

# Security Council Elections 2014

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Council Seats
- 4 Potential Council Dynamics in 2015
- 5 Established Practices in Becoming a Candidate
- 5 Campaigning for the Security Council
- 6 Modern Regional Groups and Established Practices
- 8 Special Cases in the Election of Non-Permanent Members
- 9 UN Documents
- 10 Useful Additional Resources
- 10 Annex 1: Rules and Process for Election to the Council: Relevant Charter Provisions and Rules of Procedure
- 11 Annex 2: Historical Background
- 12 Annex 3: Results of Recent Elections for Non-Permanent Members of the Security Council



Ambassador Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein, Permanent Representative of Jordan, casts his country's ballot for the two-year term on the Council to begin January 2013. (UN Photo/Evan Schneider)

## Introduction

The 69th session of the UN General Assembly is scheduled to hold elections for the Security Council on 16 October. Five of the ten non-permanent seats in the Security Council will be filled for the 2015–2016 term. The five seats available for election in 2014 will be distributed regionally as follows:

- one seat for the African Group, currently held by Rwanda;
- one seat for the Group of Asia and the Pacific Small Island Developing States (Asia-Pacific Group), currently held by the Republic of Korea;
- one seat for the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (GRULAC), currently held by Argentina; and
- two seats for the Western European and Others Group (WEOG), currently held by Australia and Luxembourg.

The Eastern European Group is not contesting any seat this year as its seat (held by Lithuania through 2015) is up for election every other year.

The five new members elected this year will take up their seats on 1 January 2015 and will serve through 31 December 2016. The procedures governing elections to the Security Council are described in detail in Annex 1.

At press time, the election for the first three seats described above seemed to be headed for a “clean slate” with one candidate put forward by each regional group:

2014, No. 2  
16 September 2014

This report is available online at [securitycouncilreport.org](http://securitycouncilreport.org).

For daily insights by SCR on evolving Security Council actions please subscribe to our “What’s In Blue” series at [whatsinblue.org](http://whatsinblue.org) or follow @SCRtweets on Twitter.

## Introduction (con't)

respectively Angola, Malaysia and Venezuela. All three candidates have previously served on the Council: Venezuela on four previous occasions (1962–1963, 1977–1978, 1986–1987 and 1992–1993), Malaysia in three (1965, 1989–1990 and 1999–2000) and Angola once (2003–2004).

One race will likely be contested this year as three candidates, New Zealand, Spain and Turkey, are competing for the two WEOG seats. All candidates have served on the Council in the past: New Zealand on three occasions (1954–1955, 1966 and 1993–1994); Spain on four (1969–1970, 1981–1982, 1993–1994 and 2003–2004) and Turkey also on four (1951–1952, 1954–1955, 1961 and 2009–2010).

The table below shows the number of seats available per region in the 2014 election, the declared candidates and their prior terms on the Council.

All 2014 candidates have previously served on the Council. Among them, Spain and Venezuela have the most prior Security Council experience, both having served four terms. Turkey has also served four times, albeit serving only a one-year term in 1961 as a result of a split term with Poland. None of the 75 UN member states that have never served on the Council (accounting for approximately 39 percent of the wider membership) is a candidate this year.

A country must obtain votes from two-thirds of the member states present and voting at the General Assembly session in order to secure a seat on the Council, regardless of whether the election is contested. This means that 129 votes are required at a minimum to win a seat if all 193 UN member states vote. (A member state can be prohibited from

REGION	SEATS AVAILABLE IN THE 2014 ELECTION	STATES RUNNING AND PREVIOUS TERMS ON THE COUNCIL
Africa	1	Angola (2003–2004)
Asia-Pacific	1	Malaysia (1965, 1989–1990, 1999–2000)
Latin America and Caribbean	1	Venezuela (1962–1963, 1977–1978, 1986–1987, 1992–1993)
Western Europe and Other	2	New Zealand (1954–1955, 1966, 1993–1994), Spain (1969–1970, 1981–1982, 1993–1994, 2003–2004) and Turkey (1951–1952, 1954–1955, 1961, 2009–2010)

voting as a result of arrears in payment of financial contributions, in accordance with Article 19 of the UN Charter.)

Elections to the Council, as with other principal organs of the UN, require formal balloting, even if candidates have been endorsed by their regional group and are running on a “clean slate”. If no candidate obtains the required number of votes in the first round, voting in the next round is restricted to the candidates that received the most votes. In this restricted ballot, the number of countries included is limited to twice the number of vacant seats; for example, if one seat is available, only the two countries that received the most votes in the first round could contest the next round. (Any votes for other candidates during this restricted voting round are considered void.) This restricted voting process can continue for up to three rounds of voting. If, at that point, a candidate still fails to garner the minimum number of votes, unrestricted voting is reopened for up to three rounds. This pattern of restricted and unrestricted voting continues until a candidate is successful in securing the required two-thirds of the votes.

In theory, it is possible, although unlikely, that a country running on a “clean slate” might not garner the requisite votes of those present in the General Assembly in the first round of voting. Such a country may then be challenged in subsequent rounds and ultimately not obtain a seat.

Historically, there have been a number of instances in which extended rounds of voting were required to fill a contested seat. This was more common before the Council’s enlargement from 11 to 15 members in 1966, and it resulted in a number of agreements to split terms that are explained below. Despite the enlargement, this has happened a few times more recently, although such situations have been solved by the withdrawal of one of the contenders or the election of a compromise candidate as opposed to agreeing on a split term. (See Annex 3 for the results of the recent elections to the Security Council. A summary of the voting in the General Assembly elections to non-permanent seats at the Security Council since 1946 is available at [www.securitycouncilreport.org](http://www.securitycouncilreport.org).)

## Council Seats

### African Group

Three non-permanent seats on the Council are allocated to Africa. One seat comes up for election every even calendar year, and two seats are contested during odd years. Even though there have been exceptions, elections for seats allocated to Africa tend to be uncontested as the Africa Group maintains an established pattern of rotation among its

five subregions (Northern Africa, Southern Africa, Eastern Africa, Western Africa and Central Africa). This year, Angola is running unopposed for the Southern Africa seat.

### Angola

Angola has been a UN member state since 1976 and has served on the Council once (2003–2004). It received the endorsement of

the AU in January 2014.

Angola—which shares the longest border with the Democratic Republic of the Congo of any of its neighbouring countries—is the current chair of the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region, and has highlighted its interest in contributing to peace and security in that region in its campaign for the Security Council. It has

## Council Seats (con't)

also emphasised the importance of a more efficient identification of the causes of conflict, including the illegal exploitation of natural resources, and focusing more on the Council's conflict prevention role. It has also shown interest in sharing its experience regarding efforts towards national reconciliation with other countries coming out of conflict situations. (During its previous Council term, Angola chaired the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa.) If elected to the Council, Angola says it will place particular importance on supporting initiatives by the UN and regional organisations to fight organised and transnational crime and international terrorism. It is also committed to promoting cooperation between the AU and the UN. As of 31 July, Angola had no peacekeepers deployed.

### Latin American and Caribbean Group

Two non-permanent seats are allocated for Latin America and the Caribbean, with one coming up for election every year. From 2008 on, there has only been one candidate every year for the GRULAC seat. (Even though sometimes the candidates did not have the endorsement of the regional group, they have not been so far challenged at the elections stage.)

In 2006, elections for the GRULAC seat on the Security Council were inconclusive after 47 rounds of voting over several weeks. With the General Assembly unable to decide between Guatemala and Venezuela, Panama agreed to stand and was elected on the 48th round as the compromise candidate (the process took from 16 October until 7 November). GRULAC seats for the Human Rights Council (HRC) and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) were also contested in 2006.

As a result of this experience, an informal understanding developed among GRULAC members to avoid contested seats to the Security Council, the HRC, and ECOSOC. Since then, Mexico (2008), Brazil (2009), Colombia (2010), Guatemala (2011), Argentina (2012), Chile (2013) and now Venezuela have all been sole candidates for Security Council seats. For a few years, elections for the GRULAC seats in the HRC and ECOSOC were also not contested. However, with regard to these last two organs, this pattern

is beginning to change. GRULAC seats at the HRC were contested in the 2013 elections and they are also expected to be contested this year. It also seems that there will be competition among GRULAC candidates in the 2016 ECOSOC elections. Given this trend, it is not clear whether, or for how long, the informal GRULAC understanding about running on a "clean slate" for the Security Council will last.

