

<i>Videoconference date</i>	<i>Videoconference record</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Decision, vote (for-against-abstaining) and record of written procedure</i>
14 August 2020	<a href="#">S/2020/805</a>	Letter dated 15 August 2020 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General and the Permanent Representatives of the members of the Security Council	Draft resolution <a href="#">S/2020/797</a> (not adopted) 2-2-11 <sup>a</sup> <a href="#">S/2020/803</a>
22 December 2020	<a href="#">S/2020/1324</a>	Letter dated 24 December 2020 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General and the Permanent Representatives of the members of the Security Council	

<sup>a</sup> *For*: Dominican Republic, United States; *against*: China, Russian Federation; *abstaining*: Belgium, Estonia, France, Germany, Indonesia, Niger, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, South Africa, Tunisia, United Kingdom, Viet Nam.

## B. Non-proliferation/Democratic People's Republic of Korea

During the period under review, Council members held a videoconference in connection with the item entitled “Non-proliferation/Democratic People’s Republic of Korea” to announce the adoption of a resolution, under Chapter VII of the Charter.<sup>854</sup> In addition, Council members held consultations of the whole and closed videoconferences in connection with the item.<sup>855</sup> More information on the videoconference is given in the table below.

<sup>854</sup> Owing to technical difficulties, instead of an open videoconference to announce the vote on resolution [2515 \(2020\)](#) the videoconference was closed. For more information on the procedures and working methods developed during the COVID-19 pandemic, see part II.

<sup>855</sup> See [A/75/2](#), part II, chap. 34. See also [S/2020/344](#), [S/2020/1045](#) and [S/2021/203](#).

On 30 March, the Council unanimously adopted resolution [2515 \(2020\)](#). By the resolution, the Council extended the mandate of the Panel of Experts appointed pursuant to resolution [1874 \(2009\)](#) in support of the Committee established pursuant to resolution [1718 \(2006\)](#), for a period of 12 months, until 30 April 2021.<sup>856</sup> The Council requested the Panel to provide periodic reports and expressed its intent to review the Panel’s mandate and to take appropriate action regarding a further extension no later than 26 March 2021, as well as to continue to follow the work of the Panel.<sup>857</sup>

<sup>856</sup> Resolution [2515 \(2020\)](#), para. 1. For more information on the mandate of the Committee established pursuant to resolution [1718 \(2006\)](#) and the Panel of Experts, see part IX, sect. I.

<sup>857</sup> Resolution [2515 \(2020\)](#), paras. 1, 2 and 4.

### Videoconference: non-proliferation/Democratic People’s Republic of Korea

<i>Videoconference date</i>	<i>Videoconference record</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Decision, vote (for-against-abstaining) and record of written procedure</i>
30 March 2020	<a href="#">S/2020/270</a>		Resolution <a href="#">2515 (2020)</a> 15-0-0 (adopted under Chapter VII) <a href="#">S/2020/246</a>

## 33. Peacebuilding and sustaining peace

During the period under review, the Council held one meeting under the item entitled “Peacebuilding and sustaining peace”, which took the form of an open

debate.<sup>858</sup> More information on the meeting, including on participants and speakers is given in table 1 below. Council members also held three open videoconferences

<sup>858</sup> For more information on the format of meetings, see part II, sect. II.

in connection with the item and the Council adopted one resolution.<sup>859</sup> More information on the videoconferences is given in table 2 below. In addition to the meeting and videoconferences, in 2020 Council members also held an informal interactive dialogue on 22 July in connection with the item.<sup>860</sup>

In 2020, Council members were briefed by a number of speakers, including the Secretary-General, the Deputy Secretary-General, the former Secretary-General, the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, the President of the Economic and Social Council and representatives from international and regional organizations, such as the African Union Development Agency, and speakers from civil society and non-governmental organizations.

