The three UN peace and security reviews conducted in 2014-2015 on peace operations, peace-building and implementation of resolution 1325 highlighted an inadequate recognition among member states and within the UN system of the potential of fully integrating a gender perspective into peace and security processes. This report focuses on the women, peace and security recommendations made specifically to the Security Council and its implementation efforts. It argues that Council members have been effective in creating new practices as well as using existing ones to respond to some of the gender recommendations of the three peace and security reviews. The report suggests, however, that implementation gaps remain and sets out options to consolidate gains in the Council’s approach to the women, peace and security agenda.
Introduction

This is Security Council Report’s (SCR) fifth research report dedicated to tracking the UN Security Council’s performance in integrating women, peace and security into its deliberations and outcomes.

This report examines important Security Council developments in 2016, most notably the establishment of an Informal Experts Group on women, peace and security and, for the first time, inviting women’s civil society representatives to brief the Council at country-specific meetings. It also reviews how the women, peace and security agenda has recently converged significantly with other thematic issues on the Council’s agenda, such as counter-terrorism, human trafficking, and sexual exploitation and abuse in peace operations.

As in our previous research reports on this thematic issue, this publication also examines how the Council has integrated the women, peace and security agenda into resolutions, presidential statements, visiting missions and the work of its sanctions committees.

The overarching observation of this research report is that the Council has created several tools with considerable potential to enable its members to increase their own access to and understanding of gender-related conflict analysis in a country-specific setting. However, as stated in SCR’s 9 February 2017 report on conflict prevention even, “the best and most timely analysis and information is useless if it is not acted upon.” Better information can lead to better outcomes, but it is not enough to generate political will. This dynamic is not specific to the Council’s consideration of women, peace and security, but this thematic agenda has an additional obstacle of overcoming a culture among Council members and within the UN system that views gender issues as an “add-on” component, rather than being one of the central tenets which support conflict prevention and underpin long-term stability.

The inadequate recognition among member states and within the UN system of the potential of fully integrating a gender perspective into peace and security processes was highlighted in the three UN peace and security reviews conducted in 2014-2015 on peace operations, peacebuilding and implementation of resolution 1325. However, the conclusions of these reviews point to ways in which gender can be taken more fully into account in the UN system’s work. The fulfillment of the new Secretary-General’s public commitment to gender parity will be an important litmus test in this regard. These reviews made several important recommendations regarding how the UN and its member states could enhance attention to and integration of women, peace and security norms. Many of the recommendations from these reviews are relevant to the interplay between the UN system’s input to the Security Council and the Council’s decision-making and mandating processes. The recommendations fell into several broad categories: conflict prevention and mediation; improving the gender architecture in field missions and at headquarters; improving gender conflict analysis and information flows; and accountability for sexual exploitation and abuse by UN personnel.

While all of these recommendations are important for the UN system to consider in order to improve its own approach towards implementation of the norms set forth in eight Security Council resolutions dedicated to women, peace and security (see Annex 1), this report will focus on the recommendations made specifically to the Security Council and its implementation efforts.

This report demonstrates that Council members have been effective in creating new practices as well as by using existing ones to respond to some of the recommendations of the three peace and security reviews. The Council’s implementation has been strongest where these recommendations were subsequently incorporated into resolution 2242 on women, peace and security adopted in October 2015. However, implementation gaps remain and in this report we set out options to further consolidate gains in the Council’s approach to the women, peace and security agenda.
Resolution 1325, adopted on 31 October 2000, recognised that conflict has a differential impact on women and that addressing the needs, views and participation of half of society would provide a positive peace dividend. Since then, the Security Council has established a broad spectrum of norms on women, peace and security, addressing issues ranging from increasing women’s participation in all aspects of action and decision-making relevant to peace and security, to highlighting women’s rights and the importance of protecting women as a vulnerable subset of broader civilian-protection considerations. Successive Council resolutions have provided a framework that gives guidance to member states on the issue and possibilities for action. These resolutions also provide instructions to the UN Secretariat on the issue, as well as guiding the Council’s own consideration and possible additional measures.

The Council’s decision to take up women, peace and security as a separate thematic issue in 2000 is seen as in line with its overall thematic agenda. The Council’s first thematic resolutions—on protection of civilians and on children and armed conflict—were adopted the year before resolution 1325. Resolution 1325 came at a time of self-reflection in the UN following a decade of peacekeeping failures in Rwanda, Somalia and the former Yugoslavia. Women were specifically targeted in Rwanda and Bosnia, including through systematic sexual violence. It also followed mobilisation by women’s groups around the world, including in the Global South, to draw attention to the gender aspects of conflict, not least at the 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, and through the Windhoek Declaration of 2000.

Following the adoption of resolution 1325, it would be nearly eight years before the Council would again address the issue substantively. Between 2008 and 2010 the Council had an astounding level of normative activity on the women, peace and security agenda, and adopted resolutions 1820, 1888, 1889 and 1960 addressing a range of issues including women’s protection and empowerment in post-conflict situations and sexual violence in conflict, together with monitoring arrangements and making such violations a possible criterion for targeted sanctions.

Between 2013 and 2015, the Council adopted three new resolutions on this thematic issue. Resolution 2106 focused on accountability for perpetrators of sexual violence in conflict and stressed women’s political and economic empowerment. Resolution 2122 addressed the persistent gaps in the implementation of the women, peace and security agenda. Resolution 2242 addressed women’s roles in countering violent extremism and terrorism, the Council’s own working methods in relation to women, peace and security, and gender recommendations made by the High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO) and the 1325 Global Study.

**Selected Gender Recommendations made to the Security Council in 2015 by the Three Peace and Security Reviews**

Selected recommendations made specifically to the Security Council fell into three categories: improving the flow of gender-related conflict analysis to Council members; better utilisation of sanctions regimes to reflect women, peace and security priorities; and the importance of the Council’s attention to accountability for sexual exploitation and abuse committed by UN personnel.

In implementing these recommendations, Council members have established new practices, most notably convening an Informal Experts Group on Women, Peace and Security and inviting women’s civil society members to brief at meetings on country situations. Council members have also continued to consolidate their existing practice in terms of mainstreaming women, peace and security into Security Council resolutions and presidential statements; integrating gender concerns into sanctions regimes and visiting missions; and giving increased attention to the issue of sexual exploitation and abuse by UN personnel.

Meanwhile, there was useful convergence of gender recommendations in the 1325 Global Study and the HIPPO report. In particular, these recommendations related to the implementation of Security Council mandates for peace operations, and were subsequently incorporated into resolution 2242. These were the need to: (1) improve the gender-responsiveness of peace operations through greater cooperation between the Department of Political Affairs (DPA) and Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), the Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict and UN Women; (2) integrate gender expertise within mission staffing structures; (3) specify gender-related performance indicators in the compacts between the Secretary-General and heads of missions; and (4) promote gender balance in UN military and police contingents. This report does not assess the implementation of these recommendations as they are made to the Secretary-General and not the Security Council. However, they are relevant to the Security Council’s mandating role and the Council should encourage the Secretariat to make tangible progress in delivering on these recommendations.
### SUMMARY OF SELECTED RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL

**Mandating**

Apply the women, peace and security agenda consistently during mandate formulation and renewal consultations.

**INFORMATION FLOW**

Establish an informal experts group on women, peace and security to maximise information, monitoring and support capacity from the UN system.

Invite regular civil society briefings, including women's organisations in particular, not only on thematic but on country-specific deliberations.

Incorporate a gender perspective in terms of reference for Security Council visiting missions.

Expand ownership of the women, peace and security agenda within the Council beyond one 'penholder' or lead, to include a co-lead role with an elected member.

**SANCTIONS**

Use existing sanction regimes to enforce thematic priorities more effectively—including women, peace and security, sexual violence in conflict, human trafficking and gross violations of women's rights.

Call for information-sharing between the Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict and all relevant sanctions committees and associated expert groups.

Provide gender expertise to expert groups assisting sanctions committees.

Include respect for the rights of women as delisting criteria in sanctions regimes that target political spoilers that may eventually need to be part of a political solution.

**SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE**

The UN Security Council should include the UN's zero tolerance policy on sexual exploitation and abuse by its own personnel systematically when mandating peace operations. The Council could also consistently request troop- and police-contributing countries (TCCs and PCCs) to undertake pre-deployment training, preventive measures and disciplinary action if necessary.

The Security Council must signal the importance that it assigns to high standards of accountability for sexual exploitation and abuse committed by UN personnel.

Sexual exploitation and abuse should be placed on the agenda of meetings of the Security Council with TCCs and PCCs and the Council should review follow-up action on all reported cases.
The 2015 Global Study on the implementation of resolution 1325 was requested by the Security Council in resolution 2122 (2013) and was carried out by UN Women. Of the Global Study’s many proposals, one concrete recommendation specifically to the Security Council was that Council members should establish an Informal Experts Group on Women, Peace and Security. Resolution 2242, adopted on 13 October 2015, expressed the Council’s intention to convene meetings of relevant Security Council experts as part of an Informal Experts Group to facilitate a more systematic approach to women, peace and security within the Council’s own work, and to enable greater Council oversight and coordination of the implementation efforts of the UN system.

Incorporating a reference to the Informal Experts Group was one of the more contentious issues during the negotiation of resolution 2242. Apparently, Russia was not opposed to the actual convening of such a group since the practice existed for another thematic issue, protection of civilians. Instead, its concern was that explicitly recognising such an informal group in a resolution could convey, in its view, an unwarranted level of legitimacy. In the end, the resolution was adopted unanimously, but it provoked a strong explanation of vote from Russia which argued that it was inappropriate to refer to the group in the resolution, owing to its informal character (S/PV.7533).

Subsequent to the adoption of resolution 2242, Spain and the UK worked with other Council members to establish what has now become known as the 2242 Informal Experts Group on Women, Peace and Security (from here on out, the 2242 Group), and were the co-chairs in 2016. The 2242 Group is not a formal subsidiary body of the Security Council. According to Council members, the drawback of its informal nature is that some of the 15 Council members choose not to attend, and its outcomes cannot be considered a reflection of Council consensus on any given issue. However, its informal nature also has benefits. One is that its working methods are flexible and do not require consensus to organise meetings. While the outcomes from such meetings cannot be considered to reflect the views of the Security Council, the information gleaned at such informal meetings can be raised by both permanent and elected members at Council-level, thereby avoiding many of the 2242 Group’s work throughout 2016 has been codified to a certain degree by the co-chairs, who have sent summaries of its meetings (as well as guidelines for the new mechanism—see Annex 2) as letters to the Secretary-General, requesting circulation to members of the Security Council.

