



# Security Council

Fifty-sixth year

**4432**<sup>nd</sup> meeting

Friday, 30 November 2001, 11.55 a.m.  
New York

*Provisional*

---

<i>President:</i>	Miss Durrant . . . . .	(Jamaica)
<i>Members:</i>	Bangladesh . . . . .	Mr. Chowdhury
	China . . . . .	Mr. Wang Yingfan
	Colombia . . . . .	Mr. Franco
	France . . . . .	Mr. Doutriaux
	Ireland . . . . .	Mr. Corr
	Mali . . . . .	Mr. Kassé
	Mauritius . . . . .	Mr. Koonjul
	Norway . . . . .	Mr. Strømme
	Russian Federation . . . . .	Mr. Lavrov
	Singapore . . . . .	Mr. Mahbubani
	Tunisia . . . . .	Mr. Jerandi
	Ukraine . . . . .	Mr. Kuchinsky
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . . . .	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America . . . . .	Mr. Cunningham

## Agenda

Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month

Letter dated 7 November 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Jamaica to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/1055)

---

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.



*The meeting was called to order at 11.55 a.m.*

### **Adoption of the agenda**

*The agenda was adopted.*

### **Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month**

#### **Letter dated 7 November 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Jamaica to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/1055)**

**The President:** The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2001/1055, which contains the text of a letter dated 7 November 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Jamaica to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

I now wish to make statement.

At the beginning of Jamaica's presidency of the Security Council this month, we underscored that one of our main objectives would be to support initiatives that would promote sustainable peace and security. While seeking to advance the peace process on all the issues before the Council, it was our aim to continue to pay particular attention to the humanitarian effects of conflicts and to the protection of civilians in armed conflict, in particular the most vulnerable — women and children.

Against this background, our programme for the month sought to highlight several conflict situations with the aim of encouraging a more proactive Security Council response. In so doing, we hoped to build confidence and trust between the Security Council and various actors, demonstrating the commitment of the Council to respond meaningfully to these crises.

As Jamaica approaches its final month in the Security Council, we believe that this wrap-up meeting provides an opportune moment to reflect on the dynamics for change within the Security Council, which will enhance the Council's capacity in its role as a vital organ of the United Nations. The notes for the wrap-up meeting, which were circulated, raised a

number of issues and posed some questions on which we invited members to comment and to offer their recommendations.

The first one relates to transparency. There have been considerable improvements in the transparency of the Security Council through open meetings and briefings and meetings between the President of the Council and affected or interested Member States, representatives of institutions and non-governmental organizations. Are there other ways in which the Council can interact with Member States and others, in order to share in their views on issues before the Council?

Secondly, Council members often receive information from press reports on initiatives taken by individual Member States, groups of States and/or organizations on issues of which the Council is seized. Should Council members be satisfied that this is an appropriate source of information in the exercise of their responsibilities, or should we establish a practice whereby the Council receives briefings on a timely basis from these actors?

Thirdly, drawing on the experience of the ministerial week, would it serve the interest of peace and security if important issues before the Council were discussed more frequently at the ministerial level?

Fourthly — and this relates to thematic debates — there have been a number of thematic debates in the Security Council that have led to several recommendations for the issues involved to be examined in respect of specific conflict situations. How can we ensure that the outcomes of these debates are mainstreamed in the resolutions of the Security Council and the reports of the Secretary-General?

Finally, over the past two years, in addition, the use of Security Council missions to areas of conflict has proved to be a very effective tool in the confidence-building between the various actors and the Security Council. Should Security Council missions be used more frequently, particularly in more difficult situations before the Council, as a means of advancing the peace?

As there is no list of speakers for this meeting, I would invite members of the Council, as we do in informal consultations, to indicate when they wish to take the floor in the course of our discussion.

**Mr. Koonjul** (Mauritius): Let me start by warmly congratulating you, Madam President, and your formidable team on a most successful presidency of the Security Council during the month of November. The agenda of the Security Council under the Jamaican presidency has been most diverse in its range of issues and has given us the opportunity to hear in this Chamber the views of a very large number of ministers, political leaders and other personalities on the subjects on which the Council has been working.

Despite the very heavy schedule occasioned by the unexpected — or, rather, I would say the expected unexpected — the Jamaican delegation has indeed fulfilled the objectives it had set out at the beginning of the month. Conflicts in Africa, the situation in Afghanistan and the predicament of civilians, in particular children in armed conflict, have been fully addressed during the month of November.

The focus on Africa in your programme of work, Madam, clearly demonstrates the commitment of the Jamaican delegation to advance the peace processes in all situations of armed conflict on the African continent. With the exception of Somalia, which was dealt with in a most adequate manner under the Irish presidency, not a single conflict situation in Africa was left out. They all received the special attention they deserved and that you, Madam, had intended for them. My delegation is most grateful to you for that.

The private meeting of the Security Council on 8 November on Burundi will, no doubt, go down in the history of the Security Council. On that day, the Security Council, at your initiative, had the opportunity to listen for the last time in this Chamber to former President Nelson Mandela speaking in his capacity as facilitator in the Burundi crisis. History will also record that a meeting took place in the Security Council with the Jamaican Minister for Foreign Affairs, The Honourable Mr. Knight, in the Chair.

Equally important was the meeting of the Security Council with the Ministers of the Arusha Regional Peace Initiative on Burundi. That meeting was timely, as it was held only a week after the establishment of a Transitional Government in Burundi. It allowed Council members to interact in a positive manner with those engaged in the Regional Initiative and encouraged them to pursue their efforts in finding a lasting solution to the Burundi crisis.

The meeting of the Security Council with the Lusaka Political Committee was opportune and fruitful. Security Council resolution 1376 (2001), adopted at the end of the meeting, enlists the commitments of the parties to the conflict on various important issues, in particular disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration (DDRRR), in order to take forward the peace process.