On 13 February, at the initiative of Belgium, which held the Presidency for the month,<sup>861</sup> the Council convened a high-level open debate<sup>862</sup> under the sub-item entitled “Transitional justice in conflict and post-conflict situations”. In her statement, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights stated that lasting peace was interlinked with justice, development and respect for human rights. Her experience in Chile had convinced her that transitional justice processes that were context-specific, nationally owned and focused on victims could connect, empower and transform societies, thereby contributing to lasting and just peace. She emphasized truth-seeking initiatives as they enabled victims to recount their experiences and opened new spaces where victims and perpetrators could re-establish a connection, adding that such processes were often deeply empowering for victims. The High Commissioner further noted that criminal accountability was vital but should be accompanied by a broad range of complementary measures to support truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence. Following the briefing by the High Commissioner, the President of the Commission for the Clarification of Truth, Coexistence and Non-Repetition of Colombia stated that transitional justice was the most comprehensive, dynamic and promising peacebuilding instrument at the disposal of victims around the world and peoples who had endured gross human rights violations during situations of internal armed conflict. He focused on five main points: victims, truth in transitional justice, non-repetition, comprehensive transition and the role of

the Security Council and the international community. With regard to the latter, the Council and the international community must play a vital role in ensuring transitional justice. Peace was the responsibility of a nation’s citizens, but the cases that called for transitional justice involved extreme ruptures in the human experience. Ensuring transitional justice was therefore incumbent on the world community, as these were dynamically and externally interrelated conflicts that no country could manage alone. The Executive Director of the Foundation for Human Rights in South Africa, Trustee of the Desmond Tutu Peace Centre and Chair of the Commission on Human Rights in South Sudan stated that it was important to ensure that peace and justice were seen as mutually reinforcing imperatives and not replaced by the erroneous notion that peace must come first, before accountability. She called on the Council to address impunity using a prevention lens to ensure the non-recurrence of violations and to address the indirect causes of conflict that exacerbated conflict, namely, structural violence, discrimination, economic exploitation, unequal power relations and climate justice.

During the discussion, several Council members shared the experience of their respective countries’ national reconciliation processes.<sup>863</sup> Several Council members called for inclusive transitional justice and highlighted the importance of the role of women in reconciliation processes.<sup>864</sup> During the debate, some speakers emphasized the importance of accountability within reconciliation processes and stressed the need to combat impunity.<sup>865</sup> Some argued that the International Criminal Court could help to bring justice or support to victims of gross violations.<sup>866</sup> Several Council members rejected one-size-fits-all strategies or generic approaches and argued that transitional justice processes should take into consideration national and local contexts.<sup>867</sup> Council members stated that the Council should play a greater role in promoting and supporting transitional justice processes.<sup>868</sup>

<sup>863</sup> Niger, Estonia, South Africa, Tunisia and Germany.

<sup>864</sup> Belgium, Estonia, South Africa, United States, Indonesia, France, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Dominican Republic and Viet Nam.

<sup>865</sup> Belgium, Niger, Estonia, Tunisia, United Kingdom, France, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Germany.

<sup>866</sup> Belgium, Estonia, Tunisia, Germany and France.

<sup>867</sup> Belgium, South Africa, United States, Indonesia, Tunisia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, France, China, Viet Nam and Russian Federation.

<sup>868</sup> Belgium, Estonia, South Africa, Indonesia, Tunisia, Germany and Dominican Republic. For more information on the discussion, see part VI, sect. IV.

<sup>859</sup> Resolution 2558 (2020). For more information on the procedures and working methods developed during the COVID-19 pandemic, see part II.

<sup>860</sup> See A/75/2, part II, chap. 28. See also S/2021/9.

<sup>861</sup> The Council had before it a concept note annexed to a letter dated 4 February 2020 (S/2020/98).

<sup>862</sup> See S/PV.8723.

On 12 August, at the initiative of Indonesia, which held the Presidency for the month,<sup>869</sup> Council members held an open videoconference<sup>870</sup> in connection with the item, under the sub-item entitled “Pandemics and the challenges of sustaining peace”. Council members were briefed by the Secretary-General, former Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and the Director of the New York University Center on International Cooperation.

The Secretary-General stated that the COVID-19 pandemic threatened hard-won development and peacebuilding gains and risked exacerbating conflicts or fomenting new ones. He identified three key dangers, namely, the erosion of public trust, the destabilization of the global economic order, and the weakening of the social fabric. Nevertheless, he argued that the pandemic also created opportunities for peace, noting that the appeal for a global ceasefire had prompted positive responses from Governments and non-State actors and that the adoption of resolution [2532 \(2020\)](#) had been a step in the right direction. He called on the Council to use its influence for an investment in prevention. In that regard, the responses to the pandemic had to be conflict-sensitive and inclusive. In addition, sustaining peace required an integrated and coherent approach through strong collaboration among humanitarian, development and peace actors. The Council and the Peacebuilding Commission could help to marshal a collaborative response to the peacebuilding impact of the pandemic, drawing on lessons from previous health crises, such as the Ebola virus disease outbreak. The Secretary-General added that the approach to the peacebuilding needs in the context of the pandemic had to be flexible and tailored, citing examples from the Peacebuilding Fund. In his statement, the former Secretary-General welcomed the adoption of resolution [2532 \(2020\)](#) calling for a humanitarian ceasefire, but expressed regret that valuable months had been wasted in arguments over the details of the text. That, he said, had weakened the message that the Council needed to send to all warring parties, namely, that it was the time to confront a common enemy. He noted that the impact of the pandemic on conflict-affected settings had been much worse than initially thought, both in terms of the

