Meeting: the promotion and strengthening of the rule of law in the maintenance of international peace and security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting and date</th>
<th>Sub-item</th>
<th>Rule 37 invitations</th>
<th>Rule 39 and other invitations</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Decision and vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6347 29 June 2010</td>
<td>Letter dated 18 June 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Mexico to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2010/322)</td>
<td>18 countries&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs and Legal Counsel of the United Nations, Acting Head of the Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations</td>
<td>Deputy Secretary-General, all Council members,&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; all invitees</td>
<td>S/PRST/2010/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Botswana, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Guatemala, Italy, Liechtenstein, Norway, Peru, Republic of Korea, Solomon Islands, South Africa and Switzerland.

<sup>b</sup> Mexico was represented by its Deputy Minister for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights.

### 38. Items relating to non-proliferation

#### A. Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction

**Overview**

During the period under review, the Security Council held one meeting in connection with the item entitled “Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction”, and adopted a resolution to extend the mandate of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) for a period of 10 years.

**20 April 2011: extension of mandate of Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004)**

On 20 April 2011, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 1977 (2011), in which it reaffirmed that it was gravely concerned by the threat of terrorism and the risk that non-State actors may acquire, develop, traffic in, or use nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and their means of delivery. The Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, decided to extend the mandate of the 1540 Committee for a period of 10 years, until 25 April 2021. In addition, the Council requested the Secretary-General to establish, in consultation with the Committee, a group of up to eight experts (“group of experts”) acting under the direction and purview of the Committee, to assist it in carrying out its mandate.<sup>845</sup>

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of Brazil emphasized that, while her Government strongly supported an effective and well-coordinated group of experts, it did not favour the idea that the group should have a leadership position on a par with, or superseding, the authority of the 1540 Committee. The representative of India emphasized that the international community should join hands in eliminating the risks related to sensitive materials and technologies falling into the hands of terrorists and non-State actors. He stated that the focus on non-State actors should in no way diminish State accountability in combating terrorism and dismantling its support infrastructure and its linkages with weapons of mass destruction. He pointed out that after the adoption of resolution 1540 (2004), his Government had taken additional steps to further strengthen its existing legislative and regulatory mechanism for exercising

---

<sup>845</sup> For more information on the sanctions measures, see part VII, sect. III, “Measures not involving the use of armed force in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter”.

For information on the mandate of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) and the mandate of the Group of Experts concerning resolution 1540 (2004), see part IX, sect. I.B, “Committees established under Chapter VII of the Charter”.

<sup>846</sup> S/PV.6518, p. 2.
control over weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.\textsuperscript{847}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{847} Ibid., p. 3.
\end{flushright}

\textbf{Meeting: non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting and date</th>
<th>Other documents</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Decision and vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6518 20 April 2011</td>
<td>Draft resolution submitted by Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Colombia, France, Gabon, Germany, Lebanon, Nigeria, Portugal, Russian Federation, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States (S/2011/257)</td>
<td>Brazil, India</td>
<td>Resolution 1977 (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{B. Non-proliferation}

\textbf{Overview}

During the period under review, the Security Council held eleven meetings under the item entitled “Non-proliferation”, including one closed meeting, adopted two resolutions under Article 41 of Chapter VII of the Charter and received eight briefings by the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006). The Council imposed new sanctions measures against the Islamic Republic of Iran and, pursuant to resolution 1929 (2010), established the Panel of Experts on the Islamic Republic of Iran.\textsuperscript{848} It also extended the mandate of the Panel of Experts for one year.\textsuperscript{849}

\textbf{9 June 2010: imposition of new sanctions measures on the Islamic Republic of Iran}

On 9 June 2010, the Council met to consider a draft resolution that would strengthen sanctions measures on the Islamic Republic of Iran.\textsuperscript{850} Prior to the adoption of the resolution, the representative of Brazil stated that her delegation would vote against the draft resolution in order to honour the Tehran declaration,\textsuperscript{851} which she emphasized provided a unique opportunity to solve the problem through dialogue rather than sanctions. She stated that sanctions would lead to the suffering of the people and play into the hands of those on all sides who did not want a peaceful resolution of the issue. The representative further expressed regret that the declaration had neither received the recognition it deserved, nor been given time to bear fruit.\textsuperscript{852} Similarly, the representative of Turkey argued that the adoption of sanctions would negatively affect the momentum created by the Tehran declaration and the overall diplomatic process. He emphasized that adoption of the draft resolution should not be seen as an end to diplomacy, and urged the Islamic Republic of Iran to work towards the implementation of the declaration and to resume talks with the five plus one group (the five permanent members of the Council plus Germany) to discuss its nuclear programme, including the suspension of enrichment.\textsuperscript{853}

The draft resolution (S/2008/447) was put to the vote, received 9 votes in favour, 5 against (China, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Russian Federation, South Africa, Viet Nam) and 1 abstention (Indonesia). The draft resolution (S/2008/447) was put to the vote, received 9 votes in favour, 5 against (China, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Russian Federation, South Africa, Viet Nam) and 1 abstention (Indonesia).

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{848} For more information on the sanctions measures, see part VII, sect. III, “Measures not involving the use of armed force in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter”. For information on the mandate of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) and the mandate of the Group of Experts, see part IX, sect. I.B, “Committees established under Chapter VII of the Charter”.\newline\textsuperscript{849} Resolution 1984 (2011). \textsuperscript{850} S/2010/283.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{851} Joint declaration by the Islamic Republic of Iran, Turkey and Brazil on nuclear fuel, signed in Tehran on 17 May 2010.\newline\textsuperscript{852} S/PV.6335, pp. 2-3.\newline\textsuperscript{853} Ibid., pp. 3-4.
\end{flushright}