Despite its intentional informal structure, much of the 2242 Group’s work has been focused on the importance of women, peace and security issues remaining buried at the subsidiary level, which would be more likely if the 2242 Group were a formal subsidiary body of the Council.

The Guidelines
On 22 December 2016, Spain and the UK sent a letter detailing the guidelines of the 2242 Group, particularly the objectives, structure, agenda and outcomes (S/2016/1106). The defining principle of the 2242 Group is that better information and analysis, combined with direct interaction with field missions, lead to better oversight and stronger implementation of women, peace and security norms in specific country situations.

The group has been co-chaired by both permanent and elected Council members. The UK is the P5 co-chair and, in 2016, the E10 co-chair was Spain. This structure will continue in 2017 with two elected Council members, Sweden and Uruguay, joining the UK to replace Spain after its term as a Security Council member ended on 31 December 2016.

UN Women functions as the secretariat for the 2242 Group and brings together relevant gender information already existing within the UN system that is specific to the country situation which the 2242 Group is preparing to discuss informally. It is done in cooperation with relevant UN personnel in the field, the gender expert and country-desk expert from the lead department at UN Headquarters, either DPA for special political missions or DPKO for peacekeeping operations, and the Office of the Special Representative for Sexual Violence in Conflict. In addition, other UN entities, such as OCHA, UNDP, UNICEF, CTED and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), may be included in the process as relevant.

The agenda, or the countries which the 2242 Group will consider, is set on an annual basis. The selection is guided by the following criteria:

- a situation which is already on the Council’s formal agenda;
- strategic opportunity for impact by the Council (such as active UN mediation, an active sanctions regime, a Council visiting mission or the existence, establishment or review of a peace operation);
- capacity of the UN system to generate relevant information and analysis (for example, whether missions, departments, offices and agencies are able to feed into the process: a peace operation, a regional office, UNHCR, OHCHR, OCHA, DPA, DPKO, UN Women, UNDP, the Special Representative for Sexual Violence in Conflict); and
- diversity of country situations, both in terms of geographic location and conflict phase—whether at risk, active or in transition and recovery.

The meetings are geared towards getting the requisite information to impact Council-level outcomes, such as:

- mandates for peace operations to include women, peace and security tasks tailored to the country under consideration;
- gender concerns incorporated into the terms of reference of Council visiting missions to enable more targeted messaging to government actors and field mission leadership during the visit;
- Council members being better equipped to ask questions of field mission leadership on specific women, peace and security issues during regular briefings and consultations; and
- Council members being better equipped to bilaterally décrête relevant actors, whether government interlocutors or relevant decision-makers at the UN, on their implementation of Council decisions.

The Meetings
Over the course of 2016, the 2242 Group met on four situations: Mali (29 February), Iraq (29 April), Central African Republic (15 June) and Afghanistan (13 July). At each meeting, Council experts received briefings from senior leadership of field missions, in each instance at the level of either Special Representative or Deputy Special Representative. Spain and the UK subsequently sent a summary of each of the 2242 Group’s meetings as a letter to the Secretary-General circulated to the Security Council. Summaries of
the follow-up meetings, held to assess progress and discuss options to enhance women, peace and security implementation in that particular country context, were circulated as well: Mali (14 September), Iraq (18 October), Afghanistan (28 November), and the Central African Republic (7 December). (All of the letters from the 2242 Group’s co-chairs are referenced in Annex 2.)

In addition, taking advantage of the presence of women’s protection advisers at their annual workshop in November at the UN Headquarters, the 2242 Group held one thematic meeting with women’s protection advisers that focused on the mandate to prevent sexual violence in conflict.

At the time of writing, it is expected that in 2017 the 2242 Group will have a second follow-up meeting for each of the country situations it considered in 2016 and will add two new issues to its work programme: the Lake Chad Basin crisis and Yemen.

Case Study: Mali
Of the four countries considered by the 2242 Group in 2016, we selected Mali as a case study to assess the impact and effectiveness of the 2242 Group on Council activity. A focus on Mali in early 2016 had the greatest scope for possible impact given that the Security Council was preparing to visit West Africa, including Mali, in early March and there was a strategic review of the UN Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) planned for mid-March ahead of the mandate renewal in June.

Mali was the first country situation to be considered by the 2242 Group, on 29 February 2016. The meeting highlighted several issues such as extremely low participation of women in peace negotiations; poor gender balance within the mission itself; disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR) process at risk of overlooking women’s needs and failing to include women in the design of its programmes despite the fact that women were already playing a critical role in supporting DDR; social media messages undermining women’s equality being used to radicalise and recruit young people in the north (three Malian parties have been listed by the 1267/1989/2253 ISIL (Da’esh) & Al-Qaida Sanctions Committee); only 4 percent of humanitarian projects with women and girls as principal beneficiaries; increased insecurity impeding the mission’s ability to document conflict-related sexual violence; and limited capacity of the judicial sector to address impunity for such crimes.

On 3 March, the Council’s terms of reference for the upcoming visiting mission (S/2016/215) were circulated. They included the need to assess:

- the inclusion of women in the monitoring committees of the peace agreement, as well as in other peace, reconciliation and electoral processes;
- MINUSMA’s support to the government in ensuring that conflict-related sexual violence is taken into full account in implementation of the peace agreement, in the context of DDR and security sector reform (SSR), in any ceasefire monitoring mechanism, and in any transitional justice arrangements; and
- MINUSMA’s performance in providing specific protection for women, including through the monitoring and reporting of conflict-related sexual violence.

It is interesting to note that the goals set out above to assess aspects of women, peace and security issues specific to Mali align closely with many of the issues raised in the 2242 Group’s meeting. In contrast, the gender references in the same document in relation to the Senegal and Guinea-Bissau legs of the same Council visiting mission are highly generalised and non-specific.

During the visit, Council members met with women leaders of civil society organisations, who expressed many of the same concerns as those which had been raised at the first meeting of the 2242 Group. Council members’ interlocutors noted the all-male Council delegation, and pointed out that none of the armed groups participating in the preceding meeting with the Council included women in their delegations. They emphasised that ensuring the political participation of women in Mali has been a concern of civil society organisations for a long time. Despite recent advances, such as the adoption of a law establishing a 30 percent quota for women in all levels of public administration, they highlighted how the translation of this norm into a reality is still far away. They also criticised the low levels of participation of women in the follow-up mechanisms to the peace agreement, as well as the lack of accountability for violations of human rights including gender-based sexual violence.

What is unclear is how Council members used the information gained during the visiting mission to enhance demands for women, peace and security implementation. If they did so, this is not apparent from the Council briefing on the visiting mission held on 16 March 2016, when the only reference to women, peace and security was that Council members had met with representatives of women’s organisations (S/PV.7647). The written report on the Mali leg of the visiting mission was somewhat more explicit than the briefing (S/2016/511). It stated that women’s groups that met with the Council described low participation of women in the peace negotiations and in the institutions established to implement the peace agreement. It also highlighted how discrimination against women was present in Malian legislative texts and was felt in women’s daily lives in regards to access to justice, education and health.

It is not clear that Council members gained from the visiting mission a much better understanding of how MINUSMA and the government are taking concrete steps to address the gender issues identified in the terms of reference. It does seem that a few permanent representatives translated what was learned in the context of the 2242 Group and in meetings with women’s civil society representatives into specific messages to MINUSMA leadership and to government actors. However, what could have been even more useful is coordinated, targeted and unified messaging on women, peace and security issues during the visit.

An observation made by some Council members regarding the 2242 Group’s impact is that the additional focus on Mali helped to sensitize MINUSMA’s leadership to the importance of, and the Council’s attention to, fully incorporating women, peace and security into the work of peace operations. Another positive outcome of the 2242 Group’s meetings, identified by Council members, was that two of the points raised in the context of 2242 Group, women’s participation and DDR, were reflected in subsequent decision-making processes: DPKO’s strategic review of MINUSMA and the Council’s adoption of resolution 2295 renewing the mission’s mandate.

The strategic review conducted in mid-March 2016, and conveyed to the Council...
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in May 2016, recommended that MINUSMA continue with its current mandate. The review did include slight changes to the mission’s mandate to support enhanced inclusiveness of peace and reconciliation processes, particularly for women. However, this was the sole reference to women, peace and security in the strategic review, which also covered mission components such as ceasefire monitoring, protection of civilians, SSR/DDR, countering violent extremism, human rights and the rule of law, and humanitarian assistance (S/2016/498). All of these components have a specific gender dimension that was raised by UN system actors in the 2242 Group and could have been better reflected in the strategic review.

Following the strategic review of MINUSMA, the Council adopted resolution 2295 in June 2016, renewing the mandate for another year. Overall, the women, peace and security references were very similar to those in the previous year’s resolution renewing the mandate (S/RES/2227). But several of these references were strengthened and made more specific. For example, the need for women’s protection and participation in regard to DDR was requested for the first time. In past resolutions, such references were only generically referred to in the context of gender as a cross-cutting issue within all mission’s activities. Resolution 2227 also included language welcoming Mali’s December 2015 law that required a 30 percent quota for women in national institutions. More operationally significant was a request by the Council for MINUSMA to assist all parties to ensure women’s full and active participation in the implementation of the peace agreement and to supply enhanced reporting on this issue to the Security Council.

It is difficult to assess the direct impact of the information exchanged at meetings of the 2242 Group on activity in the Council. Some UN Secretariat staff have suggested that the information provided in the 2242 Group meetings is not necessarily better or different than that which is already conveyed in the Secretary-General’s country reports. Indeed, since resolution 1325 was adopted in 2000 there has been a consistent trend of increased reporting on women, peace and security issues by the Secretary-General in his country-specific reports. However, the country reports on Mali do not entirely support the suggestion that the Secretariat’s current reporting on women, peace and security is sufficient for Council members to fully grasp the gender dimensions of any given conflict, let alone devise options to respond.

