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Introductory note

Part II of the Repertoire covers the practice of the Security Council in relation to its provisional rules of procedure and relevant Articles of the Charter of the United Nations. Since the provisional rules of procedure are routinely applied by the Council at its formal meetings, the focus of part II is on special applications of the rules in the proceedings of the Council, rather than on the standard applications of the rules.

Part II is divided into 10 sections, in the order of the relevant chapters of the provisional rules of procedure, as follows: section I, meetings and records (Article 28 of the Charter and rules 1 to 5 and 48 to 57); section II, agenda (rules 6 to 12); section III, representation and credentials (rules 13 to 17); section IV, presidency (rules 18 to 20); section V, Secretariat (rules 21 to 26); section VI, conduct of business (rules 27, 29 and 30, and 33); section VII, participation (rules 37 and 39); section VIII, decision-making and voting (Article 27 of the Charter and rules 31, 32, 34 to 36, 38 and 40); section IX, languages (rules 41 to 47); and section X, status of the provisional rules of procedure (Article 30 of the Charter).

The remaining rules are covered in other parts of the present Supplement, as follows: rule 28, concerning subsidiary organs of the Council, in parts IX and X; and rule 61, regarding relations with other United Nations organs, in part IV.

During the period under review, there were no instances of the application of rules 58 to 60, concerning the admission of new Members, and therefore the present Supplement contains no material relating to those rules.

* * *

During the period under review, the Council held a total of 552 meetings: 256 meetings were held in 2016, and 296 in 2017. Most of these meetings were public, as the Council held 19 private meetings in 2016, and 14 private meetings in 2017. Furthermore, the Council held a total of 170 informal consultations of the whole (consultations) in 2016, and 137 in 2017. In 2016 and 2017, Council members continued to meet in the framework of informal interactive dialogues (also known as IIDs) and Arria-formula meetings, following past practice. During the period
under review, the Council continued to expand the practice of holding “wrap-up” sessions at the end of the month, some of which were conducted in the context of public meetings of the Council.

While remaining seized of 68 agenda items, the Council considered at its meetings 49 items in 2016, and 52 items in 2017. Furthermore, out of the 49 items considered in 2016, 27 concerned country-specific and regional items, and 22 thematic and other issues. Out of the 52 items considered by the Council in 2017, 27 concerned country-specific and regional situations, and 25 thematic and other issues.

During the period under review, the Council added the item entitled “Identical letters dated 19 January 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (S/2016/53)” to its agenda, whereas the item entitled “The situation in Timor-Leste” was removed from the agenda of the Council.

In 2016, the Council adopted 77 resolutions and issued 19 statements by the President, and in 2017, the Council adopted 61 resolutions and issued 27 statements by the President, for a total of 138 resolutions and 46 presidential statements. During the period under review, there were three instances of draft resolutions not adopted due to the lack of the required nine affirmative votes, two in 2016 and one in 2017, and eight instances of draft resolutions not adopted due to a negative vote of a permanent member, two in 2016 and six in 2017.

Furthermore, during the period under review the Council also issued 23 notes by the President, 14 in 2016 and nine in 2017, as well as 88 letters by the President, 45 in 2016 and 43 in 2017.

In connection with the question of its working methods, the Council held an open debate under the item entitled “Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)” on 19 July 2016, in the context of which a wide variety of aspects of the procedure and practice of the Council were discussed (see cases 1, 4, 5, 6 and 9 below).

Moreover, three notes by the President issued during the period under review, addressed various aspects of the working methods of the Council. Presidential note of 22 February 2016 (S/2016/170) pertained to the work of the subsidiary organs of the Council and outlined, inter

---

1 S/PV.7740.
alia, measures to improve the transparency of their work, and presidential note of 15 July 2016 (S/2016/619) presented measures concerning newly elected members, including the preparation of newly elected members. The note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507) incorporated and further developed measures agreed to by the Council with regard to its working methods contained in 13 prior presidential notes adopted after the issuance of the note by the President of 26 July 2010 (S/2010/507).² The note was issued under the Chairmanship of Japan of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and other Procedural Questions (IWG).

Following the adoption of the new note, the President of the Security Council read a statement to the press highlighting the main revisions of the working methods contained in the note (SC/12976), namely with regard to the process of consultation on the monthly programme of work, the effective conduct of informal consultations, and the drafting process of outcome documents of the Council. In this connection, the new note referred to the concept of penholder or penholders, as the “informal arrangement” whereby one or more Council members initiate and chair the informal drafting process aimed at facilitating timely initiatives to ensure Council action while preserving an element of continuity.³ Moreover, the new note also revised other aspects of the working methods in connection with the dialogue with non-Council members and bodies,⁴ and missions of the Security Council, including joint missions with the Peace and Security Council of the African Union.⁵

---

³ S/2017/507 para. 78.
⁴ Ibid., para. 97.
⁵ Ibid., para. 122.
I. Meetings and records

Note


Article 28

1. The Security Council shall be so organized as to be able to function continuously. Each member of the Security Council shall for this purpose be represented at all times at the seat of the Organization.

2. The Security Council shall hold periodic meetings at which each of its members may, if it so desires, be represented by a member of the government or by some other specially designated representative.

3. The Security Council may hold meetings at such places other than the seat of the Organization as in its judgment will best facilitate its work.

Rule 1

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

Rule 2
The President shall call a meeting of the Security Council at the request of any member of the Security Council.

Rule 3

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

Rule 4

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

Rule 5

Meetings of the Security Council shall normally be held at the seat of the United Nations.

Any member of the Security Council or the Secretary-General may propose that the Security Council should meet at another place. Should the Security Council accept any such proposal, it shall decide upon the place and the period during which the Council shall meet at such place.

Rule 48
Unless it decides otherwise, the Security Council shall meet in public. Any recommendation to the General Assembly regarding the appointment of the Secretary-General shall be discussed and decided at a private meeting.

Rule 49

Subject to the provisions of rule 51, the verbatim record of each meeting of the Security Council shall be made available to the representatives on the Security Council and to the representatives of any other States which have participated in the meeting not later than 10 a.m. of the first working day following the meeting.

Rule 50

The representatives of the States which have participated in the meeting shall, within two working days after the time indicated in rule 49, inform the Secretary-General of any corrections they wish to have made in the verbatim record.

Rule 51

The Security Council may decide that for a private meeting the record shall be made in a single copy alone. This record shall be kept by the Secretary-General. The representatives of the States which have participated in the meeting shall, within a period of ten days, inform the Secretary-General of any corrections they wish to have made in this record.

Rule 52
Corrections that have been requested shall be considered approved unless the President is of the opinion that they are sufficiently important to be submitted to the representatives on the Security Council. In the latter case, the representatives on the Security Council shall submit within two working days any comments they may wish to make. In the absence of objections in this period of time, the record shall be corrected as requested.

**Rule 53**

The verbatim record referred to in rule 49 or the record referred to in rule 51, in which no corrections have been requested in the period of time required by rules 50 and 51, respectively, or which has been corrected in accordance with the provisions of rule 52, shall be considered as approved. It shall be signed by the President and shall become the official record of the Security Council.

**Rule 54**

The official record of public meetings of the Security Council, as well as the documents annexed thereto, shall be published in the official languages as soon as possible.

**Rule 55**

At the close of each private meeting the Security Council shall issue a communiqué through the Secretary-General.

**Rule 56**
The representatives of the Members of the United Nations which have taken part in a private meeting shall at all times have the right to consult the record of that meeting in the office of the Secretary-General. The Security Council may at any time grant access to this record to authorized representatives of other Members of the United Nations.

Rule 57

The Secretary-General shall, once each year, submit to the Security Council a list of the records and documents which up to that time have been considered confidential. The Security Council shall decide which of these shall be made available to other Members of the United Nations, which shall be made public, and which shall continue to remain confidential.

This section is organized under the following five headings: A. Convening of meetings pursuant to rules 1 to 5 as well as rule 48; B. Informal consultations of the whole; C. Informal gatherings of members of the Council; D. Discussions concerning meetings; and E. Records pursuant to rules 49 to 57.

During the period under review, the Council held a total of 552 meetings, an increase of 9% with respect to the previous biennium. Out of the 552 meetings, 256 meetings were held in 2016, and 296 in 2017. Most of the meetings were public; the Council held 19 private meetings in 2016, and 14 private meetings in 2017. Furthermore, during the period under review the Council held a total of 307 informal consultations of the whole (also known as consultations, or informal consultations). 170 consultations were held in 2016 and 137 were held in 2017.

In 2016 and 2017, Council members continued to hold informal interactive dialogues (IIDs) and Arria-formula meetings. During the period under review, the Council continued to

---

6 A total of 508 meetings were held in 2014-2015. Resumptions of meetings are not considered as separate meetings. For further information on meetings held in the previous biennium, see 19th Supplement, 2014-2015, part II.
hold “wrap-up” sessions at the end of the month. Whilst some “wrap-up” sessions were
conducted in the context of public meetings held under the agenda item entitled “Implementation
of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)”\(^7\), the majority took place in
the context of informal sessions.\(^8\) During 2016 and 2017, the question of the format of meetings
was raised during an open debate concerning the working methods of the Council, as illustrated
in case 1 below.

Figure 1 below shows the total number of meetings and informal consultations of the
whole held during the five-year period, between 2013 and 2017.

Figure 1

**Number of meetings and consultations: 2013-2017**

![Bar chart showing the number of meetings and consultations from 2013 to 2017]

A. Meetings

1. Application of rules related to meetings

\(^7\) See [S/PV 7616](http://www.un.org), [S/PV.7633](http://www.un.org), [S/PV.7703](http://www.un.org), [S/PV.7766](http://www.un.org), [S/PV.7892](http://www.un.org) and [S/PV.8038](http://www.un.org).

\(^8\) Some of the informal sessions were held as “Toledo style informal wrap-up sessions”, also known as “Toledo interactive briefings” (September 2016, October 2016, January 2017, May 2017, and June 2017). Toledo interactive briefings were launched in 2015, at the initiative of Spain, by members of the Council willing to present the activity of the Council for the month jointly, and in an interactive manner.
During the period under review, the Council continued to function without intervals exceeding 14 days between its meetings, as provided for under rule 1. The Council continued to convene more than one meeting a day, on certain occasions.

In 2016 and 2017, the Council did not hold any periodic meetings pursuant to rule 4 of the provisional rules of procedure or any meetings away from the headquarters in accordance with rule 5. On 20 September 2017, as the Council held its 8051st meeting under the item entitled “United Nations peacekeeping operations”, seven out of the 15 Council members were represented at the level of Head of State or Government, and seven were represented by high-level officials. This was the highest number of Heads of State or Government representing Council members since the last summit meeting held on 24 September 2014, under the item “Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts”.

During the reporting period, there were two communications from Member States requesting the Council to convene a meeting which explicitly cited rule 2 of the provisional rules of procedure as the basis for the request, and no requests citing rule 3. There were also four communications in which Member States made explicit references to Article 35 of the Charter. Table 1 below captures the communications from Member States requesting a meeting of the Council explicitly citing rule 2 and/or Article 35 of the Charter. During the period under review, there were also requests to convene meetings implicitly citing either rule 2 or 3, and/or Article 35. Table 2 below contains communications requesting an urgent or emergency meeting of the Council without explicitly citing rule 2 or 3 and/or Articles 34 or 35 of the Charter.

Table 1
Letters from Member States requesting a meeting in accordance with rule 2 and Article 35 in 2016 and 2017

---

9 Egypt, Senegal, and Ukraine were represented by their Presidents, while Ethiopia, Italy, Sweden, and the United Kingdom were represented by their Prime Ministers.
10 The United States were represented by the Vice President, China, France, Japan, Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation were represented by Foreign Ministers, and Uruguay was represented by the Deputy Minister for Political Affairs of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.
11 S/PV.7272.
12 For further details on the application of Article 35 of the Charter during the 2016 to 2017 period, please refer to part VI, section I.

Part II – Provisional rules of procedure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter addressed to the President of the Council</th>
<th>Explicit reference to Charter or provisional rules</th>
<th>Summary of meeting request</th>
<th>Meeting convened on the basis of the request (agenda item and date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 14 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Eritrea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2016/569)</td>
<td>Article 35</td>
<td>In accordance with Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter, request for an urgent meeting to discuss the attack by Ethiopia against Eritrean people in the Tsonora region on 12 June 2016</td>
<td>No meeting was convened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 23 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Eritrea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2016/568)</td>
<td>Article 35</td>
<td>Recalling previous appeal in letter dated 14 June 2016 (S/2016/569) to the Security Council on Ethiopian aggression in the Tsonora region on 12 June 2016, reiteration of request to convene an urgent meeting to discuss the incidence pursuant to Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter</td>
<td>No meeting was convened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identical letters dated 23 August 2016 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (S/2016/734)</td>
<td>Article 35</td>
<td>Request for an urgent meeting in connection with the joint military exercises by the United States and the Republic of Korea, in accordance with Articles 34 and 35</td>
<td>No meeting was convened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 1 December 2016 from the Permanent Representatives of France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Spain, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2016/1034)</td>
<td>Rule 2</td>
<td>Pursuant to rule 2 of the provisional rules of procedure, request for an urgent meeting on the situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, and for senior officials from the Secretariat and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to formally brief the Council at the meeting</td>
<td>7830th meeting (S/PV.7830) (The situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, 9 December 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 20 October 2017 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2017/882)</td>
<td>Article 35</td>
<td>In accordance with Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter, request “to bring up the US joint military exercise as its urgent agenda item under discussion”</td>
<td>No meeting was convened</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Letters from Member States requesting an urgent or emergency meeting without explicitly referring to any provision of the Charter or the provisional rules of procedure in 2016 and 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter addressed to the President of the Council</th>
<th>Explicit reference to Charter or provisional rules</th>
<th>Summary of meeting request</th>
<th>Meeting convened on the basis of the request (agenda item and date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 1 December 2017 from the Permanent Representatives of France, Italy, Japan, Senegal, Sweden, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2017/1006)</td>
<td>Rule 2</td>
<td>Request to the Council to convene a meeting on the situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, pursuant to rule 2 of the provisional rules of procedure</td>
<td>8130th meeting (S/PV.8130) (The situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, 11 December 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 6 May 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritania to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2016/427)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Request, on behalf of the Group of Arab States, for an emergency meeting to discuss the matter of protection of civilians in Syria</td>
<td>No meeting was convened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identical letters dated 6 March 2017 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (S/2017/192)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Requested that the issue of United States and Republic of Korea’s joint military exercises be placed on the Council’s agenda and discussed at a meeting</td>
<td>No meeting was convened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 2 May 2017 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2017/406)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transmittal of a request by the National Coalition of Syrian Revolutionary and Opposition Forces for an emergency meeting of the Council</td>
<td>No meeting was convened</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complaints raised by Member States concerning the application of rule 3

Part II – Provisional rules of procedure

During the period under review, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea raised various complaints for the non-convening of a meeting of the Security Council despite the requests submitted. In his letter dated 4 April 2016, the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea transmitted the remarks made by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 2 April 2016, deploring the disregard by the Council of a request to “convene an urgent meeting” in connection with the joint military drills of the United States and the Republic of Korea.\(^\text{13}\)

Subsequently, in a letter dated 22 March 2017 to the Secretary-General,\(^\text{14}\) the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea called attention to the request contained in a letter dated 6 March 2017 to the President of the Security Council,\(^\text{15}\) to hold an emergency meeting which, he noted, had received “no response at all”. Furthermore, on 15 December 2017, during the 8137\(^\text{th}\) meeting of the Council, the representative of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea deplored the fact that the Council had ignored repeated requests to raise and discuss urgently the “aggressive” military exercises conducted by the United States and the Republic of Korea.\(^\text{16}\)

2. Format

(i) Public meetings

The Council continued to convene meetings in public as provided for in rule 48 of the provisional rules of procedure, mainly for the purposes of the following: (i) receiving briefings on country-specific or regional situations, or thematic issues under its consideration; (ii) holding debates on particular agenda items; and (iii) adopting decisions.\(^\text{17}\) During the period under review, the Council held a total of 519 public meetings: 237 in 2016, and 282 in 2017 and

\(^{13}\) S/2016/324, p. 2.
\(^{14}\) S/2017/243.
\(^{15}\) S/2017/192.
\(^{16}\) S/PV.8137, p. 22. This was the first time that the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea participated, in accordance with rule 37 of the Council’s provisional rules of procedure, in a meeting convened under the item entitled “Non-proliferation/Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”, since the first meeting under this item, on 14 October 2006 (S/PV.5551). For further information on this meeting, see part I, section 37 in connection with “Non-proliferation/Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”.
\(^{17}\) According the note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507), Council members intended to continue to include the following formats for public meetings: open debate, debate, briefing and adoption, see S/2017/507, para. 21.