immediate health and humanitarian ramifications, but also in the areas of social cohesion, governance and the rule of law. He stressed that global solidarity had been loosened, while multilateralism had been under threat. Noting that the economic impacts of the pandemic would be both long-lasting and severe, he cited warnings of famines by the World Food Programme and the loss of opportunities for education. With reference to the joint resolutions on peacebuilding adopted by the Council and the General Assembly (Council resolution [2282 \(2016\)](#) and Assembly resolution [70/262](#)) and the Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the former Secretary-General stressed that they had offered an opportunity to the United Nations to focus on preventing conflicts so that the systemic causes of conflicts, rather than just the symptoms, were holistically addressed; the lessons learned could also be applied to the response to COVID-19. He said that the experience of the crisis must also spur the international community to change the priorities and the understandings of what threats and values really mattered, addressing the inequalities in societies and the gaps in social protection. Furthermore, the pandemic had demonstrated the genuine utility of sustaining peace and proved the benefits of enhancing the humanitarian-development-peace nexus and it served as an opportunity to promote greater discussions and activities on emerging threats. It had also shown that the United Nations needed to work more effectively with various partners, including regional organizations, international financial institutions, the private sector and civil society. In that regard, the Peacebuilding Commission was well positioned to help to synergize multi-stakeholder partnerships by making full use of its distinctive convening power. The Director of the New York University Center on International Cooperation stated that the pandemic had exposed fragility in all countries, in health systems and economic, social and political fabric. She identified five major drivers of conflict, namely, economic shock and rising inequality, practical problems in convening peace processes and elections, growing food insecurity, a decrease in remittances and issues concerning trade and migration, and unequal access to public-health goods. Nevertheless, she argued that positive opportunities for peacebuilding existed, such as the unprecedented demand for more international collective action, the call for ceasefires issued by the Secretary-General and supported in resolution [2532 \(2020\)](#), the opportunity to use a sustaining-peace lens from early on in the response to the pandemic and the investment in universal health and equal access to vaccines.

<sup>869</sup> The Council has before it a concept note annexed to a letter dated 30 July 2020 ([S/2020/765](#)).

<sup>870</sup> See [S/2020/799](#). Estonia and Indonesia were represented by their respective Ministers for Foreign Affairs; Germany was represented by its Minister of State at the Federal Foreign Office; South Africa was represented by its Minister for International Relations and Cooperation; and Viet Nam was represented by its Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs.

She added that those problems could become international threats to peace and security if not addressed by the Council, arguing that they formed an example of an extreme public health and economic shock that deserved to qualify as a peacebuilding risk.

Council members warned that the pandemic threatened to reverse or delay hard-won peacebuilding gains in conflict-affected areas.<sup>871</sup> Some speakers stressed the importance of international cooperation and multilateralism in the fight against the pandemic.<sup>872</sup> Council members welcomed and reaffirmed the Secretary-General's appeal for an immediate global ceasefire and facilitation of humanitarian activities during the period of crisis.<sup>873</sup> Furthermore, some participants called for the lifting of sanctions, arguing that they could undermine countries' ability to address the pandemic.<sup>874</sup> Some speakers emphasized the inclusion of both women and youth in the response to the pandemic and in peacebuilding processes in general.<sup>875</sup> Several Council members highlighted the importance of the Peacebuilding Commission during the pandemic,<sup>876</sup> some of which called for a greater advisory role for the Commission vis-à-vis the Council.<sup>877</sup>

On 3 November, at the initiative of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, which held the Presidency for the month,<sup>878</sup> Council members held an open videoconference in connection with the item on the theme "Contemporary drivers of conflict and insecurity".<sup>879</sup> At the videoconference,<sup>880</sup> Council

members heard briefings by the Deputy Secretary-General, the Chief Executive Officer of the African Union Development Agency, the Vice Chancellor of the University of the West Indies and the President of the Economic and Social Council.<sup>881</sup>