By organizing meetings of the Security Council at the ministerial level during the ministerial week of the General Assembly, the Jamaican delegation, in a remarkable manner, took optimum advantage of the presence of the Ministers in New York to highlight various issues pertaining to international peace and security. This is a practice that indeed needs to be maintained.

The large number of public meetings held under your presidency, Madam, has contributed to making the work of the Council more transparent. From the echo we have had from outside this Chamber, the general membership of the United Nations has been very appreciative and has fully benefited from those meetings. The two public meetings on children in armed conflict and the protection of civilians in armed conflict, on 20 and 21 November, indicate the genuine commitment of your delegation to making its contribution to the alleviation of the plight of civilians in armed conflict. We note that your delegation has been very consistent in its approach in this respect, be it in informal consultations or formal meetings of the Council. The adoption of a comprehensive resolution on children in armed conflict under your presidency could therefore not have been more appropriate.

The testimony given by the child soldier from Sierra Leone provided the Security Council with a rare opportunity to listen to firsthand evidence of the atrocities and trauma suffered by children in armed conflicts.

The ministerial meeting of the Security Council on counter-terrorism was an excellent initiative and provided our ministers with the opportunity to exchange views in a frank and candid manner on an issue of international importance. The meeting undoubtedly sent a clear message that the Security Council was determined to stem that scourge in all its forms and wherever it is manifest. The adoption of resolution 1377 (2001) was a further step in reaffirming that determination.

We salute the initiative of the Jamaican delegation in having persuaded the Secretariat to set up a Web site for the presidency of the Security Council, which we hope future presidencies will be able to benefit from.

My delegation is grateful to you, Madam President, for having tackled the very delicate issue of the speakers' list. We note that the new system is working well and without complaint from members of the Council. We sincerely hope that this practice will be continued under future presidencies.

Finally, I should like to state that the Jamaican delegation has indeed, during its presidency of the Security Council, used each opportunity to support and advance the Council's initiatives in the promotion of peace and security. I must say, Madam President, you have set very high standards, which you have upheld during your presidency despite the small size of your team. Following presidencies, especially those with equally small teams, will have to work very hard to maintain those standards.

**Mr. Granovsky** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The delegation of the Russian Federation highly commends your work, Madam President, and sincerely congratulates you on the successful manner in which you have discharged your responsibilities as President of the Security Council for this month.

Madam President, you were faced with the very difficult challenge of ensuring that the work of the Council proceeded smoothly during a number of very serious international events, which coincided with ministerial week in the General Assembly. It is the opinion of my delegation that you discharged the duties entrusted to you with a high degree of professionalism and fully achieved the goals set by Jamaica at the beginning of its presidency.

We also commend the manner in which Security Council made use of the presence in the General Assembly of many foreign ministers and other members of Government of various States. Suffice it to mention the meeting of the Security Council at the foreign minister level on the question of combating terrorism; the participation by the foreign ministers of many countries in the Council's meeting on Afghanistan; the Council's meeting, with the participation of members of the Political Committee for the implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, on the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

and the discussion of the situation in Burundi, with the participation of members of the Government of countries of the region.

We believe that this practice is extremely useful. We deem it very important that in November, both in the formal meetings and in the consultations of the Security Council, top priority matters were touched on that have a direct relationship to the main task of the Council — the maintenance of international peace and security. We take note in this connection of the regular discussions of the situation in Afghanistan and in a number of African States.

The meeting with President Nelson Mandela, at which we discussed the situation in Burundi, was very useful. We had a very open and very specific talk between members of the Security Council and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia and Eritrea. The Council also reacted in a timely manner to the Kosovo elections and adopted an important resolution that extended the humanitarian programme in Iraq.

Madam President, I am familiar with your particular commitment to the question of protecting civilians in conflict situations — particularly women and children — and we were not disappointed by the formal meetings of the Security Council held on these questions. They once again made it possible for us to consider those aspects of this very difficult set of problems that fall within the purview of the Security Council.

On the whole, the work of the Council in November was purposeful in nature and geared towards the attainment of practical results. A large number of practical decisions were taken, and we were able to consider the items on our agenda in a consistent and thorough manner.

**Sir Jeremy Greenstock** (United Kingdom): Madam, it is not just because you hold the presidency this month that I want to thank the Jamaican delegation for its efforts over the past few years to bring a very distinctive voice to the business of the Security Council, under your leadership and that of Ambassador Ward. It has been very important to us, and I think that we have learned quite a lot from you and from seeing the Security Council through your eyes, so I thank you not just for this month, but for the whole two years of Jamaica's work on the Council.

I would very much like to talk about your agenda, in the note that you have sent around to us, and to get a discussion going, because — perhaps particularly since 11 September — there is a growing momentum behind the work of the United Nations, in which the Security Council is playing a leading part. But we are not yet doing enough that is right, even if we are doing more things that are right.

Madam President, I think that you have put your finger on it in introducing, as a first item for discussion after that, the issue of transparency. Perhaps it is a bit ironic that we are going to have a discussion of transparency this morning with rather a pathetic number of non-Council States Members of the United Nations present with us. I thought that the whole point of having this discussion in the open was to allow the membership to listen to how the Security Council wanted to reflect their concerns about how the Security Council works.

Be that as it may, the issue of transparency is, I think, the leading area in which the Council can increase its authority and its sensitivity to outside influences, particularly among Member States that are not on the Council.

Madam President, we should consider whether there are ways for the Council to interact with Member States other than the ones we have traditionally had in our locker. I think that there are, and that we need to adapt our procedures and the way in which we work. We are beginning to talk informally more with the membership outside, and in certain areas I think that it is beginning to work. I think that the counter-terrorism Committee is a special item and that it does not necessarily set a precedent that can be used in other areas of work.

