

steps to ensure the safety and security of United Nations personnel and premises. It reiterates that the cooperation of all Member States and others concerned is indispensable for the mandates of United Nations operations to be carried out and demands that they respect fully the status of United Nations and associated personnel.

The Council supports all efforts effectively to promote and protect the safety and security of United Nations and associated personnel. In this context, the Council recalls the

Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel, adopted by the General Assembly on 9 December 1994.

The Council pays tribute to all military, police and civilian staff of the United Nations and other personnel associated with United Nations operations, as well as personnel of international humanitarian organizations, for their courageous efforts to achieve peace and to alleviate the suffering of the people living in conflict areas.

34. Items relating to peacekeeping operations

A. An Agenda for Peace: peacekeeping

Decision of 28 March 1996 (3645th meeting): statement by the President

At its 3645th meeting, held on 28 March 1996 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the President (Botswana) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 27 March 1996 from the representative of Chile addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹ which reiterated its position that troop-contributing countries had a right to be heard by the Security Council and stated that Chile would join in the consensus to adopt the statement by the President outlining arrangements for consultation and exchange of information between troop-contributing countries, the Secretariat and members of the Council.

At the same meeting, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:²

The Security Council has reviewed the arrangements for consultation and exchange of information with troop-contributing countries, which were established by the statement by its President made on behalf of the Council on 4 November 1994. The Council has given careful consideration to the views expressed on this question in its debate under the item entitled "An Agenda for Peace: peacekeeping" at its 3611th meeting on 20 December 1995, as well as to the views expressed in debates in the General Assembly.

The Council has noted the wish expressed in these debates that arrangements for consultation and exchange of information with troop-contributing countries should be improved. The Council shares this wish. It considers it essential for troop-contributing countries to be heard. It notes that many of the

concerns expressed would be met if the arrangements set out in the statement by its President of 4 November 1994 were fully implemented. It is also of the view that those arrangements can be strengthened further as set forth below.

The Council will therefore follow in future the procedures here set out:

(a) Meetings will be held as a matter of course between members of the Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat for the purpose of consultations and the exchange of information and views; the meetings will be chaired by the Presidency of the Council supported by a representative of the Secretariat;

(b) The meetings will be held as soon as practicable and in good time before the Council takes decisions on the extension or termination of, or significant changes in, the mandate of a particular peacekeeping operation;

(c) When the Council considers establishing a new peacekeeping operation, meetings will be held, unless it proves to be impracticable, with any prospective troop contributors who have already been approached by the Secretariat and who have indicated that they may be willing to contribute to the operation;

(d) The President of the Council will, in the course of informal consultations with members of the Council, report the views expressed by participants at each meeting with troop-contributing or prospective troop-contributing countries;

(e) The existing practice of inviting to these meetings Member States which make special contributions to peacekeeping operations other than troops, that is, contributions to trust funds, logistics and equipment, will continue;

(f) The monthly tentative forecast of work of the Council made available to Member States will include an indication of the expected schedule of such meetings for the month;

(g) Ad hoc meetings may be convened in the event of unforeseen developments in a particular peacekeeping operation which could require action by the Council;

(h) These meetings will be in addition to those convened and chaired by the Secretariat for troop contributors to

¹ S/1996/224.

² S/PRST/1996/13.

meet with special representatives of the Secretary-General or force commanders, or to discuss operational matters concerning particular peacekeeping operations, to which members of the Council will also be invited;

(i) Background information and an agenda will be circulated by the Secretariat to the participants well in advance of each of the various meetings referred to above; members of the Council will also circulate information as appropriate;

(j) Interpretation services in all the official languages of the Organization will continue to be available; translation of written documents will continue to be available, if possible in advance of the meetings;

(k) The time and venue of each meeting should, where possible, appear in advance in the *Journal of the United Nations*;

(l) The Council will append to its annual report to the General Assembly information about these meetings.

The Council recalls that the arrangements described above are not exhaustive. They do not preclude consultations in a variety of forms, including informal communication between the President of the Council or the members of the Council and troop-contributing countries and, as appropriate, other countries especially affected, for example, countries from the region concerned.

The Council will continue to keep arrangements for consultations and the exchange of information and views with troop contributors and prospective contributors under review and stands ready to consider further measures and new mechanisms to enhance further the arrangements in the light of experience.

B. Demining in the context of United Nations peacekeeping

Initial proceedings

Decision of 30 August 1996 (3693rd meeting): statement by the President

At its 3689th meeting, held on 15 August 1996 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included the item entitled "Demining in the context of United Nations peacekeeping" in its agenda. After the adoption of the agenda, the President (Germany) invited the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Hungary, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Ukraine and Uruguay, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. In accordance with the understanding reached in the

Council's prior consultations, he also extended invitations to the Permanent Observer of Switzerland and, under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, to Mr. Peter Küng, the head of the delegation of the International Committee of the Red Cross to the United Nations.