Part II – Provisional rules of procedure

increase of 11% in comparison with the 2014-2015 biennium in which the Council held a total of 469 public meetings.\textsuperscript{18}

During the review period, the Council held 32 high-level meetings in which two or more Council members were represented at the ministerial or higher levels,\textsuperscript{19} 26 on thematic agenda items, and six on regional and country-specific agenda items (see table 3). During 2016 and 2017, the Council held five meetings where a majority of the Council members (eight) were represented at the ministerial or higher levels, namely in connection with the situation in the Middle East, threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts, United Nations peacekeeping operations, and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and two meetings where at least a third of the Council were represented at the Head of State or government level, in relation to the situation in the Middle East, and United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting record and date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>High-level participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7606 19 January 2016</td>
<td>Protection of civilians in armed conflict</td>
<td>Ministerial level (3): Spain (Secretary of State for International Cooperation and for Ibero-America), Ukraine (Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs), Uruguay (Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7610 26 January 2016</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question</td>
<td>Ministerial level (5): Angola (Secretary of State for External Relations), Senegal (Minister for Foreign Affairs and Senegalese Abroad), Ukraine (Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs), United States (Permanent Representative to the United Nations and member of President’s Cabinet), Uruguay (Minister for Foreign Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7621 15 February 2016</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>Ministerial level (3): Angola (Secretary of State for External Relations), Spain (Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation), Venezuela (Minister for Foreign Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7653 21 March 2016</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>Ministerial level (4): Angola (Minister of External Relations), Spain (Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation), United Kingdom (Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office), United</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{18}See, for further information on meetings held in the previous biennium, see 19\textsuperscript{th} Supplement, 2014-2015, part II.  
\textsuperscript{19}In previous periods, the Repertoire would characterize as high-level meetings those meetings attended by five or more Council members represented at the ministerial or higher levels. From this Supplement, the Repertoire will be recording as high-level meetings those attended by two or more Council members represented at the ministerial or higher levels to reflect the importance attributed to these meetings in contemporary practice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting record and date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>High-level participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7690 11 May 2016</td>
<td>Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts</td>
<td>Ministerial level (6): <strong>Egypt</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>Japan</strong> (Deputy-Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>Malaysia</strong> (Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>New Zealand</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>Spain</strong> (Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation), <strong>United States</strong> (Permanent Representative to the United Nations and member of President's Cabinet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7711 10 June 2016</td>
<td>Protection of civilians in armed conflict</td>
<td>Ministerial level (7): <strong>France</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Development), <strong>Japan</strong> (Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>Senegal</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs and Senegalese Abroad), <strong>Spain</strong> (Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation), <strong>Ukraine</strong> (Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>United States</strong> (Permanent Representative to the United Nations and member of President's Cabinet), <strong>Uruguay</strong> (Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7750 28 July 2016</td>
<td>Peacebuilding and sustaining peace</td>
<td>Ministerial level (6): <strong>Angola</strong> (Minister of External Relations), <strong>France</strong> (Deputy Minister for Development and Francophonie), <strong>Japan</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>Malaysia</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>Senegal</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs and Senegalese Abroad), <strong>United States</strong> (Permanent Representative to the United Nations and member of President's Cabinet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7758 23 August 2016</td>
<td>Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction</td>
<td>Ministerial level (2): <strong>Japan</strong> (Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan), <strong>Malaysia</strong> (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Home Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7774 21 September 2016</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>Heads of State and Government (5): <strong>Egypt</strong> (President), <strong>New Zealand</strong> (Prime Minister), <strong>Senegal</strong> (President), <strong>Japan</strong> (Prime Minister), <strong>Ukraine</strong> (President)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7775 22 September 2016</td>
<td>Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts</td>
<td>Ministerial level (8): <strong>France</strong> (Minister of Environment, Energy and Marine Affairs), <strong>Malaysia</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>New Zealand</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>Senegal</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs and Senegalese Abroad), <strong>Spain</strong> (Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation), <strong>Ukraine</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>United Kingdom</strong> (Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs), <strong>United States</strong> (Secretary of State), <strong>Uruguay</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>Venezuela</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7776 23 September 2016</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>Ministerial level (7): <strong>Egypt</strong> (Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>New Zealand</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>Senegal</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs and Senegalese Abroad), <strong>Spain</strong> (Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation), <strong>Ukraine</strong> (Minister for Foreign Affairs), <strong>United Kingdom</strong> (Minister for Asia and the Pacific), <strong>United States</strong> (Secretary of State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting record and date</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>High-level participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7802 7 November 2016</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>Ministerial level (4): Senegal (Minister for Foreign Affairs and Senegalese Abroad), Spain (Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation), Ukraine (Minister for Foreign Affairs), United States (Permanent Representative to the United Nations and member of President's Cabinet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7837 15 December 2016</td>
<td>Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction</td>
<td>Ministerial level (6): Angola (Secretary of State for External Relations), New Zealand (Minister for Foreign Affairs), Senegal (Minister for Foreign Affairs and Senegalese Abroad), Spain (Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation), Ukraine (Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs), United Kingdom (Attorney General for England and Wales)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7847 20 December 2016</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>Heads of State and Government (1): Spain (Prime Minister) Ministerial level (2): Ukraine (Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs), United Kingdom (Minister of State, Department for International Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7857 10 January 2017</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>Ministerial level (9): Ethiopia (Minister for Foreign Affairs), France (Minister of State for Foreign Trade, the Promotion of Tourism and French Nationals Abroad), Italy (Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation), Japan (State Minister for Foreign Affairs), Kazakhstan (Minister for Foreign Affairs), Sweden (Minister for Foreign Affairs), Ukraine (Deputy Foreign Minister), United Kingdom (Minister of State for Europe and the Americas), United States (Permanent Representative to the United Nations and member of President's Cabinet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7882 13 February 2017</td>
<td>Threats to international peace and security</td>
<td>Ministerial level (3): Italy (Undersecretary of State of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation), Kazakhstan (Deputy Secretary of the Security Council), Ukraine (Minister for Foreign Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7886 21 February 2017</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>Ministerial level (4): Kazakhstan (Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs), Sweden (Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs), Ukraine (Minister for Foreign Affairs), United States (Permanent Representative to the United Nations and member of President's Cabinet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7898 15 March 2017</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>Ministerial level (6): Ethiopia (Minister for Women and Children's Affairs), France (Minister of Families, Children and Women’s Rights), Kazakhstan (Vice-Minister of National Economy), Sweden (Minister for Children, the Elderly and Gender Equality), Ukraine (Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs), United States (Permanent Representative to the United Nations and member of President's Cabinet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7905 23 March 2017</td>
<td>The situation in Somalia</td>
<td>Ministerial level (7): Ethiopia (State Minister for Foreign Affairs), Italy (Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation), Kazakhstan (Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Senegalese Abroad), Sweden (Minister for Foreign Affairs), Ukraine (First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs), United Kingdom (Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Part II – Provisional rules of procedure

During the period under review, the Council continued to hold meetings also in private, in accordance with rule 48 of the provisional rules of procedure. Private meetings continued to constitute a small percentage of all Council meetings, approximately 6% of all Council meetings, 33 out of a total 552 meetings held in 2016 and 2017. The Council held 19 private meetings in 2016 and 14 in 2017. Figure 2 depicts the percentage of public and private meetings during the period concerned.

Figure 2: Public and private meetings held in 2016 and 2017
Out of the 33 private meetings held in 2016 and 2017, there were 30 meetings (91%) with troop- and police-contributing countries held under the item entitled: “Meeting of the Security Council with the troop- and police-contributing countries pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B”; two meetings (6%) consisted of briefings by the President of the International Court of Justice; and one meeting (3%) was held to vote on the selection of the new Secretary-General, under the standing item entitled: “Recommendation for the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations”. Figure 3 features the breakdown of private meetings by type as described above, and table 4 provides relevant details on all private meetings held by the Council during the period under review, per item and in chronological order.

Figure 3: Private meetings held in 2016 and 2017

For further details on the deliberations on the procedure for the appointment of the Secretary-General during the 2016 to 2017 period, please refer to part IV, section I.D.
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Table 4

Private meetings in 2016 and 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Meeting record and date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation for the appointment of the Secretary-</td>
<td>S/PV.7782, 6 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General of the United Nations (one meeting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing by the President of the International Court of Justice</td>
<td>S/PV.7794, 26 October 2016; S/PV.8075, 25 October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(two meetings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Informal consultations of the whole

Informal consultations of the whole are not official meetings of the Council. They are gatherings of its members for the purpose of holding discussions and receiving briefings from the Secretariat and representatives of the Secretary-General in private. These meetings are not held in the Council’s chamber.

During the period under review, members of the Council continued to meet often in informal consultations of the whole: 170 times in 2016 and 137 times in 2017 (see figure 1 above). Frequently, informal consultations of the whole would be held immediately after public meetings of the Council.

Pursuant to the Council’s established practice, no official records of informal consultations were issued, and non-Council members were not invited. However, in several instances, press statements were issued or elements to the press were read out by the President of the Council following informal consultations.21 In the note by the President of 30 August 2017

---

21 For a complete list of press statements issued during the review period, see:
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Council members encouraged the President of the Council, with the assistance of the Secretariat, to promote additional appropriate measures to increase interactivity and a more efficient use of time during informal consultations of the whole. The note encouraged holding informal consultations on two issues at a three-hour Council meeting, notably with regard to situations routinely on its agenda, and prescribed that Council members and the Secretariat should continue to use the “Other matters” agenda item during informal consultations to raise issues of concern. In order to make consultations result-oriented as well as to increase the transparency of the work of the Security Council while securing confidentiality, the note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507) encouraged the President of the Council to make efforts, whenever appropriate, to suggest, at the end of consultations, general lines or elements to be used when providing briefings to the press.

C. Other informal meetings of the members of the Security Council

During the period under review, the Council continued to hold informal interactive dialogues and Arria-formula meetings. In practice, informal interactive dialogues have been convened with the participation of all Council members, while Arria-formula meetings have been convened with the participation of all or some Council members. Informal interactive dialogues and Arria-formula meetings are convened at the initiative of one or more members of the Council. Whilst informal interactive dialogues are presided by the President of the Security Council for the month, Arria-formula meetings are not. Frequently, the member or members convening the Arria-formula meeting would also chair the meeting. However, neither of the two types of meetings is considered a meeting of the Council; neither of these types of meetings is announced in the UN Journal or in the Council’s programme of work and no official records are prepared. Invitees to informal interactive dialogues and Arria-formula meetings include Member


22 S/2017/507, para. 45.
23 Ibid., para. 52.
24 Ibid., para. 53.
25 Ibid., para. 54.
26 For further information and details on informal interactive dialogues and Arria-formula meetings, see S/2017/507, paras. 92, 95, 97, 98 and 99.
States, relevant organizations and individuals. Whilst in past practice Arria-formula meetings were closed to the public, in recent practice, these meetings have been open to the public or even broadcast. Informal interactive dialogues are not open to the public or broadcast.

**Informal interactive dialogues**

During the reporting period, the Council held 11 informal interactive dialogues, four in 2016 and seven in 2017. According to the note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507) “when it deems appropriate” the Council may utilize informal interactive dialogues to seek the views of Member States that are parties to a conflict and/or other interested and affected parties. Seven out of the 11 informal interactive dialogues held in 2016 and 2017 concerned country-specific or regional situations, as described in table 5 below.

**Table 5**

**Informal interactive dialogues in 2016 and 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Participants (including non-members of the Council)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 June 2016</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>All Council members; Mali; Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of MINUSMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 June 2016</td>
<td>Post-conflict peacebuilding</td>
<td>All Council members; Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support; Deputy Director, Policy and Best Practices Section/Policy, Evaluation and Training Division of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO); Deputy Director of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); Central African Republic; Sierra Leone; Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission; Sweden (as Vice-Chair of the PBC); Republic of Korea (as Vice-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 Two out of the 12 Arria-formula meetings held in 2016 were broadcast, and in 2017 two out of the 17 Arria-formula meetings held were broadcast.

28 See for further details on the evolution of informal interactive dialogues, section I. C. 2 of part II of 16th to 19th Supplements, covering the period 2008 to 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Participants (including non-members of the Council)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 June 2016</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>All Council members; Special Representative of the African Union for Somalia and Head of the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM); Assistant Secretary-General for the Department of Field Support; Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Somalia (UNSOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 January 2017</td>
<td>Sudan and South Sudan</td>
<td>All Council members; Chair of the African Union High-Level Implementation Panel for Sudan (AUHIP); Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 January 2017</td>
<td>Sudan and South Sudan</td>
<td>All Council members; Chairperson of the Joint Monitoring and Evaluation Commission (JMEC) for the Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 March 2017</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>All Council members; African Union Special Representative for the Central African Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May 2017</td>
<td>Libya EUNAVFOR MED (Operation Sophia)</td>
<td>All Council members, Force Commander of EUNAVFOR MED; Deputy Secretary General for Common Security and Defence Policy and Crisis Response at the European External Action Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 June 2017</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>All Council members; Canada (as Chair of the Economic and Social Council Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Haiti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June 2017</td>
<td>Cooperation between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations in maintaining international peace and security</td>
<td>All Council members; High Representative for the African Union Peace Fund, Under-Secretary-General for Field Support, and Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 June 2017</td>
<td>Annual informal interactive dialogue on peacebuilding</td>
<td>All Council members; Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support; Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission; Deputy Permanent Representative of Egypt and Coordinator between the work of the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arria-formula meetings**

As provided for in the note by the President of 30 August 2017 ([S/2017/507](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2017/507)) Arria-formula meetings are intended to be utilized by members of the Council as “a flexible and informal forum” to enhance their deliberations, and their contact with civil society and non-governmental organizations. Further, according to the note by the President, Council members may invite, on an informal basis, any Member State, relevant organization or individual to

---

participate in Arria-formula meetings. During the period under review, the Council held a total of 29 such meetings; 12 in 2016 and 17 in 2017. Arria-formula meetings held during the period under review are listed in table 6 below.

Table 6

**Arria-formula meetings in 2016 and 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Organiser(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 January 2016</td>
<td>The Global Challenge of Accounting for Missing Persons from Conflict, Human Rights Abuses, Organized Crime, Migration and other Involuntary Causes</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 March 2016</td>
<td>Human Rights Components in Peace Operations</td>
<td>New Zealand; Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March 2016</td>
<td>Human rights situation in Crimea</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 2016</td>
<td>Food Security, Nutrition and Peace</td>
<td>Angola; Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 April 2016</td>
<td>Water, peace and security</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 April 2016</td>
<td>The situation concerning Western Sahara</td>
<td>Angola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 May 2016</td>
<td>Protection of the Palestinian civilian population in the occupied Palestinian territory*</td>
<td>Angola; Egypt; Malaysia; Senegal; Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 August 2016</td>
<td>Aleppo under siege: Syria’s latest tragedy unfolds</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 October 2016</td>
<td>Illegal Israeli settlements: obstacles to peace and the two-state solution</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 November 2016</td>
<td>Protection of critical infrastructure against terrorist attacks</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 November 2016</td>
<td>Cybersecurity and international peace and security</td>
<td>Spain; Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 December 2016</td>
<td>Synergies between Security Council resolutions on women, peace and security and the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 February 2017</td>
<td>Human rights in peace operations</td>
<td>Senegal; Sweden; Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 March 2017</td>
<td>Women, peace and security and mediation</td>
<td>Italy; United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March 2017</td>
<td>Hybrid wars as a threat to international peace and security</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April 2017</td>
<td>Security implications of climate change: Sea-level rise</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 April 2017</td>
<td>Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Syria</td>
<td>France; United Kingdom; United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 May 2017</td>
<td>International cooperation in criminal matters within the peace and security pillar: The role of central authorities</td>
<td>Italy and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 June 2017</td>
<td>Risk of famine in the conflicted-affected areas: Responding to the Secretary-General's call to action on the risk of famine in the conflict-affected areas of Yemen, Somalia, South Sudan and northeast Nigeria</td>
<td>Egypt; Ethiopia; France; Italy; Japan; Senegal; Sweden; United Kingdom; United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 June 2017</td>
<td>Preventing terrorism and violent extremism in the Horn of Africa: Enhancing partnership for regional efforts</td>
<td>Ethiopia; Italy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Ibid.
Other informal meetings

During the period under review, the Council held several informal meetings of an ad hoc nature. Following the practice started in 2007, meetings were held with the Peace and Security Council of the African Union.\(^\text{32}\) In this connection, and in accordance with the note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507), the members of the Council underscored “the importance of annual joint consultative meetings and informal dialogues with the members of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union” to exchange views on ways to strengthen cooperation and partnership.\(^\text{33}\)

D. Discussion concerning meetings

\(^{32}\) The meetings were held on 23 May 2016 (New York) and on 8 September 2017 (Addis Ababa). For information on prior practice concerning the informal joint meetings between the Security Council and the Peace and Security Council of the African Union, see part II, section I of 16th to 19th Supplements, covering the period 2007 to 2015.