All of the Secretary-General’s reports on Mali in 2016 included reporting on women, peace and security and addressed, to some degree, the issues discussed in the context of the 2242 Group, with the exceptions of countering violent extremism and gender-sensitive humanitarian response. However, the references in these reports tended to be more descriptive than analytical, and did not connect the differential impact of the conflict on women to the broader political context. This is not a particular criticism of gender reporting per sé, as most reports issued by the Secretary-General are by their very nature descriptive of all aspects of a country situation.

Briefings by senior UN officials to the Council in the course of its regular consideration of Mali did an even poorer job of transmitting the gender dimension of conflict to the Council. The five briefings to the Security Council on Mali between January 2016 and January 2017 were almost devoid of women, peace and security elements. On average, the briefings by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping, the Under-Secretary-General for Field Support, and the Special Representative of MINUSMA and his deputy, over the past year have only included one short, generalised reference to women in each briefing.


A review of the written record of formal reporting to the Council on Mali does not reflect the analytical depth of information on women, peace and security that is available within the UN system. In the coming years, the question will be whether the 2242 Group’s informal structure, geared toward frank information exchange and accountability by all UN actors for implementation obligations, can help to bring this information to bear on Council deliberations and decision-making, and thus signal to mission leadership the importance of their mission’s response to women, peace and security issues.

While some Council members have readily conceded that the 2242 Group’s impact on the situation in Mali may not have been as strong as desired, partly owing to it being the first meeting ever held by the group, there were better results in relation to other situations the group considered. For example, some Council members are of the view that there were improvements in gender reporting by the Secretary-General on Afghanistan after the 2242 Group held a meeting on that country situation. In addition, there was slightly less resistance to applying a gender lens to the strategic review carried out in 2016 for MINUSCA in the Central African Republic (CAR) and improving gender language in the resolution renewing the mandate of UNAMI in Iraq. In addition, Council members report that as a result of the 2242 Group meetings, gender issues were consistently included as an aspect of closed consultations between Council members and mission leadership on Afghanistan, the CAR, Iraq and Mali. They have reported that Iraq is the best example of how information received in the context of the 2242 Group has been subsequently raised in Council-level consultations with mission leadership—particularly the gender implications of the Mosul offensive in relation to protection issues and access to humanitarian aid.

New Practices: Increasing Gender Briefings at Country-Specific Meetings

A further recommendation of the 1325 Global Study to the Security Council that sought to improve the flow of gender information to Council members was for women’s civil society representatives to brief at country-specific meetings. The HIPPO report also encouraged the Security Council to engage more regularly with women from affected communities to better understand and respond to the specific gender concerns of conflict situations. Another recommendation of the 1325 Global Study was to consolidate the practice of hearing more regularly from the head of UN Women and the Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict on country-specific issues. These recommendations were also included in resolution 2242 on women, peace and security.

While women’s civil society briefers have been an accepted feature of the Security Council’s thematic meetings, it had never been the practice in country-specific deliberations. The inclusion of this recommendation was controversial during the negotiation of resolution 2242, and it took more than a year for the Council to implement the practice it had unanimously agreed to in October 2015 when the resolution was adopted.

The first instance of a women’s civil society briefer addressing the Council on a country situation occurred in December 2016, the last month of Spain’s term as an elected member of the Security Council when it held the presidency.

On 2 December, Victoria Wollie, the National Coordinator in Liberia for the West Africa Network for Peacebuilding, addressed the Council. She outlined the specific obstacles women and girls faced in the post-conflict phase in Liberia and the risks to their security as the UN Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) prepared to drawdown. She called particular attention to the potential lack of credibility in 2017 elections if UNMIL’s logistical support is lost, low representation of women in government, electoral violence, sexual and gender-based violence and access to education (S/PV.7824). She also highlighted the conflict prevention capacity of women’s organisations in the framework of ECOWAS’s National Early Warning System and National Response Mechanism. Her briefing contrasted with those of the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping and the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) representative, each of whom mentioned women only in the most general terms.

There was rich gender reporting on 17 March 2016 when the head of UN Women briefed the Council on Liberia along with the head of UNMIL and the PBC representative (S/PV.7649). However, the gender reporting was mainly in UN Women’s intervention, with only general references made by the other two briefers.

It could be argued that since there was a briefer specifically on gender issues at these two meetings, it is not surprising that other briefers made little reference to gender concerns. However, hearing from women’s civil society representatives and the head of UN Women is meant to enhance the Council’s attention to women, peace and security, not to stand in lieu of the responsibility of other officials to apply a gender lens to their own reporting. By way of example, the 25 August 2016 Liberia briefing did not show any discernable improvement in women, peace and security reporting by UN officials in the absence of a speaker devoted to the issue (S/PV.7761).

Since Wollie’s briefing, there has been momentum in organising such briefings. On 12 January 2017, Fatima Askira of the Search for Common Ground Nigeria addressed the Council on the Lake Chad Basin crisis (S/PV.7861). Later the same month, on 27 January, Asha Gelle, the Chair of Goodwill Ambassadors for the 30 percent reserved seats for women in the Somali elections, addressed the Council (S/PV.7873). There were efforts to have a women’s civil society briefer at the Council’s Côte d’Ivoire and Guinea-Bissau meetings in February, which proved not
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Resolution 2242 also expressed the Council’s intention to invite more regular briefings from the head of UN Women and the Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict on country-specific issues and on thematic issues other than women, peace and security. This practice, which began in 2010, has not become more or less prevalent as a result of being codified in resolution 2242. The general trend has been maintained, that the head of UN Women and the Special Representative brief the Council at meetings, outside of their respective annual briefings on women, peace and security and conflict-related sexual violence, once or twice a year (see Annex 2).

Existing Practices: Resolutions and Presidential Statements

This section of the report analyses statistical information on women, peace and security in the presidential statements and resolutions of the Security Council between 2000 and 2016.

Resolutions Adopted by the Security Council

We analysed all of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council since resolution 1325 was adopted in 2000 to focus on those which could reasonably be expected to address women, peace and security issues and then identify whether they did or not.

We excluded technical resolutions such as rollover mandate extensions, international tribunals, civil aviation, interdiction mandates and decisions regarding sanctions regimes dealing with matters where women, peace and security issues were not reasonably expected to be part of the scope of the work (for example, non-proliferation). From 2012 onwards, we have included a further layer of analysis which identifies how many women, peace and security references in relevant resolutions are included in the operative paragraphs of the resolution.

There has been a consistent trend of increasing numbers of references to women, peace and security in Security Council resolutions over the course of the 16 years since resolution 1325 was adopted, reaching a high in 2013 when 94 percent of all relevant resolutions included gender language, with 74 percent of those references being in the operative paragraphs of the resolution.

There has been a decline over the last three years, with 2016 showing only 74 percent of relevant resolutions including gender language and only 50 percent of those references being in the operative paragraphs.

Upon closer examination of situations that have been on the Council’s agenda since the peak in 2013, the general references to women in these resolutions have remained relatively constant and in many cases improved, including better women, peace and security language in relation to mandates of peace operations.

The lower percentages in 2015 and 2016 are related to a dynamic that has persistently challenged the Council, which is the tendency...
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to overlook gender when responding to an emerging or drastically deteriorating situation (Burundi and Yemen). Another pervasive dynamic is a gender-blind approach when making decisions about so-called “hard” security issues such as:

- counter-terrorism;
- military and police contingents of peace operations, whether in the context of a drawdown (UNMIL in Liberia and UNOCI in Côte d’Ivoire) or increasing troop ceilings (MINUSCA in the CAR); or
- ceasefires or cessation of hostilities (Abyei, Colombia and Syria).

Presidential Statements Adopted by the Security Council

The Security Council sometimes adopts a presidential statement in response to or anticipating a significant development in situations on its agenda, or to highlight key points following a thematic open debate. Presidential statements are considered Council decisions, albeit of a lesser weight than resolutions. However, unlike resolutions, the Council must adopt presidential statements by consensus. This informal veto power of all 15 members means that presidential statements are usually very thoroughly negotiated. We have considered as not relevant any presidential statement issued in response to a specific development, such as a multilateral event or security incident. However, we have included as relevant any presidential statement that expands upon the general situation, and as such, presents an opportunity to reinforce key points of the women, peace and security agenda.

As with Security Council resolutions, there has been a trend of increasing references to women, peace and security in presidential statements over the course of the 16 years since resolution 1325 was adopted.

The proportion of presidential statements with references to women has increased significantly from 2010. Arguably, the lower rate before 2010 could be due to the generally reactive nature of presidential statements at that time, which tended to focus on an immediate message. In most recent practice, the Security Council has used press statements as a “reactive voice” for quick messaging while presidential statements are more commonly used to set out a comprehensive outline of issues connected to a larger situation.

While the 2016 ratio of relevant presidential statements that also include gender references is quite high, the dip in the previous years is largely due to some of the same deficiencies exhibited by the Council in relation to its decision-making in resolutions. For example, presidential statements adopted in 2015 on so-called “hard” security issues, such as counter-terrorism or the intervention brigade in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), did not include women, peace and security elements. Presidential statements responding to emerging or deteriorating situations in Burundi, Boko Haram-affected areas, and Yemen in 2015 also lacked any significant gender references.
Sanctions have been a frequently used tool to address conflict in the post-Cold War era. Early on, the Council relied primarily on arms embargoes to stem conflict, but also on comprehensive sanctions imposed on a whole country or a party to a conflict, or on commodity embargoes (such as petroleum) to cripple a party’s ability to function. The concept of sanctions was sharpened during the 1990s to move from sanctions affecting entire populations to include targeted measures aimed at changing behavior or constraining certain activities of specific individuals responsible for particular actions that the Council wanted to inhibit. In the 1990s and the 2000s, the Council also began to include sanctions on commodities such as timber, diamonds and charcoal to staunch natural resource extraction that was funding conflict.

Several of these sanctions regimes were established prior to or shortly after the adoption of resolution 1325 on women, peace and security in 2000. Given the way in which the Council used sanctions at the time, combined with the lack of any established framework in the Council to provide alternative guidance, it is not surprising that the Council did not take into account the devastating impact that conflict has on women’s lives when it established the early sanctions regimes, in particular that disruptions caused by economic sanctions fall more intensively on groups and individuals affected by preexisting social, economic and political discrimination.