The President then drew the attention of members of the Council to a letter dated 24 July 1996 from the representative of Germany addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting the text of a seven-point action programme on anti-personnel mines, presented by the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany, on 18 July 1996.³

At the outset, the representative of Italy underlined the need for the United Nations to have more sophisticated equipment as well as better training focused on detection, recognition and reporting of mines.⁴

The representative of the United States stated that his Government was committed to initiating international negotiations towards a global anti-personnel landmine ban and was consulting with other States on what would be the best forum for negotiations. He stressed that the United States was dedicated to eliminating these weapons, "while taking into account [its] global responsibilities and concern for the safety of [its] soldiers".⁵

The representative of Indonesia maintained that, under the Charter, demining remained within the purview of the General Assembly, and, thus, the involvement of peacekeeping forces in mine clearance did not in itself warrant a shift of responsibility from the General Assembly to the Security Council.⁶

The representative of the Russian Federation observed that, to an increasing extent, demining was becoming an essential part of peacekeeping operations, and argued that, when necessary, it should be included in the mandate of future operations.⁷

The representative of Botswana expressed the belief that demining should always be given top priority in every peacekeeping operation, and stated

³ S/1996/621.

⁴ S/PV.3689, pp. 2-3.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 3-6.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 6-8.

⁷ Ibid., pp. 10-12.

that it was important that the demobilization of the combatants and the promotion of national reconciliation should go hand in hand with demining in order to facilitate the early return of civilians to their homes.⁸

The representative of France stated that the action of the Council on the subject needed to be seen against the background of the efforts of the international community to eliminate landmines and humanitarian interventions to alleviate the scourge caused by them, and underlined the importance of better integrating questions linked to mines with all stages of the definition and implementation of the mandates of peacekeeping missions.⁹

The representative of Chile expressed particular concern with the proliferation of anti-personnel landmines, noting that 110 million such mines lay planted and that 2 million to 5 million new mines were laid annually and only 100,000 were removed.¹⁰

The representative of the United Kingdom maintained that the United Nations must draw a clear distinction between mine clearance for the operational needs of peacekeeping operations, which was the responsibility of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, and other humanitarian demining requirements, which fell under the responsibility of the Department of Humanitarian Affairs. "The difficulties encountered in establishing viable national solutions to mine pollution in countries such as Angola and Cambodia resulted, in part, from the ambiguities in mandates between peacekeepers and humanitarian agencies", he stated.¹¹

The representative of Germany called for a rational delineation of mine-clearing responsibilities and clear hierarchies in decision-making within the United Nations system. However, he added that demining in peacekeeping should not "dogmatically" have to limit itself to the concerns of mission personnel. He stated that the welfare of the local people and their protection from the danger of landmines should also be seen as a possible element of

conflict resolution and, thus, a task of peacekeeping in a wider sense.¹²

The representative of Canada expressed the hope that all Member States would be able to take practical steps to demonstrate a commitment to achieving a global ban on anti-personnel mines, and announced his delegation's plan to convene an international conference in Ottawa in order to integrate the efforts of various international actors in developing a comprehensive approach to the landmine issue.¹³

The representative of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the European Union and associated and aligned countries, stressed the need to ensure that when a peacekeeping mandate was being considered, the mine-clearance responsibilities were clearly defined among the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Department of Humanitarian Affairs and the parties to the conflict. It was also important that a cost estimate for demining was taken into account at the start of the operation.¹⁴

The representative of Uruguay noted with appreciation that, in the framework of peacekeeping operations, the United Nations had carried out an extensive programme of assistance covering not only demining tasks but also the training of local personnel, the dissemination of information on the danger of mines and activities to abate the effects of mines.¹⁵

The representative of Pakistan argued that the linkage between a peacekeeping operation and a humanitarian programme was of critical importance, and, therefore, future peacekeeping operations should include resources for the early establishment of an integrated demining programme. He also underscored the importance of linking the peacekeeping mine-clearing activities closely to the humanitarian activities from the very beginning.¹⁶

The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran noted with satisfaction the inclusion in the mandates of several peacekeeping operations of provisions relating to mine clearance work. He stated that the Security

⁸ Ibid., pp. 12-13.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 13-14.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 17-18.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 18-20.

¹² Ibid., pp. 21-23.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 23-25.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 27-29 (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic and Slovenia; and Iceland).

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 34-35.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 35-36.