In the future, it is likely that larger countries in the group will negotiate trading places with, if not contesting, pre-existing candidates by smaller countries, rather than wait until their rotational turn comes up again.

### *Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela*

Venezuela is a founding member of the UN and has served on the Security Council four times (1962–1963, 1977–1978, 1986–1987 and 1992–1993). It announced its candidature in 2007 and was endorsed by the GRULAC in July.

If elected, Venezuela has stated that it will share its experience regarding cooperation mechanisms between regional and sub-regional organisations. It has emphasised the importance it attaches to the guiding principles of UN peacekeeping, such as the consent of the parties and non-use of force, except in self-defence and in compliance with the established mandate. Among its priorities, Venezuela includes its commitment to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the fight against terrorism.

In addition to its promotion of inclusive multilateralism, Venezuela has an interest in the peaceful settlement of disputes, including addressing the root causes of conflict and it has cited its participation in peace processes, for example in Central America. As of 31 July, Venezuela had no peacekeepers deployed.

### Western European and Others Group

The two elected WEOG seats are filled every even calendar year. In 2014 New Zealand, Spain and Turkey are contesting the two seats.

### *New Zealand*

New Zealand, a founding member of the UN, has served on the Security Council three times (1954–1955, 1966 and 1993–1994). Its candidacy, which was announced in 2004, has been endorsed by the Pacific Islands Forum.

In its campaign, New Zealand has emphasised its consistent and independent foreign policy and the lack of national interest in the conflicts currently on the Council's agenda, which can make it an honest broker. It has also highlighted its commitment to champion non-members with legitimate stakes in getting a fair hearing from the Council. Its priority areas include the improvement of early warning and conflict prevention tools for the Council (including through addressing the root causes of conflict and engaging with UN funds and programmes and international financial institutions), as well as responding to emerging threats to peace and security. Promoting disarmament and the control of small arms and light weapons are also among its key priorities. New Zealand is a member of the Group of Friends on Women, Peace and Security; Children and Armed Conflict; and Responsibility to Protect, as well as a member of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency Group (ACT). It has stressed its role in improving the interaction between the Council and troop-contributing countries in its last term on the Council (1993–1994), as well as its role trying to garner support, as Council President in April 1994, to respond to the beginning of the genocide in Rwanda.

New Zealand has participated in more than 40 peacekeeping operations in over 25 countries and as of 31 July had 11 peacekeepers deployed.

### *Spain*

A member of the UN since 1955, Spain, which announced its candidacy in 2005, has served on the Council on four occasions (1969–1970, 1981–1982, 1993–1994 and 2003–2004).

In support of its candidacy, Spain has emphasised its willingness to put its experience in preventive diplomacy and intercultural and interreligious dialogue at the service of the Council. (Along with Turkey, Spain championed the establishment of the UN Alliance of Civilisations.) It also attaches great importance to the Council's working methods and has stated its commitment to ensuring that the perspectives of countries and regional organisations are duly taken into account in the Council's decision-making process. It is a supporter of thematic issues in the Council's agenda such as the protection of civilians;

---

## Council Seats (con't)

children and armed conflict; women, peace and security; and the rule of law. Spain has also shown a keen interest in issues such as disarmament, non-proliferation and counter-terrorism. Spain is also a member of the Groups of Friends of Western Sahara, as well as the Group of Friends on Mediation and on Women, Peace and Security, and it serves on the Contact Group on Piracy off the Coast of Somalia.

During the campaign, Spain has highlighted its contribution to UN peacekeeping operations with almost 140,000 military and police personnel in the last 25 years and 598 peacekeepers deployed as of 31 July. Spain is currently present in three UN operations and some ten EU-led missions. It also hosts the UN Support Base to peacekeeping operations and a Humanitarian Logistics Hub of the World Food Programme.

### Turkey

A founding member of the UN, Turkey has served on the Security Council four times (1951–1952, 1954–1955, 1961 and 2009–2010) and announced its candidacy in May 2011.

Turkey has emphasised that its location at the centre of Afro-Eurasian geopolitics enables it to be well-placed to assist the UN in achieving its objectives. Turkey has underscored its desire to help address challenging situations in its immediate vicinity in the Middle East, North Africa and beyond. During its campaign it has highlighted its partnership with regional and subregional organisations and fora all over the world while stressing its role in championing mediation and counter-terrorism efforts within the UN:

Turkey co-chairs the Group of Friends of Mediation along with Finland, and in 2014 co-chaired the review of the implementation of the *UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy with the US*. (Along with Spain, Turkey championed the establishment of the UN Alliance of Civilisations.) During the campaign, Turkey has also highlighted its role in the provision of international humanitarian assistance (in 2012 it was the fourth-largest donor). In regards to its last term on the Council, Turkey notes its commitment to advance conflict prevention and peacebuilding, as well as the working methods agenda. As incoming chair of the G20 in 2015, it has also highlighted the nexus of peace, security and development.

Turkey currently participates in ten UN peacekeeping operations with 167 peacekeepers deployed as of 31 July. Turkey hosts regional centres of the UN Population Fund, UN Development Programme, the Food and Agriculture Organisation, the UN Industrial Development Organisation and UN Women.

### Asia-Pacific Group

One of the two Council seats allocated to the Asia-Pacific Group comes up for election every year. Malaysia is running unopposed for the Asia-Pacific Group seat this year. It is scheduled to replace the Republic of Korea, whose term expires at the end of the calendar year, and join Jordan as the two Council members from the Asia-Pacific Group. (Jordan is also currently occupying the Arab Swing Seat, which alternates every odd calendar year between the Asia-Pacific Group and the African Group.)

### Malaysia

A member of the UN since 1957, Malaysia has served on the Council three times (1965, 1989–1990 and 1999–2000). It announced its candidacy in 2001 and was endorsed by the Asia-Pacific group in January 2014.

Malaysia stresses the importance of human security and thematic issues on the Council's agenda such as women, peace and security and children and armed conflict; along with working methods and peacekeeping. It highlights the relevance of the concept of "moderation" along the continuum between conflict prevention and post-conflict peacebuilding. As a multi-cultural, multi-racial and multi-religious country, Malaysia showcases the benefits of the practice of moderation in maintaining peace, stability and unity. Malaysia portrays its facilitating role in the Mindanao Peace process—which eventually led to the signing of a 27 March 2014 Comprehensive Agreement between the government of Philippines and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front—as guided by the principle of "moderation". As a country where moderate Islam is the largest practiced religion, Malaysia believes it has a role to play in contributing to the Council's thinking on how to tackle radicalisation in the Middle East and North Africa and beyond.

Since the first deployment of peacekeepers by Malaysia in 1960, more than 29,000 military and police personnel have participated in over 30 UN peacekeeping operations. Malaysia, which as of 31 July had 890 peacekeepers deployed with UN operations, is home to the Malaysian Peacekeeping Training Centre and stresses the importance of police contributions to UN peacekeeping.

---

## Potential Council Dynamics in 2015

It seems that the current divisions in the Council over such issues as Ukraine, Syria or Israel/Palestine will not significantly change with the arrival of five new elected members. Although it is difficult to evaluate how Council dynamics in 2015 will evolve, especially without knowing the exact composition of the new membership, the interests of the current candidates provide some perspective on general patterns that might emerge.

Several of the candidates appear to have a strong national interest in countries in their respective regions that are on the Council's agenda. Angola shares a long border with the Democratic Republic of the Congo and is likely to play an important role in that issue. Turkey, a major regional actor, if elected, will enter the Council at a time of significant turmoil in the Middle East and has an important stake in developments in several neighbouring

situations that are on the Council's agenda. Spain attaches great importance to the Sahel and North Africa as a close neighbour and is also a member of the Group of Friends of Western Sahara. New Zealand, which has said to have no national interest in the conflicts currently on the Council's agenda, has made its independence a key issue of its campaign and argues that this would permit it a more principled Council service.

---

## Potential Council Dynamics in 2015 (con't)

There may be an increase in the number of elected Council members championing conflict prevention and peacebuilding issues next year. All candidates have emphasised their support for conflict prevention, which might clash with some Council members that normally take a more restrictive approach to these issues, advocating for narrowing the Council's actions to tackling mostly armed conflict situations.