\(^{33}\) See S/2017/507, para. 97. The note also provided that “Security Council [underscored] the importance of increased coordination, cooperation and interaction … with other relevant bodies including … regional organizations, including the African Union” (para. 93), and that, “the members of the Security Council [agreed] to consider joint missions of the Security Council and the Peace and Security Council of the African Union to conflict situations in Africa” (para. 122). For further information on the cooperation of the Council with regional and subregional organizations pursuant to Chapter VIII, see part VIII.
Aspects pertaining to the meetings of the Council, as well as to other forms of informal gatherings of members of the Council were discussed during the open debate on the Security Council working methods on 19 July 2016, under the item entitled: “Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)”, featured in case 1 below.

Case 1

Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)

During the open debate on the Security Council working methods, held at the 7740th meeting on 19 July 2016, a number of speakers discussed aspects pertaining to the meetings as well as other forms of informal gatherings of members of the Council, including their format. Several speakers welcomed and expressed support for the practice of holding wrap-up sessions at the end of the monthly Presidency of the Council. The representatives of Hungary, Germany and Kazakhstan maintained that the Council should hold more wrap-up sessions, whereas the representative of Guatemala regretted the increasingly rare wrap-up sessions. While expressing support for the informal briefings convened at the end of month by the Presidency, the representative of Chile opined that informal briefings should not replace the formal wrap-up sessions but rather reinforce and complement them. He further stressed that informal briefings were primarily an instrument for accountability, primarily of each presidency, while formal wrap-up sessions were a “collective and public work of the Council as a whole”. Council members referred also to “Toledo style informal wrap-up sessions”, also known as “Toledo interactive briefings”. The representative of France welcomed the practice of holding Council’s monthly wrap-up sessions in an open format in the Council Chamber, or in an interactive Toledo format. The representative of Spain underscored that Toledo briefings had been held with some

---

34 S/PV.7740, p. 3 (Japan), p. 5 (France), p. 17 (Switzerland (on behalf of the ACT group)), p. 21 (India), p. 23 (Hungary), p. 23 (Italy), p. 24 (Germany), p. 25 (Australia), p. 26 (Romania), p. 27 (Chile), p. 32 (Costa Rica), p. 38 (Kazakhstan), and p. 39 (Cuba).
35 Ibid., p. 23 (Hungary), p. 24 (Germany), p. 28 (Guatemala) and p. 38 (Kazakhstan).
36 Ibid., p. 27.
37 Ibid., p. 5 (France), p. 7 (Spain), p. 11 (Russian Federation), and p. 23 (Italy). “Toledo style informal wrap-up sessions”, also known as “Toledo interactive briefings” were launched in 2015, at the initiative of Spain, by members of the Council willing to present the activity of the Council for the month jointly, and in an interactive manner.
38 Ibid., p. 5.
regularity at the end of each presidency since October 2015 and emphasized how the Toledo format was more than a mere recapitulation of the work of the Council over a given month, but rather an informal meeting where a group of Permanent Representatives could respond to questions and comments from the membership about what had been achieved during the month. Similarly, the representative of Italy called for more frequent informal, Toledo-style wrap-up sessions, which allowed “greater interaction” with the membership on the work of the month. In this regard, he noted that the attendance and interaction achieved in those meetings were a sign of their popularity and usefulness to non-Council members. 

The representatives of the Islamic Republic of Iran, speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and Cuba, argued that closed meetings and informal consultations should be kept to a minimum and should be the exception rather than the rule. The representative of Uruguay stated that open meetings should be the norm, and the representative of Colombia noted that it was increasingly necessary to move away from the practice of closed meetings and to hold open or public meetings more frequently, in order to allow the broader membership to contribute to the deliberations of the Council. Similarly, the representatives of Hungary and Kazakhstan emphasized that the Council should increase the number of its public meetings, interactive briefings, and informal interactive dialogues, whereas the representative of Portugal suggested that, at briefings, and following the briefers’ public statements, Council members should express publicly their views. The representative of Norway underlined that the work of the Council should become “more accessible”, and encouraged new measures to enable the membership to be effectively informed about the topics discussed under “Any other business” during consultations of the whole. In the same vein, the representative of Panama argued that there was an urgent need for “improved and greater access” to the Council’s information and decision-making process, an increase in the frequency of consultations and open briefings and Arria-formula meetings, and thereby, greater interaction and coordination with the General Assembly. The representative of Australia, while recalling that pursuant to Article 24 of the Charter, the Council

39 Ibid., p. 7.
40 Ibid., p. 23.
41 Ibid., p. 20 (Iran) and p. 39 (Cuba).
42 Ibid., p. 10 (Uruguay) and p. 19 (Columbia).
43 Ibid., p. 23 (Hungary), p. 38 (Kazakhstan) and p. 41 (Portugal).
44 Ibid., p. 34.
had the responsibility to act on behalf of the entire membership, suggested that Council members should engage regularly with the broader membership through briefings with regional groups and outreach to affected countries.46

The representative of Italy called for an effective use of open meetings, such as informal interactive dialogues and Arria-formula meetings, and to continue to increase the focus and interactivity of open debates, involving, as appropriate, non-governmental actors, especially from civil society.47 Several speakers encouraged holding more Arria-formula meetings,48 while with regard to informal interactive dialogues, the representative of Egypt stated that the Council should build upon those held in 2016 with the African Union Peace and Security Council by advancing more frequent and timely consultations, as well as collaborative field missions with it.49

Concerning conflict prevention and early-warning mechanisms, some speakers called for reinstating the practice of horizon-scanning briefings on potential emerging conflicts.50

E. Records

During the period under review, verbatim records were issued following each public meeting of the Council, in accordance with rule 49 of the provisional rules of procedure, and communiqués were issued following private meetings, in accordance with rule 55. No questions were raised at Council meetings regarding the application of rules 49 to 57 in connection with the preparation, access and issuance of verbatim records, communiqués or other documents.

46 Ibid., p. 25.
47 Ibid., p. 23.
48 Ibid., p. 23 (Hungary), p. 24 (Germany), p. 25 (Australia), and p. 26 (Romania).
49 Ibid., p. 4.
50 Ibid., p. 24 (Poland), p. 25 (Australia), and p. 26 (Romania).
II. Agenda

Note

The present section deals with the practice of the Security Council concerning the agenda, in relation to rules 6 to 12 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council.

Rule 6

The Secretary-General shall immediately bring to the attention of all representatives on the Security Council all communications from States, organs of the United Nations, or the Secretary-General concerning any matter for the consideration of the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

Rule 7

The provisional agenda for each meeting of the Security Council shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General and approved by the President of the Security Council.

Only items which have been brought to the attention of the representatives on the Security Council in accordance with rule 6, items covered by rule 10, or matters which the Security Council had previously decided to defer, may be included in the provisional agenda.

Rule 8

The provisional agenda for a meeting shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to the representatives on the Security Council at
least three days before the meeting, but in urgent circumstances it may be communicated simultaneously with the notice of the meeting.

Rule 9

The first item of the provisional agenda for each meeting of the Security Council shall be the adoption of the agenda.

Rule 10

Any item on the agenda of a meeting of the Security Council, consideration of which has not been completed at that meeting, shall, unless the Security Council otherwise decides, automatically be included in the agenda of the next meeting.

Rule 11

The Secretary-General shall communicate each week to the representatives on the Security Council a summary statement of matters of which the Security Council is seized and of the stage reached in their consideration.

Rule 12

The provisional agenda for each periodic meeting shall be circulated to the members of the Security Council at least twenty-one days before the opening of the meeting. Any subsequent change in or addition to the provisional agenda shall be brought to the notice of the members at least five days before the meeting. The Security Council may, however, in urgent circumstances, make additions to the Agenda at any time during a periodic meeting.
The provisions of rule 7, paragraph 1, and of rule 9, shall apply also to periodic meetings.

During the period under review, the Secretary-General continued the practice of distributing communications from States, organs of the United Nations, or from himself concerning any matter for the consideration of the Council in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and pursuant to rule 6 of the Council’s provisional rules of procedure. The Secretary-General also continued to draw up a provisional agenda for each meeting of the Council, and communicated the provisional agenda to the representatives on the Council, in accordance with rules 7 and 8. The practice relating to the circulation of communications or the preparation of the provisional agenda was not discussed or questioned during the period under review. Furthermore, rule 12 was not applied during 2016 or 2017, as no periodic meetings were held. Hence, this section focuses on the practice and discussion regarding rules 9 to 11 and is organized under the following three main headings: A. Adoption of the agenda (rule 9); B. Matters of which the Security Council is seized (rules 10 and 11); C. Discussions concerning the agenda.

A. Adoption of the agenda (rule 9)

In accordance with rule 9 of the provisional rules of procedure, the first item for each meeting of the Council is the adoption of the agenda.

Voting on the adoption of the agenda

During the period under review, objections were raised twice to the inclusion of the item entitled “The situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea” in the agenda of the Council, as featured in case 2. In both cases, the objections led to a procedural vote in the Council, which ultimately resulted in the adoption of the provisional agenda.\(^{51}\)

Newly introduced agenda items

\(^{51}\) See: 7830\(^{th}\) meeting (S/PV.7830), on 9 December 2016, and 8130\(^{th}\) meeting (S/PV.8130), on 11 December 2017.
During the period under review, the Council added the item entitled “Identical letters dated 19 January 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (S/2016/53)” to its agenda. The item was considered for the first time at the 7609th meeting of the Council on 13 September 2016.\(^\text{52}\)

Whereas from 1998 to 2007 the Council added between 8 and 23 new items every year, since 2008 the number of new items introduced per year decreased significantly. Figure 4 provides information on the number of newly introduced agenda items since 1998.

**Figure 4: Number of newly-introduced agenda items per year (1998-2017)**

![Figure 4: Number of newly-introduced agenda items per year (1998-2017)](chart)

Modification of agenda items

According to the note by the President of the Security Council dated 21 June 2016 (S/2016/560), following consultations among Council members, the Council agreed that, as from 22 June 2016, issues pertaining to peacebuilding and post-conflict peacebuilding would be considered under the item entitled “Peacebuilding and sustaining peace”. The earlier

\(^\text{52}\) S/PV.7601. For further information on this item, see part I, section 17.
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consideration by the Council of issues under the item entitled “Post-conflict peacebuilding” would be subsumed under the new item.

Utilization of existing regional items for country-specific discussions

During the period under review, the Council continued the practice of utilizing items of a regional nature to discuss evolving country-specific situations. For example, the Council continued to consider the situations in Syria and Yemen under the items entitled “The situation in the Middle East”, and “The situation concerning the Middle East, including the Palestinian question”. Furthermore, during the period under review, the Council addressed the situation in the Gambia, following the 2016 presidential elections, under item entitled “Peace consolidation in West Africa”.

Utilization of existing items with addition of new sub-items

During the period under review, the Council continued its practice of adding new sub-items to the existing items, when considering evolving general and cross-border threats to international peace and security. Table 7 below shows a selection of new sub-items introduced between 2016 and 2017 and is organized in chronological order of appearance of the new sub-item.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting record and date</th>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>New sub-item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7620 11 February 2016</td>
<td>General issues relating to sanctions</td>
<td>Working methods of the subsidiary organs of the Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7685 3 May 2016</td>
<td>Protection of civilians in armed conflict</td>
<td>Health care in armed conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/PV.7690 11 May 2016</td>
<td>Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts</td>
<td>Countering the narratives and ideologies of terrorism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53 See for further details, sections 24 and 25 of part I.
54 See for further details, section 13 of part I.
55 The table does not include cases of routine sub-items related to briefings by the Security Council missions, briefings by the Chair of the Security Council committees, letters addressed to the President of the Security Council, reports of the Secretary-General, and meetings of the Security Council with the troop- and police-contributing countries pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B.
B. Matters of which the Security Council is seized (rules 10 and 11)

During the period under review, pursuant to rule 11 of the provisional rules of procedure and the relevant notes by the President, the Secretary-General continued to communicate each week to the representatives on the Council a summary statement of matters of which the Council was seized and of the stage reached in their consideration. The practice of including an agenda item in the summary statement upon its adoption at a formal meeting of the Council remained unchanged. On 25 January 2016, at its 7609th meeting, the Council adopted a new item entitled: “Identical letters dated 19 January 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (S/2016/53)”, and the summary statement subsequently reflected the adoption of this new item. According to the relevant notes by the President, the preliminary annual summary statement issued in January each year by the Secretary-General will reflect the matters of which the Council was seized, and identify the items which have not been considered in the preceding three years that are therefore, subject to deletion. Those items are deleted unless a Member State

56 Prior to 30 August 2017, note by the President of 26 July 2010 (S/2010/507), paras. 51 and 52, and thereafter note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507), paras. 13 and 14.
58 S/2016/10/add.5
notifies the President of the Council its request to have an item retained on the list by the end of February.\footnote{S/2010/507, para. 54 and S/2017/507 para. 16.} In the latter case, an item will remain on the list for an additional year and will be subject to the same procedure described above if not considered during that period. By contrast, if no Member State requests the item’s permanence on the list, the first summary statement issued in March of each year will reflect its deletion.\footnote{S/2010/507, paras. 53 and 54, and S/2017/507, para. 15 and 16.}

During the period under review, in accordance with rule 11 and the relevant notes by the President, the Council continued the practice of reviewing the summary statement at the beginning of each year in order to determine if the Council had concluded its consideration of any of the listed items.\footnote{S/2016/10 and S/2017/10.} In 2016, out of 16 items identified for deletion in January, the item entitled “The situation in Timor-Leste” was deleted in March. The remaining 15 items were retained for one additional year at the request of Member States.\footnote{S/2016/10/Add.10.} In 2017, 16 items were identified for deletion, and all of them remained on the list, including the item entitled “The situation between Iraq and Kuwait”, which had been added to the deletion list that year (see table 8).\footnote{S/2017/10/Add.9.}

As a result, during the period under review, the Council remained seized of 68 items in both 2016 and 2017.\footnote{S/2016/10/Add.10 and S/2017/10/Add.9.}
### Table 8

**Items proposed for deletion from the summary statement in 2016 and 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date of first and last consideration</th>
<th>Proposed for deletion in 2016</th>
<th>Status in March 2016</th>
<th>Proposed for deletion in 2017</th>
<th>Status in March 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The India-Pakistan question</td>
<td>6 January 1948; 5 November 1965</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hyderabad question</td>
<td>16 September 1948; 24 May 1949</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 20 February 1958 from the representative of the Sudan addressed to the Secretary-General</td>
<td>21 February 1958; 21 February 1958</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 31 December 1960 from the Minister for External Affairs of Cuba addressed to the President of the Security Council</td>
<td>4 January 1961; 5 January 1961</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in the India/Pakistan subcontinent</td>
<td>4 December 1971; 27 December 1971</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 3 December 1971 from the Permanent Representatives of Algeria, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Republic and the People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council</td>
<td>9 December 1971; 9 December 1971</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint by Cuba</td>
<td>17 September 1973; 18 September 1973</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation between Iran and Iraq</td>
<td>26 September 1980; 31 January 1991</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 1 October 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council</td>
<td>2 October 1985; 4 October 1985</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation between Iraq and Kuwait</td>
<td>2 August 1990; 17 June 2013</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Georgia</td>
<td>8 October 1992; 15 June 2009</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
<td>10 November 2000; 8 January 2009</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Myanmar</td>
<td>15 September 2006; 13 July 2009</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Timor-Leste</td>
<td>15 December 1975; 19 December 2012</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items considered at Security Council meetings

Whilst it remained seized of 68 items during the review period, the Council considered during its meetings 49 items in 2016, and 52 in 2017. Furthermore, out of the 49 items considered in 2016 in meetings of the Council, 26 concerned country-specific and regional situations, and 23 with thematic and other issues. Out of the 52 items considered by the Council in 2017, 27 concerned country-specific and regional situations, and 25 concerned thematic and other issues. Table 9 provides an overview of the items considered at Council meetings during the period under review.