I have been very struck by the responsiveness of the membership to the outreach programme of the counter-terrorism Committee. It is informal, but it is regular, and it gets a response from Member States. They have come to the meetings that we have had on these items, not with complaints about the Security Council — which they might well have had, given the unique nature, I think, of resolution 1373 (2001) — but in order to bring out the questions they have in their minds about the substance of what we are doing. Clearly, we cannot do that on every issue, and it is not on every issue that we need the proactive cooperation

of every Member State. But it is an area which deserves more consideration.

That may connect with a different proposal that I have made from time to time: on items where we need the implementation of our resolutions to be taken forward in transparency and with cooperation from Member States, it might help to nominate a member of the Council to help us drive forward that implementation. If that can be done transparently with the membership — and we do not as a Council feel that every such transparency meeting has to be attended by every member of the Council — and if we have a collective approach to this within which we understand each other, then I think it would be highly useful.

Here is another feature that I think is beginning to grow within the Security Council: we like passing resolutions 15 to nil. I do not know whether that is a new feeling. Obviously, we all like consensus and unanimity, but in the past we have driven things forward even where there were abstentions and negative votes. But there is something about the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly that makes consensus important, and the nature of our work in this millennial and post-11 September era is that the Security Council actually likes to show that it is unanimous on a subject because its authority is greater if we are unanimous on a subject. I think we are beginning to understand each other better on that.

Therefore, perhaps it does lend itself to an extension of our procedures, whereby we express that unanimity through what we do outside the Council in more informal meetings, where individual members or smaller groups of the Council can represent the views of the Council on specific issues. You are right, Madam President, to show that it is a two-way process. I think we have to be quite careful about groups of friends coming to brief us on an absolutely regular basis, as though there were rights to this. Where it is relevant to an issue, I think there can be that kind of interaction. But I do not think we should formalize it. I think we should handle that area in ad hoc ways and ways which serve the purpose of a subject as it is at a particular juncture.

On reports from the press, of course we are going to pay attention to the media; I think we should. But let us all be responsible about that. I would hate the Council to respond from time to time to some corners

of the British press, which can be thoroughly irresponsible. But where the press is credible and responsible on issues, it is a highly important source of both factual input and comment, and I think we should be responsive to it.

On ministers: “yes”, to a degree. I think the value of ministerial discussion is often that it is rare and gives a particular impetus to a particular subject at a particular time. I do not think we should regularize it. Ministerial discussions should always be well prepared, so that there is a good outcome and not a banal outcome. The fact of discussion alone is not enough to take a subject forward.

Here is perhaps another truth about the Security Council, and about the United Nations generally: if it is not projecting a powerful message at a particular time, ministers do not pay attention to it. Our Governments do not pay attention to the United Nations unless it directly affects their national interests on a particular day. So, I think we must be careful in our choice of ministerial debate, but also encourage greater ministerial interest in the Security Council because we are doing the right thing and we need our Governments to cap it with a ministerial response, either from capitals or in a debate.

On thematic debates, I think we are in danger of overdoing it. We need to take forward the themes that we have in a way that produces results. Mainstreaming these issues needs to be done through the interaction of the Security Council with the Secretariat and the Secretary-General. Where we have taken forward a theme, it is an invitation to the Secretariat and the agencies of the United Nations to mainstream in their own work what we have said and to bring them back to us with questions raised against a specific issue. That is the importance of thematic debate.

This can be extended to the General Assembly, as well. Let me give you a very small example. Violence against civilians has been abhorred by both the Security Council and the General Assembly. Yet where in the current draft text on a peaceful settlement of the question of Palestine is there any mention of our abhorrence of violence against civilians in general? It is not there. So, I think we need the Security Council to make sure that the themes that we advance are then mainstreamed into the specific issues where we have a voice.

If we take all those things forward — and the many others that will be raised this morning — I think we will increase the momentum behind an increasingly operational Security Council, and that that will be good for us as a Council and good for interaction with Member States.

**Mr. Corr** (Ireland): May I first thank you, Madam President, and the presidency for arranging this wrap-up open debate. The value of these concluding wrap-up meetings is not just to thank the presidency for its work during the month. It also, as you know, allows us to reflect on and assess the work of the Council during the month, and to do so at a public meeting.

To say, “thank you” first, this was a presidency of strong ambitions and goals with a clear agenda. My delegation feels that in all these areas, these tasks were very successfully met, and we very much appreciate this.

At the beginning of the month, the Jamaican presidency set its objective to support initiatives which we believe best promote sustainable peace and security. Let me briefly focus on these areas before also referring to some of the issues that Ambassador Greenstock and others have mentioned.

Ireland very much welcomed the strong focus that the Jamaican presidency placed on African issues. On the Democratic Republic of the Congo, we had a very useful and important meeting with the ministers of the Political Committee of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. Strong views were expressed at this meeting — but vigorous and healthy debate is good — and the Council adopted a very helpful resolution which moves forward the United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the process.

The second public meeting that was also very helpful, as has been said earlier, was the one with the ministers of the Regional Peace Initiative on Burundi. In both the case of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and that of Burundi, the Council was able not just to debate and to interact with ministers but also to signal frankly our own sense of engagement, involvement and views on the range of issues. The meeting on Burundi with President Mandela, in particular, offered a chance to say thank you to the President for his own central facilitation role.

On Ethiopia/Eritrea and the role of the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE), we also had a very useful meeting with the ministers from those two countries during the month. This allowed us a chance to emphasize the importance that the Council attaches to the removal of obstacles in the work of the force and to give clear indications of concerns we may have, as well as to listen to their concerns.