In addition, there appears to be a strong desire among all the candidates to enhance the transparency and inclusiveness of the Council's work. Also understandable for countries in campaign mode is the fact that most candidates have pledged to listen to interested stakeholders that are not seated on the Council and to take their perspectives into account. Two current Council members—Chile and Jordan—and a candidate (New Zealand) are members of ACT, an

initiative launched in May 2013 by a group of member states focusing on the Council's working methods, in particular those enhancing non-members' interaction with the Council. Concrete issues that ACT may want to address include, inter alia, the format and conduct of meetings, the annual report to the General Assembly, the allocation of chairs of subsidiary bodies and the penholder issue. The goals of ACT are likely to resonate with Council members that are not members of ACT but are nonetheless committed to enhancing the accountability, effectiveness and legitimacy of the Council.

Along with Jordan, two departing Council members—Australia and Luxembourg—have led on the Council's outcomes on the humanitarian situation in Syria. Although Turkey might join Jordan in working on that issue within the Council, it is unclear how losing two of the three penholders will affect

the work of the Council on this issue.

Finally, the 2014 configuration of the Council has included the largest-ever number of state parties to the Rome Statute (11 Council members). Paradoxically, discussions about the relationship among the ICC, the Council and some African member states have been polarised. While four state parties are exiting the Council (Argentina, Australia, Luxembourg and the Republic of Korea), only three candidates are state parties to the ICC (New Zealand, Spain and Venezuela). Given that Rwanda, which has been very critical of the ICC, is also leaving the Council, there is a degree of uncertainty about how the Council will handle ICC-related issues this year. In most cases, the ICC has not featured prominently in members' campaigns for a Council seat and the few references to accountability in campaign material have been fairly general.

---

## Established Practices in Becoming a Candidate

Most candidate countries follow a fairly standard path in announcing and pursuing their bid for the Council, with the exception of candidates from the African Group, which has a more involved process. If the country is a member of a subregional group, it will often first inform members of its subregional group of its intention to run and seek support. The endorsement of the subregional group then becomes an important factor in the next step.

A candidate country formalises its intention to seek a Security Council seat by

informing the rotating monthly chair of its respective regional group in New York. This is done in writing, specifying the two-year term the country seeks. The chair then incorporates that information into the UN candidacy chart of the regional group, which is maintained by each group and reviewed at monthly group meetings. At this point, most candidate countries prepare a circular note to all missions in New York, informing them of the candidacy. Most candidate countries also send a note to the Secretariat or the President

of the General Assembly or both, although this is not required by the General Assembly's rules of procedure.

As the relevant election year approaches, the regional group may decide to give its endorsement, and nearer to the election date the chair of the regional group will inform the President of the General Assembly of the "clean slate". This becomes a guide to help the Secretariat prepare the relevant documentation for the election process.

---

## Campaigning for the Security Council

Candidates seek commitments from member states to vote for them, often years in advance of the election, and may continue to do so up until the day of the vote. Campaigning for the Security Council requires significant investments of time and financial resources, although funds brought to bear vary greatly depending on a number of factors, including the wealth of the candidate and whether the campaign is contested.

(Candidates predictably tend to spend less in "clean slate" elections.)

Commitments are sought in writing, verbally or both. Member states that promise to vote for a particular candidate do not always keep their word, and as votes are cast by secret ballot, it is not possible to determine which member states might have reneged on their pledges. As a general rule, it is believed that approximately 10 percent

of written commitments and approximately 20 percent of verbal commitments should be subtracted by candidates trying to predict the number of votes they will receive on the day of the election.

There are a number of reasons why pledges may be broken. In some cases, there may not be adequate communication within the pledging government. A high-level official in the capital may pledge to vote for a particular

## Campaigning for the Security Council (con't)

candidate but fail to convey the commitment to the permanent mission to the UN in New York, where the votes are cast. Additionally, if there is a change in government, the new government may not believe that it is committed to uphold the pledges made by the preceding administration. Given the secrecy of the ballot, there are incentives to pledge to all different candidates in a competitive election.

Knowing that commitments are not foolproof, some candidate countries repeatedly cultivate those countries that have already promised to vote for them, seeking reassurances that they have not changed their minds. Candidates often seek pledges from member states at many levels of government. It is believed, for example, that Japan seeks the assurance of at least five key officials from the pledging country, from its head of state or government (or both) to its election officer in its mission to the UN, before considering a commitment to be solid.

As candidate countries generally focus their campaigns on influencing the voting decisions of diplomats in member state capitals and at UN headquarters, the foreign minister and permanent representative to the UN play a key role in the campaign process. Additionally, particularly in contested elections, many candidates employ special envoys who try to secure voting pledges from high-level

officials in various capitals. These envoys are usually former high-level government officials or diplomats. Depending on their campaign strategies and resources, candidate countries may use multiple envoys, often focusing their efforts on particular regions where they do not have strong diplomatic representation.

In order to secure voting commitments from member states, candidate countries may volunteer or be asked for certain inducements. For example, a candidate may offer development assistance to a member state in exchange for its vote, or it may promise that while on the Council it will bring attention to (or avoid) an issue of concern to that member state. Such quid pro quo arrangements are not an uncommon element of the campaign process.

The promotion of candidacies by arranging trips to the capitals or holding workshops on issues of interest (and normally not particularly controversial) in attractive locations has been used by several candidates in the last several years to raise the profile of their campaign and attract permanent representatives (those who will finally cast the vote) to these events. Swag bags filled with items imprinted with the logo of the campaign to be handed out within UN circles is believed to increase the outreach of the campaign. Customarily, on the day of the elections,

permanent representatives are offered gifts by most candidates, even those headed for a “clean slate” election.

As Security Council elections may continue for several rounds, some candidates use a campaign strategy that tries to ensure that member states that vote for them in the first round continue to do so in subsequent rounds, while attempting to secure votes in subsequent rounds from member states that did not commit to voting for them in the first round. Such a strategy can be effective in closely contested elections.

As a result of this strategy by candidate countries to gain second or subsequent round votes, some member states have made the distinction that when they commit their vote to a candidate, they do so for the duration of the electoral process, regardless of the number of rounds. However, member states are sometimes forced to make a difficult choice if, for example, their preferred candidate(s) do not win or obtain the higher result in the first round in a race with two or more candidates.

It should also be noted that member states will often shift their vote in protracted elections that come down to two candidates vying for a single seat, if it appears that their candidate of choice is losing ground and will likely not win the seat.

## Modern Regional Groups and Established Practices

The regional groups for the purposes of elections to the Security Council have been governed by a formula set out in General Assembly resolution 1991 (XVIII), which was adopted in 1963 and took effect in 1965. The key feature of the resolution was amending the UN Charter to increase the number of Council members from 11 to 15. Under that resolution, the seats originally corresponding to the African and Asia-Pacific states were combined. However, in reality, the candidates for elections for the African and Asia-Pacific seats operate separately, and this report reflects that customary practice.

The UN Charter provides that non-permanent members be elected according to equitable geographic distribution. It does not stipulate how that should be achieved. Nor does it

suggest a possible composition of appropriate geographical groups. Nevertheless, the principle of equitable geographic distribution gave rise to the establishment of electoral groups as a vehicle for achieving that goal. The regional groups, as they now operate, are as follows:

Kiribati, which had not been participating in any regional group within the UN, recently joined the Asia-Pacific group. The US is not a member of any group but attends meetings of WEOG as an observer and is considered a member of this group for electoral purposes. Israel, which did not belong to any group for many years, was given temporary membership in WEOG in May 2000, subject to renewal every four years. (Israel has announced that it plans to run for a WEOG seat on the Council in 2018.)

African Group	54 members
Asia-Pacific Group	54 members
Eastern European Group	23 members
GRULAC	33 members
WEOG	28 members

### African Group

Most of the groups have informal understandings that are not codified into actual rules. The African Group is an exception to this in that it has adopted the rules of procedure of the AU Ministerial Committee on Candidatures within the International

## Modern Regional Groups and Established Practices (con't)

System for the selection of candidates to occupy the three African seats on the Council. Subregional groups within the African Group tend to follow a disciplined rotation system. Theoretically, under this system, every country in Africa should eventually get a turn to be a candidate for a seat on the Council.

In most years, this means that the UN membership at large has little choice regarding the African candidates. However, there have been a number of exceptions. The election in 2011 was unusual in that three candidates (Mauritania, Morocco and Togo) ran for two seats. This happened because Mauritania decided to contest the North Africa/Arab swing seat with Morocco, rather than wait its turn in the rotational cycle. Morocco prevailed, as did Togo, which won the seat allocated by the African Group to the West Africa subregion. In 2000, when Sudan was the endorsed candidate, Mauritius decided to contest the seat and won election to the Council.