Table 9

Agenda items considered at meetings in 2016 and 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country-specific and regional situations</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African region</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and security in Africa</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace consolidation in West Africa</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation concerning Western Sahara</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Burundi</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in the Great Lakes Region</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Liberia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Libya</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Mali</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Somalia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in the Central African Republic</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identical letters dated 19 January 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (S/2016/53)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The question concerning Haiti</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Afghanistan</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Myanmar</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 28 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Council (S/2014/136)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Cyprus</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation concerning Iraq</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Total agenda items concerning country-specific and regional</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situations**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic and other issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing by the Chairperson-in-Office of the Organization for</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Cooperation in Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing by the President of the International Court of Justice</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefings by Chairs of subsidiary bodies of the Security Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing by the Under Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Emergency Relief Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and armed conflict</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation between the United Nations and regional and subregional</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations in maintaining international peace and security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election of five members of the International Court of Justice</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General issues relating to sanctions</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations of International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 and 31 December 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of the Security Council with the troop- and police-contributing</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>countries pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-proliferation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-proliferation/Democratic People’s Republic of Korea</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-conflict peacebuilding</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacebuilding and sustaining peace</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of civilians in armed conflict</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation for the appointment of the Secretary-General of the</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Council mission</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small arms</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to international peace and security</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribute to Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Discussions concerning the agenda

During the period under review, the discussions on the agenda of the Council occurred mainly in connection with country- or region-specific items and related to the adoption of the agenda and the frequency with which items were addressed by the Council at formal meetings, as illustrated by cases 2 and 3 below.

Case 2

The situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea

Further to the letter dated 1 December 2016 from the representatives of France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Spain, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, the United States and Uruguay addressed to the President of the Security Council,65 the Council held its 7830th meeting on 9 December 2016 under the item entitled “The situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”.66 Prior to the adoption of the agenda for the meeting, the representative of China expressed his opposition to the Council discussing the situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, stressing that the Council was not a forum for discussing human rights issues, and even less so for the “politicization of such issues”.67 This position was shared by the representative of Angola who expressed full support for the statement made by the representative of China.68 The representative of the United States responded that the

65 S/2016/1034. This item was included on the agenda of the Council in 2014, see for further background, section II of part II of 19th Supplement (2014-2015).
66 S/PV.7830. The Council held previous meetings under this item in 2014 (S/PV.7353) and 2015 (S/PV.7575).
67 Ibid., p. 2.
68 Ibid, p. 3.
“kinds of horrors” perpetrated in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea by the regime were inherently destabilizing. Recalling the threat to international peace and security posed by the nuclear and ballistic missile programmes, she stressed that the situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea was on the Council’s agenda and that was “where it belonged”.69

The representative of Japan opined that the reasons for the Council to hold a meeting on the situation in the DPRK persisted, given that there had been no tangible improvement in the human rights situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea since the publication of the 2014 report of the Human Rights Council’s Commission of Inquiry, and, given the destabilizing impact on the region and the maintenance of international peace and security of the human rights violations perpetrated by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea authorities.70 Following the discussion, the provisional agenda was adopted pursuant to a vote, with nine votes in favour, five against and one abstention.71 Speaking after the vote, the representative of the Russian Federation stated that his delegation had often opposed the inclusion of human rights issues on the agenda of the Council. He believed that such issues did not fall within the Council’s purview and should be considered in specialized bodies. He argued that the Council should concentrate on issues that represented a true threat to international peace and security. Furthermore, he stated that “burdening” the Council’s agenda with issues that were not within its remit inevitably weakened the Council’s focus and forced and undermined the effectiveness of its work.72

The representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela added further that the initiative showed the Council’s “growing interference” in issues outside its specific competency.73

In 2017, further to the letter dated 1 December 2017 from the Permanent representatives of France, Italy, Japan, Senegal, Sweden, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, the United States and Uruguay addressed to the President of the Security Council,74 the Council met on 11 December 2017 to address again the item entitled “The situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”. Similarly to what had happened in 2016, following statements by the representatives of

69 Ibid, p. 2.
70 Ibid, p. 3.
71 In favour: France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States and Uruguay; against: Angola, China, Egypt, Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of); abstentions: Senegal. For more details on voting, see section A. Adoption of the agenda (rule 9), above.
72 S/PV.7830, p. 3.
73 Ibid., p. 4.
74 S/2017/1006.
China and the United States, the provisional agenda was put to a vote and was adopted with ten votes in favour, three votes against and two abstentions. Speaking after the vote, the representative of Egypt reiterated that the Council was not the “relevant international forum” to address internal affairs or human rights situations in countries, unless the matter concerned acts of genocide or ethnic cleansing, which had a direct impact on international peace and security. Similarly, the representative of the Plurinational State of Bolivia underscored that the Charter of the United Nations stipulated unequivocally that the primary responsibility of the Security Council was the maintenance of international peace and security, and that issues pertaining to human rights did not fall under the competence of the Council. By contrast, the representative of Uruguay stressed the intimate link between the systematic violation of human rights and the generation of conflicts, and the potential for conflicts to become threats to international peace and security, while the representative of Japan reaffirmed his call on the Council to keep the situation on its agenda. The representative of Italy underscored the “intimate link” between violations of human rights and the repercussions for the maintenance of international peace and security, reaffirming that the matter fully fell within the scope and the mandate of the Security Council, while the representative of Ukraine expressed support for the agenda of the meeting, asserting that “systematic and consistent gross human rights violations” were a clear early-warning sign and indication of a credible threat to international peace and security, the maintenance of which was the primary responsibility of the Council.

Case 3


---

75 S/PV.8130, p. 3 (China and the United States).
76 In favour: France, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Senegal, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States and Uruguay; against: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China and Russian Federation; abstentions: Egypt and Ethiopia. For more details on the voting see section A. Adoption of the agenda (rule 9), above.
77 S/PV.8130, p. 3.
78 Ibid, p. 4.
79 Ibid., p. 16 (Uruguay).
80 Ibid., pp. 18-19 (Japan).
81 Ibid, p. 16 (Italy) and p. 14 (Ukraine).

Part II – Provisional rules of procedure
During the period under review, as the Council addressed the item entitled “Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)” relating to the situation in Kosovo, Member States exchanged views on the approach and frequency with which this item was discussed at Council meetings. Their positions were reiterated at most of the meetings in which this item was considered.

At the 7760th meeting on 25 August 2016, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that the issue did not need to be on the Council’s agenda. While recognizing the ongoing challenges, the representative of New Zealand asserted that the Council should adopt a more flexible approach as to how it considered this agenda item, mindful of the many other issues of more immediate gravity.

During the 7811th meeting, the representative of New Zealand reiterated his position on this issue, and the representatives of Malaysia called for a reduction in the frequency of Council meetings held under this item.

During the 7891st meeting, whilst expressing concern at the heightened tension between Serbia and Kosovo, the representative of the United Kingdom called for a reduction in the number of meetings and the number of reports arguing that it contributed to the tensions in the region. By contrast, the representative of Kazakhstan affirmed that the situation in Kosovo still needed the continuing attention of the Council as an ongoing item on its agenda. The representative of Serbia highlighted the importance of convening regular quarterly meetings of the Council to discuss the item in question at unchanged intervals.

At the 7940th meeting, the representative of Japan made reference to the Secretary-General’s report to affirm that it was long overdue to modify the reporting cycle that was in place since 1999 and that a half-year cycle would be “more than sufficient”. The representative of the United Kingdom also referred to the same report to state that given that the reporting

---

82 See for example, S/PV.7760; S/PV.7811; S/PV.7891; S/PV.7940; S/PV.8025, and S/PV.8100.
84 Ibid., p. 22.
85 S/PV.7811, p. 17.
86 Ibid., p. 23.
87 S/PV.7891, p. 17.
88 Ibid., p. 18.
89 Ibid., p. 4.
90 S/PV.7940, pp. 18-19.
period since the last Council meeting had been comparatively quiet, the Council’s attention so soon after the last meeting was not warranted.\(^91\)

---

III. Representation and credentials

Note

The present section covers the practice of the Council concerning representation and credentials of its members, in relation to rules 13 to 17 of the provisional rules of procedure.

Rule 13

Each member of the Security Council shall be represented at the meetings of the Security Council by an accredited representative. The credentials of a representative on the Security Council shall be communicated to the Secretary-General not less than twenty-four hours before he takes his seat on the Security Council. The credentials shall be issued either by the Head of the State or of the Government concerned or by its Minister of Foreign Affairs. The Head of Government or Minister of Foreign Affairs of each member of the Security Council shall be entitled to sit on the Security Council without submitting credentials.

Rule 14

Any Member of the United Nations not a member of the Security Council and any State not a Member of the United Nations, if invited to participate in a meeting or meetings of the Security Council, shall submit credentials for the representative appointed by it for this purpose. The credentials of such a representative shall be communicated to the Secretary-General not less than twenty-four hours before the first meeting which he is invited to attend.

Rule 15
The credentials of representatives on the Security Council and of any representative appointed in accordance with rule 14 shall be examined by the Secretary-General who shall submit a report to the Security Council for approval.

**Rule 16**

Pending the approval of the credentials of a representative on the Security Council in accordance with rule 15, such representative shall be seated provisionally with the same rights as other representatives.

**Rule 17**

Any representative on the Security Council, to whose credentials objection has been made within the Security Council, shall continue to sit with the same rights as other representatives until the Security Council has decided the matter.

During the period under review, in accordance with rule 13 of the provisional rules of procedure, the credentials of the representatives of the members of the Security Council were communicated to the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General subsequently submitted his report to the Council pursuant to rule 15. Such reports were transmitted to the Council when there were changes in the representation of members of the Council,92 as well as when representatives of the newly elected members of the Council were designated prior to the beginning of each term.93 No discussions regarding the interpretation and application of rules 13 to 17 arose during the period under review.

---

93 For the reports of the Secretary-General concerning the credentials of the representatives and deputies and alternate representatives of Council members elected for the periods 2016 to 2017 and 2017 to 2018, see S/2015/1017 and S/2016/507, respectively.
IV. Presidency

Note

The present section covers the practice of the Council concerning the monthly rotation of the presidency, role of the President, and temporary cessation of the chair by the President during the consideration of a particular question with which the Member State he or she represents is directly connected, in relation to rules 18 to 20 of the provisional rules of procedure.

Rule 18

The presidency of the Security Council shall be held in turn by the members of the Security Council in the English alphabetical order of their names. Each President shall hold office for one calendar month.

Rule 19

The President shall preside over the meetings of the Security Council and, under the authority of the Security Council, shall represent it in its capacity as an organ of the United Nations.

Rule 20

Whenever the President of the Security Council deems that for the proper fulfilment of the responsibilities of the presidency he should not preside over the Council during the consideration of a particular question with which the member he represents is directly connected, he shall indicate his decision to the Council. The presidential chair shall then devolve, for the purpose of the consideration of that question, on the representative of the member next in English
alphabetical order, it being understood that the provisions of this rule shall apply to the representatives on the Security Council called upon successively to preside. This rule shall not affect the representative capacity of the President as stated in rule 19, or his duties under rule 7.

This section is organized under the following headings: A. The role of the President of the Security Council (rules 18 and 19); and, B. Discussions concerning the Presidency of the Security Council. During the period, there were no instances of application of rule 20.

A. The role of the President of the Security Council (rules 18 and 19)

In accordance with rule 18 of the provisional rules of procedure, the presidency of the Council was held in turn for one calendar month by the members of the Council in the English alphabetical order. In addition to presiding over meetings of the Council, informal consultations of the whole and informal interactive dialogues, the President of the Council continued to perform several functions under the authority of the Council, in accordance with rule 19. These functions included among others, (i) briefing non-Council members and the media on the monthly programme of work of the Council at the beginning of the month; (ii) representing and delivering statements on behalf of the Council, including the presentation of the annual report of the Council to the General Assembly; and (iii) delivering statements or elements to the press, following informal consultations of the whole or whenever Council members reached an agreement on the text. Representatives of Council members continued to submit, in their national

---

94 Implementing the note by the President of the Security Council of 10 December 2015 (S/2015/944), the annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly (A/71/2) covered the period from 1 August 2015 to 31 December 2016. The 17-month coverage period was a transitional arrangement and, as stipulated in the presidential note, the period of coverage for all future reports would be from 1 January to 31 December, as opposed to 1 August to 31 July. At its 8021st meeting, on 9 August 2017 (S/PV.8021), the Council adopted its report to the General Assembly (A/71/2). Subsequently, the report of the Council (A/71/2) was introduced to the General Assembly at its ninety fifth plenary meeting on 28 August 2017 by the President of the Council for the month of August (Egypt). See for further details, section I.F of part IV concerning the annual and special reports of the security Council to the General Assembly.
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capacities, monthly assessments providing information on the main aspects of the work of the Council during their respective presidencies, following their completion.95

Following previous practice, and in accordance with the notes by the President of 26 July 2010 (S/2010/507)96 and 10 December 2015 (S/2015/944),97 the introduction to the Annual Report of the Council to the General Assembly was prepared under the coordination of the President of the Council for the month of July 2016 (Japan).98 Throughout the month, the President continued the practice of convening informal meetings with Member States to exchange views on the Annual Report, a practice initiated in 2008.99

In 2016 and 2017, during their respective presidencies, Council members continued to take the initiative of bringing to the attention of the Council emerging general and cross-border threats to international peace and security, at times adding new sub-items to existing thematic agenda items with a view to informing the deliberations.100 In several such instances, to frame the discussion, concept papers prepared by the monthly presidency were circulated prior to those meetings.101

The note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507) encouraged the incoming presidencies to discuss the provisional monthly programme of work with other members of the Council well in advance of their respective presidencies.102 The note prescribed also that Council members, during their respective presidencies, should ordinarily plan not more than four days per week of Council business, with Fridays normally being reallocated to facilitate the work of the Council’s subsidiary bodies.103 During the period under review, a complaint was raised in a

---

95 See for example, S/2016/1119 and S/2017/390. A list of the monthly assessments during the period under review is provided in the annual reports of the Council to the General Assembly (A/71/2 and A/72/2).
96 S/2010/507, para. 71 (a).
97 S/2015/944, para. 4.
98 The note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507) retained the same language, see paras. 125 to 139.
99 For details, see S/PV.8021.
100 See for further details on referrals by Member States pursuant to Article 35 of the Charter, section I.A of part VI.
101 See for example the letter dated 1 December 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Spain addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2016/1013) forwarding a concept note on the theme “Preventing catastrophe: a global agenda for stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction by non-State actors”, prior to the 7837th meeting of the Council on 15 December 2016 (S/PV.7837); the letter dated 1 July 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Japan addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2016/585), circulating a concept note on the working methods of the Security Council prior to the 7740th meeting of the Council on 19 July 2016 (S/PV.7740); and the letter dated 3 February 2017 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2017/108) transmitting a concept note on the theme “Maintenance of international peace and security: conflicts in Europe”, prior to the 7886th meeting of the Council on 21 February 2017 (S/PV.7886).
103 Ibid., para. 1.
communication to the Council regarding the role of the President. The memorandum of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs annexed to a letter dated 22 November 2016 from the permanent representative of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to the President of the Security Council, stated, inter alia, that the United States had put the human rights situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea on the agenda of the Security Council on 10 December 2015, “abusing” its presidency of the Council.104

B. Discussions concerning the Presidency of the Security Council

In 2016 and 2017, aspects of the presidency of the Security Council were discussed during Council meetings, particularly in the context of debates on the Council’s working methods under the item entitled “Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)”, as featured in case 4 below.

At the 7621st meeting on 15 February 2016, the representative of Kazakhstan encouraged closer collaboration among the Presidents of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, so as to create “a new global development strategy for peace”.105 Furthermore, at the 7886th meeting on 21 February 2017, the representative of Belarus noted that the President of the Security Council failed to pay tribute to the deceased Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Churkin, with a statement from the President, “as would have been appropriate”.106

Case 4

Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)

At the 7616th meeting of the Council, on 29 January 2016, the representative of the United Kingdom noted that the three most recent monthly presidencies of the Council all held informal wrap-up sessions with Member States outside the Security Council Chamber. In this

104 S/2016/988.
105 S/PV.7621, p. 49.
106 S/PV.7886, p. 42.
connection, he stated that informal wrap-up sessions had the same benefit as formal ones in terms of transparency, but they had the “added benefit” of allowing interactivity.\(^{107}\)

Similarly, at the 7740\(^{th}\) meeting, on 19 July 2016, the representative of Mexico emphasized that the holding of monthly wrap-up sessions by some Council members at the end of their presidency had “enabled the Council to increase the transparency”, and added that it was imperative for more presidencies to adopt such an approach.\(^{108}\) During that meeting, the representative of Colombia underscored that it was necessary to continue the “good practice” of publishing the monthly forecast by the Council presidency, keeping it updated, making it publicly available, modifying it whenever necessary, and distributing it to the members of the Council with the appropriate changes.\(^{109}\) The representative of the United Kingdom, echoing France’s position with regard to the overload of the programme of work,\(^{110}\) suggested that instead of filling it on the basis of reporting cycles, incoming presidencies could rather set out the reports that were expected and ask Council members whether there was a need for a meeting.\(^{111}\) The representative of Egypt stressed the need for practical and more meaningful partnerships with regional and subregional organizations, particularly the African Union. He asserted that the Council should hold more frequent and timely consultations, as well as collaborative field missions with the African Union and he encouraged the Presidents of the Council to organize meetings that would promote such cooperation.\(^{112}\)

At the 7703\(^{rd}\) meeting on 31 May 2016, on the topic of Security Council missions, the representative of the United Kingdom declared that the mission to Somalia, in May 2016, had reaffirmed that trips to countries on the agenda of the Council could have a positive and tangible influence, and encouraged future presidencies to arrange more visits to such countries.\(^{113}\) At the same meeting, the representative of Malaysia welcomed the proposal to involve newly elected members in the Council’s work as early as possible, and expressed support for the proposal to fully consult incoming members with regard to the process of identifying new Chairs of subsidiary bodies and for the presidency to take a much larger role. She stated that ideally the

---

\(^{107}\) S/PV 7616, p. 10.