Resolution 1325 signaled the Council’s willingness to consider the potential impact of sanctions on the general population, bearing in mind the special needs of women and girls, in order to consider appropriate humanitarian exemptions. However, this guidance came at a time when the Council was shifting away from comprehensive sanctions toward the concept of “targeted sanctions” or “smart sanctions”. The use of targeted sanctions focusing on specific individuals who hold decision-making powers or are personally suspected of bearing the greatest responsibility for serious violations of international law—in the context of women, peace and security—emerged in the late-2000s.

Following the adoption of resolution 1820 (2008), references to the Council’s concern regarding sexual violence increased in resolutions renewing sanctions regimes, and similarly increased in expert groups’ reports submitted to the relevant sanctions committees. Resolution 1888 (2009) further developed such language and called for all relevant UN missions and bodies to share information with sanctions committees and their expert groups. And more recently, resolution 1960 (2010) asked the Secretary-General to include in his annual reports on conflict-related sexual violence an annex listing parties credibly suspected of bearing responsibility for patterns of rape and other forms of sexual violence “as a basis for more focused United Nations engagement with those parties, including, as appropriate, measures in accordance with the procedures of the relevant sanctions committees”.

The Council has used individual sanctions to explicitly address sexual and gender-based violence in armed conflict in four instances. It added sexual violence as a criterion for targeted sanctions in the DRC through resolution 1807 (2008); Somalia in resolution 2002 (2011); the CAR in resolution 2127 (2013); and South Sudan in resolution 2206 (2015).

The cases of Côte d’Ivoire and Sudan provide interesting examples of how the imposition of targeted measures for serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law can generate other opportunities to address violations of women’s rights.

In resolution 1572 (2004), the Council added serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law to the designation criteria for the Côte d’Ivoire sanctions regime, and while sexual violence was not a specific listing criterion, rape and sexual abuse are specifically mentioned in the justification for designation of individuals as part of a larger set of serious human rights abuses. (The Côte d’Ivoire sanctions regime was terminated in April 2016.)

In the case of Sudan, the original listing criteria from resolution 1591 (2005) included violations of international humanitarian or human rights law or other atrocities. Seven years later, in resolution 2035 (2012), the Council defined “atrocities” to include sexual and gender-based violence.

Perhaps the most developed gender and human rights language to be found in designation criteria is in the South Sudan sanctions regime. On 3 March 2015, through resolution 2206, the Security Council decided to create a sanctions regime that could impose targeted sanctions “in order to support the search for an inclusive and sustainable peace in South Sudan”. The designation criteria allows the 2206 South Sudan Sanctions Committee to target individuals and entities directly or indirectly responsible for “the targeting of civilians, including women and children, through the commission of acts of violence (including killing, maiming, torture, or rape or other sexual violence), abduction, enforced disappearance, forced displacement, or attacks on schools, hospitals, religious sites, or locations where civilians are seeking refuge, or through conduct that would constitute a serious abuse or violation of human rights or a violation of international humanitarian law”. Given the disproportionate and differential impact of violations such as enforced disappearances, forced displacement and deliberate destruction of civilian infrastructure on women and girls, comprehensive designation criteria can go far toward ensuring sanctions regimes are in line with women, peace and security commitments.

---

2. This section is based on research previously published in more extensive detail in SCR’s 2013 and 2014 cross-cutting reports on women, peace and security and in subsequent SCR publications; it is also drawn from research the author completed for the Global Study on the implementation of resolution 1325.
SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN UNSC SANCTIONS REGIMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNSC Sanctions Regime</th>
<th>Designation Criteria Include Sexual Violence</th>
<th>Designation Criteria Include Rape as Part of a Set of Human Rights Abuses</th>
<th>Individuals Listed by the UNSC for Sexual Violence/Rape</th>
<th>Entities Listed by the UNSC for Sexual Violence or Rape</th>
<th>Sanctions Committee’s Expert Group includes Women’s Rights</th>
<th>Parties to the Conflict that include the UNSC’s Expert Group in the Annex of the SG’s Report on Conflict-Related Sexual Violence</th>
<th>Parties to the Conflict that include the SG’s Report on Conflict-Related Sexual Violence</th>
<th>Delisting</th>
<th>SRSG for SVIC has Briefed the Sanctions Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire (sanctions regime terminated April 2016)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are three key areas in which gender considerations could be better reflected in sanctions regimes: designation criteria, referral processes, and delisting.

**Designation criteria:** The main context in which the Council considers gender issues in sanctions regimes relates to the designation criteria. There are 13 active UN sanctions regimes, of which sexual and gender-based violence is explicitly incorporated as a listing criterion in four regimes (the CAR, the DRC, Somalia and South Sudan) and implicitly incorporated in one other regime (Sudan). But even when systematic sexual and gender-based crimes or violations of women’s rights were included as a designation criterion, very few individuals have been sanctioned for such violations. Out of these five regimes, only 14 individuals and four entities have been designated based on such criteria: nine individuals and three entities by the 1533 DRC Sanctions Committee, four individuals and one entity by the 2127 CAR Sanctions Committee, and one individual by the 2206 South Sudan Sanctions Committee.

**Referral process:** The second most frequent way in which gender considerations are taken into account relates to the referral process. In three situations (the DRC, Sudan and South Sudan), the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict is explicitly invited to refer individuals and/or entities to be included in the sanctions list for cases of sexual violence and/or gender-based crimes. However, to date, no submission of names by the Special Representative has resulted in a listing.

In addition, the annex of the Secretary-General’s annual report on conflict-related sexual violence, which lists parties credibly suspected of committing or being responsible for patterns of rape or other forms of sexual violence in situations of armed conflict on the agenda of the Security Council, could be better utilised as a basis for considering targeted sanctions against entities responsible for such violations. The Secretary-General’s annex from April 2016 (S/2016/361) lists 47 entities, representing a mix of state and non-state forces across ten conflict situations. There is only overlap with sanctions designations in two conflict situations: the Lord’s Resistance Army in the CAR and the Allied Democratic Forces-National Army for the Liberation of Uganda and Democratic Liberation Forces of Rwanda in the DRC.

**Delisting process:** Delisting procedures have constituted a prominent issue for sanctions related to counter-terrorism. However, only one such process includes gender considerations: the 1988 Afghanistan Sanctions Committee. Resolution 1988 required this Committee to ensure that the delisting process takes into account the respect of women’s rights by individuals and/or entities.

**Women, Peace, Peace and Security, Counter-Terrorism and Security Council Sanctions Regimes**

The 1988 Afghanistan Sanctions Committee has an interesting history regarding its incorporation of gender elements. Resolution 1267 establishing what was then the 1267 Taliban Sanctions Committee was adopted on 15 October 1999—a year before resolution 1325 on women, peace and security. Resolution 1267 reiterated the Council’s deep concern over the continuing violations of international humanitarian law and of human rights, particularly discrimination against women and girls. Resolution 1333 (2000) maintained these references to women and expanded the sanctions regime to include Al-Qaeda. However, references to women in resolutions related to what became the 1267 Taliban/Al-Qaeda Sanctions Committee fell away following the US-led bombing of Afghanistan in October 2001. Such references were not to reappear until June 2011, when the Council adopted resolution 1988 separating Taliban sanctions from the Al-Qaeda regime in anticipation of reconciliation talks with the Taliban in Afghanistan. Since 2011, resolutions on Taliban sanctions have included respect for the Afghan constitution, including its
provisions on human rights and the rights of women, as part of the delisting criteria.

At the time of writing, the majority of the 1,345 individuals and entities listed by Security Council sanctions committees are in the 1988 Afghanistan Sanctions Committee (174 individuals and ten entities) and the 1267/1989/2253 ISIL (Da’esh) & Al-Qaida Sanctions Committee (398 individuals and 151 entities). While it is unlikely that respecting the rights of women as delisting criteria could ever be implemented in relation to the ISIL (Da’esh) & Al-Qaida sanctions regime (since neither the entity, nor any government, is likely to be willing to engage in a political reconciliation process), in theory it could be applied to delisting criteria in other sanctions regimes that target political spoilers who may eventually need to be part of a political solution.

**Women, Peace and Security, Counter-Terrorism, Human Trafficking and Security Council Sanctions Regimes**

Another area emerged on the Council’s thematic agenda in December 2015, when it adopted its first presidential statement on human trafficking, which has points of overlap with the Council’s consideration of women, peace and security and counter-terrorism.

The Secretary-General’s April 2016 report on conflict-related sexual violence highlighted the use of sexual violence by terrorist groups to increase their power, recruitment base and revenue through human trafficking. The Special Representative’s Office has stressed that the links between terrorism and human trafficking should be part of the global action on curbing financial flows to violent extremists, as trafficking in women and girls remains a critical component of financial flows to ISIL which operates in Iraq and Syria. The office has emphasised that existing mechanisms to counter terrorist financing, as well as Security Council sanctions regimes, are tools that could be used to monitor and disrupt human trafficking.

Resolution 2242 (2015) recognised that sexual and gender-based violence is used as a tactic of terrorism by certain groups, and expressed the Council’s intention to designate terrorist groups that engaged in such violations; it committed to ensuring that the relevant expert groups for sanctions committees have the necessary gender expertise. Resolution 2331 (2016) reiterated these points, as well as noting that human trafficking, in particular the sexual enslavement of women, is a revenue stream and recruitment tactic for certain terrorist groups.

The December 2016 resolution also included operational aspects of how the Council and its sanctions committees could address human trafficking. It signaled the Council’s intention to integrate the issues of human trafficking and sexual violence in conflict into the work of relevant sanctions committees. However, during the negotiation of resolution 2331, several Council members, including China, Russia and the US, had concerns about expanding the work of the ISIL (Da’esh) & Al-Qaida Sanctions Committee or the reporting scope of its Monitoring Team to include human trafficking. In the end, there was no specific reference to the ISIL (Da’esh) & Al-Qaida Sanctions Committee nor was the request included for the Committee’s Monitoring Team to report on human trafficking as a revenue stream for ISIL. However, the resolution does request that the Monitoring Team, when consulting with member states, include the issue of trafficking in persons in areas of armed conflict and the use of sexual violence in armed conflict as it relates to ISIL and Al-Qaeda, and report to the Committee on these discussions.

