 March 1990,

1. *Approves* the report of the Secretary-General;

2. *Decides* to authorize, on a contingency basis in accordance with that report, an enlargement of the mandate of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America and the addition of armed personnel to its strength, in order to enable it to play a part in the voluntary demobilization of the members of the Nicaraguan resistance;

3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council fully informed of further developments regarding the implementation of the present resolution.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of the United States observed that, together with OAS and

---

<sup>21</sup> S/21207.

other observers, the United Nations had played a key role in the free and fair elections that had taken place in Nicaragua in February. He hoped it could play a further essential role in the democratization of that troubled region. His Government's position on the question of the *contras* was clear: it wanted and encouraged them to demobilize freely and return to their land to contribute to its development. He welcomed the framework of the expanded ONUCA mandate as providing a useful starting-point for achieving agreement by all the involved parties on a settlement leading to the voluntary demobilization and repatriation of the Nicaraguan resistance. He stressed that the first priority had to be the achievement of a formal agreement on and adherence to a ceasefire, and a clear-cut separation of forces within the country. Noting that the conditions for, and the mechanisms to verify, a comprehensive settlement were not yet in place, he added that his Government believed that, in addition to ONUCA, it was essential that the International Support and Verification Commission be made fully operational. He added that his Government also supported the Secretary-General's intention to deploy the final phase of ONUCA immediately.<sup>22</sup>

The representative of Cuba stated that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution on the understanding that it authorized the Secretary-General to expand the mandate of ONUCA and strengthen it with armed personnel "for the specific purpose of playing a role in the demobilization of the members of what is termed the Nicaraguan resistance". Alluding to concerns that had been expressed with regard to the financial implications of the United Nations operation, he observed that "it would be ironic if, at the end of this episode, it were to fall to the international community and to all Members of the Organization to pay for the mechanisms to monitor the end of an operation that should never have taken place, particularly since the so-called Nicaraguan resistance [had] benefited from well-known external financing".<sup>23</sup>

**Decision of 20 April 1990 (2919th meeting):  
resolution 653 (1990)**

By a letter dated 19 April 1990 addressed to the President of the Security Council,<sup>24</sup> the Secretary-General referred to his statement at the Council's

---

<sup>22</sup> S/PV.2913, pp. 3-5.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

<sup>24</sup> S/21257.

informal consultations earlier that day,<sup>25</sup> in which he had informed the members of the Council that a series of agreements had been signed that day in Managua by the Government of Nicaragua, representatives of the President-Elect, representatives of the Nicaraguan resistance and the Archbishop of Managua, relating to the voluntary demobilization of members of the Nicaraguan resistance. The agreements provided for the establishment of a ceasefire, security zones and a timetable for voluntary demobilization from 25 April to 10 June 1990. As a consequence of those agreements, the parties had requested that ONUCA should monitor both the ceasefire, which had come into effect on 19 April, and the separation of forces which would result from the withdrawal of the Nicaraguan Government's forces from the security zones, to which the members of the Nicaraguan resistance would move. The Secretary-General believed that the agreements just signed constituted an important step forward in the Central American peace process, and therefore recommended that the Council approve the necessary enlargement of the ONUCA mandate to include the new tasks.

At its 2919th meeting, held on 20 April 1990 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Central America: efforts towards peace". Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Ethiopia) drew the attention of the members of the Council to the letter from the Secretary-General and to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of its consultations.<sup>26</sup> The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 653 (1990), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Having examined* the letter addressed to the President of the Council by the Secretary-General on 19 April 1990 concerning the United Nations Observer Group in Central America, as well as his statement of the same date to the members of the Security Council in which he briefed them on the agreements signed at Managua that day, which envisage the complete demobilization of the Nicaraguan resistance by the Observer Group during the period from 25 April to 10 June 1990,

*Reaffirming* its resolutions 644 (1989) of 7 November 1989 and 650 (1990) of 27 March 1990,

1. *Approves* the proposals concerning the addition of new tasks to the mandate of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America contained in the letter of the Secretary-General of 19 April 1990 and in his statement;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on all aspects of the operations of the Observer Group before the expiry of the current mandate period on 7 May 1990.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of Cuba said that his delegation supported the draft resolution above all because the adoption of a formal procedure by which the Council acceded to the Secretary-General's request through a resolution was the least the Council should do in dealing with a request implying a substantial alteration to the expanded mandate given by the Council to ONUCA. However, his delegation had grave reservations about some aspects of the request made to the Council — both as regards substance and procedure. The request before the Council was the result of a series of agreements which the Council did not yet have before it. He said that he had seen the agreements, and expressed concern about several elements of the agreement establishing the ceasefire, which conferred a task on ONUCA which Cuba did not regard as clearly defined and which implied, *inter alia*, that the Nicaraguan resistance would continue to have an organized military structure and would receive humanitarian assistance. He stated that it would be immoral — and unprecedented — if the United Nations were to provide such assistance to uniformed units, militarily organized and with their leadership intact. He also pointed out an apparent discrepancy between another of the agreements and the resolution just adopted concerning the role of ONUCA. Whereas the agreement suggested that the demobilization would be carried out in the presence of ONUCA, the resolution clearly provided for the demobilization of the Nicaraguan resistance by ONUCA. In conclusion, he stressed that the United States, as the Government responsible for the perpetuation and insolubility of the situation in Nicaragua, should cover the costs involved in ending it, not the international community.<sup>27</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union stated that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution expanding the mandate of ONUCA on the basis of the explanations of the tasks, composition and timetable for the disarmament of the *contras* and the

---

<sup>25</sup> S/21259.

<sup>26</sup> S/21258.

<sup>27</sup> S/PV.2919, pp. 6-15.

financing of the operation, as laid down in the Secretary-General's statement during the Council's consultations. While welcoming the 19 April agreements which would eventually lead to the full demobilization of the Nicaraguan resistance, he expressed concern about the sincerity of the *contra* leaders with regard to those agreements. The Council could not permit a situation in which the security zones that had been created were transformed into a springboard for the armed opposition in Nicaraguan territory, a kind of State within a State. The existence of those zones, as his Government saw it, would be legitimate only within the context of the implementation of the main task of ensuring the disarming of the *contras* within the prescribed timetable. Non-compliance could not only dash hopes of national reconciliation in Nicaragua but also undermine the authority of the United Nations in the region.<sup>28</sup>

The representative of the United States took exception to the assertion of the representative of Cuba that somehow the United States was responsible for all the ills that had befallen Nicaragua. He expressed full support for the agreement by which the parties in Nicaragua expected to achieve peace; that was not something imposed on them by outsiders but something that they had arrived at themselves. He also supported the efforts of the Secretary-General and the United Nations to contribute to that process.<sup>29</sup>

**Decision of 4 May 1990 (2921st meeting):  
resolution 654 (1990)**

On 27 April 1990, pursuant to resolution 653 (1990), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report containing an account of the operations of ONUCA during its first six months.<sup>30</sup> He recalled that the original mandate of the Observer Group was to verify compliance by the five Central American Governments with the security undertakings each of them had given to the others in the Esquipulas II Agreement: namely, to cease aid to irregular forces and insurrectionist movements operating in the region; and to prevent the use of its territory for attacks on other States. To that end, mobile teams of military observers had been deployed in phases. While specific breaches of the security undertakings had not been

directly observed by ONUCA patrols, cross-border movements had undoubtedly taken place during the period under review, especially a major movement of members of the Nicaraguan resistance from Honduras into Nicaragua. ONUCA had received and investigated complaints about alleged violations of the security undertakings. Although the five Governments concerned had fully cooperated with ONUCA, the hostilities in El Salvador had limited its ability to patrol in that country and no verification centre had so far been set up outside the capital. The Secretary-General also recalled that, following the elections in Nicaragua in February, there had been two enlargements of the ONUCA mandate, at the request of the Nicaraguan parties: to monitor the ceasefire and separation of forces in Nicaragua; and to demobilize members of the Nicaraguan resistance. The Secretary-General welcomed this evolution in the role of ONUCA; he had hoped that its very presence in the area would encourage the five Central American Governments to ask the Council to give ONUCA additional functions as the peace process developed. He hoped to approach the Council before long regarding the monitoring of a cessation of the armed confrontation in El Salvador.