\(^{109}\) Ibid., p. 19.

\(^{110}\) Ibid., pp. 5-6.

\(^{111}\) Ibid., p. 8.

\(^{112}\) Ibid., p. 4.

\(^{113}\) S/PV 7703, p. 11. For further information on Security Council missions, see part I, section 36.
presidency should lead in a way that could introduce greater transparency and inclusiveness in the Council’s work.\textsuperscript{114}

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., p. 16.
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V. Secretariat

Note

The present section covers the practice of the Security Council concerning the functions and powers of the Secretary-General in connection with meetings of the Council, in relation to rules 21 to 26 of its provisional rules of procedure.

Rule 21

The Secretary-General shall act in that capacity in all meetings of the Security Council. The Secretary-General may authorize a deputy to act in his place at meetings of the Security Council.

Rule 22

The Secretary-General, or his deputy acting on his behalf, may make either oral or written statements to the Security Council concerning any question under consideration by it.

Rule 23

The Secretary-General may be appointed by the Security Council, in accordance with rule 28, as rapporteur for a specified question.

Rule 24

The Secretary-General shall provide the staff required by the Security Council. This staff shall form a part of the Secretariat.

Rule 25
The Secretary-General shall give to representatives on the Security Council notice of meetings of the Security Council and of its commissions and committees.

Rule 26

The Secretary-General shall be responsible for the preparation of documents required by the Security Council and shall, except in urgent circumstances, distribute them at least forty-eight hours in advance of the meeting at which they are to be considered.

During the period under review, the Secretary-General and senior officials of the Secretariat continued to attend Council meetings and to provide briefings to the Council, as requested. Council members also continued to request briefings by senior officials from the Secretariat. For example, in two letters addressed to the President of the Security Council dated 1 December 2016,115 and 1 December 2017,116 respectively, Council members requested briefings by a senior official from the Secretariat and by a senior official from the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to allow Council members to receive further information from the Secretariat on this situation and its implications for international peace and security.

Under the item entitled “United Nations peacekeeping operations”, at the 7918th meeting on 6 April 2017, the representative of Sweden stated that the Council must be supported in its work and receive input from the Secretary-General with reliable, high-quality conflict analysis, prepared jointly by the whole of the United Nations system, and noted that the briefings by the Secretariat should give more comprehensive overviews of a situation, so as to enable the Council to make better-informed decisions.117

115 S/2016/1034.
117 S/PV.7918, p. 21-22.
At the 7926th meeting on 18 April 2017, in relation to human rights and prevention of armed conflict under the item entitled “Maintenance of international peace and security”, the representative of Sweden stated that briefings to the Council by the Secretariat should always include human rights as part of broader conflict analysis, drawing on the whole of the United Nations system to support the Council’s decision-making. Further aspects concerning briefings by the Secretariat were discussed in further detail under the item entitled “Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)”, as illustrated in case 5 below.

Case 5
Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)

At its 7740th meeting, on 19 July 2017, the Council held an open debate on its working methods. The representative of Australia stated that the Council must become better at predicting and preventing the escalation or relapse into conflict, and emphasised that frank, timely and independent assessments from the Secretariat on situations where populations were at risk were crucial to that end. In addition, she underscored that briefings by the Secretary-General’s Special Advisers on the Prevention of Genocide and on the Responsibility to Protect were valuable in ensuring that the Council was well placed to prevent mass atrocities.

At the 7892nd meeting, on 28 February 2017, the Council held a formal wrap-up session under the same item and addressed the work of the previous month. The representative of Uruguay stressed the importance of having as much information as possible from the Secretariat during consultations of the whole (also known as informal consultations), including illustrative documents, such as detailed maps. He underscored that it was also necessary for Council members to be able to obtain from the Secretariat the required documentation before those meetings, asserting that it was totally unacceptable for the Secretariat to deny access to indispensable documentation. Similarly, the representative of the Plurinational State of Bolivia voiced concern over the lack of transparency of the Secretariat, claiming that in several

---

118 S/PV.7926, p. 12.
119 S/PV.7740, p. 25.
120 S/PV.7892, p. 10-11.
instances, access to some documentation had not been allowed, and affirming that it was essential to ensure that all information be available to all Council members to allow them to make decisions as equal members.121

During the period under review, the Council issued the note by the President of 22 February 2016 (S/2016/170). The note requested the Secretariat to announce all meetings and provisional agendas of the subsidiary organs of the Council to the public, in the Journal of the United Nations and on the websites of the subsidiary organs.122 The note acknowledged also the support given by the Secretariat to incoming Chairs of subsidiary organs and requested the Secretariat to consider further measures to provide incoming Chairs and their staffs with additional substantive and methodological briefings on the work of relevant subsidiary organs of the Council.123 These provisions were reproduced in the note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507).124

The note by the President of 15 July 2016 (S/2016/619) invited the newly elected members of the Council to observe all meetings of the Council and its subsidiary organs and the informal consultations of the whole for a period of three months, as from 1 October immediately preceding their term of membership. In this connection, the note invited the Secretariat to provide all relevant communications of the Council to the newly elected members during this period.125 By the same note the Council invited the Secretariat to continue to take appropriate measures to familiarize the newly elected members with the work of the Council and its subsidiary organs, including by providing briefing materials and holding seminars before they begin to attend Council meetings.126 These provisions were reproduced in the note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507).127

Furthermore, the note by the President of 15 July 2016 (S/2016/619) further developed the language of the note by the president of 5 June 2014 (S/2014/393) and encouraged the Chairs of the subsidiary organs, with the assistance of the Secretariat, to provide those members of the

121 Ibid., p. 12.
122 S/2016/170, para. 1.(d).
123 Ibid., para. 3.(a).
124 S/2017/507, paras. 103 and 117.
125 S/2016/619, para. 2.
126 Ibid., para. 4.
127 S/2017/507, paras. 140 and 142.
Council that would take over the chairmanships, with written and oral briefings about the work done during the outgoing chairmanship and to maintain informal meetings with the incoming Chairs, as necessary, including with the assistance of the Secretariat.\textsuperscript{128} The note requested also the Secretariat to consider further measures to provide incoming Chairs and their staffs with additional substantive and methodological briefings on the work of relevant subsidiary organs.\textsuperscript{129} These provisions were reproduced in the note by the President of 30 August 2017 (\textit{S/2017/507}).\textsuperscript{130}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{128} \textit{S/2016/619}, para. 9. \\
\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., para. 11. \\
\textsuperscript{130} \textit{S/2017/507}, paras. 115 and 117.
\end{flushleft}
VI. Conduct of business

Note

The present section covers the practice of the Council concerning the conduct of business in its meetings, in relations to rules 27, 29, 30 and 33 of its provisional rules of procedure.

Rule 27

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

Rule 29

The President may accord precedence to any rapporteur appointed by the Security Council.

The Chairman of a commission or committee, or the rapporteur appointed by the commission or committee to present its report, may be accorded precedence for the purpose of explaining the report.

Rule 30

If a representative raises a point of order, the President shall immediately state his ruling. If it is challenged, the President shall submit his ruling to the Security Council for immediate decision and it shall stand unless overruled.

Rule 33

The following motions shall have precedence in the order named
over all principal motions and draft resolutions relative to the
subject before the meeting:
1. To suspend the meeting;
2. To adjourn the meeting;
3. To adjourn the meeting to a certain day or hour;
4. To refer any matter to a committee, to the Secretary-General or
to a rapporteur;
5. To postpone discussion of the question to a certain day or
indefinitely; or
6. To introduce an amendment.

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

During 2016 and 2017 no explicit reference was made to rules 27, 29, and 30. During the
period under review, rule 33 was explicitly referred to once during the Council’s deliberations.
At the 8073rd meeting, on 24 October 2017, under the item entitled “The situation in the Middle
East”, the representative of the Russian Federation proposed to adjourn the meeting until 7
November 2017, in accordance with rule 33.3 of the provisional rules of procedure.  The
procedural motion was put to vote by the President of the Council, and received four votes in
favour, eight votes against and three abstentions. The proposal was therefore not adopted,
having failed to obtain the required number of votes.

During the period under review, the President of the Council routinely requested speakers
to limit their statements to four minutes, or, less frequently, to five minutes. On one
occasion, the President of the Council reminded the invitees to limit their statements to no more

131 S/PV.8073, p. 2.
132 For more information on the conduct of business in the context of voting on draft resolutions, amendments and
substantive motions see section VIII below.
133 S/PV.8073, p. 3.
134 See for example: S/PV.7606, p. 30, S/PV.7621, p. 30, S/PV.7847, p. 29, S/PV.7929, p. 29, S/PV.8079, p. 31,
S/PV.8144, p. 23.
135 See for example: S/PV.7616, p. 2; S/PV.7829, p. 9; S/PV.7882, p. 23; and S/PV.7898, p. 8.
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than ten minutes. Following the request by the President, delegations frequently delivered a condensed version of the statement and subsequently circulated in writing, or made available online the full text. Occasionally, speakers delivered condensed versions of their statements without a request by the President. Furthermore, following an established practice, during the period under review joint statements were delivered by both Council members and other Member States who had been invited to participate in Council meetings. During the period under review, joint statements were delivered also by Council members in line with the so-called “Toledo formula” by which a Council member delivers a statement on behalf of itself and one or more other Member States.

Regarding the speaking order, the note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507) reproduced the provisions of the note by the President of 15 October 2014 (S/2014/739), and captured past and current practice. The note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507) provided that the speaking order for meetings of the Council as a general

136 See S/PV.7891, p. 4.
138 See for example: S/PV.7629, p. 64 (the Netherlands), S/PV.7653, p. 27 (Uruguay) and p. 46 (European Union), S/PV.7711, p. 31 (Nepal) and p. 61 (Belgium).
139 For example, at the 7610th meeting on 26 January 2016, under the item entitled “The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question”, the representative of India delivered a shortened version of his statement and subsequently circulated the full text thereof (S/PV.7610, p. 36). At the 7980th meeting on 21 June 2017, under the item entitled “The situation in Afghanistan”, the representative of the European Union read a shortened version of her statement and subsequently distributed the full text (S/PV.7980, p. 30).
140 For example, at the 7629th meeting on 23 February 2016, under the item entitled “Post-conflict peacebuilding”, the representative of Egypt delivered a joint statement on behalf of the delegations of Egypt, Spain and Ukraine (S/PV.7629, p. 7). At the 7740th meeting on 19 July 2026, under the item entitled “Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)”, the representative of Egypt delivered a joint statement on behalf of the three African members of the Security Council: Angola, Senegal, and Egypt (S/PV.7740, p. 3). At the 7651st meeting on 17 March 2016, under the item entitled “The question concerning Haiti”, the representative of Peru delivered a joint statement on behalf of the Group of Friends of Haiti (S/PV.7651, pp. 23-24). For more information and examples on statements delivered by Member States on behalf of regional or international organizations, or groups of States, see section VII.A below, concerning participation in Security Council meetings.
141 For example, at the 7816th meeting on 18 November 2016, under the item entitled “Cooperation between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations in maintaining international peace and security”, the representative of Spain stated that Spain and the United Kingdom were participating jointly in the meeting under the so-called Toledo formula, and he subsequently stated that Spain aligned itself with the statement to be delivered by the representative of the United Kingdom (S/PV.7816, pp. 20-21). At the 7638th meeting on 2 March 2016, under the item entitled “Non-proliferation/Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”, the representative of Uruguay referred to the Toledo formula in order not to repeat points already covered by other Council members (S/PV.7638, p. 13).
142 S/2017/507, paras. 24 to 34.
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practice would be established by a draw and that the President of the Council would deliver his or her national statement last after all Council members. However, in certain cases, the speaking order was established by the use of a sign-up sheet, and the President of the Council made his or her national statement before the other members took the floor.\(^{143}\) In certain cases, the President of the Council adjusted the list of speakers and inscribed first the delegation(s) responsible for the drafting process in order to allow it or them to make an introductory or explanatory presentation.\(^{144}\) Furthermore, in cases when an unscheduled or emergency meeting was convened, the President adjusted the list of speakers so that the delegation having requested the meeting could speak before other Council members in order to present the rationale for convening the meeting.\(^{145}\) During the period under review, the President of the Council would inscribe first the Chairs of the subsidiary bodies of the Council when presenting their work as it occurred on several occasions during the reporting period.\(^{146}\) Also as per established practice, the list of speakers was adjusted when high-level officials were representing Council members at a meeting to follow protocol.\(^{147}\) During 2016 and 2017, non-Council members with a direct

\(^{143}\) For example, at the 8144\(^{\text{th}}\) meeting on 20 December 2017, under the item entitled “Maintenance of international peace and security”, the representative of Japan and President of Council for the month, took the floor after the briefing by the Secretary-General and delivered a single statement comprising introductory remarks and his national statement before the other members took the floor (S/PV.8144, pp. 3-5).

\(^{144}\) For example, at the 8139\(^{\text{th}}\) meeting on 18 December 2017, under the item entitled “The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question”, the representative of Egypt, who had submitted the draft resolution contained in document (S/2017/1060), took the floor before other Council members and gave an introductory presentation (S/PV.8139, pp. 2-3).

\(^{145}\) For example, at the 7777\(^{\text{th}}\) meeting on 25 September 2016, under the item entitled “The situation in the Middle East”, the representatives of the United States, France and the United Kingdom, who had convened the meeting, delivered statements before other Council members (S/PV.7777, pp. 5-13).

\(^{146}\) For example, at the 7884\(^{\text{th}}\) meeting on 15 February 2017, under the item entitled “The situation in the Central African Republic”, the representative of Ukraine spoke first and before other Council members, and briefed the Council in his capacity as Chair of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 2127 (2013), concerning the Central African Republic (S/PV.7884, pp. 6-9).