Council might consider, when necessary, including mine clearance as part of the functions of peacekeeping operations in the future.¹⁷

The representative of India emphasized “intrinsic and structural differences” between peacekeeping operations and peacebuilding activities, pointing to the constraints of mine clearance by the military, such as limited availability of time and resources and possible duplication with specialized agencies. He maintained that the impact of landmines on the economic and social activities of an affected area made demining an integral part of the post-conflict peacebuilding of a nation.¹⁸

A number of other speakers acknowledged that the negative effects of mines often obstructed reconciliation, peace processes, reconstruction and the reintegration of refugees. In particular, speakers shared the concern that the proliferation of land mines constituted a major problem to United Nations peacekeeping operations in terms of the safety of peacekeepers and their freedom of movement. This was the reason why, in their view, mine clearing had already been part of the mandates of many peacekeeping missions, and that, as appropriate, future peacekeeping operations should play a role in demining activities, including demining training and mine-awareness programmes.¹⁹

At its 3693rd meeting, held on 30 August 1996 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council resumed its consideration of the item on the agenda.

At the same meeting, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:²⁰

The Security Council has reviewed the issue of demining in the context of United Nations peacekeeping and has given

careful consideration to the views expressed in the open debate under the item entitled “Demining in the context of United Nations peacekeeping” at its 3689th meeting on 15 August 1996.

The Council, bearing in mind its responsibilities with regard to United Nations peacekeeping, notes that the widespread indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines in areas of United Nations peacekeeping operations poses serious impediments to such operations and to the safety of United Nations and other international personnel. Against this background, the Council states the following:

1. Operational demining should be, wherever appropriate, an important element and an integral part of peacekeeping mandates. This will facilitate the implementation of those mandates and better enable the Secretary-General to allocate appropriate resources towards achieving their objectives.

2. The early deployment of mine clearance units will often be important to the effectiveness of a peacekeeping operation. The Council encourages the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations to examine options for achieving such early deployment. It also encourages Member States to examine whether and in what form they might be able to help in this respect.

3. The tasks of, on the one hand, operational mine clearance during peacekeeping operations, which is the responsibility of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, and, on the other hand, longer-term humanitarian mine-clearance activities, which fall under the responsibility of the Department of Humanitarian Affairs, are different. The Council is, however, aware of linkages and complementarities between different elements of conflict resolution as well as of the need to ensure a smooth transition from demining as a peacekeeping requirement to demining as part of peacebuilding in a follow-up phase.

The Council, thus, is of the opinion that coordination and a clear delineation of responsibilities between the two Departments as well as with regard to other United Nations agencies dealing with demining could be further improved so as to avoid duplication of effort and to guarantee a coherent and integrated approach towards the whole range of short- and long-term demining needs. With particular reference to paragraph 51 of the report of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations of 7 May 1996, the Council requests the Secretary-General to intensify his efforts aiming in this direction.

The Council emphasizes the importance of coordination by the United Nations of activities related to mine clearance in the context of United Nations peacekeeping, including those by regional organizations, in particular in the areas of information and training.

4. The primary responsibility for demining in the context of United Nations peacekeeping lies with parties responsible for the laying of mines. Parties to a conflict must desist from further mine laying once a peacekeeping operation is established. They are also obliged to facilitate humanitarian and military demining efforts by providing detailed maps and other

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 43-44.

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 44-45.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 6 (China); pp. 8-9 (Republic of Korea); p.10 (Honduras); pp. 15-17 (Egypt); pp. 17-18 (Chile); pp. 20-21 (Guinea-Bissau); pp. 25-27 (New Zealand); pp. 29-31 (Nicaragua); pp. 32-34 (Norway); pp. 36-37 (Ukraine); pp. 37-39 (Australia); pp. 39-40 (Croatia); pp. 40-41 (Colombia); pp. 41-43 (Hungary); pp. 45-46 (Malaysia); pp. 46-47 (Switzerland); pp. 47-49 (International Committee of the Red Cross); pp. 49-50 (Argentina); pp. 50-53 (Bosnia and Herzegovina); and pp. 52-53 (Panama).

²⁰ S/PRST/1996/37.

relevant information on those mines that have already been laid by them and by contributing financially or otherwise to their removal.

5. The international community should intensify, multilaterally or bilaterally, its efforts in assisting those parties to a conflict which have shown their readiness to cooperate with mine clearance, mine awareness and training programmes in the context of United Nations peacekeeping operations. In this connection, the Council welcomes the establishment by the Secretary-General of a United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Demining as a necessary and timely mechanism to channel funding to humanitarian demining operations.

The Council appeals to all States to contribute to this Fund as well as to other voluntary funds set up by the Secretary-General for certain peacekeeping operations which contain demining elements.