The Secretary-General acknowledged, but did not share, the view that recent and prospective developments in Central America, notably the elections in Nicaragua, the imminent demobilization of the members of the Nicaraguan resistance and the early start of talks under his auspices between the Government of El Salvador and FMLN, had rendered obsolete the original ONUCA mandate to verify the five Governments' compliance with their security commitments. He believed that those developments needed to be followed up and consolidated and that more time was needed to assess the consequences of what had happened and was happening in the region. He therefore considered it prudent to leave the mandate and military observer strength of ONUCA unchanged for the time being, adding that the five Central American Governments had also expressed the wish that the Council should extend the ONUCA mandate in its present form. The Secretary-General accordingly recommended that the Council extend the mandate of ONUCA, as defined in its previous resolutions, for a further period of six months. His recommendation was made on the understanding that, in accordance with the agreements signed by the Nicaraguan parties concerned, the ONUCA tasks of monitoring the

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., pp. 16-18.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., pp. 19-21.

<sup>30</sup> S/21274.



ceasefire and separation of forces in Nicaragua and demobilizing members of the Nicaraguan resistance would lapse with the completion of the demobilization process, not later than 10 June 1990.

On 2 May 1990, in an addendum to his report of 27 April,<sup>31</sup> the Secretary-General observed, as a matter of grave concern, that the demobilization of the Nicaraguan resistance had not begun on 25 April, as stipulated in the Managua agreements of 18 and 19 April. He added that it had always been intended that the role of ONUCA in this process should be to help ensure the speedy return of the members of the Nicaraguan resistance to civilian life and not to assist them in establishing armed camps for an indefinite period of time on Nicaraguan territory. It was on that basis and on the strength of the agreements signed at Managua that he had recommended to the Council that ONUCA should play the part requested of it in monitoring the ceasefire and separation of forces. He believed that serious efforts should now be made by all concerned to get the demobilization process back on track.

At its 2921st meeting, held on 4 May 1990 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General of 27 April and 2 May. The President (Finland) drew the attention of the Council members to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.<sup>32</sup> The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 654 (1990), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolutions 637 (1989) of 27 July 1989, 644 (1989) of 7 November 1989, 650 (1990) of 27 March 1990 and 653 (1990) of 20 April 1990, as well as the statement made by the President of the Security Council on its behalf on 7 November 1989,

*Recalling* the initial agreement reached at Geneva on 4 April 1990 by the parties to the conflict in El Salvador, under the auspices of the Secretary-General,

1. *Approves* the report of the Secretary-General of 27 April and 2 May 1990;

2. *Decides* to extend, under its authority, the mandate of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America as defined in resolutions 644 (1989), 650 (1990) and 653 (1990), for a further period of six months, that is, until 7 November

1990, on the understanding, as expressed by the Secretary-General in his report, that the tasks of the Observer Group of monitoring the ceasefire and separation of forces in Nicaragua and demobilizing members of the Nicaraguan resistance will lapse with the completion of the demobilization process, not later than 10 June 1990, and bearing in mind the need to continue to monitor expenditures carefully during this period of increasing demands on peacekeeping resources;

3. *Welcomes* the efforts of the Secretary-General to promote the achievement of a negotiated political solution to the conflict in El Salvador;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council fully informed of further developments and to report on all aspects of the operations of the Observer Group before the expiry of the current mandate period and in particular to report to the Council not later than 10 June concerning the completion of the demobilization process.

**Decision of 23 May 1990 (2922nd meeting):  
statement by the President**

At its 2922nd meeting, held on 23 May 1990 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council considered the item entitled "Central America: efforts towards peace". After the adoption of the agenda, the President stated that, following consultations among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement on their behalf:<sup>33</sup>

The members of the Council recall that the Council, in conformity with its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, has supported the Central American peace process from the outset. This has resulted in its decision to set up a United Nations Observer Group for Central America, whose mandate it subsequently enlarged and reaffirmed on two occasions.

The members of the Council also recall the decision taken by the Council in its resolution 654 (1990) of 4 May 1990 to extend the mandate of the Observer Group until 7 November 1990 on the understanding that its tasks of monitoring the ceasefire and separation of forces in Nicaragua and demobilizing members of the resistance would lapse with the completion of the demobilization process, not later than 10 June 1990.

The members of the Council, taking note of the report of the Secretary-General and fully supporting his efforts, express their concern at the slow pace of the demobilization process during its first two weeks. It is clear that the process must be accelerated if the deadline of 10 June set for its completion is to be met.

In the light of the foregoing, the members of the Council call on the resistance to meet fully and urgently the

---

<sup>31</sup> S/21274/Add.1.

<sup>32</sup> S/21286.

---

<sup>33</sup> S/21331.

commitments it made in agreeing to demobilize. They also support the Government of Nicaragua in its efforts to facilitate, by taking the necessary steps, timely demobilization and urge it to continue such efforts. They also call on all others with influence in this matter to take actions to ensure that demobilization now proceeds in accordance with the agreements entered into by the Nicaraguan parties, and in particular to ensure that the 10 June deadline is respected.

The members of the Council request the Secretary-General, through a senior representative, to continue to observe the situation on the ground first-hand and to report to the Council by 4 June.

The members of the Council request the Secretary-General to convey the Council's position to the five Central American Presidents.

The members of the Council also request the Secretary-General to convey the Council's concerns about the situation described above to the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States, who shares responsibilities with the Secretary-General of the United Nations as regards the operations of the International Support and Verification Commission.

**Decision of 8 June 1990 (2927th meeting):  
resolution 656 (1990)**

On 4 June 1990, pursuant to the presidential statement made on 23 May, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on the progress of the demobilization process in Nicaragua.<sup>34</sup> He observed that the rate of demobilization had increased following the signing on 30 May of an agreement entitled the "Managua Protocol"<sup>35</sup> between the Nicaraguan Government, the leaders of the Nicaraguan resistance and the Archbishop of Managua. However, the leaders of the resistance had still not achieved the minimum target to which they had committed themselves in that document. He warned that, unless there was a substantial increase in the pace of demobilization, the whole process would not be completed by the agreed target date of 10 June. The Secretary-General also reported that that his Alternate Personal Representative had met with the Secretary General of OAS and conveyed to him the Council's concerns, in accordance with the request contained in the presidential statement of 23 May. It was agreed that closely coordinated steps would need to be taken by the United Nations and OAS in the event that the various agreements relating to the demobilization process were not implemented. The

Secretary-General further stated that, if by 10 June demobilization had not been very largely completed, the Council would need to consider the decisions it should take to deal with the matter.