The African rotation generally follows a systematic cycle based on the following principle:

- Northern Africa and Central Africa rotate running for one seat every odd calendar year;
- Western Africa runs for one seat every odd calendar year; and
- Eastern Africa and Southern Africa rotate running for one seat every even calendar year.

Nonetheless, the picture can become complicated as some countries that can claim to straddle more than one geographic region have at times chosen to shift from one subgroup to another. Challengers can emerge within the same subregional grouping, upsetting the rotation. Candidate countries can often be persuaded to drop out to avoid a competitive election. Moreover, there have been times when rival candidates have emerged and continued all the way through the election. In addition, within a subgroup some countries may choose to run more often, while others choose to run less frequently or not at all.

The process for selecting a candidate in the African Group usually has a defined path. First, the subregional groups select the potential candidate countries and forward their names to the African Group for endorsement. The group submits the candidates to the Committee on Candidatures of

the African Group in New York, which transmits the information to the AU Ministerial Committee on Candidatures. The AU committee follows its written rules of procedure in selecting candidates. (The African Group and the AU are made up of the same members with the exception of Morocco, which is not part of the AU.) Subregional organisations, of which there are several in Africa, may add their endorsement before the list goes to the AU Ministerial Committee. The AU Executive Committee makes the final decision during AU summit meetings. Despite the written rules of procedure for candidate selection, however, some countries in the past have submitted their candidature directly to the AU Ministerial Committee on Candidatures, bypassing the process in New York.

Overall, the system of rotation tends to favour “clean slate” elections. There have been times when this has resulted in the election of candidates that might have struggled in a contested election and whose presence on the Council added little to resolving problems or was counterproductive.

A factor that seems to be coming more into play recently is the growing desire by some member states in the region to be elected more often than strict adherence to the rotation system would allow. Nigeria was elected for the 2014–2015 term after having been a Council member in 2010–2011, and South Africa was on the Council in 2007–2008 and again in 2011–2012. Although some have argued against the “miniaturisation” of the Council by carrying too many small states, smaller countries have suggested that they too contribute to international peace and security and should have the opportunity to serve on the Council.

### Asia-Pacific Group

In 2011, the Asian Group officially changed its name to the Group of Asia and the Pacific Small Island Developing States, also called the Asia-Pacific Group. The name change was made to account for the fact that more than 26 percent of the group’s members are Pacific Island countries.

In the Asia-Pacific Group there are no formally established practices for rotation of the two seats, one of which becomes available every year. While it has almost the same number of countries as the African Group, the Asia-Pacific Group’s wide geographic

span—from the Middle East to Polynesia—has led to much looser regional coordination.

Until the mid-1990s, there was a fairly consistent South Asian presence on the Council, with Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Pakistan rotating seats. In practice, South Asian countries rarely run against each other. (One exception occurred in 1975, when India and Pakistan, contesting the same seat, needed eight rounds before Pakistan finally prevailed.)

Since 1958, Japan has also been a regular presence on the Council. Japan has accumulated 20 years on the Council, which ties it with Brazil for the highest number of years on the Council among non-permanent members, and since 1966, it has never been off the Council for more than six years consecutively. (Japan was last a Council member in 2009–2010, after having served in 2005–2006. It currently intends to contest the 2015 election for a seat in 2016–2017.)

Although it is not the case this year, the lack of a formal rotation system has meant that there frequently is competition for the Asia-Pacific seat regardless of whether a candidate declares itself far in advance. While larger member states have tended to declare their candidacy closer to the election year, smaller candidate countries have tended to announce their decision to run many years ahead of time. The only subgroup within the Asia-Pacific Group that endorses its candidates is the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), made up of Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam. ASEAN endorsed Malaysia as a candidate in 2013.

### The Arab Swing Seat

There is an established practice that spans the Asia-Pacific and African Groups. As discussed in Annex 2 below, General Assembly resolution 1991 A (XVIII) provided five seats for “Asia and Africa” and in practice the seats have been divided into three seats for Africa and two for Asia. In 1967, after Jordan ended its two-year term in what had been the Middle East seat, there was a year with no Arab state on the Council, which coincided with the “Six-Day war”. It appears that at some point there was an informal agreement, although there are no known records, that one seat would be reserved for an Arab state and that Asia and Africa would take turns every

---

## Modern Regional Groups and Established Practices (con't)

two years to provide a suitable candidate. As a result, this seat is often called the “Arab swing seat”. An Arab country has continuously occupied a seat on the Council since 1968.

### Eastern European Group

The Eastern European Group is the smallest UN regional group, consisting of 23 member states, with the election for one seat every odd calendar year. This is the group that has expanded the most in recent decades, with 15 new members since 1991 due to the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the splitting of other states in the region (former Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia). The Eastern European seat was included in the permanent members’ “gentlemen’s agreement” in 1946. But soon thereafter, the meaning of that agreement was contested, with the Soviet Union and the West vying for 20 years to place their preferred candidates in this seat. It also became a hotly contested seat among new member states that did not have a clear regional grouping. (For example in 1955, when there was no Asian seat, the Philippines competed with members of the Eastern European Group for a seat. When the voting remained deadlocked after 36 rounds between the Philippines and Yugoslavia, the two countries agreed to accept a split term: Yugoslavia served on the Council in 1956 and the Philippines in 1957.)

### Western European and Others Group

With 28 members, WEOG is the second-smallest UN regional grouping, and two seats become available to it every even calendar year. Strictly speaking, it is not a geographical group, as it comprises Western Europe plus “others”. Its members, however, share broadly similar levels of economic development and political

values. The “others” subgroup is made up of three members of what was previously called the British Commonwealth Group. The British Commonwealth Group grew rapidly in the late 1950s as states in Africa and Asia became independent. Most of these newly independent states joined the Asian and African Groups and GRULAC. Australia, Canada and New Zealand became the “others” in WEOG. Israel is the other non-European state that participates in WEOG, having been a member since 2000. With France and the UK as members and the US attending meetings as an observer, WEOG also includes three of the five permanent members of the Council. (The Holy See is also an observer in WEOG.)

WEOG practices what might be called an open-market approach to elections, which produces a regular pattern of contested candidatures. This year’s competitive election—which follow competitive elections in 2008 (Austria, Iceland and Turkey), 2010 (Canada, Germany and Portugal) and 2012 (Australia, Finland and Luxembourg)—suggest that WEOG is likely to remain highly competitive in the coming years.

There are several subgroups within WEOG: the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), the CANZ (Canada, Australia and New Zealand) and the Benelux (Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands). There are informal understandings within the Nordic countries and CANZ subgroups that have helped members to support each other’s campaigns.

In its first term on the Council (1951–1952), Turkey served as the Middle Eastern Council member, it occupied the Eastern European seat twice (1954–1955 and 1961) and has ran for the WEOG seat since.

### Latin American and Caribbean Group

After the expansion of the Council and the reorganisation of the UN regional groups that occurred as a result of General Assembly resolution 1991 A (XVIII), the Latin American Group took in the Caribbean states, several of which were members of the British Commonwealth, and became the Group of Latin American and Caribbean states (GRULAC).

Like most of the other groups, GRULAC has no formal rules regarding rotation. For much of the last 60 years, non-Caribbean countries have tended to dominate regional representation. Historically, the group was often able to reach consensus on “clean slates”. However, the group has also produced two of the most protracted and bitterly contested voting sessions in UN history. As mentioned above, in 1979, the contest between Colombia and Cuba went to 154 rounds before Mexico was elected as a compromise candidate in the 155th round. In 2006, there were 47 rounds between Guatemala and Venezuela, with Panama finally coming in as the compromise candidate in the 48th round.

After the difficult 2006 Council elections, GRULAC moved towards a more coordinated system to avoid highly contentious competition in future UN elections. There was an emerging sense that there should only be one candidate running each year and that GRULAC countries should not compete with each other. As noted above, the consensus has begun to crack with respect to elections for the HRC and ECOSOC, and it may not be long before there is competition again for the GRULAC seat in the Security Council.

---

## Special Cases in the Election of Non-Permanent Members

---

Even though an election (in one or more rounds) is the usual way for five non-permanent members to secure a Council seat, there have been several instances in which other procedures were used.