6. Demining activities should, as much as possible, make use of the appropriate modern mine-clearance technologies and specialized equipment and focus on the creation and strengthening of local demining capabilities; training programmes should attach particular importance to this aspect. Where this would be of benefit to the operational effectiveness of a peacekeeping operation, consideration should also be given to including provision for the training of a local demining capability in mandates of peacekeeping operations.

The Council encourages the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, given its responsibility for a comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations, to continue and intensify its consideration of the operational demining aspects of peacekeeping operations. These considerations might include an analysis of mine-clearance experience in previous peacekeeping operations.

The Council is of the view that the elements outlined in this statement are not exhaustive. The Council will thus keep this issue under review in the context of the establishment of peacekeeping operations and the consideration of specific mandates.

C. Civilian police in peacekeeping operations

Initial proceedings

Decision of 14 July 1997 (3801st meeting): statement by the President

At its 3801st meeting, held on 14 July 1997 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the item "Civilian police in peacekeeping operations" in its agenda.

At the same meeting, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:²¹

The Security Council has established or authorized a growing number of peacekeeping operations which contain both civilian and military components. It takes particular note of the increasing role and special functions of civilian police in such operations.

The Council notes the efforts by the General Assembly and its Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations in carrying out their task to review all aspects of peacekeeping operations, including enhancing the capacity of the United Nations system to accommodate the growing demand for civilian police in peacekeeping operations. It furthermore commends the efforts of the Secretary-General in this regard. The Council encourages States to look for further means to enhance the ways in which civilian police components of peacekeeping operations are set up and supported.

The Council considers that in operations mandated by the Security Council or the General Assembly the civilian police perform indispensable functions in monitoring and training national police forces and can play a major role, through assistance to local police forces, in restoring civil order, supporting the rule of law and fostering civil reconciliation. It sees an increasingly important role for civilian police, among others, in contributing to the building of confidence and security between parties and among local populations, in order to prevent conflict, to contain conflict or to build peace in the aftermath of conflict

The Council encourages States to make available to the United Nations at short notice appropriately trained civilian police, if possible through the United Nations standby arrangements. It welcomes the role of United Nations selection assistance teams in this regard.

The Council underlines the importance of the recruitment of qualified civilian police from the widest possible geographic range to serve in United Nations operations. It also expresses the importance of the recruitment of female police officers to United Nations operations.

The Council encourages States individually or collectively to provide appropriate training of civilian police for international service. It encourages the Secretary-General to provide assistance and guidance to Member States in order to promote a standardized approach to the training and recruitment of civilian police.

The Council underlines the necessity for United Nations civilian police, in accordance with their mandates, to be trained as required, *inter alia*, to render assistance and support in the reorganization, training and monitoring of national police and to help to defuse tension on the ground through negotiations. The

²¹ S/PRST/1997/38.

Council furthermore considers it essential that United Nations civilian police contingents contain adequate legal expertise.

The Council underlines the need for close coordination between civilian police and the military, humanitarian and other civilian components of United Nations operations. It encourages efforts by Member States to organize joint training between civilian and military components designated for United Nations operations in order to improve coordination and security for personnel in the field.

The Council expresses its gratitude to those countries which have contributed civilian police to the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations.

D. United Nations peacekeeping: Dag Hammarskjöld Medal

Initial proceedings

Decision of 22 July 1997 (3802nd meeting): resolution 1121 (1997)

At its 3802nd meeting, held on 22 July 1997 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the item “United Nations peacekeeping: Dag Hammarskjöld Medal” in its agenda. The President (Sweden) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council’s prior consultations.²²

The Secretary-General stated that the draft resolution provided a clear way of honouring the memory of those women and men, military and civilian, including United Nations volunteers, who had lost their lives in the service of peace on United Nations peacekeeping operations.²³

The President then made a statement on behalf of the Council expressing gratitude to those who had served the United Nations in the cause of peace and honouring those who had lost their lives.²⁴ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1121 (1997), which reads:

The Security Council,

Recalling that maintenance of international peace and security is one of the purposes of the United Nations as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations,

Noting the essential role of United Nations peacekeeping operations in the maintenance of international peace and security,

Recalling the presentation in 1988 of the Nobel Peace Prize to the United Nations peacekeeping forces,

Recognizing the sacrifice of those who have lost their life in the service of United Nations peacekeeping operations,

Remembering the more than 1,500 individuals from 85 countries who have died in United Nations peacekeeping operations,

1. *Decides* to establish the Dag Hammarskjöld Medal as a tribute to the sacrifice of those who have lost their life as a result of service in peacekeeping operations under the operational control and authority of the United Nations;
2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to establish, in consultation with the Security Council, criteria and procedures for bestowing and administering the Medal;
3. *Requests* Member States to cooperate, as appropriate, with the presentation of the Medal.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

²² S/1997/569.

²³ S/PV.3802, pp. 2-3.