On 8 June 1990, pursuant to resolution 654 (1990), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on ONUCA in which he provided an update on the status of the demobilization process.<sup>36</sup> He considered it doubtful that the process could be completed by 10 June. However, he reported that rapid progress had been made during the week just ended by the largest group of the Nicaraguan resistance, whose leaders had stated publicly and to the Government that they would honour their commitments. In those circumstances, the Nicaraguan Government had indicated its wish that that part of the mandate of ONUCA which was related to monitoring the ceasefire and separation of forces and demobilizing the members of the Nicaraguan resistance should not be allowed to lapse on 10 June but should be extended for a sufficient period to permit demobilization to be completed. The Secretary-General added that he thought it would be a mistake for ONUCA, which had played such a central role in making demobilization possible, to be withdrawn when the work was now, on the whole, proceeding rapidly and its completion was within reach. He accordingly recommended that the Council should authorize an extension of the relevant part of the ONUCA mandate for a period of up to 19 days, until 29 June 1990.

At its 2927th meeting, held on 8 June 1990 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included in its agenda the Secretary-General's reports of 4 and 8 June. The President (France) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.<sup>37</sup> He also drew their attention to a letter dated 7 June 1990 from the representatives of Spain and Venezuela, addressed to the Secretary-General.<sup>38</sup> As prominent contributors to ONUCA, they expressed their support for an extension of its mandate, as it related to demobilization, for a short and clearly defined period.

---

<sup>34</sup> S/21341.

<sup>35</sup> The text of the Managua Protocol on disarmament is attached to the Secretary-General's report.

---

<sup>36</sup> S/21349.

<sup>37</sup> S/21350.

<sup>38</sup> S/21347.

The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 656 (1990), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolution 654 (1990) of 4 May 1990 and the statement made by the President of the Council on its behalf on 23 May, concerning the United Nations Observer Group in Central America,

*Expressing* its concern that the process of demobilization has not yet been fully completed, although progress is now being made after the removal of obstacles that prevented the conclusion of the demobilization process on 10 June 1990, as stipulated in resolution 654 (1990),

*Having studied* the report submitted by the Secretary-General on 4 June 1990 as well as his statement of 8 June to the members of the Council,

1. *Decides* that the tasks of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America of monitoring the ceasefire and separation of forces in Nicaragua and demobilizing members of the Nicaraguan resistance shall be extended, on the understanding, as recommended by the Secretary-General, that those tasks will lapse with the completion of the demobilization process, not later than 29 June 1990;

2. *Urges* all those directly involved in the demobilization process to take all necessary measures to maintain and, if possible, increase the rate of demobilization so as to complete it, at the latest, on the date specified in paragraph 1 above;

3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council fully informed of further developments and in particular to report to it not later than 29 June 1990 concerning the completion of the demobilization process.

On 29 June 1990, pursuant to resolution 656 (1990), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a further report on ONUCA,<sup>39</sup> informing it that the demobilization of the Nicaraguan resistance had essentially been completed the previous day. He stated that, by twice enlarging the mandate of ONUCA and later extending the deadline for the completion of demobilization, the Council had enabled ONUCA to play a role in helping end the conflict in Nicaragua.

**Decision of 6 September 1990: letter from the President of the Security Council to the Secretary-General**

By a letter dated 29 August 1990 addressed to the President of the Security Council,<sup>40</sup> the Secretary-

---

<sup>39</sup> S/21379.

<sup>40</sup> S/21718.

General referred to the negotiations which were under way, under his auspices, between the Government of El Salvador and FMLN. He stated that, as he had informed the Council in his statement in informal consultations of 3 August 1990,<sup>41</sup> it was envisaged that the United Nations would in due course be formally requested to carry out a number of tasks relating to the verification of a ceasefire, the monitoring of the forthcoming electoral process and the verification of respect for human rights. The parties and a wide range of representatives of Salvadorian society shared the wish that preparations for carrying out the envisaged requests should be initiated at the earliest possible date. Despite the absence of a formal and verifiable ceasefire, the Secretary-General believed that the time had come to take steps which would permit the United Nations to assess the local situation and begin preparations, including the possible establishment of a small preparatory office in El Salvador, in order to enable a United Nations verification mission to undertake the monitoring tasks as soon as circumstances permitted. He therefore sought the concurrence of the Council with his making the necessary preparatory arrangements as soon as practicable. Verification per se would await further consultation with the members of the Council.

By a letter dated 6 September 1990 addressed to the Secretary-General,<sup>42</sup> the President of the Council informed him that his letter of 29 August concerning preparatory arrangements for a United Nations verification mission in El Salvador had been brought to the attention of the members of the Council and that they concurred with his proposal.

**Decision of 5 November 1990 (2952nd meeting): resolution 675 (1990)**

On 26 October 1990, pursuant to resolution 654 (1990), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report containing an account of ONUCA operations during the period from 7 May to 26 October 1990 and his recommendations on its future.<sup>43</sup> He reported that, with the successful demobilization of the members of the Nicaraguan resistance, the Observer Group had now reverted to its original mandate: namely, verification of compliance by the five Central American Governments with their security

---

<sup>41</sup> S/22031, annex.

<sup>42</sup> S/21718.

<sup>43</sup> S/21909.

undertakings under the Esquipulas II Agreement. With its role limited to verification, ONUCA did not have the authority or the capacity to prevent physically either the movement of armed persons or warlike material across borders or other violations of the security commitments. Those were tasks that fell within the competence of the security forces of the Governments concerned. Experience had also shown that the capacity of ONUCA to detect violations of the security undertakings was very limited, mainly due to the fact that an international peacekeeping operation could not undertake the detection of clandestine activities without assuming functions that properly belonged to the security forces of the countries concerned, not least because they required armed personnel to carry them out. Although Governments had sometimes agreed that an armed United Nations peacekeeping operation should implement such a mandate on their territory, that was not the case in Central America. Nevertheless, the ONUCA method of operation — maintaining a regular and visible presence in those parts of the region where breaches of the undertakings would seem most likely to occur — enabled it to play an important part in ensuring compliance with the security commitments. Through its presence, it was able to perform a preventive or deterrent function which fell short of physical prevention or deterrence, but made it more difficult for activities contrary to the Esquipulas II Agreement to be carried out. The presence of ONUCA also provided a means whereby the Central American Governments could take up with each other, through an impartial third party, complaints about violations of the security undertakings.

As to the future of ONUCA, the Secretary-General reported that the five Governments had confirmed that they wished its mandate to be extended for six months. He agreed that it was important to maintain a United Nations military presence in the region in order to support the Central American peace process and concluded that ONUCA should maintain its current method of operation, with Observer Groups based in each country. However, following the end of the conflict in Nicaragua and the demobilization of the members of the Nicaraguan resistance, he considered that it would be possible to close some of the verification centres whose tasks were primarily related to the Nicaraguan conflict. That would permit a reduction of approximately 40 per cent in the number of military observers currently assigned to ONUCA.

Those proposals had been accepted by each of the five countries. With regard to his efforts to achieve a negotiated political solution to the conflict in El Salvador, the Secretary-General reiterated his previously expressed view that verification or observation of the implementation of such a settlement would most appropriately be carried out as an integrated whole, rather than as separate enterprises. It followed that verification of the military aspects would be undertaken by a military component rather than by ONUCA. He accordingly recommended to the Council that the mandate of ONUCA should be extended for a further period of six months, until 7 May 1991, and that its tasks and method of operation should continue to be those approved by the Council in its resolution 644 (1989) of 7 November 1989. If the Council approved that recommendation, the Secretary-General intended to reduce the strength of the ONUCA military observers as proposed, by mid-December.