This was the case on 18 October 2013, when Saudi Arabia—which had just been elected to fill one of the five non-permanent seats for the 2014–2015 term along with Chad,

Chile, Lithuania and Nigeria—refused to take its seat. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Saudi Arabia apologised in a statement “for not accepting [the] membership of the Security Council”, citing the double standards of the Council and its failure to tackle the conflict in Syria, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. The decision

was formally conveyed in a 12 November letter addressed to the Secretary-General. The unprecedented move led to questions about the process to fill the vacant seat. The two main options were for the General Assembly to hold an extraordinary election or for the President of the General Assembly to appoint a member after consultations with member states. The first option was chosen,

## Special Cases in the Election of Non-Permanent Members (con't)

TERM	MEMBER STATES INVOLVED	NUMBER OF ROUNDS COMPLETED	KEY DOCUMENTS
1956–1957	Yugoslavia and Philippines	36	<a href="#">A/PV.560</a> (20 December 1955) was the meeting where Yugoslavia was elected. <a href="#">A/PV.612</a> (7 December 1956) was the meeting where Philippines was elected.
1960–1961	Poland and Turkey	52	<a href="#">A/PV.857</a> (12 December 1959) was the meeting where Poland was elected. <a href="#">A/PV.941</a> (9 December 1960) was the meeting where Turkey was elected.
1961–1962	Liberia and Ireland	14	<a href="#">A/PV.959</a> (20 December 1960) was the meeting where Liberia was elected. <a href="#">A/PV.1044</a> (30 October 1961) was the meeting where Ireland was elected.
1962–1963	Romania and Philippines	10	<a href="#">A/PV.1068</a> (1 December 1961) was the meeting where Romania was elected. <a href="#">A/PV.1154</a> (17 October 1962) was the meeting where Philippines was elected.
1964–1965	Czechoslovakia and Malaysia	12	<a href="#">A/PV.1254</a> (1 November 1963) was the meeting where Czechoslovakia was elected. <a href="#">A/PV.1313</a> (29 December 1964) was the meeting where Malaysia was elected [consultations by the President].

and Jordan submitted its formal candidacy to fill the vacant seat on 18 November. After being endorsed by the Arab and Asia-Pacific Groups (19 and 22 November, respectively), Jordan was elected in a 6 December meeting of the General Assembly.

There were several occasions when extraordinary elections were held following the withdrawal of an elected member to the Council, as a result of a one-year agreement with another member state. Following multiple non-conclusive rounds of vote, the two contenders would agree to split the term. After the end of the first year on the Council, the member that was elected would first withdraw, thus allowing for an extraordinary election to take place. Some of the results of the elections were contested in the General Assembly, with claims that they did not respect the criteria of equitable geographical distribution contained in Article 23(1) of the UN Charter.

In 1955, an attempt by the President of the General Assembly to break an impasse in the election between the Philippines and

Yugoslavia and warning against the discrediting of the organisation got the two contenders to agree to a split term for the first time. After the representatives of these countries drew lots on the President's office and agreed on the order to their one-year term, the gentlemen's agreement was presented to the General Assembly, where it was met by resistance and the objections or reservations of at least 17 delegations. However, the agreement was upheld and a trend started to occasionally resort to split terms, validated by the balloting of the General Assembly.

A procedure that has been used only once was the selection of non-permanent members following consultations by the President of the General Assembly. In December 1964, there were four candidates—Jordan, Mali, the Netherlands and Uruguay—competing for three seats for the 1965–1966 term on the Council. (Malaysia had been automatically selected to serve on the Council for one year following an agreement with Czechoslovakia after inconclusive 1963 elections.) Fearing that an election would be protracted and

inconclusive, as they had been in the previous years, the President of the General Assembly proposed an alternative way of selecting the incoming non-permanent members of the Security Council ([A/PV.1312](#)). Indicating that the procedure would not constitute a precedent, he would consult privately with member states, soliciting their preferences among the candidates anonymously and in writing. On the afternoon of 29 December, the President informed the General Assembly that as a result of the consultations, the Netherlands and Uruguay would be awarded two-year terms. Following further consultations, he announced on 30 December that an agreement had been brokered between Jordan and Mali to serve a split term (one year each). The General Assembly did not object to the procedure, and the candidates were selected as suggested, although three countries—Albania, Cambodia and Indonesia—expressed reservations about the process. Due to the enlargement of the Security Council in 1965—from 11 to 15 members—Jordan served a complete two-year term.

## UN Documents on Security Council Elections

### GENERAL ASSEMBLY DOCUMENTS

[A/68/PV.61](#) (6 December 2013) and [A/68/PV.34](#) (17 October 2013) were the plenary records of the 2013 elections of non-permanent members.

[A/68/599](#) (12 November 2013) was a letter from Saudi Arabia to the Secretary-General formalising the country's decision not to accept the membership to the Security Council.

[A/67/PV.27](#) (18 October 2012) was the plenary record of the 2012 elections of non-permanent members.

[A/59/881](#) (20 July 2005) was a note verbale from Costa Rica containing information on elections from 1946 to 2004.

[A/55/463](#) (9 October 2000) was the letter from Uganda on Sudan's candidature.

[A/RES 1991 A \(XVIII\)](#) (17 December 1963) was the resolution adopting amendments to the Charter on the composition of the Council and establishing the allocation of seats to various regions.

[GAOR 1st Session, Part 1, 14th Plenary Session and Part II](#) (12 January 1946) was the first election of non-permanent members.

---

# UN Documents on Security Council Elections (con't)

## OTHER

UN Charter

A/520/Rev.15 and amendment 1 and 2 are the rules

of procedure of the General Assembly, including amendments and additions.

[Repertory of Practice of the United Nations Organs, Supplement 6, Volume III on Article 23](#) See <http://www.un.org/en/sc/repertoire/> for the online version of the Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council.

www.un.org/en/sc/repertoire/ for the online version of the Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council.

---

## Useful Additional Resources

*The Procedure of the UN Security Council*, Sydney Bailey and Sam Daws, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

*Fifteen Men on a Powder Keg: A History of the UN Security Council*, Andrew Boyd, (New York: Stein and Day, 1971).

*The pernicious consequences of UN Security Council membership*, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and Alastair Smith, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol. 54, No. 5, 2010.

*The United Nations Security Council and the rally 'round the flag effect*, Terrence L. Chapman and Dan Reiter, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol. 48, No. 6, 2004.

*The determinants of election to the United Nations Security Council*, Axel Dreher et al, CESifo Working Paper Series, No. 3902, 2012.

*The United Nations Security Council in the Age of Human Rights*, Jared Genser and Bruno Stagno

Ugarte (eds.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

*Reforming the United Nations: Lessons from a History in Progress*, Edward Luck, *International Relations Studies and the United Nations Occasional Papers*, No.1, 2003.

*Eyes on the Prize: The Quest for Non-permanent Seats on the UN Security Council*, David Malone, *Global Governance*, vol. 6, No. 1, January–March 2000.

*Politics and Change in the Security Council*, Norman J. Padelford, *International Organisation*, vol. 14, No.3, Summer 1960.

*A History of the United Nations Charter*, Ruth Russell, The Brookings Institute, 1958.

*The Once and Future Security Council*, Bruce Russett (ed.), (New York: St Martin's Press, 1997).

*The Charter of the United Nations, A Commentary*,

Bruno Simma et al (eds.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

*What is Equitable Geographic Representation in the Twenty-First Century?*, Ramesh Thakur (ed.), *International Peace Academy, Seminar Report*, 26 March 1999.

*The Oxford Handbook on the United Nations*, Thomas G. Weiss and Sam Daws (eds.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

*Taking Stock, Moving Forward, Report to the Foreign Ministry of Finland on the 2012 Elections to the United Nations Security Council*, *International Peace Institute*, April 2013

*Rules of Procedure of the AU Ministerial Committee on Candidatures within the International System*, Doc. EX.CL/213 (VIII)

*United Nations Handbook 2013–2014* published by the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

---

## Annex 1: Rules and Process for Election to the Council: Relevant Charter Provisions and Rules of Procedure

### Charter Provisions on Election to the Council

The UN Charter, in article 23, specifies the number of non-permanent members to be elected:

*The General Assembly shall elect ten other Members of the United Nations to be non-permanent members of the Security Council...*

It also stipulates the length of their term:

*The non-permanent members...shall be elected for a term of two years.*

The practical impact of rotation occurring every two years is mitigated by staggering the cycle, so that the General Assembly elects five members each year for the stipulated two-year period. This was determined by rule 142 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Despite the specification of a two-year term, there have been exceptions when members have served shorter terms. There have been one-year terms, either to break electoral deadlocks or to establish the required rotational cycle.