On Afghanistan, the presidency naturally and rightly gave a great deal of attention to ensuring that the Council received regular briefings and that we had the chance to discuss the humanitarian situation, but also to have broad discussions on the wider issues that, I think, can only have been very helpful to Mr. Brahimi in the period leading into Bonn. The humanitarian issue, of course, was crucial in our discussions during the month, and it provided a very useful chance not only for the Secretariat to brief the Council but also for the Council to express our own concerns on issues of food security for civilians and on the rights under humanitarian law not only of civilians but also of persons seeking to surrender and of persons giving up arms, about which the International Committee for the Red Cross (ICRC) has reminded us over recent weeks.

I would like to pay particular tribute to Jamaica on another issue: the Working Group on peacekeeping operations. Again, this goes not just for the period of the presidency but also the period before it. It is right at this stage to pay particular tribute to Ambassador Ward for his work in this area during the month and over the recent period.

Madam President, I will briefly address some of the points in your paper. On the normative side Ireland found extremely helpful the debates on “Children and armed conflict” and the “Protection of civilians in armed conflict”. They were debates in which we were able to give clear views and cast light on issues of enormous importance, not just to the Council but also to the work of the Organization.

On transparency, my delegation has consistently and strongly supported this as an important matter, especially in the context of public meetings.

On the issue of normative debates, there are, however, two caveats that do seem important to us, and they echo some of the comments that Ambassador Greenstock made. Because the Council has become so engaged in so many issues over recent years — an incremental process that is clearly continuing — there

is naturally and rightly a demand from within the United Nations system for it to integrate the normative framework into the work of the Council. The difficulty with this, of course, is that the Council has limited time at its disposal in any given month to address the range of issues that come before it, and it is clear that, while the normative framework is crucial, at the same time the Council should not do what belongs to other United Nations bodies, whether it is the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, agencies or other bodies. The Council has its own role under the Charter. It cannot do or re-do what should be or is being done elsewhere. To do otherwise would dissipate its own central Charter obligations and would also, paradoxically, diminish the rightful and separate role that other United Nations bodies have in these areas.

This is not in any way to say that the normative role is not crucial or that we should not debate it, as we did very substantially this month in key areas; but it is to say that the crucial issue is for the Council to ensure that in thematic areas where there is a normative framework agreed — whether it is in peacekeeping, peace-building, children, gender issues, humanitarian issues or other spheres — the central role for the Council must be to ensure that what is already agreed must be fully operationalized in our own work. This is true, for example, in issues such as peacekeeping and peacemaking and in examples such as the Democratic Republic of the Congo or Sierra Leone, where a whole range of requirements is involved. What we have to do, issue by issue, situation by situation, is to ensure that what is already agreed is fully implemented.

How this can be done is difficult, given the pressures on the Council’s timescale. It could be done by setting up a committee or by having one member of the Council monitor these issues and report on them. There are a range of options. But clearly there is something of a weakness in this approach.

A further brief point I wish to make is about the Council’s workload. It does seem to my delegation that the Council is too overloaded and, at times, is spread too thin while assessing many of the issues before it. We have to look seriously at our agenda and procedures. For example, do we need to formalize committees of the Council to filter issues before full debates? Do we need time limits on speeches? Whatever the answer, there is a problem in this area, and we do feel that it needs to be addressed.

A final point in this area relates to the role of the Secretariat, which performs heroically — not just for the Council but across the United Nations spectrum. There may well be a case for looking again at the possibility of the Secretariat having a full analysis and research unit to draw together all of these different threads — normative, thematic and operational — into a framework that would enable it to meet Council requirements substantially in that area.

On the issue of press reports, we fully share the view that there should be briefings in this area and that it is unwise for the Council or for some Council members to have to act simply on the basis of press briefings.

On ministerial meetings, we also see great value in this practice, particularly ministerial week. The meetings this month on counter-terrorism and Afghanistan were very useful. But as has also been said, there is a risk in setting up a hierarchy of importance of Council meetings. All Council meetings are important; therefore, this matter needs to be approached with some sensitivity and wisdom, while at the same time with full agreement on the importance of ministerial meetings from time to time.

In conclusion, my delegation thought that the presidency's work programme was excellent during the month, and we want to warmly thank you, Madam President, and everybody on the Jamaican team. I would also like to echo what was said earlier, that as Jamaica leaves the Security Council at the end of the year, you will be very much missed among those of us who stay on. We very much admired the creativity, the independence and the determination that Jamaica brought to the work of the Council, and we pay you warm tribute for your contribution.

**Mr. Jerandi** (Tunisia) (*spoke in French*): Madam President, like other colleagues, I would like to warmly congratulate you, on behalf of my delegation, on the way you have conducted the business of the Council during the month of November. Re-reading the programme of work that you so perfectly executed shows that you have achieved the objectives that you spelled out at the beginning of the month, as related in the document that you kindly made available to us. We congratulate you once again on this.

The Council held consultation meetings, as well as open meetings, on various items on its agenda. Open debates were held on the topics of “Children and armed

conflict” and “Protection of civilians in armed conflict”, and this reinforces the vision of our delegation that, when it is a question of dealing with a crisis or a conflict — or even a situation of intra- or inter-State tension — we must duly take into account the related consequences of the conflict and the decisions of the Council regarding the social, humanitarian, regional and subregional aspects of the situation under consideration.

We agree with you, Madam President, that the issues of children and civilians in conflict should be given complete attention by the Council both in specific cases and during the decision-making process.

Turning to the items on the Council's agenda, we deem relevant the practice of holding regular briefing sessions, particularly on situations that could be called “hot”, as is currently the case of Afghanistan. We wonder why this practice has not been applied to the situation prevailing in the occupied Palestinian territories. As I hardly need recall, it is the longest conflict in recent times, yet it receives the least attention from the Security Council. Initiatives are being taken here and there to try to resolve the conflict, and the tension in the region is high. But that should not prevent Council members from being informed about or discussing such steps as are being taken, or from considering the facts on the ground, which are very often distorted by certain media. I agree with the comment that members of the Council receive most of their information about certain initiatives through the media. My delegation believes that the media certainly play an important role, but that is not enough to enable the Council duly to discharge its mandate.