At its 2952nd meeting, held on 5 November 1990 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (United States) drew the attention of the Council members to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.<sup>44</sup> The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 675 (1990), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolutions 637 (1989) of 27 July 1989 and 644 (1989) of 7 November 1989, as well as the statement made by the President of the Security Council on its behalf on 7 November 1989,

1. *Approves* the report of the Secretary-General of 26 October 1990;
2. *Decides* to extend, under its authority, the mandate of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America, as defined in resolution 644 (1989), for a further period of six months, that is, until 7 May 1991, bearing in mind the report of the Secretary-General and the need to continue to monitor expenditures carefully during this period of increasing demands on peacekeeping resources;
3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council fully informed of further developments and to report on all aspects of the operations of the Observer Group before the expiry of the new mandate period.

---

<sup>44</sup> S/21927.

**Decision of 6 May 1991 (2986th meeting):  
resolution 691 (1991)**

On 29 April 1991, pursuant to resolution 675 (1990), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report containing an account of the organization and operational activities of ONUCA during the period from 27 October 1990 to 29 April 1991, together with his recommendations concerning the future of the mission.<sup>45</sup> He remained convinced that ONUCA continued to make a valuable contribution to the peace process in Central America by providing an impartial mechanism for verifying that the five Central American Governments were complying with their security commitments under the Esquipulas II Agreement. The five Presidents, themselves, had expressed their full confidence in ONUCA. He re-emphasized, however, the point made in his report of 26 October 1990,<sup>46</sup> that the Observer Group was not mandated, staffed or equipped to detect clandestine activities or to take physical action to prevent them, functions that properly belonged to the five Governments. Noting that the extensive patrolling activities of ONUCA had not so far led to the detection of a single violation of the security undertakings, the Secretary-General intended to modify its method of operations on the basis of recommendations by his Chief Military Observer aimed at making the mission more cost-effective. While ONUCA would continue to maintain a regular and visible presence in potentially sensitive border areas, that presence would be more directly focused on liaison and exchange of information with the security authorities of the States concerned, in order to enable ONUCA to verify that those States were taking the action necessary to enable them to comply with their security commitments. Those tasks could be carried out satisfactorily with a somewhat reduced strength of military observers. The five Central American Governments had welcomed the Secretary-General's decision to recommend a further six months' extension of the mission's mandate but wished to maintain its strength at its current level. However, based on the recommendations of the Chief Military Observer, and bearing in mind the Council's reference in resolution 675 (1990) to the need to continue to monitor expenditures carefully during a period of increasing demands on peacekeeping resources, the Secretary-General considered it right to recommend a modest

reduction in the strength of ONUCA. He accordingly recommended that the mission's mandate should be extended for an additional period of six months, until 7 November 1991; that its mandate should continue to be the one approved by the Council in resolution 644 (1989); and that its strength should be reduced to 130 military observers.

At its 2986th meeting, held on 6 May 1991 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (China) drew the attention of the Council members to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.<sup>47</sup> The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 691 (1991), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolutions 637 (1989) of 27 July 1989, 644 (1989) of 7 November 1989 and 675 (1990) of 5 November 1990, as well as the statement made by the President of the Security Council on its behalf on 7 November 1989,

1. *Approves* the report of the Secretary-General of 29 April 1991;
2. *Decides* to extend, under its authority, the mandate of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America, as defined in resolution 644 (1989), for a further period of six months, that is, until 7 November 1991, bearing in mind the report of the Secretary-General and the need to continue to monitor expenditures carefully during this period of increasing demands on peacekeeping resources;
3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council fully informed of further developments and to report on all aspects of the operations of the Group before the expiry of the new mandate period.

**Decision of 20 May 1991 (2988th meeting):  
resolution 693 (1991)**

On 21 December 1990, pursuant to resolution 637 (1989), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report in which he provided an account of his efforts to promote the achievement of a negotiated political situation to the conflict in El Salvador.<sup>48</sup> He recalled that, in his report of 8 November 1990,<sup>49</sup> he had reported on two agreements between the Government of El Salvador and FMLN arrived at under his

<sup>45</sup> S/22543.

<sup>46</sup> S/21909.

<sup>47</sup> S/22564.

<sup>48</sup> S/22031.

<sup>49</sup> S/21931.

auspices: the Geneva Agreement of 4 April 1990,<sup>50</sup> on the framework for negotiations to end the armed conflict by political means; and an agreement concluded at Caracas, on 21 May 1990,<sup>51</sup> on the agenda and schedule of the negotiating process. The initial objective of the negotiation process, as set out in the Geneva Agreement, was to achieve political agreements for arranging a halt to the armed confrontation and any acts that infringed the rights of the civilian population, compliance with which would have to be verified by the United Nations, subject to the approval of the Council. The Secretary-General recalled that he had also drawn attention to the agreement on human rights reached between the two parties at San José on 26 July 1990,<sup>52</sup> which contained detailed commitments to guarantee unrestricted respect for human rights in El Salvador, and provided for the establishment of a United Nations verification mission in the country upon cessation of the armed conflict.

The Secretary-General stated that while significant progress had been made to date — as exemplified by the San José Agreement on Human Rights — considerable problems had been encountered in reaching agreement on the issue of the armed forces, the most sensitive and complex issue on the agenda. Given the pervasive character of that question, it had not been possible to make substantive progress on other items. The Secretary-General recalled that, having considered the complex and interrelated character of the verification tasks envisaged for the United Nations under the above-mentioned agreements, he had put forward to the members of the Council the concept of an integrated operation under the authority of the Security Council to ensure proper coordination of operations on the ground and the rational use of resources,<sup>53</sup> a concept with which they had concurred. He reported that the Government of El Salvador and FMLN had since signified their desire to have the human rights mechanism in place as soon as possible without waiting for other agreements, notably a ceasefire agreement, to be concluded. He emphasized that such a desire was in keeping with the objectives laid down in the Esquipulas II Agreements, which had

been endorsed by the Council in resolution 637 (1989), with its emphasis on democratization and respect for human rights as key components of the peace process. The importance of international verification of Central American peace agreements had also been underlined by the Central American Governments as well as in successive General Assembly resolutions, notably resolution 45/15. Accordingly, the Secretary-General informed the Council of his intention to request its authorization to establish a United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL) to monitor compliance with the agreements concluded between the Government of El Salvador and FMLN, commencing with the verification of the Agreement on Human Rights. He recommended that the human rights verification component of ONUSAL be established as soon as the necessary preparations had been made on the ground: in particular, the extent to which the tasks of the mission could be conducted in the absence of a ceasefire had been determined; the personnel required for such a complex operation, for which “no precedent exist[ed] in the annals of the United Nations”, had been recruited; and satisfactory arrangements had been worked out with the Government and FMLN to ensure the safe deployment and effective functioning of ONUSAL. He intended to dispatch to El Salvador in early 1991 a technical mission to assist him in preparing an operational plan for submission to the Council. In the meantime, he had established the small preparatory office in El Salvador with which the Council had previously concurred.

On 16 April 1991, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report<sup>54</sup> recommending the establishment of the human rights component of ONUSAL, on the basis of the conclusions of a preliminary mission to El Salvador in March. The preliminary mission had reached the conclusion that there was a strong and widespread desire among all sectors of political opinion in the country that the United Nations should commence, as soon as possible, the verification of the Agreement on Human Rights without awaiting a ceasefire. It considered, moreover, that, in the absence of the other political agreements envisaged in the 1990 Geneva Agreement, ONUSAL would be able to reach working arrangements on an ad hoc basis with the military, security and judicial authorities and FMLN. The preliminary mission had also concluded that the risks posed by the armed

---

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, annex I.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, annex II.