The Deputy Secretary-General stated that the COVID-19 pandemic continued to exacerbate the risks and drivers of conflict, reversing development and peacebuilding gains, aggravating conflicts and undermining efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. She stated that the climate emergency was a major driver of inequality, insecurity and conflict. Noting that the drivers of conflict were not static, she stressed that building and sustaining peace required addressing the root causes as they developed and interacted with one another. The pandemic had highlighted the necessity of investing in inclusive, equitable governance and institutions, as well as tackling root causes, so as to address the drivers of all kinds of crises and shocks. The Chief Executive Officer of the African Union Development Agency drew attention to the critical situation in West Africa in general and in the Sahel in particular. Given the high natural population growth, those States and their Governments' capacity to provide public services and administer their territory would remain glaringly inadequate. He emphasized the security crisis throughout the region, which affected civilian populations causing food insecurity and displacement of populations. Moreover, structural obstacles to development and the challenging security situation were compounded by new risk factors exacerbating an already fragile situation, such as the warming in the Sahel and the increase in the frequency of extreme weather events. He suggested several measures to mitigate the socioeconomic fragility and financial poverty of States and concluded by emphasizing the importance of data, their analysis and the consensus built around them as tools for the formulation of holistic, coherent and sustainable policies and methods of intervention. The Vice Chancellor of the University of the West Indies highlighted the reparatory justice movement against the legacies of slavery, violent colonization and institutional racism. He called upon the United Nations to reconvene the 1960s Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the

<sup>871</sup> Indonesia, Viet Nam, South Africa, Germany, Belgium, China, Dominican Republic, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and United Kingdom. For more information on the discussion, see part VII, sect. I.

<sup>872</sup> Viet Nam, South Africa, Germany, Belgium, China, France and Tunisia.

<sup>873</sup> Viet Nam, South Africa, China and Niger.

<sup>874</sup> Viet Nam, South Africa, China, Russian Federation and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

<sup>875</sup> Estonia, Germany, Dominican Republic, France, Niger and Tunisia.

<sup>876</sup> Estonia, South Africa, Germany, Belgium, China, Dominican Republic, France, Russian Federation and United Kingdom.

<sup>877</sup> Estonia, Germany and Dominican Republic.

<sup>878</sup> The Council had before it a concept note annexed to a letter dated 30 October 2020 (S/2020/1064).

<sup>879</sup> An analytical summary of the videoconference was subsequently distributed annexed to a letter dated 29 December 2020 from the representative of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines to the Secretary-General (S/2020/1328).

<sup>880</sup> See S/2020/1090. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines was represented by its Prime Minister. Belgium was represented by its Minister of Development Cooperation; Estonia was represented by its Deputy Minister for

Foreign Affairs; Germany was represented by its Minister of State at the Federal Foreign Office; the Russian Federation was represented by its Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs; South Africa was represented by its Deputy Minister of International Relations and Cooperation; Tunisia was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs; the United Kingdom was represented by its Minister of State for the Commonwealth, the United Nations and South Asia; and Viet Nam was represented by its Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs.

<sup>881</sup> See S/2020/1090.



Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to settle the matter of reparations, noting that it was a necessary part of the International Decade for People of African Descent adopted by the United Nations to alleviate the continuing suffering of people of African descent who had been the targeted victims of violent colonization. He also called upon the Council to acknowledge the reparations for the slavery movement and to “assist the world in moving on and beyond the historical site of these crimes”. The President of the Economic and Social Council referred to Articles 55 and 65 of the Charter and argued that the Charter’s framers had clearly conceived that the United Nations would both collectively maintain and enforce peace and create the conditions for peace and stability. He argued that the Member States had failed to live up to the ideals of collective and cooperative security and recalled in that regard the Secretary-General’s observation earlier in the year that “inequality was the hallmark of our times”. He stressed that the origins of many, if not most, of the conflicts and disputes on the agenda of the Security Council could be traced to this unequal world order and called for the implementation by the international community of several forms of debt suspension and restructuring, as well as reforms to address structural inequalities.<sup>882</sup>

At the meeting,<sup>883</sup> a number of Council members stressed that the COVID-19 pandemic had exposed vulnerabilities and exacerbated root causes of conflict.<sup>884</sup> Council members also highlighted climate change as a major driver of conflict.<sup>885</sup> The representative of the Russian Federation stated, however, that climate change was not to be considered as a universal factor underlying conflict and global insecurity. Council members called for a whole-of-system approach to peacebuilding with an enhanced coordination among United Nations institutions and agencies.<sup>886</sup> Some Council members underscored the importance of cooperation between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations.<sup>887</sup> Several Council members stressed that peace and development were linked and interdependent.<sup>888</sup> Several participants acknowledged the

work of the Peacebuilding Commission and called for the strengthening of its advisory role.<sup>889</sup>