\(^{147}\) For example, at the 7882\(^{\text{nd}}\) meeting on 13 February 2017, under the item entitled “Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts”, Ukraine, who was the President of the Council and was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs, Italy, who was represented by its Undersecretary of State for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, and Kazakhstan, who was represented by its Deputy Secretary of the Security Council of Kazakhstan, took floor after the briefers but before other Council members (S/PV.7882, pp. 10-13). At the 7938\(^{\text{th}}\) meeting on 15 May 2017, under the item entitled “Women and peace and security”, Uruguay, who was the President of the Council and was represented by its Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Sweden, who was represented by its Minister of Defense, both took floor after the briefers but before other Council members (S/PV.7938, pp. 8-11). For more information on high-level meetings, see section I.
interest in the matter under consideration, spoke prior to Council members,\textsuperscript{148} consistent with prior practice as well as relevant notes by the President.\textsuperscript{149}

By the note of the President of 30 August 2017 (\textit{S/2017/507}), the Council expressed its commitment to continue to take steps to improve the focus and interactivity of its open debates.\textsuperscript{150} In particular, the note reflected the understanding that open debates could benefit from the contributions of both Council members and the wider membership,\textsuperscript{151} and the acknowledgement by Council members of the usefulness of concept notes to help focus the discussion.\textsuperscript{152}

During the period under review, Council members continued the practice of circulating concept notes ahead of open debates, and concept notes were at times issued in annex to letters addressed to the Secretary-General or the President of the Security Council.\textsuperscript{153}

During the period under review, the Council continued to use video tele-conferencing for its meetings, a practice that has become increasingly prevalent since its introduction in 2009.\textsuperscript{154} During 2016 and 2017, Council members were briefed via video tele-conferencing in meetings and consultations more than 70 times, decreasing from 101 in 2014, the peak year, to 73 in 2017. The frequency of video tele-conferencing remained high compared with years prior to 2014, as shown in figure 5 below.\textsuperscript{155}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{148} \textit{S/2010/507}, para. 31 and \textit{S/2017/507}, para. 33.
\item \textsuperscript{149} For example, at the 7673\textsuperscript{rd} meeting on 18 April 2016, and at the 7929\textsuperscript{th} meeting on 20 April 2017, both under the item entitled “The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question”, the representative of Israel, who was invited under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, and the Permanent Observer of the Observer State of Palestine, who was invited under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, both took the floor before Council members, as per established practice in connection with this item during the period under review (\textit{S/PV.7673}, pp. 4-9, and \textit{S/PV.7929}, pp. 5-10). Similarly, at the 7722\textsuperscript{nd} meeting on 21 June 2016, under the item entitled “The situation in Afghanistan”, the representative of Afghanistan spoke after the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan and Head of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA), who was invited under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, but before Council members, as per established practice in connection with this item (\textit{S/PV.7722}, pp. 4-7). At the 8080\textsuperscript{th} meeting on 30 October 2017, under the item entitled “Peace and Security in Africa”, Mali who was invited under rule 37, and was represented and spoke after the Secretary-General but before Council members (\textit{S/PV.8080}, pp. 3-6). For more information concerning participation in Security Council meetings, see section VII.A below.
\item \textsuperscript{150} \textit{S/2017/507}, para. 43.
\item \textsuperscript{151} Ibid., para. 38.
\item \textsuperscript{152} Ibid., para. 40.
\item \textsuperscript{153} See for example, letter dated 1 July 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (\textit{S/2016/585}), and letter dated 1 February 2017 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (\textit{S/2017/104}).
\item \textsuperscript{154} Ibid., Annex, para. 60.
\item \textsuperscript{155} For information on participation in Council meetings via VTC, see also section VII.B.
\end{itemize}
Figure 5: Number of video teleconferencing, 2009-2017

![Bar chart showing the number of video teleconferencing from 2009 to 2017.

- 2009: 1
- 2010: 11
- 2011: 31
- 2012: 44
- 2013: 41
- 2014: 101
- 2015: 85
- 2016: 79
- 2017: 73

The chart shows an increase in the number of video teleconferencing meetings over the years, peaking in 2014.]}
VII. Participation

Note

This section covers the practice of the Council concerning the extension of invitations to non-members of the Council for their participation in meetings of the Council. Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter of the United Nations, and rules 37 and 39 of the provisional rules of procedure describe instances where invitations can be extended to non-members of the Council to participate, without vote, when it so decides.

Article 31

*Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council may participate, without vote, in the discussion of any question brought before the Security Council whenever the latter considers that the interests of that Member are specially affected.*

Article 32

*Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council or any state which is not a Member of the United Nations, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute. The Security Council shall lay down such conditions as it deems just for the participation of a state which is not a Member of the United Nations.*

Rule 37

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

Rule 39

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

During the period under review, the Council continued to invite non-members to participate in its meetings. These invitations were extended by the President at the beginning or during Council meetings either under the “relevant provisions” of the Charter without an explicit reference to a specific Article or rule, or under rules 37 or 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council. Specifically, Member States continued to be invited under rule 37, while representatives of the Secretariat, other United Nations organs, specialized agencies, funds and programmes, regional and other intergovernmental organizations, or other invitees, including representatives of non-governmental organizations, were invited under rule 39. While Member States requested invitations in letters addressed to the President of the Council, in most cases these were not issued as official documents of the Council.156

During the period under review, in relevant notes of the President, the Council reaffirmed the invitation to newly elected members to observe all meetings of the Council and extended the period from six weeks immediately preceding their term of membership to three months, as from 1 October each.157 Notwithstanding the foregoing, in exceptional circumstances, the Security

---

156 See for example the letters dated 14 and 24 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Eritrea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2016/569) and S/2016/568), pursuant to which the Government of Eritrea requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council, in accordance with Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter, and that a representative of the Government of Eritrea be allowed to participate in and make a statement at the meeting in accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council. For more information on meetings, see section II above.

Council will not invite the newly elected members to a specific private meeting of the Council or to specific informal consultations of the whole if a request to that effect was made by a member of the Council. The notes further provided that the newly elected members will not be invited to the meetings of the Council or the informal consultations of the whole related to the selection and appointment of the Secretary-General. In addition, the newly elected members could be invited to the monthly luncheon with the Secretary-General held in December immediately preceding their term of membership, at the discretion of the President of the Council for that month.\(^{158}\)

This section is divided into four subsections: A. Invitations extended under rule 37; B. Invitations extended under rule 39; C. Invitations not expressly extended under rule 37 or rule 39; and, D. Discussions relating to participation.

### A. Invitations extended under rule 37

In accordance with the relevant Articles of the Charter and provisional rules of procedure, all States, whether or not members of the United Nations, can be invited to participate in Council meetings when: (a) the interests of a Member State are “specially affected” (Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37); (b) a Member State or a non-Member State is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Council (Article 32 of the Charter); and (c) a Member State of the United Nations brings a matter to the attention of the Council in accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Charter (rule 37).\(^{159}\)

During the period under review, there were no changes to the procedure for extending invitations to Member States to participate in the proceedings of the Council. Member States invited under rule 37, in line with previous practice, continued to speak occasionally in other capacities, such as on behalf of regional or international organizations, or groups of States through delivering joint statements.\(^{160}\) There was no instance during the period under review

---

\(^{158}\) S/2016/619, para. 3 and S/2017/507, para. 141.

\(^{159}\) For more details on referral of a dispute or situation to the Council by States, see section I. A above.

\(^{160}\) For example, the representatives of Kuwait, at the 7621st meeting on 15 February 2016, and the representative of Uzbekistan, at the 7863rd meeting on 17 January 2017, spoke on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (S/PV.7621, pp. 55-56 and S/PV.7863, pp. 48-49). Similarly, the representatives of the Islamic Republic of Iran and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), at the 7653rd meeting on 21 March 2016 and the 7802nd meeting on 7 November 2016, respectively, delivered statements on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (S/PV.7653, pp. 53-54 and S/PV.7802, pp. 30-32). The representatives of Slovenia and Panama spoke on behalf of the Human Security
where a request from a Member State to participate in a Council meeting was put to a vote or denied at a public meeting.

B. Invitations extended under rule 39

In accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, members of the Secretariat or other persons may be invited to supply the Council with information or give other assistance in examining matters within its competence.

Following previous practice, invitations under rule 39 were extended to representatives of Member States on an exceptional basis, only if their participation was in a role other than as representative of their State, for example, as chairpersons of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and its country-specific configurations.\(^{161}\)

During the period under review, a total of 667 invitations were extended under rule 39, with 327 in 2016 and 340 in 2017 (see figure 6).

\(^{161}\) For example, at the 8109\(^{th}\) meeting on 20 November 2017, the representative of Switzerland and Chair of the Burundi configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission was invited under rule 39 (S/PV.8109, p. 2). Similarly, at the 7883\(^{rd}\) meeting on 14 February 2017, the representative of Brazil was invited under rule 39 in his capacity as Chair of the Guinea-Bissau configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/PV.7883, p. 2). The representative of Morocco was invited under rule 39 at the 7787\(^{th}\) meeting on 10 October 2016 as the Chair of the Central African Republic configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/PV.7787, p. 2). At the 7723\(^{rd}\) meeting on 22 June 2016, the representatives of Sweden and Kenya were invited under rule 39 as former and current Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, respectively (S/PV.7723, p. 2). Similarly, at the 7976\(^{th}\) meeting on 19 June 2017, the representatives of the Republic of Korea and Kenya were invited under rule 39 as current and former Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission, respectively (S/PV.7976, p. 2).
Figure 6: Invitations under rule 39, 2013-2017

Out of the 327 invitees under rule 39, in 2016, 270 were men and 57 were women, whereas in 2017, out of the 342 invitees, 258 were men and 82 were women. As shown in figure 7 below, in the recent past, the number of male speakers invited under rule 39 has been 3 to 4 time higher than the number female speakers invited under rule 39. This notwithstanding, the percentage of women invited under rule 39 increased during the period under review, from 17.4% in 2016 to 24.1% in 2017.
For the purposes of this part, invitations under rule 39 have been grouped under the following four main categories: 162 (a) officials belonging to the United Nations system; 163 (b) invitees from international organizations other than the United Nations; 164 (c) officials representing regional intergovernmental organizations; 165 (d) representatives of other entities such as non-governmental organizations. 166 During the period under review, invitations under rule 39 were most often extended to officials belonging to the United Nations system, while

---

162 Previous Supplements used two different categories for invitees of the Secretariat and Security Council subsidiary bodies, and the United Nations organs, subsidiary bodies or agencies. For simplicity purposes, these two categories have now been subsumed under the category United Nations system.

163 For example, at the 7634th meeting on 26 February 2016, the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for Syria was invited under rule 39 (S/PV.7634). Also, at the 7990th meeting on 29 June 2017, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs was invited under rule 39 (S/PV.7990). The category “UN system” includes officials of the African Union–United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID).

164 For example, at the 7698th meeting on 26 May 2016, the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court was invited under rule 39 (S/PV.7698). Similarly, at the 7898th meeting on 15 March 2017, the Special Representative of the INTERPOL to the United Nations was invited under rule 39 (S/PV.7898).

165 For example, at the 7651st meeting on 17 March 2016, the Head of the Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations was invited under rule 39 (S/PV.7651). Also, at the 8022nd meeting on 10 August 2017, the Permanent Observer of the African Union to the United Nations was invited under rule 39 (S/PV.8022).

166 For example, at the 7699th meeting on 26 May 2016, the Coordinator of the Association des femmes peules autochtones du Tchad was invited under rule 39 (S/PV.7699). Similarly, at the 8119th meeting on 30 November 2017, the Project Leader of the Cultural Heritage Protection of the Italian Ministry of Culture was invited under rule 39 (S/PV.8119).
representatives of other entities, such as non-governmental organizations, were invited less frequently, as shown in figure 8 below. Starting from late 2016, the Security Council increasingly extended invitations to civil society briefers to brief the Council at meetings convened under regional or country-specific agenda item.  

Figure 8: Breakdown of rule 39 invitations by category 2013-2017

Videoconferencing

The Council continued the practice of inviting speakers who joined the meetings via video tele-conferencing (VTC), a practice that has become increasingly prevalent since its introduction in 2009. In this regard, the note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507),

---

167 In 2016, Ms. Victoria Wollie, National Coordinator for the West Africa Network for Peacebuilding - Women in Peacebuilding Network in Liberia invited under rule 39, briefed the Council under the item entitled “The situation in Liberia” (S/PV/7824).

168 For example, at the 7603rd meeting on 14 January 2016, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Head of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) was invited under rule 39 and briefed the Council via video teleconference from Goma (S/PV.7603, pp. 2-4). Similarly, at the 7971st meeting on 15 June 2017, the Commissioner for Peace and Security of the African Union was invited under rule 39 and briefed the Council via teleconference from Addis Ababa.
reiterated that Council members intended to resort more often to the use of video
teleconferencing for briefing the Council, where appropriate, while preserving a balanced
approach between video teleconferencing and briefings in person, including during open
meetings in the open chamber.\textsuperscript{169}

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

During the period under review, the Council extended several invitations not expressly
under rule 37 or rule 39 as shown in table 10 below.

Invitations to representatives of the Holy See and Palestine to participate in meetings of
the Council were routinely extended “in accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and
the previous practice in this regard”, without specification of any rules.

Table 10

\textbf{Invitations not expressly extended under rule 37 or rule 39 in 2016-2017}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invitee</th>
<th>Meeting record and date</th>
<th>Agenda item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>\textit{S/PV.7606}, 19 January 2016</td>
<td>Protection of civilians in armed conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{S/PV.8079}, 27 October 2017</td>
<td>Women and peace and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy See</td>
<td>\textit{S/PV.8082}, 31 October 2017</td>
<td>Children and armed conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

video teleconference from Addis Ababa (\textit{S/PV.7971}, pp. 3-4). For more information on video tele-conferencing see
section VI on conduct of business.\textsuperscript{169} \textit{S/2017/507}, para. 60. See also note by the President of 5 June 2012 (\textit{S/2012/402}).
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\textbf{Repertoire website:} \url{http://www.un.org/en/sc/repertoire}
D. Discussions relating to participation

During the period under review, when non-Council members were invited to participate in a meeting, Council members generally spoke before Member States invited under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure and before those not expressly invited under any rule, except in some instances when parties directly involved in the matter under consideration took the floor before Council members.\(^{170}\) By contrast, the practice of the Council with regard to participants invited under rule 39 was less consistent and dependent on whether they participated as briefers for the meeting.

\(^{170}\) For example, at the 7722\(^{nd}\) meeting on 21 June 2016, under the item entitled “The situation in Afghanistan”, following established practice in connection with this item, the representative of Afghanistan spoke after the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Afghanistan and Head of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA), who was invited under rule 39, but before Council members (S/PV.7722, pp. 4-7). For more information on speaking order see section VI above.
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A variety of issues concerning the participation in Council meetings were raised in meetings of the Council in 2016 and 2017. During the 7826th meeting held on 5 December 2016, on the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the representative of New Zealand stated that his delegation “would have seen real value” in having the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights participating in that briefing to share his observations on his visit to the country and on the work of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. At that meeting the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Head of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), as well as the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs were invited to brief the Council under rule 39. In addition, at the 8079th meeting held on 27 October 2017, on women and peace and security, the representative of Spain proposed to the members of the Council that in Security Council debates concerning country-specific situations, members of civil society be invited to describe the situation on the ground, when advisable because of the circumstances. Participation in Security Council meetings was discussed in further detail during the open debate held at the 7740th meeting on 19 July 2016, under the item entitled “Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)”, as illustrated in case 6 below.

Case 6

Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)

The Council held its 7740th meeting on 19 July 2016, under the item entitled “Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)”, further to the concept note circulated by Japan to “look at the implementation of note 507 and other relevant notes concerning the working methods of the Council to identify successful practices as well as possible shortcomings, and consider making necessary adjustments”. During the discussion, the representative of Japan recalled that pursuant to the presidential note of 15 July 2016, the newly elected members were invited to observe the Council’s meetings from 1

171 S/PV.8079, p. 54.
172 S/2016/585, p.3.
October, immediately preceding their term of membership. In this regard, he expressed his conviction that this measure would benefit the Council as a whole by allowing it to function much more effectively right from the beginning of the year. Similarly, the representative of the Russian Federation referred to presidential note of 26 July 2010 (S/2010/507) as an important aid for non-permanent members preparing to work on the Council, which would be particularly relevant for the year of 2016 as newly elected members would be able to attend Council meetings much earlier. With respect to the participation of the wider membership in Security Council meetings, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, stated that the number of public meetings of the Council should be increased, in accordance with Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter, and that Council meetings should provide “real opportunities” to take into account the views and contributions of Member States, particularly non-Council members, whose affairs were on the agenda of the Council. He emphasized that transparency, openness and consistency were key elements that the Council should observe in all its activities, approaches and procedures, and regretted that the Council had neglected those important elements in numerous instances, which included, among others, “repeatedly restricting” participation in certain debates and discriminating against non-members of the Council, particularly with regard to the sequence in and time limits for statements during the open debates. The representative of Cuba stressed also that States that were directly “involved or especially affected” should always participate in the Council’s deliberations on issues that concerned them directly citing Article 31 of the Charter. The representative of Italy called to expand consultation and cooperation with regional and subregional organizations, including by inviting, as appropriate, relevant organizations to participate in the Council’s private and public meetings.

173 S/2016/619, para. 2.
174 S/PV.7740, pp. 2-3.
175 Ibid., p. 11.
176 Ibid., p. 20.
177 Ibid., p. 21.
178 Ibid., p. 39.
179 Ibid., p. 23.
VIII. Decision-making and voting

Note

The present section covers the practice of the Council with regard to decision-making, including voting. Article 27 of the Charter, along with rule 40 of the provisional rules of procedure, govern the voting in the Council. According to those provisions, decisions on procedural matters require an affirmative vote of nine out of 15 Council members whilst decisions on substantive matters are made by an affirmative vote of nine Council members, including all the permanent members.

This section also covers rules 31, 32, 34 to 36 and 38 of the provisional rules of procedure that govern the conduct of business in the context of voting on draft resolutions, amendments and substantive motions.

Article 27

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

Rule 31

Proposed resolutions, amendments and substantive motions shall normally be placed before the representatives in writing.

Rule 32
Principal motions and draft resolutions shall have precedence in the order of their submission.

Parts of a motion or of a draft resolution shall be voted on separately at the request of any representative, unless the original mover objects.

Rule 34

It shall not be necessary for any motion or draft resolution proposed by a representative on the Security Council to be seconded before being put to a vote.