<sup>52</sup> S/21541.

<sup>53</sup> See the statement made by the Secretary-General in informal consultations on 3 August 1990 (S/22031, annex).

---

<sup>54</sup> S/22494; see also Corr.1 and Add.1 of 20 May 1991.

conflict to the tasks of verification and to the security of personnel were not to a degree that should prevent the establishment of the mission before a ceasefire. In the light of those and other relevant considerations, the Secretary-General accepted the preliminary mission's recommendation that the human rights component of ONUSAL be established at the earliest feasible moment in advance of a ceasefire agreement. He proposed that ONUSAL adopt a progressive approach to assuming the verification tasks envisaged for it under the Human Rights Agreement, concentrating first on the active monitoring of the human rights situation, and of the processing by the parties of cases involving allegations of human rights violations. In conclusion, the Secretary-General strongly recommended that the Council give early authorization for the initial establishment of ONUSAL as outlined above. He advised against linking the approval of this proposal to the success of the negotiations as a whole, reiterating his conviction that the commencement of the verification of human rights by ONUSAL would promote a significant improvement in the human rights situation in El Salvador and would act as a positive impetus to the negotiations. Once there was agreement on the ceasefire and the United Nations was called upon to play the broader role envisaged for it, the corresponding resources could be included in the mission's structure to enable it to operate effectively as an integrated whole.

At its 2988th meeting, on 20 May 1991, the Council included in its agenda the reports of the Secretary-General of 21 December 1990 and 16 April and 20 May 1991.<sup>55</sup> The President (China) drew the attention of the Council members to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.<sup>56</sup> The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 693 (1991), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolution 637 (1989) of 27 July 1989, in which it lent its full support to the Secretary-General for the continuation of his mission of good offices in Central America,

*Recalling also* the Geneva Agreement of 4 April 1990 and the Caracas Agenda of 21 May 1990 concluded between the Government of El Salvador and the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional,

*Deeply concerned* at the persistence of and the increase in the climate of violence in El Salvador, which seriously affects the civilian population, and thus stressing the importance of the full implementation of the Agreement on Human Rights signed by the two parties at San José on 26 July 1990,

*Welcoming* the Mexico Agreements between the two parties of 27 April 1991,

*Having considered* the reports of the Secretary-General of 21 December 1990 and 16 April and 20 May 1991,

*Commending* the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative for Central America for their efforts at good offices, and expressing its full support for their continuing efforts to facilitate a peaceful settlement to the conflict in El Salvador,

*Underlining* the great importance that it attaches to the exercise of moderation and restraint by both sides to ensure the security of all United Nations-employed personnel as well as to the adoption by them of all other appropriate and necessary measures to facilitate the negotiations leading to the achievement of the objectives set forth in the Geneva and other above-mentioned agreements as soon as possible, including their full cooperation with the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative to this end,

*Recognizing* the right of the parties to determine their own negotiating process,

*Calling upon* both parties to pursue the current negotiations urgently and with flexibility, in a concentrated format on the items agreed upon in the Caracas Agenda, in order to reach, as a matter of priority, a political agreement on the armed forces and the accords necessary for the cessation of the armed confrontation and to achieve as soon as possible thereafter a process which will lead to the establishment of the necessary guarantees and conditions for reintegrating the members of the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional within a framework of full legality into the civil, institutional and political life of the country,

*Expressing its conviction* that a peaceful settlement in El Salvador will contribute to a successful outcome in the Central American peace process,

1. *Approves* the report of the Secretary-General of 16 April and 20 May 1991;

2. *Decides* to establish, under its authority and based on the Secretary-General's report referred to in paragraph 1, a United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador to monitor all agreements concluded between the two parties, whose initial mandate in its first phase as an integrated peacekeeping operation will be to verify the compliance by the parties with the Agreement on Human Rights signed at San José on 26 July 1990, and also decides that the subsequent tasks or phases of the Mission will be subject to approval by the Council;

---

<sup>55</sup> S/22031, and S/22494/Corr.1 and Add.1.

<sup>56</sup> S/22616.

3. *Also decides* that the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador will be established for an initial period of twelve months;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to take the necessary measures to establish the first phase of the Mission as described in paragraphs 2 and 3;

5. *Calls upon* both parties, as agreed by them, to pursue a continuous process of negotiations in order to reach at the earliest possible date the objectives set forth in the Mexico Agreements of 27 April 1991 and all other objectives contained in the Geneva Agreement of 4 April 1990, and to this end to cooperate fully with the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative in their efforts;

6. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council fully informed on the implementation of the present resolution.

**Decision of 30 September 1991 (3010th meeting): resolution 714 (1991)**

On 25 September 1991, the Government of El Salvador and FMLN signed the New York Agreement,<sup>57</sup> at United Nations Headquarters. The Agreement provided guarantees and conditions on which to reach a peaceful settlement of the armed conflict. These included provisions concerning the establishment of a National Commission for the Consolidation of Peace (COPAZ), responsible for overseeing the implementation of all political agreements reached by the parties, the creation of which was to be explicitly endorsed by Council resolution.

At its 3010th meeting, held on 30 September 1991 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council considered the item entitled "Central America: efforts towards peace". Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (France) drew the attention of the Council members to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.<sup>58</sup> The resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 714 (1991), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolution 637 (1989) of 27 July 1989, by which it lent its full support to the Secretary-General for his mission of good offices in Central America,

---

<sup>57</sup> S/23082.

<sup>58</sup> S/23090.

*Also recalling* its resolution 693 (1991) of 20 May 1991, by which it established the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador,

*Welcoming* the New York Agreement signed 25 September 1991 by the Government of El Salvador and the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional, which provides guarantees and conditions on which to reach a peaceful settlement to the armed conflict, including, inter alia, the provisions concerning the National Commission for the Consolidation of Peace, permitting the reintegration of the members of the Frente Farabundo Martí within a framework of full legality into the civil, institutional and political life of the country,

*Welcoming also* the oral report of the Secretary-General made at the consultations held on 30 September 1991,

1. *Commends* the parties for the flexibility and seriousness which they demonstrated during the course of the recent talks in New York;

2. *Congratulates* the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative for Central America for their skilful and tireless efforts which have been vital to the peace process;

3. *Expresses its appreciation* for the contributions of the Governments of the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General — Colombia, Mexico, Spain, and Venezuela — which have advanced the peace process in El Salvador;

4. *Urges* both parties, at the next negotiating round, which will begin on 12 October 1991, to proceed at an intensive and sustained pace to reach at the earliest possible date a ceasefire and a peaceful settlement to the armed conflict in accordance with the framework of the New York Agreement;

5. *Reaffirms its full support* for the urgent completion of the peace process in El Salvador, and expresses its readiness to support the implementation of a settlement;

6. *Urges* both parties to exercise maximum and continuing restraint, particularly with respect to the civilian population, in order to create the best climate for a successful last stage of the negotiations;

7. *Calls upon* both parties to continue to cooperate fully with the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador.