In 2020, the Council unanimously adopted one resolution in connection with the item. Pursuant to the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding and sustaining peace,<sup>890</sup> the General Assembly and the Council concluded the 2020 comprehensive review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture through the adoption of identical resolutions, namely, Assembly resolution [75/201](#) and Council resolution [2558 \(2020\)](#), both of 21 December.<sup>891</sup> By resolution [2558 \(2020\)](#), the Council reaffirmed that development, peace and security and human rights were interlinked and mutually reinforcing. Moreover, the Council expressed grave concern regarding the devastating impact of the COVID-19 pandemic across the world, especially in conflict-affected countries.<sup>892</sup> The Council welcomed the progress made in the implementation of the resolutions on peacebuilding and sustaining peace by Member States as well as the important role of the Peacebuilding Commission, and called upon it to continue strengthening its advisory, bridging and convening roles in support of nationally owned priorities and efforts in the countries and regions under its consideration. The Council noted that peacebuilding financing remained a critical challenge and therefore took note of the Assembly’s decision to convene a high-level meeting during its seventy-sixth session to advance, explore and consider options for ensuring adequate, predictable and sustained financing for peacebuilding. By the same resolution, the Council called for a further comprehensive review of United Nations peacebuilding in 2025 and requested the Secretary-General to present to the Assembly

<sup>882</sup> For more information on the relations between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, see part IV, sect. II.

<sup>883</sup> See [S/2020/1090](#).

<sup>884</sup> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Tunisia, Germany, Russian Federation, South Africa, Viet Nam, China, Dominican Republic, France, Indonesia and Niger.

<sup>885</sup> Belgium, Estonia, Germany, South Africa, United Kingdom, China, Dominican Republic, France, Indonesia and Niger.

<sup>886</sup> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Belgium, Russian Federation, South Africa, China, France and Indonesia.

<sup>887</sup> South Africa, Viet Nam, China, Indonesia and Niger.

<sup>888</sup> Belgium, Estonia, South Africa, United Kingdom, China, Niger, Indonesia and France.

<sup>889</sup> Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark (on behalf of the Nordic countries), El Salvador, European Union, Georgia, Guatemala, Ireland, Japan, Malta, Namibia, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Switzerland and United Arab Emirates. For more information on the Peacebuilding Commission, see part IX, sect. VII.

<sup>890</sup> See [S/2020/773](#). In addition to the report of the Secretary-General, inputs for the 2020 review of the peacebuilding architecture were also provided by, among others, the Peacebuilding Commission through the letter dated 2 July 2020 from the Chair of the Commission ([S/2020/645](#)) and the group of independent eminent persons through its letters transmitted by the Secretary-General in a letter dated 6 July 2020 (see [S/2020/678](#)). The group of independent eminent persons was requested to submit its reflections on the implementation of the resolutions on the peacebuilding architecture through identical letters dated 31 January 2020 and 3 February 2020 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Council ([S/2020/91](#)).

<sup>891</sup> For more information on relations between the Council and the General Assembly, see part IV, sect. I.

<sup>892</sup> Resolution [2558 \(2020\)](#), third and seventh preambular paragraphs.

and the Council an interim report in 2022 and a second, detailed report in 2024 in advance of the review, as well as to continue to present a report every two years following that

review, on continued implementation of the resolutions on peacebuilding and sustaining peace.<sup>893</sup>

<sup>893</sup> Ibid., paras. 1, 2, 4 and 5.

**Table 1**  
**Meeting: peacebuilding and sustaining peace**

<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Sub-item</i>	<i>Other documents</i>	<i>Rule 37 invitations</i>	<i>Rule 39 and other invitations</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Decision and vote (for-against-abstaining)</i>
<a href="#">S/PV.8723</a> 13 February 2020	Transitional justice in conflict and post-conflict situations  Letter dated 4 February 2020 from the Permanent Representative of Belgium to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General ( <a href="#">S/2020/98</a> )		42 Member States <sup>a</sup>	United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, President of the Commission for the Clarification of Truth, Coexistence and Non-Repetition of Colombia, Executive Director of the Foundation for Human Rights in South Africa, Permanent Observer of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Head of the Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations	All Council members <sup>b</sup> and all invitees <sup>c</sup>	

<sup>a</sup> Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Gambia, Georgia, Guatemala, India, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey and Ukraine.