Rule 35

A motion or draft resolution can at any time be withdrawn so long as no vote has been taken with respect to it.

If the motion or draft resolution has been seconded, the representative on the Security Council who has seconded it may require that it be put to the vote as his motion or draft resolution with the same right of precedence as if the original mover had not withdrawn it.

Rule 36

If two or more amendments to a motion or draft resolution are proposed, the President shall rule on the order in which they are to be voted upon. Ordinarily, the Security Council shall first vote on the amendment furthest removed in substance from the original
proposal and then on the amendment next furthest removed until all amendments have been put to the vote, but when an amendment adds to or deletes from the text of a motion or draft resolution, that amendment shall be voted on first.

Rule 38

Any Member of the United Nations invited in accordance with the preceding rule, or in application of Article 32 of the Charter, to participate in the discussions of the Security Council may submit proposals and draft resolutions. These proposals and draft resolutions may be put to a vote only at the request of a representative on the Security Council.

Rule 40

Voting in the Security Council shall be in accordance with the relevant Articles of the Charter and of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

This section is organized under five headings: A. Decisions of the Council; B. Sponsorship in accordance with rule 38; C. Decision-making by voting; D. Decision-making without a vote; and, E. Discussions concerning the decision-making process.

During the period under review, rule 31 was routinely applied in Security Council meetings. In addition, during 2016 and 2017, Council members made explicit reference to rule 32 with regard to the order in which two different draft resolutions should be put to the vote. As described in greater detail in case 7 below, at the 8105th meeting on 16 November 2017, under the item entitled “The situation in the Middle East”, the President of the Security Council and the representative of the United States made explicit references to rule 32 of the Council’s provisional rules of procedure regarding the order of voting on two competing draft resolutions presented at the meeting.
There were no instances where rule 34 was invoked during the reporting period.

Rule 36 was also explicitly referenced during the review period. During the 7643rd meeting held on 11 March 2016 under the item entitled “United Nations peacekeeping operations”, the President of the Council invoked rule 36 of the provisional rules of procedure and put to a vote an amendment submitted by Egypt (S/2017/239) to paragraph 2 of draft resolution S/2016/235 that had been submitted by the United States. The proposed amendment failed to obtain the required number of votes and the Council proceeded to vote on the draft resolution, which was adopted.

A. Decisions of the Council

During the period under review, the Council continued to adopt, at its meetings, resolutions and statements by the President, in addition to taking procedural decisions. Decisions of the Council also took the form of notes or letters by the President, which were seldom adopted at meetings and mostly issued as official documents of the Council.

During the period under review, the Council adopted a total of 138 resolutions and 46 presidential statements. In 2016, the Council adopted 77 resolutions and issued 19 statements by the President, whereas in 2017, the Council adopted 61 resolutions and issued 27 statements by the President.

Figure 9 shows the total number of resolutions adopted and statements by the President issued during the last decade (2008 to 2017).

---

180 S/PV.7643, pp. 2-3.
181 Ibid., p. 3. The proposed amendment contained in document S/2016/239 failed to obtain the required number of votes as follows: in favour: Angola, China, Egypt, Russian Federation, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of); against: France, Japan, New Zealand, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom and United States, abstentions: Senegal. Following the voting on the amendment, the votes for draft resolution S/2016/235 were as follows: in favour: Angola, China, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of); abstentions: Egypt. See for further details, section 27 of part I on “United Nations peacekeeping operations”.

Part II – Provisional rules of procedure

During the period under review, the Council also issued 23 notes by the President, 14 in 2016 and nine in 2017, and 88 letters by the President, 45 in 2016 and 39 in 2017.

**Multiple decisions in one meeting**

Finally, at the 8135th meeting, under the item entitled “Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan”, the Council adopted resolution 2392 (2017), and issued presidential statement S/PRST/2017/25.  

B. Sponsorship in accordance with rule 38

A draft resolution may be submitted by any member of the Council. According to rule 38 of the provisional rules of procedure, any Member of the United Nations may also submit a proposal, but a proposal may be put to the vote only at the request of a Council member. Those Member States which submit a draft resolution become sponsors of the draft resolution. A draft resolution may become a presidential text if all the Council members agree to be co-sponsors.

During the period under review, a total of 150 draft resolutions were considered by the Council, out of which eight were presidential texts. Figure 10 below shows the number of presidential texts, compared to the total number of resolutions adopted per year, for the period 2008 to 2017.

**Figure 10: Number of presidential texts for the period 2008-2017**

---

184 S/PV 8063.
185 S/PV.8135.
During the period under review, 23 draft resolutions were sponsored by non-Council members as shown in table 11 below.

Table 11
Draft resolutions sponsored by non-Council members in 2016 and 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft resolution</th>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Meeting record and date</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Council member sponsors</th>
<th>Non-Council member co-sponsors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/202</td>
<td>Non-proliferation/Democratic People’s Republic of Korea</td>
<td>S/PV.7638, 2 March 2016</td>
<td>2270 (2016)</td>
<td>10 Council members&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>43 Member States&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/380</td>
<td>Protection of civilians in armed conflict</td>
<td>S/PV.7685, 3 May 2016</td>
<td>2286 (2016)</td>
<td>13 Council members&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>72 Member States&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/744</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>S/PV.7763, 30 August 2016</td>
<td>2305 (2016)</td>
<td>11 Council members&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/797</td>
<td>Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts</td>
<td>S/PV.7775, 22 September 2016</td>
<td>2309 (2016)</td>
<td>10 Council members&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>27 Member States&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/800</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>S/PV.7776, 23 September 2016</td>
<td>2310 (2016)</td>
<td>5 Council members: France, Japan, Spain, United Kingdom, United States</td>
<td>40 Member States&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/838</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>S/PV.7783, 6 October 2016</td>
<td>2312 (2016)</td>
<td>7 Council members: France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom</td>
<td>32 Member States&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/846</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>S/PV.7785, 8 October 2016</td>
<td>Not adopted owing to negative vote of a permanent member</td>
<td>6 Council members: France, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States</td>
<td>40 Member States&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/862</td>
<td>The question concerning Haiti</td>
<td>S/PV.7790, 13 October 2016</td>
<td>2313 (2016)</td>
<td>9 Council members: Angola, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Ukraine, United States, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)</td>
<td>Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Peru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft resolution</th>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Meeting record and date</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Council member sponsors</th>
<th>Non-Council member co-sponsors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/999</td>
<td>Non-proliferation/Democratic People's Republic of Korea</td>
<td>7821, 30 November 2016</td>
<td>2321 (2016)</td>
<td>9 Council members: France, Japan, New Zealand, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay</td>
<td>42 Member States&lt;sup&gt;k&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/1047</td>
<td>Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts</td>
<td>S/PV.7831, 12 December 2016</td>
<td>2322 (2016)</td>
<td>12 Council members&lt;sup&gt;l&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>39 Member States&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/1052</td>
<td>Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction</td>
<td>S/PV.7837, 15 December 2016</td>
<td>2325 (2016)</td>
<td>All Council members&lt;sup&gt;n&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>62 Member States&lt;sup&gt;o&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/1073</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>S/PV.7847, 20 December 2016</td>
<td>2331 (2016)</td>
<td>10 Council members&lt;sup&gt;p&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>50 Member States&lt;sup&gt;q&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/1138</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>S/PV.7855, 20 December 2016</td>
<td>2336 (2016)</td>
<td>1 Council member: Russian Federation</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/119</td>
<td>Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts</td>
<td>S/PV.7882, 13 February 2017</td>
<td>2341 (2017)</td>
<td>8 Council members: France, Italy, Japan, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.</td>
<td>39 Member States&lt;sup&gt;r&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/172</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>S/PV.7893, 18 February 2017</td>
<td>Not adopted owing to negative vote of a permanent member</td>
<td>7 Council members: France, Italy, Japan, Sweden, Ukraine, United States, United Kingdom</td>
<td>35 Member States&lt;sup&gt;s&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/242</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>S/PV.7907, 24 March 2417</td>
<td>2347 (2017)</td>
<td>10 Council Members&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>47 Member States&lt;sup&gt;u&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/443</td>
<td>Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts</td>
<td>S/PV.7949, 22 May 2017</td>
<td>2354 (2017)</td>
<td>13 Council Members&lt;sup&gt;v&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>50 Member States&lt;sup&gt;w&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/781</td>
<td>United Nations peacekeeping operations</td>
<td>S/PV.8051, 20 September 2017</td>
<td>2378 (2017)</td>
<td>All Council members&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>47 Member States&lt;sup&gt;y&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/788</td>
<td>Threats to international peace and security</td>
<td>S/PV.8052, 21 September 2017</td>
<td>2379 (2017)</td>
<td>11 Council members&lt;sup&gt;z&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>36 Member States&lt;sup&gt;aa&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft resolution</td>
<td>Agenda item</td>
<td>Meeting record and date</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Council member sponsors</td>
<td>Non-Council member co-sponsors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/827</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>S/PV.8061, 5 October 2017</td>
<td>2380 (2017)</td>
<td>6 Council members: France, Italy, Japan, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom</td>
<td>26 Member States(^{\text{ab}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/884</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>S/PV.8073, 24 October 2017</td>
<td>Not adopted owing to negative vote of a permanent member</td>
<td>6 Council members: France, Italy, Japan, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States</td>
<td>35 Member States(^{\text{cc}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/973</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>S/PV.8111, 21 November 2017</td>
<td>2388 (2017)</td>
<td>11 Council members(^{\text{dd}})</td>
<td>47 Member States(^{\text{ee}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/1051</td>
<td>Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts</td>
<td>S/PV.8148, 21 December 2017</td>
<td>2396 (2017)</td>
<td>11 Council members(^{\text{ff}})</td>
<td>55 Member States(^{\text{gg}})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay.

\(^{b}\) Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Turkey and Vanuatu.

\(^{c}\) Angola, Egypt, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

\(^{d}\) Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Micronesia, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovak, Slovenia, Somalia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates and Vanuatu.

\(^{e}\) Angola, Egypt, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom and United States.

\(^{f}\) Angola, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, United Kingdom, United States and Uruguay.

\(^{g}\) Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey.

\(^{h}\) Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Federated States of Micronesia, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden and Turkey.
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1. Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia and Sweden.

2. Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Turkey and United Arab Emirates.

3. Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Turkey.

4. Angola, Egypt, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States and Uruguay.

5. Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia and Turkey.

6. Angola, China, Egypt, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

7. Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam.

8. Angola, France, Japan, Malaysia, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay and Venezuela.

9. Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and Vanuatu.

10. Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and United Arab Emirates.

11. Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey and United Arab Emirates.

12. Ethiopia, France, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Senegal, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom and Uruguay.

13. Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Moroccan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey.
Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States and Uruguay.

Albania, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey and United Arab Emirates.

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States and Uruguay.

Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Viet Nam.

Ethiopia, France, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Senegal, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States and Uruguay.

Albania, Austria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey and United Arab Emirates.

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia and Spain.

Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Turkey.

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ethiopia, France, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Senegal, Sweden, Ukraine, United States and Uruguay.

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Belize, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia and Turkey.

Ethiopia, France, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Senegal, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States and Uruguay.

Albania, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Kenya, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Micronesia, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey and United Arab Emirates.
C. Decision-making by voting

According to Article 27 (2) and (3) of the Charter, decisions of the Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine Council members. On all other matters, be they substantive or non-procedural, an affirmative vote of nine Council members is required, including the concurring votes of the permanent members. However, the result of a vote in the Council often does not in itself indicate whether the Council considers the matter voted upon as procedural or substantive. For example, whether a vote is procedural or not, cannot be determined when a proposal is: (a) adopted by a unanimous vote; (b) adopted with an affirmative vote of all permanent members; or (c) not adopted without having obtained the necessary nine affirmative votes. If a proposal is adopted, having obtained nine or more affirmative votes, with one or more permanent members casting a negative vote, that indicates that the vote is considered procedural. Conversely, if the proposal is not adopted, the vote is considered substantive. On certain occasions, in its early years, the Council found it necessary to decide, by vote, the question whether the matter under consideration was procedural within the meaning of Article 27 (2). This procedure is known as the “preliminary question”, after the language used in the San Francisco Statement on Voting Procedure. In recent years, including during the period under review, however, there have been no instances of the Council in which the Council decided to examine the preliminary question. Furthermore, procedural motions, such as the adoption of the agenda, the extension of invitations, and the suspension or adjournment of a meeting, have generally been decided upon by the Council without a vote. When such motions were voted upon, the vote was considered procedural. During the period under review, there were four instances where the Council voted on procedural matters as shown in table 12.

Table 12
Cases in which the vote indicated the procedural character of the matter, 2016-2017

---

187 At the 8073rd meeting on 24 October 2017, under the item entitled “The situation in the Middle East”, the procedural motion on the issue of adjourning the meeting was put to the vote (S/PV.8073). For more information, see section VI above.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Meeting record and date</th>
<th>Votes in favour</th>
<th>Votes against</th>
<th>Abstention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2272 (2016)</td>
<td>United Nations peacekeeping operations</td>
<td>S/PV. 7643, 11 March 2016</td>
<td>14 (Angola, China, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2285 (2016)</td>
<td>The situation concerning Western Sahara</td>
<td>S/PV. 7684, 29 April 2016</td>
<td>10 (China, Egypt, France, Japan, Malaysia, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States)</td>
<td>2 (Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))</td>
<td>3 (Angola, New Zealand and Russian Federation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2303 (2016)</td>
<td>The situation in Burundi</td>
<td>S/PV. 7752, 29 July 2016</td>
<td>11 (France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (Angola, China, Egypt, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2304 (2016)</td>
<td>Reports of Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan</td>
<td>S/PV. 7754, 12 August 2016</td>
<td>11 (Angola, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (China, Egypt, Russian Federation, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2310 (2016)</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>S/PV. 7776, 23 September 2016</td>
<td>14 (Angola, China, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2312 (2016)</td>
<td>Maintenance of international peace and security</td>
<td>S/PV. 7783, 6 October 2016</td>
<td>14 (Angola, China, Egypt, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2317 (2016)</td>
<td>The situation in Somalia</td>
<td>S/PV. 7807, 10 November 2016</td>
<td>10 (France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United States, and Uruguay)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (Angola, China, Egypt, Russian Federation, and Venezuela)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Non-adoption of draft resolutions

According to Article 27 (3) of the Charter, a draft resolution on non-procedural matters is not adopted when it fails to obtain the nine affirmative votes required, or when a negative vote is cast by a permanent member. During the period under review, there were three instances of draft resolutions not adopted due to the lack of the necessary nine affirmative votes, two in 2016 and one in 2017, and eight instances of draft resolutions not adopted due to a negative vote cast by a permanent member, two in 2016 and six in 2017 as shown in table 14 below.

Table 14
## Draft resolutions not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member or for lack of the requisite number of votes, 2016 and 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft resolution</th>
<th>Meeting record and date</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Votes in favour</th>
<th>Votes against</th>
<th>Abstention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/846</td>
<td>S/PV.7785 8 October 2016</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>11 (Egypt, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay)</td>
<td>2 (Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))</td>
<td>2 (Angola and China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/847</td>
<td>S/PV.7785 8 October 2016</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>4 (China, Egypt, Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))</td>
<td>9 (France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom and United States)</td>
<td>2 (Angola and Uruguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/1026</td>
<td>S/PV.7825 5 December 2016</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>11 (Egypt, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay)</td>
<td>3 (China, Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))</td>
<td>1 (Angola)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2016/1085</td>
<td>S/PV.7850 23 December 2016</td>
<td>Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan</td>
<td>7 (France, New Zealand, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (Angola, China, Egypt, Japan, Malaysia, Russian Federation, Senegal, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/172</td>
<td>S/PV.7893 28 February 2017</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>9 (France, Italy, Japan, Senegal, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay)</td>
<td>3 (Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, and Russian Federation)</td>
<td>3 (Egypt, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/315</td>
<td>S/PV.7922 12 April 2017</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>10 (Egypt, France, Italy, Japan, Senegal, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay)</td>
<td>2 (Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and Russian Federation)</td>
<td>3 (China, Ethiopia, and Kazakhstan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/884</td>
<td>S/PV.8073 24 October 2017</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>11 (Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Italy, Japan, Senegal, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay)</td>
<td>2 (Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and Russian Federation)</td>
<td>2 (China, and Kazakhstan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/2017/962</td>
<td>S/PV.8105 16 November 2017</td>
<td>The situation in the Middle East</td>
<td>11 (Ethiopia, France, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Senegal, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay)</td>
<td>2 (Bolivia (Plurinational State of), and Russian Federation)</td>
<td>2 (China, and Egypt)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Decision-making without a vote

A procedural motion or a substantive motion may be adopted in the Council without a vote or by consensus. During the period 2016-2017, there were two instances of resolutions adopted without a vote, namely resolution 2311 (2016), of 6 October 2016, concerning the question of the recommendation for the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and resolution 2324 (2016), of 14 December 2016, concerning the tribute to the outgoing Secretary-General.