We also agree that the Council should do all that it can to listen to Member States through, inter alia, the regional and subregional organizations, such as the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), which are doing outstanding work, particularly in managing conflicts in West Africa.

With regard to Africa, my delegation is pleased to see the continent and its concerns occupying an important place in the activities of the Council. I cannot pretend that I would not be equally pleased if there were no conflicts in Africa with which the Council had to deal. We welcome the fact that the Council is involving to a greater extent the States and parties concerned in considering these items on its agenda.



We are pleased in particular that the Council has forged partnerships in the past two years with the Political Committee for the Implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, the Regional Peace Initiative on Burundi, and ECOWAS. The meetings that were held in the framework of those partnerships, including those held under your presidency, Madam, have proved their usefulness. We support the continuation of that tradition.

We believe that ministerial meetings of the Council are useful, particularly when very important issues for international peace and security are at stake. It has almost become a tradition for members of the Council to meet at least at ministerial level during the general debate in the General Assembly. But we believe that one or two meetings at that level throughout the year, especially on major topics, would be a positive contribution.

Those were just a few points that I wanted to transmit to you, Madam, as your presidency comes to an end. Once again, I would like to emphasize that, thanks to your diplomatic skill and wisdom, and the professionalism of your entire delegation, it has been an outstanding presidency.

**Mr. Chowdhury** (Bangladesh): Over the past month, Madam President, you have led us with wisdom, skill and determination. You have brought your prodigious qualities to your responsibilities, and they have also been reflected in your remarks today. You deserve high praise. We also pay tribute to Ambassador Ward and others in your mission for their splendid work; truly, it has been a great presidency.

The circulation of your paper setting out the objectives for the month was a useful innovation. It enabled the Council to focus on the issues to be followed during the month. This paper has now emerged as a point of reference as we assess our performance throughout November and as we reflect on the follow-up. This month has witnessed the adoption of a number of landmark resolutions. Much credit for that fact is owed to your innovative exercise. You set for us a dozen objectives. Let me flag some that we believe to be key.

On the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the ministerial meeting with the Lusaka parties was marked by a significant breakthrough: the commitment of the *Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie* to demilitarize Kisangani. The Council will

have to pursue that long-sought objective. Resolution 1304 (2000) remains, essentially, on paper only. Let us pursue implementation of resolution 1376 (2001) through all means. If need be, the Council should step up pressure on the parties to facilitate the phase III deployment of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Some progress has been achieved with regard to the operation of the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea. Nonetheless, the peace process is threatened by the mounting hostility between Addis Ababa and Asmara. The violation of the demilitarized zone is one of a number of negative developments. We should seek the advice of the Secretary-General on a possible course of action; perhaps a Council mission to the area would help calm the situation.

Now I would like to refer to Afghanistan. Afghanistan has, naturally, dominated our agenda throughout the month. The United Nations has assumed the central role that the General Assembly recommended. Without any prejudice to ongoing efforts, let me in this connection raise the issue of the United Nations peacekeeping capacity. Our heads of State and Government made a solemn commitment in this regard last year. The reality is that the Council's role in Afghanistan remains limited. Once again, the capacity of the United Nations to respond quickly in a conflict situation remains in question. The responsibility had to be assumed by a coalition of the willing. The developments on the ground far outpaced the preparedness of the United Nations to rapidly put in place a peacekeeping operation.

This brings me to the thematic and operational issue of peacekeeping operations. My delegation appreciates the time allotted by your presidency, Madam, to the Working Group. However, I understand that there is lack of consensus on a favourable response to the proposal of the troop-contributing countries for setting up mission-specific committees.

It would be unfortunate if the Council were to retract the commitment it made in its recent presidential statements and resolutions. Let me make one point clear — and I am speaking for the largest troop-contributing country. Bangladesh strongly endorses the draft note presented by Ambassador Ward as Chairman of the Working Group. Resolution 1353 (2001) recognized partnership with the troop-contributing countries. We, as troop-contributing

countries — contributors of formed units — have a high stake in the missions concerned. We are seeking an institutional framework to foster this partnership. The troop-contributing countries, in asking for the framework, are seeking one shared objective — that is, doing right by peacekeeping.

My final point involves the relationship between the Chamber and the world beyond. The Council is primarily responsible for the maintenance of peace and security, although that is not its exclusive responsibility. We need a partnership with a broader United Nations membership — the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the United Nations agencies, funds and programmes and other stakeholders, including the non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Within the United Nations system this could and, indeed, should be done within the ambit of the Charter, as has been remarked.

A way to engage the outside world is, perhaps, to have increased recourse to public meetings. We must make ourselves relevant to the rest of the world. The Council must be brought out of the consultation room. In emphasizing this point, I refer to the discussion on the matter in January this year, under Ambassador Mahubani's presidency. Greater transparency in our work is essential if we want the world to hear us and listen — I echo some of the sentiments of Ambassador Greenstock today. But how do we go about that? Would unscripted deliberations make the Council's work more interactive? Should we cease to restate our national positions only in formal statements? The right answers to these queries could render our performance more rewarding.

We need to explore ways and means for substantive dialogue with the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, as well as with the other funds and programmes. Sir Jeremy's initiative for joint meetings with the Economic and Social Council should be pursued.

The Arria-formula meetings have been used fruitfully. This has particularly assisted in discussions with the NGOs. The Council should arrange for regular exchange of information and views with humanitarian and human rights non-governmental actors, as well as those associated with gender mainstreaming. Such partners as those have unsurpassed outreach. We should also relate more widely to the think tanks. All of us keenly profited from yesterday's conference. The

initiative, coming after the forum on regional approaches sponsored by Ambassador Valdivieso, set a very positive trend.