Article 23 also contains a provision that ensures that no member can become a de facto permanent member by being re-elected to serve continuously in the Council:

*A retiring member shall not be eligible for immediate re-election.*

This is further reinforced by rule 144 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which also states that a retiring member of the Council will not be eligible for immediate re-election.

In addition to the provisions stated above, the Charter also specifies the criteria that the members of the General Assembly should

apply when considering which countries should be elected to serve on the Council. It provides in article 23 that due regard shall be:

*...specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution.*

“[C]ontribution ... to the maintenance of international peace and security” is often interpreted in this context as levels of contribution to human or financial contributions for peacekeeping operations and peace processes. “[C]ontribution ... to the other purposes of the Organization”, by contrast, is a very wide term. In recent years, most discussions regarding article 23 at the General Assembly have focused on the criteria of equitable geographical distribution, with issues related to

---

## Annex 1: Rules and Process for Election to the Council: Relevant Charter Provisions and Rules of Procedure (con't)

the candidates' contribution to international peace and security being left aside.

A key procedural provision of the Charter that is relevant to Security Council elections is article 18(2). This requires a two-thirds majority vote in the General Assembly on important questions. Under that article, election to the Council is defined as an important question.

In addition, article 18(3) defines the required majority by reference to members present and voting. This refers to members casting an affirmative or negative vote. Members who abstain from voting are considered not voting.

### Relevant Rules of Procedure

Voting, especially during elections to the Security Council, can sometimes produce tense and dramatic situations on the floor of the General Assembly. In such circumstances, understanding the relevant rules of procedure can become very important.

Rule 88 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly indicates that once the president of the General Assembly announces the commencement of voting, the process can only be interrupted on a point of order regarding the conduct of the vote. Furthermore, explanations of vote are not permitted when votes are cast by secret ballot.

Elections are governed by rules 92, 93 and

94 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under rule 92, elections to the Council are held by secret ballot. Nominations are not required. Countries simply declare their intention to run, sometimes many years ahead, either by circular note to all members of the UN or to the chair of their regional grouping, or both.

Rule 93 sets out the procedure that applies when there is only one vacancy to be filled and no candidate obtains the required two-thirds majority in the first ballot. It provides that:

*...a second ballot shall be taken, which shall be restricted to the two candidates obtaining the largest number of votes...if a two-thirds majority is required the balloting shall be continued until one candidate secures two-thirds of the votes cast...*

What this first part of rule 93 means is that if there are more than two candidates and there is no clear winner on the first ballot, the lower-polling candidates drop out and the contest then continues to a second ballot between the top two candidates. The effect of rule 93 is that voting simply continues until one candidate prevails, either by securing the required majority or because the other withdraws.

If neither candidate receives the required

majority on the second and third ballots, rule 93 says that after the third inconclusive ballot, votes may be cast for “*an eligible ... Member*”. This allows new candidates to come into the process, and the fourth ballot is therefore technically referred to as an unrestricted ballot. (It also allows any candidate excluded after the first restricted ballot to come back again.)

If a result is not achieved after three of these unrestricted ballots, rule 93 requires that the pool again be reduced to the top two. This cycle then repeats until a result is achieved. The emergence of new candidates during the unrestricted stage is rare but not unprecedented. If a trend is starting to emerge in one direction after a succession of inconclusive ballots, it is not unusual for the candidate with fewer votes to withdraw.

Rule 94 is similar to rule 93 but is applied when there are two or more seats to be filled.

*When two or more elective places are to be filled at one time under the same conditions, those candidates obtaining in the first ballot the majority required shall be elected.*

Rule 94 also specifies that if additional rounds of voting are required, the pool is reduced by a formula that says that remaining candidates should not be more than twice the number of places available.

---

## Annex 2: Historical Background

When the UN was established in 1945, the Charter provided for 11 members of the Security Council: five permanent members and six elected members.

Article 23(2) included a provision that in the first election of Council members, three members would be chosen for a period of one year so that in the future three new members could be elected annually. This was decided by drawing lots for the one- and two-year terms.

In the first election, on 12 January 1946, the following countries were elected: Australia, Brazil, Egypt, Mexico, the Netherlands and Poland. The pattern of geographical

distribution was: two seats for Latin America, one for the Middle East, one for Eastern Europe, one for Western Europe and one for the British Commonwealth.

The interpretation of what equitable geographic distribution should mean in terms of seats was based on an informal agreement among the permanent members, sometimes known as the London Agreement. From the start there was a lack of agreement about what had been agreed to. The US saw the 1946 formula as only applying to the first election, but the Soviet Union maintained that there had been a gentlemen's agreement of a more general nature for the future

meaning of geographic distribution.

The Charter clearly specifies a two-year term for elected members of the Council, but in addition to the 1946–47 period, split terms started to occur in the late 1950s until the Council was enlarged in 1965. This was in part driven by fall-out from the disagreement over regional rotation and associated Cold War politics. But the aspirations of newly independent countries were also an important factor. The first example of this was seen in 1955 when the Philippines and Poland contested a seat. After four inconclusive ballots, Poland withdrew and Yugoslavia declared its candidacy. However, the stalemate continued, and

## Annex 2: Historical Background (con't)

after two months and more than 30 rounds of voting, it was informally agreed that the Philippines would withdraw and that Yugoslavia would resign after one year, at which point the Philippines would run as the only candidate for that seat. As explained in detail above, over the next few years, this became an increasingly common occurrence.

By the early 1960s, there was a growing acceptance that the original composition of the Council had become inequitable and unbalanced. Between 1945 and 1965, UN membership rose from 51 to 117 member states, with the proportion of Asian, African

and Caribbean states increasing from 25 percent to about 50 percent. On 17 December 1963, the General Assembly adopted resolution 1991 A (XVIII), which contained amendments to the Charter to address the issue by increasing the number of elected members to ten. The resolution also dealt with the issue of geographic distribution, which was resolved as follows:

- five elected members from the African and Asian states (subsequently subdivided in practice into two seats for the Asian Group and three seats for the African Group);
- one from the Eastern European states;

- two from the Latin American states (including the Caribbean); and
- two from the Western European states and other states (including Australia, Canada and New Zealand).

At the same time, article 27 was altered so that resolutions of the Council required the vote of nine members instead of seven. This also meant that for the first time the permanent members could be out-voted by non-permanent members, although only on procedural questions.

## Annex 3: Results of Recent Elections for Non-Permanent Members of the Security Council

The left-hand column lists the year and the UN General Assembly Session in which the voting was held, as well as the number of the plenary meetings (the ordinal numbers) and the date of meetings. The middle column

reflects the highest number of votes and abstentions in a given round of elections. (The number of votes cast to fill the different seats in a given round is not always the same.) Candidate countries that won the election are in

bold. A table with the complete results can be found in the PDF of the *Special Research Report on Security Council Elections 2014* at [www.securitycouncilreport.org](http://www.securitycouncilreport.org).