Statements by the President continued to be adopted by consensus. A total of 46 statements by the President were adopted during the period under review. In comparison to past practice where most of the statements by the President adopted were read out at meetings, during the period under review, 22 out of 46 statements were adopted without the text being read out. Furthermore, in several instances, resolutions and statements by the President were adopted during the course of a meeting rather than at the beginning or at the end.

189 For example, see S/PV.7771 and S/PV.8139.
Following past practice, during the period under review, notes and letters by the President of the Council were adopted by consensus and issued as official documents. In 2016 and 2017, the Council issued 23 notes and 88 letters by the President.\textsuperscript{190} Notes and letters by the President are rarely adopted during Council meetings. During the period under review, in one instance, a note by the President was adopted during a meeting of the Council, namely, the adoption of the draft report of the Council to the General Assembly for the period 1 August 2015 to 31 December 2016 (S/2017/691).\textsuperscript{191}

Three notes adopted during the period under review addressed aspects of the working methods of the Council. Presidential note of 22 February 2016 (S/2016/170) stated the commitment of Council members to improving the process of selection and preparation of Chairs of subsidiary organs, as well as the interaction and coordination among the subsidiary organs, and, between the subsidiary organs and the Council as a whole. Presidential note of 15 July 2016 (S/2016/619) stated the commitment of Council members to implementing measures concerning newly elected members, including their preparation and the selection and preparation of Chairs of subsidiary organs. The note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507) incorporated and further developed measures agreed to by the Council with regard to its working methods contained in 13 prior presidential notes adopted after the issuance of the note by the President of 26 July 2010 (S/2010/507).\textsuperscript{192} The note by the President of 30 August 2017 (S/2017/507) was issued under the Chairmanship of Japan of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and other Procedural Questions (IWG). The revisions contained in the new note concerned, among others, the monthly programme of work of the Council, the practice of informal consultations of the whole, the drafting process of outcome documents of the Council, the dialogue with non-Council members and bodies, and Security Council missions.

E. Discussions concerning the decision-making process

\textsuperscript{190} For the complete list of notes by the President of the Security Council issued in 2016 and 2017, see part I, section XIII of the report of the Security Council to the seventy-first and seventy-second sessions of the General Assembly (A/71/2 and A/72/2), respectively, or visit: https://www.un.org/en/sc/documents/notes/. For the complete list of letters from the President of the Council issued in 2016 and 2017, see part I, section III of the above-mentioned reports or https://www.un.org/en/sc/documents/letters/.\textsuperscript{191} S/PV.8021.

During the period under review, both procedural and non-procedural aspects of the decision-making process were discussed during Council meetings. The application and interpretation of rule 32 of the provisional rules of procedure was discussed in the context of a meeting under the item “The situation in the Middle East”, as featured in case 7 below. Moreover, Member States also discussed proposals to restrain the exercise of the veto, in particular the political statement on the suspension of the veto in case of mass atrocities as presented by France and Mexico as well as the Code of Conduct regarding Security Council action against genocide, crimes against humanity or war crimes, as elaborated by the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency (ACT) Group. These discussions took place at meetings under two different items, namely “Maintenance of international peace and security”, and “Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)”, and are featured in cases 8 and 9 respectively.

In 2016 and 2017, the exercise of the veto was also discussed in the context of meetings concerning country- and region-specific items, particularly in connection with the crisis in Syria under the agenda item “The situation in the Middle East”, as featured in case 10 below.

Furthermore, at the 8128th meeting, on 8 December 2017, under the item “The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question”, the Permanent Observer of the Observer State of Palestine explicitly referred to paragraph 3 of Article 27, calling upon the Council to adopt a resolution denouncing the recognition by the United States of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

Case 7
The situation in the Middle East

At the 8105th meeting held on 16 November 2017 under the item entitled “The situation in the Middle East”, two competing draft resolutions concerning Syria were presented to the Council: draft resolution S/2017/933 submitted by the Russian Federation and China, and draft

193 Accountability, Coherence and Transparency (ACT) Group members: Austria, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Hungary, Ireland, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Maldives, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania and Uruguay.
194 S/PV.8128, p. 17.
resolution S/2017/962 submitted by the United States. According to rule 32 of the provisional rules of procedure, draft resolutions shall have precedence in the order of their submission. At the meeting, whereas draft resolution S/2017/933 was submitted first, the representative of the Russian Federation requested the President of the Council to vote first on the draft resolution submitted by the United States. He argued that the priority provided for in rule 32, on the consideration of draft resolutions in accordance with the order of their submission, allowed for the “possibility and right” for whoever submitted a draft resolution first, to request that it be put to a vote first in cases when there was a counter draft before the Council. He stressed however, that rule 32 constituted a “privilege” that one could refuse to avail oneself of. Furthermore, he argued that submission under rule 32 should include “publication in blue” and the request for a vote. He concluded that since the United States was the first to request a vote, draft resolution S/2017/933 should be put to a vote second. The representative of the United States responded reading the text of rule 32, and stressing the need to “go according to the procedure”. She emphasized that rule 32 specified exactly what the order of voting should be, and affirmed that the Council should be “disciplined”, “abide by rule 32” and “take the politics out of the situation”. The representative of the Russian Federation requested a procedural vote on the question of whether his country’s draft resolution should be put to a vote second after the draft resolution submitted by the United States. The President of the Council stated that in his understanding, in accordance with rule 32, the draft resolution submitted by the Russian Federation should be put to a vote first, and, as requested, subsequently put the procedural motion to a vote. The procedural motion was then put to a vote and was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required number of votes. The representative of the Russian Federation subsequently invoked rule 35 of the provisional rules of procedure and withdrew its draft resolution.

Case 8

Maintenance of international peace and security

195 S/PV.8105, p. 2.
196 Ibid., p. 2.
197 Ibid., p. 3.
198 Ibid., p. 3.

Part II – Provisional rules of procedure
At the 7621st meeting held on 15 February 2016 under the item entitled “Maintenance of international peace and security”, several delegations underscored the need to review the “right of veto”. In that regard, many speakers expressed their support for the Code of Conduct regarding Security Council action against genocide, crimes against humanity or war crimes, elaborated by the ACT Group. Furthermore, a number of Member States also urged the permanent members of the Council to voluntarily refrain from the use, or the threat of use, of the veto in cases of mass atrocities, and referred to the political statement on the suspension of the veto in case of mass atrocities presented by France and Mexico. The representative of Peru emphasised that in some instances the Council had not effectively fulfilled its role in the maintenance of international peace and security and underscored the importance of achieving comprehensive reform of the Council, particularly with regard to its working methods and the use of the veto. The representative of Spain stated that too often, the Council did not fulfil its responsibility, because one of the permanent members used the right of veto or threatened to use it. Similarly the representative of Guatemala noted that the abuse of the use of the veto and the threat of its use had prevented the Council from fulfilling its mandate. The representative of Ukraine deplored the frequent use of the veto by the Russian Federation and asserted that, in abusing the right of the veto in the Council, the Russian Federation neglected its obligations, as a permanent member, to maintain peace and security.

At the 7857th meeting held on 10 January 2017 under the same item, the representative of the United States, deplored the fact that, on the one hand, the Russian Federation suggested that failure to respect State sovereignty was the main driver of conflict, while on the other hand, it had used its veto to insulate itself from the consequences of “trampling” on Ukraine’s sovereignty. Furthermore, the representative of Ukraine deplored the Council’s inability to react to the deteriorating situation in Syria due to consecutive vetoes from one permanent

---
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Part II – Provisional rules of procedure

Several speakers reiterated the calls to restrict the use of the veto in cases of mass atrocities, and the representative of Poland stressed that the Council should not be hampered by the use of the veto in taking action aimed at stopping or preventing situations involving war crimes or crimes against humanity. The representative of Latvia emphasized that with the privilege of being a permanent member of the Council and having the veto power, also came the responsibility to use that power in the interest of common peace and security, and noted that the Council had not always lived up to that special responsibility. Similarly, the representative of Finland stated that the Council held a special responsibility in conflict prevention, and underscored that one concrete line of action to that end would be the commitment of all Council members to support timely and decisive action by the Council to prevent or end mass atrocities, and to refrain from the use of the veto in those situations.

Similarly, at the 7886th meeting held on 21 February 2017 under the same item, speakers called for restraint in the use of the veto. The representative of Ukraine expressly referred to paragraph 3 of Article 27 of the Charter, concerning the abstention from voting by a party to a dispute, and argued that it was no longer acceptable that this provision continued to be “blatantly ignored”.

Case 9

Implementation of the Note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)

Decision-making by the Council, and the veto power, were among the issues discussed at the open debate on the Council’s working methods, held at its 7740th meeting on 19 July 2016, under the above-referenced item. Several speakers referred to and expressed support for the ACT Code of Conduct, and encouraged permanent members of the Council to voluntarily refrain from using the veto in situations involving mass atrocities.
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from the use of the veto, in accordance with the French-Mexican political declaration on the suspension of the veto in case of mass atrocities.\textsuperscript{215} The representative of Ukraine called it a “disgrace” that paragraph 3 of Article 27 of the Charter, for which a party to a dispute should refrain from voting continued to be “blatantly ignored”.\textsuperscript{216} In this connection, the representative of Georgia reiterated that the right to the veto should be restricted when a decision of the Council aimed at preventing crimes against humanity, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and genocide, and when a permanent member was involved in the conflict under consideration, and, therefore could not exercise its rights impartially.\textsuperscript{217}

The representative of New Zealand indicated that elected members had to take responsibility for the way the Council operated. He underlined that it was not only the veto that was to blame for the Council’s “dysfunction”, as the acquiescence of the non-permanent members was also a big factor. The representative of New Zealand concluded that since nine votes were needed to adopt any resolution, and procedural resolutions could not be vetoed, if the elected members were prepared to assert themselves, the permanent members could not “dictate terms”, especially on working methods, which were “quintessentially” a procedural matter.\textsuperscript{218}

The representative of Belgium reiterated the need for a moratorium on the use of the veto in cases of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes.\textsuperscript{219} The representative of Cuba stated further that the veto was an “anachronistic” and “anti-democratic” privilege that should be eliminated as soon as possible.\textsuperscript{220} The representative of Turkey asserted that the question of veto was “the most obvious and urgent issue in the working methods” of the Council,\textsuperscript{221} and the representative of Chile stated that, although the use of the veto did not constitute a method of work in itself, it had nevertheless negative repercussions on the unity of the Council and its work, perpetuating the imbalance of power between the permanent and elected members.\textsuperscript{222} Furthermore, the representative of Indonesia, called for a complete abolishment of the veto and
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stated that his delegation would nonetheless support any steps to regulate its use responsibly, in view of the present entrenched realities.\textsuperscript{223}

\textbf{Case 10}

\textit{The situation in the Middle East}

At its 7774\textsuperscript{th} meeting on 21 September 2016, the Council held a high-level briefing under the item entitled “The situation in the Middle East”. The President of Ukraine affirmed that the United Nations and the Security Council had failed to bring peace and security to Syria and underscored the urgent and critical need to reform the Council, particularly with regard to the veto power. He concluded that no veto should be able to block the Council’s action when it had to respond to situations of mass atrocities.\textsuperscript{224} Similarly, while touching upon the right of veto, the President of Senegal stated that the Council “must be reformed”. He further asked whether a veto could be vetoed when there was a risk of genocide or crimes against humanity.\textsuperscript{225}

At the 7785\textsuperscript{th} meeting on 8 October 2016 under the same item, following the failure by the Council to adopt two draft resolutions concerning the situation in Syria,\textsuperscript{226} the representative of the United Kingdom condemned the fifth veto on Syria in five years from the Russian Federation, adding that the veto prevented the Council from reaching unity on the matter “denigrated” the Council’s credibility and constituted a “cynical abuse of the privileges and responsibilities of permanent membership”.\textsuperscript{227} The representative of Ukraine expressed disappointment for the fact that the political statement on the suspension of the veto in cases of mass atrocities, which he described as an initiative to curb the use of veto by the permanent members, had yet to gain traction.\textsuperscript{228}
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IX. Languages

Note

The present section covers rules 41 to 47 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, in relation to the official and working languages of the Council, interpretation and the languages of meeting records and published resolutions and decisions.

Rule 41

*Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish shall be both the official and the working languages of the Security Council.*

Rule 42

*Speeches made in any of the six languages of the Security Council shall be interpreted into the other five languages.*

Rule 43

[Deleted]

Rule 44

*Any representative may make a speech in a language other than the languages of the Security Council. In this case, he shall himself provide for interpretation into one of those languages. Interpretation into the other languages of the Security Council by the interpreters of the Secretariat may be based on the interpretation given in the first such language.*
Rule 45

Verbatim records of meetings of the Security Council shall be drawn up in the languages of the Council.

Rule 46

All resolutions and other documents shall be published in the languages of the Security Council.

Rule 47

Documents of the Security Council shall, if the Security Council so decides, be published in any language other than the languages of the Council.

During the period under review, rules 41 to 47 were consistently applied. There were several meetings where speakers delivered their statements in a language other than the six official languages of the United Nations in accordance with rule 44.\textsuperscript{229} In one instance, a Council member expressed dissatisfaction with the interpretation of his statement. At the 7779\textsuperscript{th} meeting on 19 September 2016, under the item entitled “Protection of civilians in armed conflict”, the representative of the Russian Federation took the floor to clarify that, in his view, the interpretation of his statement was not entirely accurate. In this connection, he asked Council

\textsuperscript{229} For example, at the 7637\textsuperscript{th} meeting, on 29 February 2016, the representative of Serbia (First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs) spoke in Serbian. The English translation was made available by the delegation (S/PV.7637, pp. 4-7 and pp. 24-25). At the 7653\textsuperscript{rd} meeting, on 21 March 2016, the representative of Portugal (Minister for Foreign Affairs) spoke in Portuguese. The English interpretation was provided by the delegation (S/PV.7653, pp. 33-35). At the 7774\textsuperscript{th} meeting, on 21 September 2016, the representative of Japan (Prime Minister) delivered his statement in Japanese. The English text was provided by the delegation (S/PV.7774, pp. 16-17).
members to refer to the correct version of the statement which would be circulated at a later stage.\(^{230}\)

Furthermore, by presidential note of 22 February 2016 (\textit{S/2016/170}) later incorporated into note by the President of 30 August 2017 (\textit{S/2017/507}), Council members encouraged the Secretariat to maintain the translation of all United Nations sanctions lists into all official languages of the United Nations, and to ensure that the information on the websites of the subsidiary bodies of the Council, including the reports of sanctions monitoring teams, groups and panels, was accurate and updated in all official languages.\(^{231}\)
X. Status of the provisional rules of procedure

**Note**

The present section covers the deliberations of the Council concerning the status of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council, last amended in 1982.\(^{232}\) Article 30 of the Charter of the United Nations provides that the Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure. However, since their adoption by the Council at its first meeting held on 17 January 1946, the rules of procedure have remained provisional.

**Article 30**

*The Security Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure,*

*including the method of selecting its President.*

During the period under review, the question of the status of the provisional rules of procedure, including in connection with Article 30 of the Charter, was raised at the 7740\(^{th}\) meeting held on 19 July 2016 on the working methods of the Council. During the debate, several speakers stressed that the Security Council rules of procedure should cease to be provisional and should be formalized in order to improve the transparency and accountability of its work.\(^{233}\)

\(^{232}\) The provisional rules of procedure of the Council were amended eleven times between 1946 and 1982: five times during its first year at its 31\(^{st}\), 41\(^{st}\), 42\(^{nd}\), 44\(^{th}\) and 48\(^{th}\) meetings on 9 April, 16 and 17 May, 6 and 24 June 1946; twice in its second year at the 138\(^{th}\) and 222\(^{nd}\) meetings, on 4 June and 9 December 1947; at its 468\(^{th}\) meeting on 28 February 1950; 1463\(^{rd}\) meeting, on 24 January 1969; 1761st meeting, on 17 January 1974; and 2410th meeting, on 21 December 1982. The provisional rules have been issued as documents S/96 and Rev.1 to 7, the latest version having been issued under the symbol S/96/Rev.7.

\(^{233}\) *S/PV.7740*, p. 15 (Mexico), p. 20 (Islamic Republic of Iran), p. 29 (Singapore), p. 32 (Costa Rica), p. 36 (South Africa) and p. 39 (Cuba).