On a personal note, I would like to say that I am the newest kid on the block. But I was fortunate enough to receive my initiation during the period of your stewardship, Madam. Some days ago, in this Chamber, Olara Otunnu gave a rendition of a song by Bob Marley. Today, with the torch passing to Mali, but in the full knowledge that your contribution will continue, let me cite another great singer closely associated with your country, Harry Belafonte, and say, "Jamaica, farewell".

**Mr. Doutriaux** (France) (*spoke in French*): France will not say farewell to you as in the song, Madam President, as you certainly will remain here with us beyond the month of your presidency. As other speakers have already said, your mark, and that of your country, on the work of the Security Council and the United Nations extends beyond the work done during just this one month, which has indeed been excellent. Beyond your work this month, Madam President, I would like, by way of example, to mention your tireless work on behalf of children and in preparation for the summit on children, as well as the work done by your Deputy Permanent Representative, Mr. Ward, in the area of cooperation with troop-contributing countries. I believe that the work of Jamaica and its Mission in those two areas will go far beyond this month, however substantial the month of your presidency has been.

Madam President, you have submitted a document to the Council about which I would like to make a few comments. My first comment relates to transparency. I think the President is correct in continuing to emphasize the importance of improving the transparency of the Council's work. Many efforts have been made in the last year or two, and we must continue in that direction. I believe that we are responding better and better to the demands of non-members of the Council for an interactive dialogue with them. Of course, as others have said, the open and transparent meetings are sometimes very formal and replete with too many repetitive national statements. Each of us, members and non-members of the Council alike, needs to make an effort to make meetings more interactive and less formal. There are several ways of doing that. As others have said, that could involve meetings with other bodies. For instance, Ambassador

Greenstock made an excellent proposal to hold an informal meeting with the Economic and Social Council and, possibly, with the presidency of the General Assembly. This could also involve closed meetings with groups of countries, such as the ones we have had on numerous occasions with the signatories to the Lusaka agreements, with those involved in the Arusha process on Burundi, and with the Economic Community of West African States on Sierra Leone and the West African region. I think we should continue in that vein.

I would like in particular to emphasize the dialogue between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries. We believe that we must go further on the basis of the recommendations made by the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations, led by Ambassador Ward. As the Ambassador of Bangladesh has just said, we should be able to continue to make progress. France has for several months suggested establishing subsidiary Council bodies for the major peacekeeping operations, and in that framework we could hold regular dialogues between Council members and troop-contributing countries. We believe that we must continue the thinking that has begun in the Working Group and that, as one of us has already proposed, the Group could continue its activities next year in order to make further progress in the dialogue with troop-contributing countries. We are making that proposal for the very simple reason that we can have peacekeeping operations only if we have contingents available for peacekeeping; hence the importance of having a very regular dialogue with troop-contributing countries.

The President's note also refers to briefings the Council could receive from Member States, organizations and groups of friends. There are sometimes questions with regard to the usefulness of groups of friends. I would recall that such groups involve members of the Council as well as non-members. This has also provided a way of having dialogue with non-members of the Council that are Members of the United Nations. That, too, is part of the spirit of transparency and dialogue. But, of course, groups of friends do not exist to do the work of the Council. That must be clear. The Council has its own responsibilities and must fully assume them. But there is no reason why groups of friends or the coordinator of a group of friends could not fully brief the Council on their activities as necessary. I think that the

importance of groups of friends is that they bring together countries that are particularly interested in a given crisis, including troop-contributing countries when a peacekeeping operation exists, to discuss how they can act together usefully for the cause of peace in the region concerned.

My last comment has to do with ministerial meetings. In this regard we have seen that the practice is for ministers to meet at the margins of the General Assembly's ministerial week. I believe that has been the case for a number of years. Should that be formalized or not? Undoubtedly, it should not be formalized. At the same time, however, we need to recognize that this takes place almost systematically every year during the ministerial week. As others have said, those meetings need to be well prepared, lead to useful results and deal with very well-defined topics that are closely related to the work of the Security Council.

I have a final point on thematic debates. Thematic debates are very useful when they deal with matters under the purview of the Security Council. As to how they can be linked to conflict situations, I believe that depends on the particular thematic debate. I believe that the thematic debate on the protection of children in armed conflict was very useful, as this is a problem that comes up in questions before the Council — for example, in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in the Great Lakes region and in Sierra Leone. We can use the resolution on the protection of children in armed conflict, adopted under the presidency of Jamaica, to deal with conflicts before the Council. But, in general terms, we must also ensure that we respect the competence of the General Assembly. I recall that in certain thematic debates in the past certain non-members of the Council that were invited to participate in the debate stated that we had to see to it that the Council did not impinge on the General Assembly's competences.

I thank you again, Madam President, for the very complete agenda we had during November. I also thank you for your very useful note, which has made it possible for us to respond to some of the questions you posed to us.

**Mr. Chen Xu (China)** (*spoke in Chinese*): Several things about our work in November were unique. For one, great changes have taken place in the situation in Afghanistan. Despite the fact that the Council's

schedule was very tight this month, the presidency still made timely arrangements for briefings and discussions. That illustrates the importance we attach to the question of Afghanistan. We have achieved good results.

Another thing that makes November unique is that we made good use of the presence of foreign ministers attending the general debate of the General Assembly here in New York to hold a series of important meetings that have had notable results, especially with regard to the situation in Africa.

A third aspect that made November unique was the fact that the work of the Council was more transparent, and that it was very thoughtfully and meticulously arranged by the President. We made our plans at the beginning of the month, and now, at the end of the month, we are wrapping up. The presidency also distributed written materials to that end. We would also like to express our gratitude to you, Madam President, and your Mission for your excellent performance this month.

I would like to make three brief comments by way of reviewing the goals we set for this month.