Also during 2016, then elected Council member New Zealand, which also chaired the ISIL (Da’esh) & Al-Qaida Sanctions Committee, tried to arrange for the Special Representative to brief the Committee. These attempts were persistently resisted by Russia, and the briefing never took place. In the end, it was agreed that the Special Representative’s Office could provide a written submission to the ISIL (Da’esh) & Al-Qaida Sanctions Committee on the crimes committed by ISIL, particularly its systematic use of sexual violence as a tactic of terrorism and its links to trafficking in persons. A summary of this report was also transmitted to the Council as a Secretary-General’s letter on 20 December 2016 (S/2016/1090).

Despite commitments made in resolutions 2242 and 2331, designating groups for their use of sexual violence as a tactic of terrorism has not been well integrated in the Council’s sanctions work nor have any of the committees’ expert groups been provided with gender expertise. It is still too early to assess whether the push to monitor ISIL’s use of sexual slavery and human trafficking as a revenue stream in the ISIL (Da’esh) & Al-Qaida Sanctions Committee will gain traction. Several Council members have noted that if the Committee can focus on ISIL’s revenue streams as a result of illicit funding via oil exports, traffic of cultural heritage, ransom payments and external donations, as established in resolution 2199, then surely the sale and trafficking of women can also be prioritised.

**Existing Practices: Addressing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse**

The UN’s zero tolerance policy on sexual exploitation and abuse by UN peacekeepers deserves separate consideration. The Council has inserted a “zero tolerance” provision for sexual exploitation and abuse by UN personnel—with some inconsistencies—into UN peacekeeping mandates in recent years, while such references are non-existent in resolutions establishing or renewing mandates for political missions.

This section reviews the mandates of UN peace operations in effect in 2016 for references to the zero tolerance policy, and examines whether there was reporting on this policy in relevant Secretary-General’s reports in 2016.

**Background**

The Security Council began to focus on the issue of sexual exploitation by peacekeeping personnel in the early 2000s, following disturbing reports of sexual exploitation and abuse by UN personnel of vulnerable people—often the very people that the UN was supposed to protect.
Existing Practices: Addressing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (con’t)

In October 2003, the Secretary-General issued a bulletin on special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse (ST/SG/2003/13). The bulletin provided clear definitions of such misconduct and announced that this policy was applicable to all UN staff: military, police, and civilians. The UN Conduct and Discipline Unit defines zero tolerance as a policy that sexual exploitation and abuse will not be tolerated. It includes measures to prevent such abuse and to discipline all persons who are found to have committed such abuse.

References in peacekeeping mandates to the zero tolerance policy started to appear following a March 2005 report by Zeid Ra’ad Zeid al-Hussein, the then-Permanent Representative of Jordan, appointed by Secretary-General Kofi Annan as his Special Adviser on Sexual Exploitation and Abuse. The report presented an alarming picture of a widespread and largely tolerated phenomenon of sexual abuse and exploitation by UN peacekeeping personnel and put forward a series of concrete recommendations on training and accountability as well as for disciplinary and criminal measures (A/59/710).

On 31 May 2005, the Council adopted a presidential statement recognising the shared responsibility of the Secretary-General and member states to take every measure to prevent sexual exploitation and abuse by peacekeepers and reiterating the importance of ensuring that sexual exploitation and abuse are properly investigated and appropriately punished (S/PRST/2005/21). Specifically, in the presidential statement the Council committed itself to include relevant provisions for prevention, monitoring, investigation and reporting of misconduct cases in its resolutions establishing or renewing mandates. It also asked the Secretary-General to report on the matter in his periodic mission reports, by providing a summary of the preventive measures taken to implement a zero tolerance policy and of the outcome of actions taken against personnel found culpable of sexual exploitation and abuse.

In the context of resolution 1820 on women, peace and security adopted in 2008, the Council requested the Secretary-General to continue and strengthen efforts to implement the policy of zero tolerance of sexual exploitation and abuse in UN peacekeeping operations and urged troop- and police-contributing countries (TCCs/PCCs) to take appropriate preventative action, including pre-deployment and in-theatre awareness training, and other action to ensure full accountability in cases of such misconduct involving their personnel.

This request was reiterated in resolutions 1888, 1960, 2106 and 2242. Furthermore, when resolution 2106 was adopted, reference to this policy was strengthened urging member states to ensure full accountability, including prosecutions, in cases of such misconduct involving their nationals. In previous resolutions addressing this issue, there had only been undefined calls for “accountability”. Resolution 2242 requested the Secretary-General to include a section on conduct and discipline including, whenever relevant, adherence to his zero tolerance policy on sexual exploitation and abuse, in all his reports on country situations.

Developments in 2016

In practice, the Council has not been involved in following-up allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse, and the issue has been left to the discretion of the Secretariat and TCCs/PCCs. However, following harrowing accounts of sexual exploitation and abuse in the CAR, the Council adopted its first resolution on sexual exploitation and abuse in March 2016.

On 10 March, the Secretary-General briefed the Security Council on his annual report to the General Assembly on special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (A/70/729). The next day, the Council adopted resolution 2272 that supported many of the Secretary-General’s recommendations to address this issue.

Resolution 2272 endorsed the Secretary-General’s decision to repatriate units where there is credible evidence of patterns of sexual exploitation and abuse; requested the Secretary-General to replace military or police units if the home country has not taken appropriate accountability measures, and if accountability measures are not appropriate to then determine whether that member state should participate in current or future peace operations; requested the Secretary-General to gather and preserve evidence of sexual exploitation and abuse, and assist victims; welcomed the expansion of the UN’s vetting of peacekeeping personnel; urged member states to assess their own national legal and administrative frameworks that govern military and police misconduct; urged TCCs/PCCs to conduct investigations within six months, take appropriate accountability steps and report fully to the UN on actions taken; and requested follow-up reporting by the Secretary-General to the Security Council.

Resolution 2272 constituted a response by the Security Council to the increasing allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse in the CAR by MINUSCA personnel, as well as by members of the French parallel forces, and by soldiers from the Chad and Equatorial Guinea contingents of the AU-led peacekeeping mission there that preceded the re-hatting of some of its troops into MINUSCA.

In December 2015, an independent panel appointed by the Secretary-General to review how the UN handled reports of sexual exploitation and abuse by international peacekeeping forces in the CAR released its report. The panel found systemic failures in UN reporting chains and inadequate responses by several UN officials, including by the then-head of MINUSCA, Babacar Gaye. In August 2015, due to these allegations, the Secretary-General had asked for Gaye’s resignation. In January 2016, the DRC contingent to MINUSCA was repatriated. However, allegations continued to be lodged against MINUSCA personnel.

The 2015 annual Secretary-General’s report to the General Assembly details 69 allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse in ten peace operations, and is the first to publicly disclose the nationality of UN personnel allegedly involved. Fifty-four of the allegations involved members of UN military contingents or police, and 15 involved civilian UN staff. Twenty-two of these allegations were specific to MINUSCA. As of 31 December 2016, the UN’s conduct and discipline unit had registered 103 new allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse during the year, 52 of them in the CAR.

Council members have been unanimous in their condemnation of sexual exploitation and abuse by UN personnel, and resolution 2272 welcomed the Secretary-General’s initiative in February 2016 to appoint a Special Coordinator on Improving the UN Response to Sexual Exploitation and Abuse. But the negotiations leading up to
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the adoption of resolution 2272 were contentious and demonstrated divisions among Council members.

Elected Council member Egypt, while condemning the prevalence of sexual exploitation and abuse and fully supporting the UN’s zero tolerance policy, was of the view that the Council is not the right venue to consider conduct and discipline issues.

Egypt and Senegal also argued that the Council is not able to fully represent the points of view of TCCs/PCCs. There were particular concerns about the repatriation of units instead of finding a way forward that would ensure accountability and transparency without punishing an entire unit of a particular contingent.

Russia also expressed some reluctance to proceed with negotiations on an issue which, in their view, infringed on the sovereignty of member states, especially in urging member states to assess their national frameworks. Several Council members expressed the view that sexual exploitation and abuse was better dealt with in the General Assembly’s Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, where negotiations on the same issue had also been difficult.

Permanent members France, the UK and the US, as well as New Zealand and Spain, were supportive of the draft, arguing that the Council has an oversight responsibility for the mandates it approves. Several Council members on both sides of this divide expressed concern that the initial draft of the resolution was limited to military and police units in UN peace operations, and did not include UN civilian personnel who accounted for 22 percent of the 2015 allegations. These members were also concerned that the draft did not refer to non-UN international forces operating under Council authorisation, although the French and AU forces in the CAR, as well as the AU-led AMISOM in Somalia, have been accused of sexual exploitation and abuse. Some Council members argued that references to non-UN forces had already been included in the sexual exploitation and abuse provisions of resolution 2242 on women, peace and security adopted in October 2015, and that a Council resolution specifically focused on sexual exploitation and abuse should meet the same standard.

Following a week of negotiations, resolution 2272 was adopted on 11 March, with Egypt abstaining.

Assessment of Security Council Inclusion of the UN’s Zero Tolerance Policy in Resolutions

Below is a chart reflecting Council activity and Secretariat reporting to the Council on sexual exploitation and abuse by UN personnel in 2016. The chart tracks whether the Council included reference to the zero tolerance policy on sexual abuse and exploitation when mandating UN missions. It records whether the Council specifically requested the Secretary-General to report back on misconduct, and whether TCCs/PCCs were specifically requested to undertake pre-deployment training, preventive measures and/or disciplinary action. The chart also tracks the Secretary-General’s country-specific reports and whether they reported on sexual exploitation and abuse, specifically or generally, and whether they included a separate section on conduct and discipline.

Missions excluded from this review include those that are not renewed annually through a Security Council resolution, such as UNMIK in Kosovo. Regional offices, such as UNOWAS in West Africa and the Sahel, are not established or renewed by Security Council resolutions but through an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the Council. In these cases, the Council does not have a regular opportunity to include references to the zero tolerance policy.

We reviewed the resolutions renewing mandates in effect in 2016 for 15 peacekeeping operations (13 UN operations and two operations of other multilateral organisations authorised by the Security Council) and five political missions. Of these 20 missions, 50 percent (10 of 20) had mandates that included a reference to the Secretary-General’s zero tolerance policy (see chart on page 16).