**Decision of 6 November 1991 (3016th meeting):  
resolution 719 (1991)**

On 28 October 1991, pursuant to resolution 691 (1991), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on the structure and operations of ONUCA during the period from 30 April to 28 October 1991, together with his recommendations regarding the future of the mission.<sup>59</sup> He noted that since the

---

<sup>59</sup> S/23171.



establishment of ONUCA, the political and military environment in which it functioned had been profoundly affected by a number of developments inside as well as outside Central America. These included the disengagement of the Powers that had earlier actively supported opposing sides in Central America and their announced intention to revise their policies vis-à-vis Central America, emphasizing their support for negotiated political solutions and assistance for economic and social development rather than military purposes. On the regional level, after 10 years of devastating internal strife in Nicaragua, there was now a climate of relative peace and tranquillity in the country. As for El Salvador, the agreements recently signed by both parties in New York constituted an important step towards the establishment of a lasting peace. He added that the ongoing direct negotiations between representatives of the Government of Guatemala and the Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemalteca also gave hope for an end to that conflict. In the light of the improved situation in the region, the five Central American Governments were making efforts to arrive at new collective security arrangements for the region, which would enable them to dispense with the need for international verification of their compliance with the Esquipulas II Agreement. In the meantime, however, the five Governments had indicated their wish that the mandate of ONUCA be extended for a further six months. The Secretary-General concluded that, in the prevailing fluid and dynamic situation, it would not be right to withdraw ONUCA or further reduce the scope of its operations. He therefore recommended a further extension of the Observer Group's mandate until 30 April 1992. He suggested, however, that the Council might wish to request him to report during the new mandate period if developments in the region indicated that the future of ONUCA should be reconsidered.

At its 3016th meeting, on 6 November 1991, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (Romania) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of its prior consultations.<sup>60</sup> The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 719 (1991), which reads:

---

<sup>60</sup> S/23196.

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolutions 637 (1989) of 27 July 1989, 644 (1989) of 7 November 1989, 675 (1990) of 5 November 1990 and 691 (1991) of 6 May 1991, as well as the statement made by the President of the Security Council on its behalf on 7 November 1989,

1. *Approves* the report of the Secretary-General of 28 October 1991;

2. *Decides* to extend, under its authority, the mandate of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America, as defined in resolution 644 (1989), for a further period of five months and twenty-three days, that is, until 30 April 1992, bearing in mind the report of the Secretary-General and the need to continue to monitor expenditures carefully during this period of increasing demands on peacekeeping resources;

3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council fully informed of further developments and to report on all aspects of the operations of the Group before the expiry of the new mandate period, and in particular to report to the Council within three months from the date of adoption of the present resolution, taking account of any developments in the region which indicate that the present size of the Group or its future should be reconsidered.

#### **Decision of 3 January 1992: statement by the President**

On 31 December 1991, the Government of El Salvador and FMLN signed the Act of New York.<sup>61</sup> That instrument recorded that the two parties had concluded a number of further agreements whose implementation would put a final end to the armed conflict in El Salvador. The Final Peace Agreements would be signed in Mexico City on 16 January 1992, following a final round of negotiations on two outstanding issues.

On 3 January 1992, following consultations among the members of the Council, the President (United Kingdom) made the following statement on behalf of the Council:<sup>62</sup>

The members of the Security Council have noted with appreciation the briefing provided by the Secretary-General on the agreement signed late in the night of 31 December 1991 by the Government of El Salvador and the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional which, when implemented, will put a definite end to the Salvadorian armed conflict. The members of the Council warmly welcomed the agreement which is of vital importance for the normalization of the situation in El Salvador and in the region as a whole. They place on record their thanks

---

<sup>61</sup> S/23402, annex.

<sup>62</sup> S/23360.

and appreciation for the enormous contribution of the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy for Central America, their collaborators, and all the Governments, especially those of Colombia, Mexico, Spain and Venezuela, that have assisted the Secretary-General in his efforts.

The members of the Council urge the parties to show maximum flexibility in resolving the pending issues in the negotiations at United Nations Headquarters in New York starting this weekend. They also urge the parties to exercise maximum restraint and to take no action in the coming days which would be contrary to the agreement reached in New York and to the excellent spirit in which these talks took place.

They welcomed the Secretary-General's intention, stated today, to submit a written report and proposals early next week with a view to Council action both regarding verification of ceasefire arrangements and the monitoring of the maintenance of public order pending the establishment of the new National Civil Police. This will require the approval by the Council of new tasks for the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador. The members of the Council stand ready to deal expeditiously with any recommendations that the Secretary-General may make.

**Decision of 14 January 1992 (3030th meeting):  
resolution 729 (1992)**

On 10 January 1992, pursuant to resolution 693 (1991), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report,<sup>63</sup> recommending the enlargement of ONUSAL and an increase in its strength to enable it to undertake the additional functions desired of it by the Government of El Salvador and FMLN under the Final Peace Agreements to be signed in Mexico City on 16 January 1992. He noted that two of the agreements in particular envisaged additional verification and monitoring functions for ONUSAL, which would require an immediate and substantial increase in its strength. Under the Agreement on the Cessation of Armed Conflict, which provided for a ceasefire to come into force on 1 February 1992, the Mission would verify all aspects of the ceasefire and the separation of forces. Under the Agreement on National Civil Police, the Mission would monitor the maintenance of public order during the transitional period pending the establishment of the National Civil Police. If the mandate of ONUSAL were to be enlarged to fulfil these new tasks, it would be necessary to increase its strength by adding two new divisions — a Military Division and a Police Division — to the existing Human Rights Division. The Secretary-General recommended that the Council should take the

---

<sup>63</sup> S/23402 and Add.1 of 13 January 1992.

decision now to enlarge the ONUSAL mandate and increase its strength, in advance of signature of the agreements giving rise to the additional tasks for the Mission, so that ONUSAL would be ready to fulfil its new responsibilities as soon as the ceasefire came into force. He added that, in the exercise of his good offices with regard to the Central American peace process, he would continue, as provided in the Geneva Agreement of 4 April 1990, to call upon Member States, in particular Colombia, Mexico, Spain and Venezuela (informally known as the “Friends of the Secretary-General”) for support.<sup>64</sup>

At its 3030th meeting, held on 14 January 1992 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (United Kingdom) invited the representative of El Salvador, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. He then drew the attention of the Council members to the statement made by the President of the Council on 3 January 1992,<sup>65</sup> and to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.<sup>66</sup> The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 729 (1992), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolution 637 (1989) of 27 July 1989,

*Recalling also* its resolution 714 (1991) of 30 September 1991, as well as the statement made by the President of the Security Council on behalf of its members on 3 January 1992 following the signature of the Act of New York on 31 December 1991,

*Recalling further* its resolution 693 (1991) of 20 May 1991 by which it established the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador,

*Welcoming* the conclusion of agreements between the Government of El Salvador and the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional, which are to be signed at Mexico City on 16 January 1992 and which, when implemented, will put a definitive end to the Salvadorian armed conflict and will open the way for national reconciliation,

*Calling upon* both parties to continue to exercise maximum moderation and restraint and to take no action which would be contrary to or adversely affect the agreements to be signed in Mexico City,

---

<sup>64</sup> S/23402, paras. 17-19.

<sup>65</sup> S/23360.

<sup>66</sup> S/23411.