First, as mentioned before, making good use of the presence of ministers for the General Assembly to convene ministerial meetings focussed on important questions is conducive to strengthening direct contacts between the Security Council and the leaders of various countries, as well as to promoting the resolution of specific issues. It is worth reflecting on our experience in this regard and attaching some importance to it. Of course, the question of whether it is necessary to regularly convene ministerial meetings during the plenary session of the General Assembly should be determined for the most part by prevailing circumstances and necessities.

Secondly, we are in favour of the Security Council's giving greater heed to the opinions and recommendations of parties concerned in the questions on its agenda. The Chinese delegation has maintained that, before making important decisions, the Security Council should provide opportunities to hear the opinions of non-members. We hope that we shall be able to reach consensus on this question and implement it.

At present, we engage in various formalities, such as private formal meetings, Arria formula meetings and

direct contact between the presidency and the parties concerned. All these can be made good use of. We also support the strengthening of cooperation and communication among the Security Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat. We also appreciate the efforts made by Ambassador Ward in presiding over the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations. We believe that the discussions of the Working Group will have a positive outcome.

Thirdly, the Security Council held thematic debates this month, such as on children and armed conflict and the protection of civilians in armed conflict. These issues have many elements in common, including the measures and recommendations made concerning them. Provided that the overall result does not suffer, it would be a good idea to lump related questions together and to discuss them jointly, which could enhance our efficiency and avoid repetition. The result of this would be even better than what we have now.

As far as the Security Council is concerned, the best way to protect civilians is to redouble its efforts to end conflicts as soon as possible. At the same time, we are also in favour of improving coordination and cooperation between the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations so that we can make joint efforts to solve the problems before us.

**Mr. Mahbubani** (Singapore): Please allow me to begin by commending you, Madam, for organizing this wrap-up meeting.

Actually, I would like to begin with a plea to my colleagues to try as much as possible to institutionalize these wrap-up meetings, because they can be useful on many counts. First, of course, we can review what we did, where we succeeded and where we failed during the month. Secondly, I think we can also reflect on long-term trends and on how our work is going over the longer term. Thirdly and equally importantly, this is probably the only window that we have in the course of the month to reflect on how we can improve the work of the Council. Clearly, we do need to develop some kind of culture of innovation within the Council. These sort of meetings, if they are institutionalized, can provide us the opportunity to do so.

But to do that, at some point in time we do need to have a very serious discussion within the Council on what exactly our priorities are. I notice that

Ambassador Chowdhury of Bangladesh said that our primary responsibility is to handle threats to international peace and security, but are we primarily a deliberative body, a legislative body or an operational body? I think we do bits of all three, but we have to figure out what our priorities are; then, we can decide how we allocate our time. I hope that, at some point, we will get to such a discussion.

In this regard, I must say that I, like Ambassador Greenstock, regret the lack of participation of the Member States at this meeting. It is, unfortunately, a bad sign and what makes it sad is that, by having it open to the Member States, we thought that we could, in a sense, engage them. But we have not done so yet. I would also like to appeal to the Members that are not here to take such wrap-up meetings more seriously.

For example, we are in the middle of the plenary session of the General Assembly and I am told that, in one of the discussions in the Third Committee, there was apparently an effort to mention a Security Council resolution on women and peace and security. Several members of the General Assembly said: "No, that is the job of the Security Council. We will not endorse what the Security Council does." I think that represents a very unhealthy disconnect between the Security Council and the rest of the United Nations community. The representative of France also referred to that. We have to address that disconnect. Perhaps one way of doing that is through these wrap-up meetings and by making them open and interactive. In that way we can probably engage the non-members.

Coming to the work of this month, you, Madam, have been praised so much I am not so sure that I can add very much. What really impressed us was your time management. Increasingly, frankly, in the work of the Council, the most valuable and precious commodity we have is time. Indeed, we have found that, since we joined the Council, it is like a sponge, soaking up all our time. We just find it very difficult to manage all our other duties, but you, Madam, did it brilliantly in a month when you also had to deal with the ministerial week and, of course, the Thanksgiving holiday. Thus, in a very truncated month, you did a tremendous amount of work and we commend you for that. Of course, we commend you for producing, at the very beginning of month, the objectives paper and, at the end of the month, notes for the wrap-up meeting. This sort of systematic approach, we hope, will also become institutionalized.

What I would like to do now is talk a bit about the successes of the month in procedural and substantive issues. I think that, if these meetings are to be useful, we should also talk about failures. Let me reassure you, Madam, it is not about the failures of the presidency; it is about the failures of the Council.

As to the successes on the procedural issues, there have been several and they are, I think, significant ones. First, of course, is the setting up of the Security Council presidential web site. I think it is better to have one web site permanently on the United Nations web site, rather than to have it switch from month to month to different missions. It provides one-stop shopping for the Council's provisional programme of work, outputs, press statements, presidential statements and resolutions. I think that is a very important innovation, but we do need to try to develop it a bit further.

Ambassador Chowdhury talked about how we can make our informal consultations more transparent. We can do what France did when it held the presidency of the Council. On the French web site, it provided a daily summary of what was discussed and said in the informal consultations — of course, without revealing any names or countries. We know that this is time-consuming because we tried it during the Singapore presidency and we could not do it. Small missions do not have the resources to do it, but it is something that the Secretariat could try to do.

At the same time, of course, I think that we really made a very important innovation with the speakers' list. I am glad that Ambassador Koonjul referred to this. It may seem to be a small thing that we switched from whatever system we had in the past to drawing lots, but frankly, because it has created regularity and predictability and we can actually know when we are going to speak during the course of the day, it has made everyone feel that we have a level playing field when it comes to the selection of the speakers. I think it has also helped to improve the chemistry among the members and to make them feel that we were all equally treated and that we do not just belong to class A or class B within the Council.

We also thank you, Madam, for convening the informal working group on documentation and procedures, despite the busy month — and that is why it is quite remarkable. The working group, as members

know, has begun work on the report of the Security Council to the General Assembly.