The Council has never consistently included the zero tolerance policy in the mandates of UNOCI in Côte d’Ivoire, UNAMID in Darfur and UNMIL in Liberia, and did not do so in 2016. The Council also almost never includes the zero tolerance policy in its resolutions establishing or renewing political missions. The exception was UNSOM in Somalia: resolutions 2102 (2013) and 2158 (2014) included the zero tolerance policy, but references disappeared in 2015 when resolution 2232 was adopted, renewing both UNSOM and the authorisation for the AU-led peacekeeping operation AMISOM.
### Assessment of Security Council Inclusion of the UN’s Zero Tolerance Policy in Resolutions (con’t)

#### UN’S ZERO TOLERANCE POLICY IN 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Council Resolutions</th>
<th>Conduct and Discipline Unit</th>
<th>Secretary-General’s Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolutions in Effect at December 2016</td>
<td>Allegations of SEA as of December 2016</td>
<td>Requests of TCC training and/or disciplinary action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISFA (Abyei)</td>
<td>S/RES/2318</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUSCA (CAR)</td>
<td>S/RES/2301</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFICYP (Cyprus)</td>
<td>S/RES/2300</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOCI (Côte d’Ivoire)</td>
<td>S/RES/2284</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDOF (Golan Heights)</td>
<td>S/RES/2330</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAMID (Darfur)</td>
<td>S/RES/2296</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONUSCO (DRC)</td>
<td>S/RES/2277</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUSTAH (Haiti)</td>
<td>S/RES/2313</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFIL (Lebanon)</td>
<td>S/RES/2305</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMIL (Liberia)</td>
<td>S/RES/2308</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUSMA (Mali)</td>
<td>S/RES/2295</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMISS (South Sudan)</td>
<td>S/RES/2327</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINURSO (Western Sahara)</td>
<td>S/RES/2285</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excluded Missions:
- UNTSO, UNMOGIP, UNMIK

#### Peacekeeping Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peacekeeping Operations</th>
<th>UNISFA (Abyei)</th>
<th>MINUSCA (CAR)</th>
<th>UNFICYP (Cyprus)</th>
<th>UNOCI (Côte d’Ivoire)</th>
<th>UNDOF (Golan Heights)</th>
<th>UNAMID (Darfur)</th>
<th>MONUSCO (DRC)</th>
<th>MINUSTAH (Haiti)</th>
<th>UNIFIL (Lebanon)</th>
<th>UNMIL (Liberia)</th>
<th>MINUSMA (Mali)</th>
<th>UNMISS (South Sudan)</th>
<th>MINURSO (Western Sahara)</th>
<th>Excluded Missions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNISFA (Abyei)</td>
<td>S/RES/2318</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUSCA (CAR)</td>
<td>S/RES/2301</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFICYP (Cyprus)</td>
<td>S/RES/2300</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOCI (Côte d’Ivoire)</td>
<td>S/RES/2284</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDOF (Golan Heights)</td>
<td>S/RES/2330</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAMID (Darfur)</td>
<td>S/RES/2296</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONUSCO (DRC)</td>
<td>S/RES/2277</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUSTAH (Haiti)</td>
<td>S/RES/2313</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFIL (Lebanon)</td>
<td>S/RES/2305</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMIL (Liberia)</td>
<td>S/RES/2308</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUSMA (Mali)</td>
<td>S/RES/2295</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMISS (South Sudan)</td>
<td>S/RES/2327</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINURSO (Western Sahara)</td>
<td>S/RES/2285</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Mission</th>
<th>UNISFA (Abyei)</th>
<th>MINUSCA (CAR)</th>
<th>UNFICYP (Cyprus)</th>
<th>UNOCI (Côte d’Ivoire)</th>
<th>UNDOF (Golan Heights)</th>
<th>UNAMID (Darfur)</th>
<th>MONUSCO (DRC)</th>
<th>MINUSTAH (Haiti)</th>
<th>UNIFIL (Lebanon)</th>
<th>UNMIL (Liberia)</th>
<th>MINUSMA (Mali)</th>
<th>UNMISS (South Sudan)</th>
<th>MINURSO (Western Sahara)</th>
<th>Excluded Missions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNISFA (Abyei)</td>
<td>S/RES/2318</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUSCA (CAR)</td>
<td>S/RES/2301</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFICYP (Cyprus)</td>
<td>S/RES/2300</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOCI (Côte d’Ivoire)</td>
<td>S/RES/2284</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDOF (Golan Heights)</td>
<td>S/RES/2330</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAMID (Darfur)</td>
<td>S/RES/2296</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONUSCO (DRC)</td>
<td>S/RES/2277</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUSTAH (Haiti)</td>
<td>S/RES/2313</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFIL (Lebanon)</td>
<td>S/RES/2305</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMIL (Liberia)</td>
<td>S/RES/2308</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUSMA (Mali)</td>
<td>S/RES/2295</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMISS (South Sudan)</td>
<td>S/RES/2327</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINURSO (Western Sahara)</td>
<td>S/RES/2285</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Observations and Options

The 2242 Group
It is too early to assess the impact of the information exchanged at meetings of the 2242 Group on activity in the Council itself, let alone whether peace operations have improved their response to the differential needs of women in conflict-affected areas. Nevertheless, various Council members have pointed out that the 2242 Group’s meetings have:

• provided in-depth information from the UN system on gender conflict analysis, additional to that included in the Secretary-General’s country-specific reports or briefings to the Council;
• helped identify ways in which women, peace and security implementation deficiencies could be addressed;
• provided a welcome opportunity for direct interaction with mission leadership and field staff, as a way to identify what the peace operation needs from headquarters to better implement its mandate;
• provided an opportunity to get away from discussion of women, peace and security in a “silo” and to place it within the broader political, security and humanitarian context;
• provided Council members with the information necessary to incorporate focused gender concerns into interventions in the Council;
• helped Council members to enhance their delegation’s own internal coordination in advocating for gender references to be included, sharpened or strengthened in Council deliberations on country-specific issues; and
• led to a better understanding by Council members’ country experts of how women, peace and security norms can be operationalised to benefit mission performance, thereby lowering resistance to including gender references in Council outcomes.

Areas for improvement for the 2242 Group in the coming year could include better follow-up activity. As demonstrated in the case study, the 2242 Group arguably improved the ability of Council members to identify issues related to women’s participation and protection needs in the context of Mali. However, it is unclear how extensively that information was used to enhance the opportunities for political messaging during the visiting mission, prioritising mandate tasks to better respond to women in the country, or holding mission leadership accountable during Council deliberations for fulfilling its women, peace and security obligations.
Observations and Options (con’t)

Council members have identified other areas for improvement in 2017, such as:
• more regular raising of issues identified in the 2242 Group during deliberations in the Council, including specific questions to UN headquarters and field leadership during consultations;
• begin raising issues identified in the 2242 Group when they are relevant to issues being discussed by permanent representatives in the Secretariat’s informal situational awareness briefings (for example, several of the countries considered in situational awareness briefings coincide with those considered by the 2242 Group: Afghanistan, Iraq, Mali and northern Nigeria);
• regular engagement of all Council members in the 2242 Group meetings—so far, China has never attended and Russia only rarely;
• better engagement of all Council members’ relevant country experts in the 2242 Group meetings, which should be structured to avoid gender experts talking only to other gender experts, in order to avoid isolating gender issues from the broader context of the conflict;
• encouraging more exchange during the meetings on how the Council and peace operations can cooperate to improve field response to women, peace and security issues, in particular on ways gender expertise can be embedded within all functional components and on what the peace operation needs from New York to better implement its mandate in the field; and
• improving forward planning of the 2242 Group’s meetings with field and headquarters interlocutors.

Another concern is that some Council members view the 2242 Group as an accountability mechanism for UN actors, whereas others view it as a forum for honest exchange and dialogue to yield improved performance by the Council as well as by UN actors. For the long-term success of the 2242 Group, it may be useful that the latter view is adopted.

Increasing Gender Briefings at Country-Specific Meetings
The practice of inviting women’s civil society briefers to address the Council at country-specific meetings has been established and should be consolidated in the coming year.

Council members should also continue to encourage and be open to more frequent country-specific briefings, both in formal meetings and informal consultations, by the head of UN Women and the Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict, particularly when they have timely and relevant information that could enrich Council deliberations.

UN officials should apply a gender lens in their briefings to the Council, rather than regarding sporadic and general references to women as fulfilling their women, peace and security reporting obligations.

Incorporating a Gender Perspective in Security Council Visiting Missions
Resolution 1888 (2009) expressed the Council’s intention to hear women’s perspectives during its visiting missions to conflict areas. Over the years, the Council has increased the incorporation of women, peace and security considerations into the terms of reference of the visit. In 2016, the Council carried out five visits:
• Burundi and AU Headquarters (January)
• West Africa: Mali, Guinea-Bissau and UNOWAS in Dakar (March)
• Somalia, Kenya and Egypt (May)
• South Sudan and AU Headquarters (September)
• the DRC and Angola (November)

Four of the five sets of terms of reference included a gender perspective and during the visiting mission there was interaction with women’s civil society representatives. The exception to this trend was the January 2016 visit to Burundi, which did not include gender in the terms of reference nor comprised any meetings with women’s civil society stakeholders. When gender was not included in the terms of reference, the issue tended to be overlooked by Council members during the visiting mission. It is clear that such interactions and stakeholder feedback will be unlikely to occur without conscious planning.

Despite the overall improvement in incorporating gender in the terms of reference and meeting with women’s civil society groups during the visiting mission, it seems that the Council still struggles with how to reflect what they learn from these stakeholders in messaging to government interlocutors and peace operation leadership. It similarly has difficulty in bringing what was learned about women, peace and security issues in the field into deliberations back in New York.

Expanding Ownership of the Women, Peace and Security “Pen”
One of the recommendations from the 1325 Global Study was that ownership by a permanent member of the “pen” on the women, peace and security agenda within the Council should be shared with an elected member. Currently the “pen” on the Council has not expanded to include an elected Council member as a co-lead. The UK is the current penholder on women, peace and security issues, while the US holds the pen in relation to conflict-related sexual violence. However, the inclusion of Spain, Sweden and Uruguay as co-chairs of the 2242 Group has helped to magnify the voices of elected members in shaping the women, peace and security agenda in the Council.