<sup>b</sup> Belgium (President of the Security Council) was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Defence; Estonia was represented by its Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs; and the Niger was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs, Cooperation, African Integration and Nigeriens Abroad.

<sup>c</sup> Guatemala was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs; and Spain was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs, European Union and Cooperation. The representative of Norway spoke on behalf of the Nordic countries. The representative of Azerbaijan spoke on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. The Head of the Delegation of the European Union spoke on behalf of the European Union and its member States, as well as Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Montenegro, North Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Turkey and Ukraine. The High Commissioner for Human Rights participated in the meeting by videoconference from Geneva.

Table 2  
**Videoconferences: peacebuilding and sustaining peace**

<i>Videoconference date</i>	<i>Videoconference record</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Decision, vote (for-against-abstaining) and record of written procedure</i>
12 August 2020	<a href="#">S/2020/799</a>	Letter dated 14 August 2020 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General and the Permanent Representatives of the members of the Security Council	
3 November 2020	<a href="#">S/2020/1090</a>	Letter dated 5 November 2020 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General and the Permanent Representatives of the members of the Security Council	
21 December 2020	<a href="#">S/2020/1273</a>	Letter dated 21 December 2020 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General and the Permanent Representatives of the members of the Security Council	Resolution <a href="#">2558 (2020)</a> 15-0-0 <a href="#">S/2020/1269</a>

### 34. Threats to international peace and security

During the period under review, the Council held no meetings in connection with the item entitled “Threats to international peace and security”. Council members did, however, hold three videoconferences in 2020 in connection with the item.<sup>894</sup> More information on the videoconferences is given in the table below. In addition, the Council adopted its resolution [2544 \(2020\)](#) in connection with the item.

In 2020, in connection with the item, Council members heard two briefings on the progress in the work of the United Nations Investigative Team to Promote Accountability for Crimes Committed by Da’esh/Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (UNITAD), at which the Special Adviser and Head of UNITAD briefed the members of the Council on the activities of the Investigative Team. In the videoconference held on 15 June, he presented the fourth report<sup>895</sup> on the activities of UNITAD and informed the Council about the significant progress made in the identification and collection of new sources of evidentiary material which, if fully harnessed, had the potential to mark a paradigm shift in the prosecution of ISIL (Da’esh) members for the crimes they had committed in Iraq.<sup>896</sup> The Special Adviser noted that UNITAD had moved forward a number of its lines of investigation into a phase of evidence consolidation and legal analysis. He further provided Council members with updates on the progress made in the investigation of crimes in the

areas of Mosul, Sinjar and Tikrit, noting the cooperation of UNITAD with the Iraqi and Kurdistan Regional Government authorities. With regard to the fifth report of UNITAD,<sup>897</sup> on 10 December Council members held another videoconference<sup>898</sup> in which the Special Adviser presented the innovative solutions that UNITAD had developed to confront the unprecedented challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, including the use of remote interviews and submission of evidence through a new online portal. The Special Adviser stated that the provision of meaningful support by UNITAD to Iraqi investigative judges represented an important moment in the implementation of its mandate, adding that with the potential adoption of legislation in Iraq allowing for the prosecution of international crimes, it was possible to begin to see a clear path towards the fulfilment of the promise made by the Council to survivors and affected communities through resolution [2379 \(2017\)](#). The Special Adviser also underlined the partnerships built by UNITAD with non-governmental organizations and with the religious leadership of Iraq. Concluding his briefing, the Special Adviser noted that UNITAD would continue to rely on the unanimous support of the Council members. Following the briefing, several Council members expressed their full support for the work of UNITAD,<sup>899</sup> with some focusing on the importance of cooperation with a range of local actors, including civil society.<sup>900</sup> Other Council members noted the

<sup>894</sup> For more information on the procedures and working methods developed during the COVID-19 pandemic, see part II.

<sup>895</sup> See [S/2020/386](#).

<sup>896</sup> See [S/2020/547](#).

<sup>897</sup> See [S/2020/1107](#).

<sup>898</sup> See [S/2020/1193](#).

<sup>899</sup> Belgium, Dominican Republic, Estonia, France, Niger, United Kingdom and United States.

<sup>900</sup> Germany, Indonesia and South Africa.