GA SESSION	ELECTION ROUNDS	CANDIDATE COUNTRIES AND VOTES
<b>1995 UNGA50</b> 53rd 08-11-95	<b>1 ROUND</b> Round 1: 177 votes, 7 abstentions	<b>Chile</b> 168, <b>Egypt</b> 159, <b>Republic of Korea</b> 156, <b>Guinea-Bissau</b> 128, <b>Poland</b> 128, Benin 60, Albania 48, Ghana 1, Mexico 1, Tunisia 1
<b>1996 UNGA51</b> 39th 21-10-96	<b>2 ROUNDS</b> Round 1: 181 votes, 1 abstention Round 2: 181 votes, 9 abstentions, restricted	<b>Kenya</b> 172, <b>Sweden</b> 153, <b>Japan</b> 142, Portugal 112, Costa Rica 105, Australia 91, Bolivia 73, India 40, Colombia 1, Dominican Republic 1 <b>Costa Rica</b> 167, <b>Portugal</b> 124, Australia 57, Bolivia 5 [withdrew]
<b>1997 UNGA52</b> 30th 14-10-97	<b>1 ROUND</b> Round 1: 174 votes, 6 abstentions	<b>Bahrain</b> 172, <b>Gabon</b> 171, <b>Gambia</b> 169, <b>Brazil</b> 167, <b>Slovenia</b> 140, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 30, Argentina 1, Zambia 1
<b>1998 UNGA53</b> 33rd 08-10-98	<b>1 ROUND</b> Round 1: 176 votes, 4 abstentions	<b>Malaysia</b> 174, <b>Argentina</b> 171, <b>Namibia</b> 167, <b>Canada</b> 131, <b>Netherlands</b> 122, Greece 87, Chile 1, Philippines 1, Senegal 1, Zimbabwe 1
<b>1999 UNGA54</b> 34th 14-10-99	<b>4 ROUNDS</b> Round 1: 172 votes Round 2: 170 votes, restricted Round 3: 170 votes, restricted Round 4: 167 votes, 6 abstentions, restricted	<b>Bangladesh</b> 172, <b>Tunisia</b> 172, <b>Mali</b> 171, <b>Jamaica</b> 171, Ukraine 92, Slovakia 79 Ukraine 98, Slovakia 72 Ukraine 113, Slovakia 57 [withdrew] <b>Ukraine</b> 158, Slovakia 3

## Annex 3: Results of Recent Elections for Non-Permanent Members of the Security Council (con't)

GA SESSION	ELECTION ROUNDS	CANDIDATE COUNTRIES AND VOTES
<b>2000 UNGA55</b> 32nd 10-10-00	<b>4 ROUNDS</b> Round 1: 173 votes, 5 abstentions  Round 2: 173 votes, 6 abstentions, restricted Round 3: 173 votes, 4 abstentions, restricted Round 4: 173 votes, 5 abstentions, restricted	<b>Colombia</b> 168, <b>Singapore</b> 168, <b>Ireland</b> 130, Norway 114, Italy 94, Mauritius 95, Sudan 69  Mauritius 102, Norway 100, Italy 70, Sudan 65 Mauritius 110, Norway 110, Italy 62, Sudan 58 <b>Norway</b> 115, <b>Mauritius</b> 113, Italy 57, Sudan 55
<b>2001 UNGA56</b> 23rd 08-10-01	<b>2 ROUNDS</b> Round 1: 177 votes, 2 abstentions  Round 2: 178 votes, restricted	<b>Guinea</b> 173, <b>Cameroon</b> 172, <b>Syrian Arab Republic</b> 160, <b>Bulgaria</b> 120, Mexico 116, Dominican Republic 60, Belarus 53, Dominica 1 <b>Mexico</b> 138, Dominican Republic 40
<b>2002 UNGA57</b> 20th 27-09-02	<b>1 ROUND</b> Round 1: 183 votes, 5 abstentions	<b>Angola</b> 181, <b>Germany</b> 180, <b>Spain</b> 180, <b>Chile</b> 178, <b>Pakistan</b> 172, India 1
<b>2003 UNGA58</b> 42nd 23-10-03	<b>1 ROUND</b> Round 1: 182 votes, 7 abstentions	<b>Benin</b> 181, <b>Philippines</b> 179, <b>Algeria</b> 178, <b>Brazil</b> 177, <b>Romania</b> 174, Argentina 1, Poland 1, Republic of Korea 1
<b>2004 UNGA59</b> 32nd 15-10-04	<b>1 ROUND</b> Round 1: 189 votes, 1 abstention	<b>Argentina</b> 188, <b>Greece</b> 187, <b>United Republic of Tanzania</b> 186, <b>Japan</b> 184, <b>Denmark</b> 181, Bhutan 1
<b>2005 UNGA60</b> 29th 10-10-05	<b>1 ROUND</b> Round 1: 191 votes, 6 abstentions	<b>Congo</b> 188, <b>Qatar</b> 186, <b>Slovakia</b> 185, <b>Ghana</b> 184, <b>Peru</b> 144, Nicaragua 43, Indonesia 1
<b>2006 UNGA 61</b> 32nd 16-10-06	<b>48 ROUNDS</b> Round 1: 192 votes, 7 abstentions  Round 2: 192 votes, 4 abstentions, restricted Round 3: 191 votes, 5 abstentions, restricted Round 4: 191 votes, 6 abstentions, restricted	<b>Italy</b> 186, <b>South Africa</b> 186, <b>Belgium</b> 180, <b>Indonesia</b> 158, Guatemala 109, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 76, Nepal 28 Guatemala 114, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 74 Guatemala 116, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 70 Guatemala 110, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 75
33rd 16-10-06	Round 5: 192 votes, 5 abstentions, unrestricted Round 6: 192 votes, 5 abstentions, unrestricted Round 7: 192 votes, 5 abstentions, unrestricted	Guatemala 103, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 83, Mexico 1 Guatemala 93, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 93, Mexico 1 Guatemala 96, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 89, Cuba 1, Mexico 1
34th 17-10-06	Round 8: 192 votes, 5 abstentions, restricted Round 9: 192 votes, 4 abstentions, restricted Round 10: 191 votes, 4 abstentions, restricted Round 11: 191 votes, 8 abstentions, unrestricted Round 12: 191 votes, 7 abstentions, unrestricted Round 13: 192 votes, 5 abstentions, unrestricted Round 14: 191 votes, 7 abstentions, restricted Round 15: 192 votes, 7 abstentions, restricted	Guatemala 102, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 85 Guatemala 107, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 81 Guatemala 110, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 77 Guatemala 107, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 76 Guatemala 107, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 77 Guatemala 112, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 75 Guatemala 108, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 76 Guatemala 107, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 78 Guatemala 108, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 76
35th 17-10-06	Round 16: 192 votes, 8 abstentions, restricted Round 17: 190 votes, 8 abstentions, unrestricted Round 18: 191 votes, 6 abstentions, unrestricted Round 19: 192 votes, 6 abstentions, unrestricted Round 20: 192 votes, 9 abstentions, restricted	Guatemala 104, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 78 Guatemala 100, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 85 Guatemala 107, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 79 Guatemala 102, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 81