Security Council Resolutions and Presidential Statements
There has been a consistent trend of increasing references to women, peace and security in Security Council resolutions and presidential statements over the course of the 16 years since resolution 1325 was adopted. However, the Council could be expected to incorporate a gender lens more consistently at the outset of its response to emerging crises, and in its decision-making about so-called “hard” security issues such as counter-terrorism, military and police contingents in peace operations, and monitoring ceasefires.

Women, Peace and Security and Sanctions
There were no major developments in the Council’s work in the sanctions committees in 2016 when considering sexual violence or rape as designation criteria in various regimes. However, there was a significant increase in Council members’ willingness to hear briefings in sanctions committee meetings from the Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict, with the exception of the ISIL (Da’esh) & Al-Qaeda Sanctions Committee where it was resisted by Russia.

To further strengthen its work to incorporate women, peace and security into relevant...
sanctions committees, the Council could:

• Expand the designation criteria in other relevant sanctions regimes where sexual violence in conflict is persistently perpetrated.
• Formally call for information-sharing between the Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict and all relevant sanctions committees and associated expert groups, in particular the ISIL (Da’esh) & Al-Qaida Sanctions Committee.
• Welcome the submission of the names of perpetrators of sexual violence by the Special Representative to the relevant sanctions committees, and ensure follow-up at committee level to consider whether to adopt targeted measures against such individuals.
• Formally require expert groups assisting sanctions committees to report, where relevant, on sexual and gender-based violence, and to include gender experts as part of the composition of such groups.
• Consider adding respect for the rights of women to the delisting criteria in other sanctions regimes that target political spoilers who may eventually need to be part of a political solution.

**Sexual Exploitation and Abuse**

There were important developments in 2016 regarding the UN response to violations of the UN’s zero tolerance policy on sexual exploitation and abuse—by its own personnel, and how the Council addresses these. 2016 was the first year that the Secretary-General:

• Repatriated troops due to widespread allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse (January).
• Appointed a Special Coordinator on Improving the UN Response to Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (February).
• Briefed the Council on his report to the General Assembly on sexual exploitation and abuse—the first such report to publicly disclose the nationality of UN personnel allegedly involved (March).
• Included in his annual report on sexual violence in conflict issues related to widespread sexual exploitation and abuse, previously seen exclusively as a conduct issue (April).

In March 2016, the Council adopted its first resolution on sexual exploitation and abuse. However, the Council remains inconsistent in this area. An immediate measure the Council could take is ensuring consistent inclusion of all aspects of this policy in all resolutions renewing or establishing peace operations. The Council could also consistently request TCCs/PCCs to undertake pre-deployment training, preventive measures, and disciplinary action when necessary. To ensure accountability, the Council could reiterate its call in its 31 May 2005 presidential statement and in resolution 2242 for reporting on the follow-up to allegations of such misconduct in relevant Secretary-General’s reports, which would be readily incorporated if all country-specific Secretary-General’s reports included a conduct and discipline section.

Council members could encourage the Secretary-General to continue the practice of briefing the Council each year on his report to the General Assembly on sexual exploitation and abuse and encourage the ongoing public disclosure of the nationality of UN personnel allegedly involved in that report.

Finally, Council members could implement the recommendation made in the peace operations review to use the private format of the regular Security Council meetings with TCCs/PCCs to review follow-up action on all reported allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse.

---

**Annex 1: Security Council Resolutions on Women, Peace and Security**


Resolution 1325 looked at several aspects of the impact of conflict on women and girls and expressed concern that armed conflict has a disproportionate effect on them. This impact is felt even when women and girls are not directly engaged in hostilities. Resolution 1325 recognised that women’s needs should be taken into account by those planning demobilisation and reintegration programs. The resolution stressed the importance of the equal participation of women in peace and security processes, as well as the need to increase their decision-making roles in conflict prevention and conflict resolution.

Resolution 1325 also emphasised the obligations that international law places on parties to conflicts to protect women in situations of armed conflict, including by taking special measures to protect women and girls from gender-based violence, and stressed state responsibility for ending impunity for such crimes.

**Resolution 1820 (2008)**

In the jurisprudence of the International Criminal Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, it emerged that sexual violence had been a specific tactic of war and was recognised as a crime against humanity, and could be an act of genocide if certain conditions are met. Additionally, evidence of widespread, systematic, brutal and highly publicised sexual violence perpetrated against the women of the eastern DRC played a pivotal role in creating the environment for the Council’s next substantive decision on the women, peace and security agenda—resolution 1820, adopted on 19 June 2008.

Resolution 1820 addressed sexual violence in conflict and post-conflict situations and expressed the Council’s willingness to use sanctions against perpetrators of sexual violence in armed conflict. Three months prior to the adoption of resolution 1820, the Council had added sexual violence in the DRC as a criterion for targeted sanctions, through resolution 1807. Already in 2006, the 1572 Côte d’Ivoire Sanctions Committee had included rape and sexual abuse of women among the reasons for applying targeted sanctions to three individuals. Resolution 1572, which established the Côte d’Ivoire sanctions regime in 2004, had included “serious violations of human rights” among the criteria for sanctions.

In addition, resolution 1820 enumerated the possible measures parties could take to protect women and children from sexual violence and stressed the need to...
end impunity. It noted that rape and other forms of sexual violence could constitute a war crime, a crime against humanity or an act with respect to genocide.

Resolution 1820 also requested the Secretary-General to continue and strengthen efforts to implement the policy of zero tolerance of sexual exploitation and abuse in UN peacekeeping operations.

Resolution 1888 (2009)
Resolution 1888, adopted on 30 September 2009, aimed at strengthening efforts to end sexual violence against women and children in armed conflict and established the mandate of the Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict. It further developed language regarding expanding Security Council sanctions regimes to include sexual violence as a designation criterion and called for all relevant UN missions and bodies to share information with sanctions committees through expert groups.

This resolution included a range of measures to develop capacity to implement resolution 1820, including:
• a request for the Secretary-General to appoint a Special Representative;
• a request to deploy rapidly a team of experts to situations of particular concern with respect to sexual violence in armed conflict; and
• a decision to include specific provisions in peacekeeping mandates, as appropriate, for women’s protection advisers.

Resolution 1889 (2009)
On 5 October 2009, the Council adopted resolution 1889, addressing the need to take into account women’s protection and empowerment in post-conflict situations. This resolution reinforced resolution 1325, and (as resolution 1888 had in relation to resolution 1820) focused on how to implement key elements of resolution 1325. In terms of practical application, it called upon the Secretary-General to submit to the Security Council a set of indicators for use at the global level to track implementation of resolution 1325.

Resolution 1960 (2010)
Resolution 1960, adopted on 16 December 2010, requested the Secretary-General to establish monitoring, analysis and reporting arrangements on conflict-related sexual violence. The resolution also called upon parties to armed conflict to make time-bound commitments to prohibit and punish perpetrators of sexual violence. The Secretary-General was asked to include in his annual reports on conflict-related sexual violence an annex listing parties credibly suspected of bearing responsibility for patterns of rape and other forms of sexual violence, “as a basis for more focused United Nations engagement with those parties, including, as appropriate, measures in accordance with the procedures of the relevant sanctions committees”. The Council reiterated its intention, when adopting or renewing targeted sanctions in situations of armed conflict, to consider including rape and other forms of sexual violence as designation criteria. The resolution also called for the Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict to share with relevant Security Council sanctions committees, including through relevant expert groups, all pertinent information about sexual violence.

Resolution 2106 (2013)
Resolution 2106 was adopted on 24 June 2013 and addressed impunity and effective justice for crimes of sexual violence in conflict. It highlighted that states bear the primary responsibility to protect civilians but also drew attention to the range of sexual violence offences in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and the statutes of the ad hoc international criminal tribunals. The resolution linked national responsibility to address sexual violence and women’s political and economic empowerment as central to long-term prevention strategies. It also explicitly called for addressing sexual violence concerns in disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration processes; in security sector reform processes; and in justice sector reform initiatives.

Resolution 2122 (2013)
Resolution 2122 was adopted on 18 October 2013 to address the persistent gaps in the implementation of the women, peace and security agenda. This was the first resolution since resolution 1325 (2000) that substantially addressed the participation aspects of the women, peace and security agenda, as the five resolutions adopted on this thematic issue since 2000 largely focused on sexual violence in conflict and other protection aspects of the agenda.

This resolution recognised that the Security Council needed to receive better information on implementation of this aspect of the agenda to improve its own work. The resolution requested:
• more regular briefings by the Executive Director of UN Women;
• that UN officials, in particular Special Envoys, Special Representatives and DPA and DPKO, include information on women, peace and security in their briefings and reports to the Council;
• that commissions of inquiry report on gender-specific elements of conflict; and
• that the Secretary-General undertake a global study ahead of the 2015 High-Level Review to assess progress at the global, regional and national levels in implementing resolution 1325.

Resolution 2242 (2015)
Resolution 2242 was adopted on 13 October 2015 and includes practical actions to improve the implementation of the women, peace and security agenda in several areas:
• greater integration between the UN agendas on countering violent extremism, countering terrorism and women, peace and security; and
• improving the Council’s own working methods in relation to women, peace and security implementation by: (1) forming an Informal Experts Group on this thematic agenda; (2) considering greater integration of gender into the work of sanctions regimes, including by ensuring relevant expert groups have gender expertise; and (3) inviting women’s civil society representatives to brief on country-specific issues.

It also incorporated gender recommendations from the 1325 Global Study and the High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations report, such as the need to: (1) improve the gender-responsiveness of peace operations through greater cooperation between DPA, DPKO, the Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict and UN Women; (2) integrate gender expertise within mission staffing structures; (3) specify gender-related performance indicators in the compacts between the Secretary-General and heads of missions; and (4) achieve better gender balance in UN military and police contingents.
Annex 2: Key UN Documents on Women, Peace and Security

SECURITY COUNCIL LETTERS OF THE 2242 INFORMAL EXPERT GROUP
S/2016/682 (29 July 2016) and S/2016/1103 (22 December 2016) were the summary notes, respectively, on the 29 February and 14 September meetings of the 2242 Group on Mali.