*Expressing its conviction* that a peaceful settlement in El Salvador will make a decisive contribution to the Central American peace process,

*Welcoming* the intention of the Secretary-General to convey shortly to the Council his recommendation on the termination of the mandate of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America,

1. *Approves* the report of the Secretary-General of 10 and 13 January 1992;

2. *Decides*, on the basis of the report of the Secretary-General and in accordance with the provisions of resolution 693 (1991), to enlarge the mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador to include the verification and monitoring of the implementation of all the agreements once these are signed at Mexico City between the Government of El Salvador and the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional, in particular the Agreement on the Cessation of the Armed Conflict and the Agreement on the Establishment of a National Civil Police;

3. *Also decides* that the mandate of the Mission, enlarged in accordance with the present resolution, will be extended to 31 October 1992 and that it will be reviewed at that time on the basis of recommendations to be presented by the Secretary-General;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to take the necessary measures to increase the strength of the Mission as recommended in his report;

5. *Calls upon* both parties to respect scrupulously and to implement in good faith the commitments assumed by them under the agreements which are to be signed at Mexico City and to cooperate fully with the Mission in its task of verifying the implementation of these agreements;

6. *Reaffirms its support* for the Secretary-General's continuing mission of good offices with regard to the Central American peace process, and in particular for his observations in paragraphs 17 to 19 of the report regarding his intention to continue, as was foreseen in the Geneva Agreement of 4 April 1990 concerning the process which is to end definitively the armed conflict, to rely on the Governments of Colombia, Mexico, Spain and Venezuela, as well as other States and groups of States, to support him in the exercise of his responsibilities;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council fully informed of developments relating to the implementation of the present resolution and to report on the operations of the Mission before the expiry of the new mandate period.

### **Decision of 16 January 1992 (3031st meeting): resolution 730 (1992)**

On 14 January 1992, pursuant to resolution 719 (1991), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on ONUCA,<sup>67</sup> in which he recommended that its operational mandate be terminated with effect from 17 January 1992, so as to enable him to proceed with the transfer of certain personnel and equipment from ONUCA to ONUSAL. He recalled the observations made in his predecessor's report of 28 October 1991,<sup>68</sup> concerning the need to reconsider the future of ONUCA in case of an early and successful conclusion of the peace process in El Salvador, and the widely held view that peacekeeping operations should be set up to do a specific task for a specific period and then be disbanded. The Secretary-General also referred to his report of 10 January 1992, which contained details of the major additional tasks of verification which would now fall to ONUSAL and of the resources that it would require.<sup>69</sup> In the circumstances, he believed that the Council should decide to terminate the mandate of ONUCA, and had so informed the five Central American countries in which the Observer Group was deployed. He believed that, in the present case, those considerations must necessarily prevail over the parties' concerns at the termination of a peacekeeping operation in which they had come to have confidence.

At its 3031st meeting, held on 16 January 1992 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (United Kingdom) drew the attention of the Council members to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.<sup>70</sup> The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 730 (1992), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolution 719 (1991) of 6 November 1991,

*Recalling also* its resolution 729 (1992) of 14 January 1992,

1. *Approves* the report of the Secretary-General of 14 January 1992;

---

<sup>67</sup> S/23421.

<sup>68</sup> S/23171.

<sup>69</sup> S/23402 and Add.1.

<sup>70</sup> S/23427.

2. *Decides*, in accordance with the recommendation in paragraph 7 of the report, to terminate the mandate of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America with effect from 17 January 1992.

**Decision of 3 June 1992: statement by the  
President**

On 26 May 1992, pursuant to resolution 729 (1992), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report describing ONUSAL activities since the ceasefire between the Government of El Salvador and FMLN formally came into effect on 1 February 1992.<sup>71</sup> The Mission had been carrying out the various verification tasks assigned to it in the agreements signed by the parties. In addition to its specific verification responsibilities, ONUSAL was exercising its good offices to help the parties to implement the agreements. In those endeavours, it had received valuable support from the four “Friends of the Secretary-General” (Colombia, Mexico, Spain and Venezuela), as well as other interested Governments. ONUSAL had also been participating as an observer in the work of the National Commission for the Consolidation of Peace. The Secretary-General observed that the peace process was not an easy one. The agreements were complex and demanded a commitment to compromise and fundamental adjustments in political and social attitudes. Nor were they self-executing. The United Nations was committed to assisting the two parties, but success would be assured only by their political will and their acceptance of national reconciliation as the overriding national goal. The Secretary-General commended the parties for their success in maintaining the ceasefire, which had not once been violated. However, he reported that there had been some serious delays in implementing various provisions of the agreements, which had undermined each side’s confidence in the other’s good faith. He was particularly concerned by the continuing failure of both sides to concentrate all their forces in the designated locations. Other sources of serious concern were the Government’s delay in adopting measures which it had committed itself to take to facilitate the reintegration of the FMLN ex-combatants into civilian life — especially as regards agriculture, political activity and recruitment into the National Civil Police — and the failure of FMLN to return the first 20 per cent of its combatants to civilian

---

<sup>71</sup> S/23999, and Add.1 of 19 June 1992.

life. The Secretary-General added that the Mission was operating in an atmosphere of deep distrust and its insistence on maintaining its impartiality was sometimes misperceived by each side as being partiality towards the other. In that context, he reported with regret that there had recently been a recurrence of threats against the security of the Mission and its personnel.

On 3 June 1992, following consultations among the members of the Council, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:<sup>72</sup>

The members of the Security Council have taken note of the report of the Secretary-General of 26 May and 19 June 1992 on the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador.

The members of the Council are pleased that the ceasefire is holding and there has not been a single violation since it came into force on 1 February 1992.

However, the members of the Council are deeply concerned about the many delays by both parties in implementing agreements concluded between the Government of El Salvador and the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional and the climate of mutual suspicion that still remains. If that situation were to continue, it would jeopardize the very foundation of the agreements.

The members of the Council urge both parties to demonstrate good faith in implementing the agreements fully, to abide by the agreed time limits, to exert every effort to bring about national reconciliation in El Salvador and to implement the process of demobilization and reform.

The members of the Council reaffirm their full support for the efforts made by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative for El Salvador, with the assistance of the Governments of the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General and other Governments concerned. They commend the staff of the Mission, who are working under very difficult conditions, and express their concern about the threats to their safety. They remind the parties of their obligation to take all necessary measures to guarantee the safety of the Mission and its members.

The members of the Council will continue to monitor closely developments in the implementation of the peace agreements in El Salvador.

**Decision of 30 October 1992 (3129th meeting):  
resolution 784 (1992)**

By a letter dated 19 October 1992 addressed to the President of the Security Council on the situation in

---

<sup>72</sup> S/24058.

El Salvador,<sup>73</sup> the Secretary-General reported that he did not believe that it would be possible to complete the demobilization of FMLN by 31 October 1992, as provided for in the Peace Agreements of 16 January 1992. He noted that delays in implementing the land transfer programme and the police project, both of which were to have been completed before the demobilization, had led to a suspension of the demobilization process.

By a letter dated 28 October 1992 addressed to the President of the Security Council,<sup>74</sup> the Secretary-General confirmed that, because of the above-mentioned difficulties, the demobilization process would not be completed on schedule. He had presented proposals for overcoming those difficulties to both parties. In the meantime, he recommended that the Council extend the mandate of ONUSAL for an interim period of one month, until 30 November 1992. The Secretary-General anticipated that, by then, he would be able to make a specific recommendation on the mandate and strength that ONUSAL would need in order to verify implementation of the final phases of the peace process in El Salvador.