## Annex 3: Results of Recent Elections for Non-Permanent Members of the Security Council (con't)

GA SESSION	ELECTION ROUNDS	CANDIDATE COUNTRIES AND VOTES
36th 19-10-06	Round 21: 192 votes, 12 abstentions, restricted Round 22: 191 votes, 12 abstentions, restricted Round 23: 190 votes, 5 abstentions, unrestricted Round 24: 192 votes, 7 abstentions, unrestricted Round 25: 192 votes, 8 abstentions, unrestricted Round 26: 191 votes, 7 abstentions, restricted Round 27: 191 votes, 8 abstentions, restricted Round 28: 192 votes, 8 abstentions, restricted Round 29: 192 votes, 7 abstentions, unrestricted	Guatemala 101, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 79 Guatemala 102, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 77 Guatemala 108, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 77 Guatemala 106, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 79 Guatemala 103, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 81 Guatemala 104, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 80 Guatemala 105, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 78 Guatemala 105, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 79 Guatemala 107, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 77, Costa Rica 1
37th 19-10-06	Round 30: 192 votes, 7 abstentions, unrestricted Round 31: 192 votes, 6 abstentions, unrestricted Round 32: 189 votes, 6 abstentions, restricted Round 33: 191 votes, 6 abstentions, restricted Round 34: 190 votes, 6 abstentions, restricted Round 35: 191 votes, 7 abstentions, unrestricted	Guatemala 107, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 77, Bolivia 1 Guatemala 108, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 77, Bolivia 1 Guatemala 107, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 76 Guatemala 108, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 77 Guatemala 108, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 76 Guatemala 103, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 81 Guatemala 109, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 72 Guatemala 107, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 78, Chile 1 Guatemala 105, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 77 Guatemala 105, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 78 Guatemala 101, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 84 Guatemala 100, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 82, Chile 1, Dominican Republic 1
40th 25-10-06	Round 36: 187 votes, 6 abstentions, unrestricted Round 37: 192 votes, 6 abstentions, unrestricted Round 38: 187 votes, 5 abstentions, restricted Round 39: 189 votes, 6 abstentions, restricted Round 40: 190 votes, 5 abstentions, restricted Round 41: 190 votes, 6 abstentions, unrestricted	Guatemala 105, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 75, Uruguay 1 Guatemala 106, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 78, Ecuador 2, Jamaica 1 Guatemala 106, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 76 Guatemala 104, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 78 Guatemala 101, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 79 Guatemala 101, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 78, Barbados 1, Ecuador 1, Uruguay 1
44th 31-10-06	Round 42: 186 votes, 5 abstentions, unrestricted Round 43: 191 votes, 4 abstentions, unrestricted Round 44: 189 votes, 7 abstentions, restricted Round 45: 189 votes, 7 abstentions, restricted Round 46: 188 votes, 8 abstentions, restricted Round 47: 189 votes, 7 abstentions, unrestricted	Guatemala 100, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 82, Chile 1, Dominican Republic 1 Guatemala 105, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 75, Uruguay 1 Guatemala 106, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 78, Ecuador 2, Jamaica 1 Guatemala 106, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 76 Guatemala 104, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 78 Guatemala 101, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 79 Guatemala 101, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 78, Barbados 1, Ecuador 1, Uruguay 1
49th 07-11-06	Round 48: 189 votes, 9 abstentions, unrestricted	<b>Panama</b> 164, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 11, Guatemala 4, Barbados 1
<b>2007 UNGA62</b>	<b>3 ROUNDS</b>	
26th 16-10-07	Round 1: 190 votes, 4 abstentions Round 2: 190 votes, 3 abstentions, restricted Round 3: 189 votes, 9 abstentions, restricted	<b>Burkina Faso</b> 185, <b>Viet Nam</b> 183, <b>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya</b> 178, Costa Rica 116, Croatia 95, Czech Republic 91, Dominican Republic 72, Mauritania 2, Senegal 1 Costa Rica 119, Croatia 106, Czech Republic 81, Dominican Republic 70 <b>Croatia</b> 184, <b>Costa Rica</b> 179, Czech Republic 1, Dominican Republic 1
<b>2008 UNGA63</b>	<b>1 ROUND</b>	
28th 17-10-08	Round 1: 192 votes, 6 abstentions	<b>Mexico</b> 185, <b>Uganda</b> 181, <b>Japan</b> 158, <b>Turkey</b> 151, <b>Austria</b> 133, Iceland 87, Iran (Islamic Republic of) 32, Madagascar 2, Australia 1, Brazil 1
<b>2009 UNGA64</b>	<b>1 ROUND</b>	
20th 15-10-09	Round 1: 190 votes, 7 abstentions	<b>Nigeria</b> 186, <b>Gabon</b> 184, <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> 183, <b>Brazil</b> 182, <b>Lebanon</b> 180, Iran (Islamic Republic of) 1, Liberia 1, Sierra Leone 1, Togo 1, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) 1

## Annex 3: Results of Recent Elections for Non-Permanent Members of the Security Council (con't)

GA SESSION	ELECTION ROUNDS	CANDIDATE COUNTRIES AND VOTES
<b>2010 UNGA65</b>	<b>3 ROUNDS</b>	
28th 12-10-10	Round 1: 191 votes, 5 abstentions	<b>India</b> 187, <b>Colombia</b> 186, <b>South Africa</b> 182, <b>Germany</b> 128, Portugal 122, Canada 114, Pakistan 1, Swaziland 1
	Round 2: 191 votes, restricted	Portugal 113, Canada 78
	Round 3: 184 votes, 2 abstentions, restricted	<b>Portugal</b> 150, Canada 32
<b>2011 UNGA66</b>	<b>17 ROUNDS</b>	
37th 21-10-2011	Round 1: 193 votes, 2 abstentions	<b>Guatemala</b> 191, <b>Morocco</b> 151, <b>Pakistan</b> 129, Togo 119, Mauritania 98, Azerbaijan 74, Slovenia 67, Kyrgyzstan 55, Hungary 52, Fiji 1
	Round 2: 193 votes, 2 abstentions, restricted	Togo 119, Slovenia 97, Azerbaijan 90, Mauritania 72
	Round 3: 193 votes, 1 abstention, restricted	<b>Togo</b> 131, Slovenia 99, Azerbaijan 93, Mauritania 61
38th 21-10-11	Round 4: 192 votes, 1 abstention, restricted	Slovenia 98, Azerbaijan 93
	Round 5: 193 votes, 1 abstention, unrestricted	Azerbaijan 98, Slovenia 93, Hungary 1
	Round 6: 193 votes, 1 abstention, unrestricted	Azerbaijan 96, Slovenia 95, Estonia 1
	Round 7: 193 votes, 1 abstention, unrestricted	Azerbaijan 100, Slovenia 91, Estonia 1
	Round 8: 191 votes, 1 abstention, restricted	Azerbaijan 110, Slovenia 80
	Round 9: 191 votes, 1 abstention, restricted	Azerbaijan 113, Slovenia 77
39th 24-10-11	Round 10: 193 votes, restricted	Azerbaijan 110, Slovenia 83
40th 24-10-11	Round 11: 193 votes, 1 abstention, unrestricted	Azerbaijan 110, Slovenia 82
	Round 12: 193 votes, 1 abstention, unrestricted	Azerbaijan 111, Slovenia 81
	Round 13: 192 votes, 1 abstention, unrestricted	Azerbaijan 111, Slovenia 80
	Round 14: 192 votes, 1 abstention, restricted	Azerbaijan 110, Slovenia 81
	Round 15: 193 votes, restricted	Azerbaijan 117, Slovenia 76
	Round 16: 193 votes, restricted	Azerbaijan 116, Slovenia 77
	Round 17: 193 votes, 24 abstentions, unrestricted	<b>Azerbaijan</b> 155, Slovenia 13, Hungary 1
<b>2012 UNGA67</b>	<b>2 ROUNDS</b>	
27th 18-10-2012	Round 1: 193 votes, 8 abstentions	<b>Argentina</b> 182, <b>Rwanda</b> 148, <b>Australia</b> 140, Luxembourg 128, Republic of Korea 116, Finland 108, Cambodia 62, Bhutan 20, United Republic of Tanzania 3, Barbados 1, Cuba 1, Democratic Republic of the Congo 1
	Round 2: 192 votes, restricted	<b>Republic of Korea</b> 149, <b>Luxembourg</b> 131, Finland 62, Cambodia 43
<b>2013 UNGA68</b>	<b>1 ROUND AND A SPECIAL ELECTION</b>	
34th 17-10-2013	Round 1: 191 votes, 5 abstentions	<b>Lithuania</b> 187, <b>Chile</b> 186, <b>Nigeria</b> 186, <b>Chad</b> 184, <b>Saudi Arabia</b> 176 (declined), Senegal 2, The Gambia 2, Lebanon 1, Croatia 1
61st 6-12-2013	Round 1: 185 votes, 4 abstentions	<b>Jordan</b> 178, <b>Saudi Arabia</b> 1

The material in this publication is subject to copyright ownership. Material in this publication may be freely used as in the public domain. You are free to copy, distribute, or make derivative works of the work under the following conditions: you must attribute the work to Security Council Report, Inc.; you may not use this work for commercial purposes; if you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under a license identical to this one.

#### Security Council Report Staff

**Joanna Weschler**  
Deputy Executive Director &  
Director of Research

**Amanda Roberts**  
Coordinating Editor &  
Senior Research Analyst

**Shamala Kandiah Thompson**  
What's in Blue Editor & Senior  
Research Analyst

**Astrid Forberg Ryan**  
Senior Research Analyst &  
Development Officer

**Victor Casanova Abos**  
Research Analyst

**Charles Cater**  
Research Analyst

**Dahlia Morched**  
Research Analyst & Communications  
Coordinator

**Paul Romita**  
Research Analyst

**Eran Sthoeger**  
Research Analyst

**Benjamin Villanti**  
Research Analyst

**Robbin VanNewkirk**  
Publications Coordinator

**Vladimir Sesar**  
Research Associate

**Lindiwe Knutson**  
Research Assistant

**Maritza Tenerelli**  
Administrative Assistant

**Marie-Eve Loisele**  
Endeavor Fellow

**Stevenson Swanson**  
Editorial Consultant

Security Council Report is a non-profit organisation supported by the Governments of Angola, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and Uruguay, and the Ford Foundation and John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.

Design Point Five, NY

**Security Council Report**  
One Dag Hammarskjöld Plaza  
885 2nd Ave at 48th St, 21st Floor  
New York NY 10017

**Telephone** +1 212 759 6394  
**Fax** +1 212 759 4038  
**Web** [securitycouncilreport.org](http://securitycouncilreport.org)  
[whatsinblue.org](http://whatsinblue.org)