S/2016/683 (29 July 2016) and S/2016/1104 (22 December 2016) were the summary notes, respectively, on the 29 April and 18 October meetings of the 2242 Group on Iraq.

S/2016/672 (29 July 2016) and S/2016/1105 (22 December 2016) were the summary notes, respectively, on the 15 June and 7 December meetings of the 2242 Group on the CAR.

S/2016/673 (29 July 2016) and S/2016/1059 (14 December 2016) were the summary notes, respectively, on the 13 July and 28 November meetings of the 2242 Group on Afghanistan.

S/2016/1106 (22 December 2016) contained the guidelines for the 2242 Group.

S/2016/1107 (22 December 2016) was the summary of the 10 November meeting of the 2242 Group with women’s protection advisers.

SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

Thematic Resolutions
S/RES/2331 (20 December 2016) was the first-ever resolution on human trafficking, which condemned the phenomenon and stressed how human trafficking can exacerbate conflict and foster insecurity.

S/RES/2272 (11 March 2016) addressed sexual exploitation and abuse in peace operations, with Egypt abstaining.

Sanctions-Related Resolutions
S/RES/2339 (27 January 2017), S/RES/2262 (27 January 2016), S/RES/2196 (22 January 2015), S/RES/2134 (28 January 2014) and S/RES/2127 (6 December 2013) were on the CAR sanctions regime and included targeted measures with designation criteria including sexual and gender-based violence and, as of January 2015, requested information-sharing between the Special Representative and the 1533 DRC Sanctions Committee.

S/RES/2206 (3 March 2015) established the South Sudan sanctions regime that included targeted measures with designation criteria including sexual and gender-based violence and requested information-sharing between the Special Representative and the 2206 Sanctions Committee.


S/RES/2265 (10 February 2016), S/RES/2200 (12 February 2015), S/RES/2138 (13 February 2014), S/RES/2091 (14 February 2013) and S/RES/2035 (17 February 2012) requested the Panel of Experts to provide the Sudan Sanctions Committee with information on individuals who commit sexual and gender-based violence.

S/RES/2002 (29 July 2011) expanded the Somalia sanctions regime to include sexual and gender-based violence as criteria for targeted sanctions.


SECURITY COUNCIL PRESIDENTIAL STATEMENTS

Women, Peace and Security
S/PRST/2016/9 (15 June 2016) was on the role of women in conflict prevention and resolution in Africa.

S/PRST/2015/25 (16 December 2015) was on trafficking in persons in situations of conflict, with a particular focus on ISIL and the impact on women and children.

S/PRST/2014/21 (28 October 2014) addressed the particular needs of displaced women, highlighted the impact of violent extremism on women and welcomed the Secretary-General’s commissioning of a global study.

S/PRST/2012/23 (31 October 2012) highlighted the impact of women’s civil society organisations, recognised the need in the Council’s own work for more systemic attention to the women, peace and security agenda, and welcomed the Secretary-General’s call for enhanced women’s participation, at all levels, in conflict prevention, conflict resolution and peacebuilding.

S/PRST/2012/2 (23 February 2012) followed the first open debate on conflict-related sexual violence, commended the work of the Special Representative, and stressed the need for continued data collection under the monitoring, analysis and reporting arrangements on sexual violence.

S/PRST/2011/20 (28 October 2011) expressed concern about challenges that hinder the implementation of resolution 1325; underlined the importance of the mandate of the Special Representative, and requested a comprehensive overview of women’s participation in mediation and preventive diplomacy in the next Secretary-General’s report.

S/PRST/2010/22 (26 October 2010) supported taking forward resolution 1325 as an initial framework for the UN system and member states to track implementation of resolution 1325; and expressed its intention to convene a high-level review in five years.

S/PRST/2010/8 (27 April 2010) requested the Secretary-General to undertake more consultation on the global indicators to implement resolution 1325.


S/PRST/2007/5 (7 March 2007) was on women, peace and security on the occasion of International Women’s Day.

S/PRST/2006/42 (8 November 2006) asked the Secretary-General to report in 12 months on implementation of his Action Plan to implement resolution 1325.


S/PRST/2004/40 (28 October 2004) welcomed the Secretary-General’s report on the implementation of 1325 by the UN system.

S/PRST/2002/32 (31 October 2002) responded to the first Secretary-General’s report on the impact of conflict on women and girls.

Other
S/PRST/2012/29 (20 December 2012) was on peacebuilding and included extensive references to the critical role of women in conflict resolution and peacebuilding.

S/PRST/2005/21 (31 May 2005) recognised the shared responsibility of the Secretary-General and member states to take every measure to prevent sexual exploitation and abuse by peacekeepers, and reiterated the importance of ensuring that sexual exploitation and abuse are properly investigated and appropriately punished.

SECURITY COUNCIL MEETING RECORDS

Open Debates on Women, Peace and Security
S/PV.7793 (25 October 2016); S/PV.7533 and Res. 1 (13 and 14 October 2015);

S/PV.7289 (28 October 2014); S/PV.7044 (18 October 2013); S/PV.6877 (30 November 2012); S/PV.6642 and Res.1 (28 October 2011); S/PV.6111 and Res.1 (26 October 2010); S/PV.6196 and Res.1 (5 October 2009); S/PV.6005 and Res.1 (29 October 2008); S/PV.5916 and Res.1 (9 June 2008); S/PV.5766 and Res.1 (23 October 2007); S/PV.5556 and Res.1 (26 October 2006); S/PV.5294 and Res.1 (27 October 2005); S/PV.5066 and Res.1 (28 October 2004); S/PV.4852 and Res.1 (29 October 2003); S/PV.4635 and Res.1 (28 to 29 October 2002); S/PV.4588 and Res.1 (25 July 2002); S/PV.4208 and Res.1 (24 to 25 October 2000)

Open Debates on Sexual Violence in Conflict
S/PV.7704 (2 June 2016); S/PV.7425 (15 April 2015); S/PV.7660 (25 April 2014); S/PV.6984 (24 June 2013); S/PV.6984 (17 April 2013); S/PV.6722 and Res. 1 (23 February 2012); S/PV.6453 and Res. 1 (16 December 2010);

S/PV.6195 (30 September 2009)

Other
S/PV.7642 (10 March 2016) was a briefing by the Secretary-General on his annual report to the General Assembly on special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and abuse.

S/PV.7585 (16 December 2015) was a briefing on the trafficking of persons in situations of conflict, with a particular focus on ISIL.

S/PV.7374 (30 January 2015) was the open debate on the implementation of resolution 1325.
on the protection of civilians with a particular focus on the protection challenges of women and girls in conflict and post-conflict settings.

**BRIEFINGS BY THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE ON SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN CONFLICT**

S/PV.7847 (20 December 2016) was a briefing by Special Representative Bangura at a ministerial-level open debate on trafficking in persons in conflict situations.

S/PV.7508 (20 August 2015) was a briefing by Special Representative Bangura at a meeting on SSR.

S/PV.7282 (22 October 2014) was a briefing by Special Representative Bangura at a meeting on South Sudan.

S/PV.7098 (22 January 2014) was a briefing by Special Representative Bangura on the humanitarian and human rights situation in the CAR, along with the Special Representative for Children and Armed Conflict, the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide, and the Operations Director of OCHA.

S/PV.6949 (18 March 2013) was a briefing by Special Representative Wallström on the humanitarian situation in Syria, along with the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs, the High Commissioner for Refugees and the Special Representative for Children and Armed Conflict.

S/PV.6899 (11 January 2013) was a briefing by Special Representative Bangura on the uprising by the Seleka rebel alliance and subsequent ceasefire agreements with the CAR government.

S/PV.6515 (14 April 2011) was a briefing by Special Representative Wallström on the implementation of resolution 1960; on the activities of her office’s Team of Experts; and on situations in Libya, Côte d’Ivoire and the DRC.

S/PV.6378 (7 September 2010) was a briefing by Special Representative Wallström on the July 2010 Walikale rapes in the DRC.

S/PV.6302 (27 April 2010) was the first briefing by Wallström to the Council on her plans to implement her mandate as the first Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict.

**BRIEFING BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF UN WOMEN**

S/PV.7658 (28 March 2016) was a briefing by the head of UN Women, Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka, at an open debate on the role of women in conflict prevention and resolution in Africa.

S/PV.7649 (17 March 2016) was a briefing by the head of UN Women, Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka, on her visit to Liberia in February 2016.

S/PV.7206 (24 June 2014) was a briefing by the head of UN Women, Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka, on her visit to the CAR in May 2014.

S/PV.7141 (18 March 2014) was a briefing by the head of UN Women, Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka, on her 18-19 February 2014 trip to South Sudan, during a regular UNMISS briefing.

S/PV.7592 (24 April 2012) was a briefing by the head of UN Women, Michelle Bachelet, on women's political participation as voters and candidates, gender-based election-related violence and gender issues in transitional justice mechanisms.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL'S REPORTS**

**Implementation of Resolution 1325**


**Conflict-Related Sexual Violence**

S/2016/361 (20 April 2016), S/2015/203 (23 March 2015), S/2014/181 (13 March 2014), S/2013/149 (14 March 2013) and S/2012/33 (13 January 2012) are the annual reports on conflict-related sexual violence.

**Implementation of Resolution 1820**

S/2010/604 (24 November 2010) was the second report in response to resolution 1820 and included proposals for the monitoring and analysis and reporting arrangements on conflict-related sexual violence.

S/2009/362 (20 August 2009) was the first report in response to resolution 1820.

**Women and Peacebuilding**

S/2010/466 (7 September 2010) was a report on women and peacebuilding.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY DOCUMENTS**

A/70/729 (16 February 2016) was a report of the Secretary-General on special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse.

A/RES/63/311 (14 September 2009) established UN Women.

A/59/710 (24 March 2005) was a report by Zeid Ra’ad Zeid al-Hussein, the Secretary-General’s Special Adviser, on sexual abuse and exploitation by UN peacekeeping personnel, that included a series of recommendations on training and accountability as well as discipline.

ST/SGB/2003/13 (9 October 2003) was a bulletin on special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse, providing clear definitions of such misconduct and announced that this policy was applicable to all UN staff: military, police and civilian.
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