At its 3129th meeting, held on 30 October 1992 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included in its agenda the letter of 28 October from the Secretary-General. The President (France) drew the attention of the Council members to the Secretary-General's letter of 19 October, and to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.<sup>75</sup> The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 784 (1992), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolution 637 (1989) of 27 July 1989,

*Recalling also* its resolutions 693 (1991) of 20 May 1991, 714 (1991) of 30 September 1991 and 729 (1992) of 14 January 1992,

*Taking note* of the letter from the Secretary-General of 19 October 1992 addressed to the President of the Security Council, in which he announced a delay in the schedule laid down in resolution 729 (1992),

*Taking note also* of the letter from the Secretary-General of 28 October 1992 addressed to the President of the Security Council, in which he proposed an interim extension of the current mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador,

1. *Approves* the proposal of the Secretary-General to extend the current mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador for a period ending on 30 November 1992;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to submit to the Security Council, between now and that date, recommendations on the period of extension of the mandate, on the mandate itself and on the strength that the Mission will need, taking into account progress already made, in order to verify the implementation of the final phases of the peace process in El Salvador, together with their financial implications;

3. *Urges* both parties to respect scrupulously and to implement in good faith the commitments assumed by them under the agreements signed on 16 January 1992 at Mexico City and to respond positively to the Secretary-General's latest proposals to them aimed at overcoming the current difficulties;

4. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of Venezuela noted that, together with Colombia, Spain and Mexico, his country had assisted in the delicate tasks of guaranteeing the agreements entered into by the Secretary-General. He supported unreservedly the efforts of the Secretary-General and, referring to paragraph 3 of the resolution, urged both parties to respond positively to his latest proposals to them aimed at overcoming the current difficulties. However, he emphasized that his country understood those proposals to be practical and realistic responses and not a renegotiation of the agreements signed on 16 January 1992 in Mexico City.<sup>76</sup>

The representative of Ecuador said that the United Nations had played a unique role in building peace in El Salvador and stated that its impartiality in the conflict had made it possible for it to present objective proposals which had gained the approval of the parties. He welcomed, therefore, the Secretary-General's further initiative and urged the parties to cooperate with him. Although compliance with the original schedule envisaged in the peace agreements would have been preferable, the success achieved so far should not be jeopardized. A short and specific extension of the time frame, if it served the purpose of

---

<sup>73</sup> S/24688.

<sup>74</sup> S/24731.

<sup>75</sup> S/24737.

---

<sup>76</sup> S/PV.3129, pp. 3-6.

reactivating the peace process and was supported with goodwill by the parties, could be very positive.<sup>77</sup>

**Decision of 30 November 1992 (3142nd meeting): resolution 791 (1992)**

On 23 November 1992, pursuant to resolutions 729 (1992) and 784 (1992), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report recommending the extension of the mandate of ONUSAL for a further six months.<sup>78</sup> He reported that ONUSAL continued to carry out all the verification functions assigned to it under the various agreements signed by the Government of El Salvador and FMLN. The Mission had also used its good offices in a variety of ways to assist the parties in overcoming difficulties that had arisen in the implementation of the peace accords, and had participated as an observer in the National Commission for the Consolidation of Peace. With regard to the timetable for implementation of the accords, the Secretary-General stated that his representative had, earlier in November, concluded arrangements with the parties which would formally bring the armed conflict to an end on 15 December 1992 (instead of by 31 October, as originally envisaged). The arrangements stipulated that compliance with specific undertakings by one side would be contingent upon compliance with specific undertakings by the other side. ONUSAL was therefore now verifying, with close attention, implementation by the parties to ensure that compliance took place on schedule.

The Secretary-General observed that the peace process continued to show signs of becoming irreversible, noting in particular the impeccable observance of the ceasefire and the involvement of FMLN in political activities. He welcomed the manner in which the parties had overcome obstacles, but noted that the implementation of the peace accords in their entirety would require flexibility and restraint, especially in the zones of former conflict. Successful completion of the peace process would also require continuing support from the international community — both through the continued existence of ONUSAL and through voluntary contributions for activities that the Government could not finance itself but which it would be inappropriate to include in the Mission's budget.

As the ONUSAL mandate under resolution 693 (1991) was “to monitor all agreements concluded between the two parties”, and certain major undertakings — such as the reduction of the Armed Forces and the deployment of the National Civil Police — extended into 1994, the Secretary-General intended to submit to the Council at regular intervals his recommendations on the future activities and strength of the mission, taking into account the progress made in implementing the peace process. He anticipated that ONUSAL would complete its work by mid-1994. In the interim, he recommended that the Council extend the mission's mandate for a further period of six months, to 31 May 1993. Such a decision would be another sign of the international community's commitment to support the peace process in El Salvador. That commitment was of course based on the belief that Salvadorians themselves would show a matching commitment. The Secretary-General stressed that only through determined efforts by all sectors of Salvadorian society would the country return to the path of lasting peace. He called on the Salvadorian media to play a positive role in that regard, expressing concern at anonymous threats that had appeared in the newspapers, aimed at FMLN leaders, political figures and members of ONUSAL, which the Government had been repeatedly asked to investigate.<sup>79</sup>

At its 3142nd meeting, held on 30 November 1992 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (Hungary) drew the attention of the Council members to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.<sup>80</sup>

Speaking before the vote, the representative of Venezuela stated that, as one of the “Friends of the Secretary-General”,<sup>81</sup> and with the support and participation of the United States, his country bore witness to the peace efforts of the United Nations in El Salvador. The peace process had demonstrated the positive scope of two main roles that could be played: on the one hand, the participation of the United Nations as mediator and guarantor of the peace agreements entered into by the parties in a civil conflict, with whom main responsibility rested; and, on the other hand, the important support role that could be

---

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

<sup>78</sup> S/24833, and Add.1 of 30 November 1992.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 84.

<sup>80</sup> S/24861.

<sup>81</sup> Colombia, Mexico, Spain and Venezuela.

played by friendly countries in the dialogue leading to agreements and in follow-up with regard to implementation. Those two roles could help to ensure, at the national and international levels, trust in the peace process and the reconciliation process.<sup>82</sup>

The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 791 (1992), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolution 637 (1989) of 27 July 1989,

*Recalling also* its resolutions 693 (1991) of 20 May 1991, 714 (1991) of 30 September 1991, 729 (1992) of 14 January 1992 and 784 (1992) of 30 October 1992,

*Having studied* the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador of 23 and 30 November 1992,

*Noting with appreciation* the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General to support implementation of the several agreements signed between 4 April 1990 and 16 January 1992 by the Government of El Salvador and the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional to re-establish peace and promote reconciliation in El Salvador,

*Noting* the intention of the Secretary-General to continue, in this as in other peacekeeping operations, to monitor expenditures carefully during this period of increasing demands on peacekeeping resources,

1. *Approves* the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador of 23 and 30 November 1992;

2. *Decides* to extend the mandate of the Mission as defined in resolutions 693 (1991) and 729 (1992), for a further period of six months ending on 31 May 1993;

3. *Welcomes* the intention of the Secretary-General to adapt the future activities and strength of the Mission, taking into account progress made in implementing the peace process;

4. *Urges* both parties to respect scrupulously and to implement in good faith the solemn commitments they have assumed under the agreements signed on 16 January 1992 at Mexico City and to exercise the utmost moderation and restraint, both at present and following the conclusion of the ceasefire phase, in order to respect the new deadlines agreed upon by them for the successful completion of the peace process and for the restoration of normal conditions, especially in the zones of former conflict;

5. *Shares*, in this context, the preoccupations expressed by the Secretary-General in paragraph 84 of his report;

6. *Reaffirms its support* for the Secretary-General's use of his good offices in the El Salvador peace process and calls upon both parties to cooperate fully with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for El Salvador and the Mission in their tasks of assisting and verifying the parties' implementation of their commitments;

7. *Requests* all States, as well as the international institutions in the fields of development and finance, to continue to support the peace process, in particular through voluntary contributions;

8. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council fully informed of further developments in the El Salvador peace process and to report, as necessary, on all aspects of the operations of the Mission, at the latest before the expiry of the new mandate period;

9. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

---

<sup>82</sup> S/PV.3142, pp. 3-5.