One point we do want to emphasize is that if, just after a massive debate in the General Assembly on the report of the Security Council to the Assembly, we decide to ignore the views expressed and proceed to do exactly the same thing next year as we did in previous years, then we reinforce the views of those who say the Security Council does not listen to the members of the General Assembly. If we want to show that we are listening, then it is time for us to produce some real changes. And it can be done. Frankly, there is no reason why we should spend \$600,000 a year for that report. It should cost us no more than \$50,000. This can be done, and we have discovered in the course of working on it that there is much duplication that can be cut out.

Let me turn briefly to the successes on the substantive front. Here, clearly, I think the work we did on Afghanistan, including the meeting with Lakhdar Brahimi on 13 November and of course the adoption of resolution 1378 (2001), was very important. But equally important were the discussions we had in informal consultations. In the course of the discussions, I thought we were moving towards developing a sort of informal consensus among member States about what was doable and what was not doable within Afghanistan. The tragedy is that that institutional memory is lost. There is no agreed record of it. No summary points of it are kept. And when we come to making the big decisions on what kind of peacekeeping operations are to be set up in Afghanistan, we will not have an institutional memory to draw upon.

But, here, I am glad, Madam, that you organized the candid discussion that we had yesterday, together with the International Crisis Group (ICG) and the World Peace Foundation. I thought the level of the discussion was quite remarkable. I have never seen a better discussion of the question, "Can the United Nations say no?", as we had in yesterday's meeting, and I hope that some of that will be recorded and kept.

The other major decision we made was on Iraq, where we unanimously adopted resolution 1382 (2001). We know that the key provisions of the resolution lie in operative paragraph 2 and operative paragraph 6 — and I will not go into the details here. In this regard, we would like to commend the permanent five for working closely together and producing a consensus text for us.

We are aware that they must have worked very hard; there must have been very complex trade-offs. We do not know what happened behind the scenes, but we do know that the result was a good one. We also know that, frankly, we have a massive job ahead of us over the next six months, if we are to finalize work on the next Iraq resolution. I understand that some of my colleagues have actually read the Goods-Review List. I must confess that I never had the chance to read it before we adopted it. It is too big a volume. But we will all have to read it at some point in time.

Very briefly, on the other issues that we discussed, such as Kosovo, we thank you, Madam, for giving us the time to reflect on them before we adopted the presidential statements. But I want to add a small footnote on the Kosovo issue. This represents a small, personal discovery. When we were discussing the results of the elections in Kosovo, I asked my colleagues when we were going to renew the mandate of the Kosovo peacekeeping operation. Then I discovered — and this reflects my ignorance — that while in every other mandate, there is a six- or three-month time limit, in Kosovo, there is no time limit. It is in perpetuity. Now there must have been some good reason why this was done. But I could not figure out why, nor who did it. Again, because of the lack of institutional memory, I'm not sure whom to turn to. But clearly we are meant to turn to those that were members of the Council at that time to ask them the reason for these double standards.

I also want to respond briefly to the comments made by Ambassador Doutriaux on the Group of Friends. I agree with him that the Group does play a useful role. I also agree that they help, in a sense, to link the Security Council with the General Assembly members. But I also would like to make a plea for greater transparency in their work. Sometimes we are not quite sure how they arrive at the various decisions that they present to us. Some indication of the background that went into their thinking would be useful to us.

Finally, turning to the failures — and as I have said, it is also very important to address failures — the biggest failure of the Council this past month was not to complete our work on the Working Group on Sanctions. The deadline for the work was November 2000. Now it is November 2001. But what is even more tragic is that the people who actually worked on this Working Group on Sanctions, especially

Bangladesh and the others — all the elected members who can actually remember what work they did will all be gone in a month. Then we have to start from scratch again. That, I think, is something that we should not accept.

I also want to touch a bit on the work of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations. Here, I would like to pay tribute to Ambassador Ward for the incredibly hard work that he has done. The only tragedy here is that the Working Group has still not made much progress on the establishment of a new mechanism of cooperation between the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries. I recall Ambassador Chowdhury's call for stronger efforts to be made in that direction, because we were, in a sense, moving towards a relationship of greater trust between the troop-contributing countries and Security Council members. That movement has stalled because of the fear that their views are not being heard in the Working Group.

I have a quick note on the thematic debates. We think that the debates held on children in armed conflict and the protection of civilians were very important. Certainly, the presence of the child soldier from Sierra Leone was a dramatic event. But we also believe — and we said this when the debate took place — that it is time to start clustering these thematic debates on issues involving the protection of civilians, of women and of children and organizing them in such a way as to respond to Ireland's call for reducing the workload; the workload is obviously becoming too great for the Council.

Let me end with one concrete suggestion. Fortunately, we are having this meeting in the open. There will be a record of what has been said here, but we think that there have been many valuable, specific suggestions that have been made on how to improve the work of the Council. I hope we can try to make a kind of catalogue of the suggestions. We tried this in January at the closed, wrap-up meeting we had. We should begin to institutionalize this, and we hope that this can be done.

We will not join in the debate between Bangladesh and France on whether or not we should bid you farewell, Madam, but we look forward to continuing to work with you.

**Mr. Kuchinsky** (Ukraine): First of all, I would like to congratulate you, Madam, and your team on the

successful conclusion of your presidency during this very challenging month, which was filled — or should I say, jam-packed — with all sorts of events and activities, both in the Council and outside it. I also thank you for the efficient and professional performance of your presidential duties, which greatly contributed to the constructive consideration of many issues on the Council's agenda. In fact, the programme of work that you had distributed on the eve of your presidency has been successfully completed, and I would say that the results are quite impressive.

In November, we had an extremely important ministerial meeting on counter-terrorism. We discussed Afghanistan intensively and adopted a very significant resolution to that effect. We managed to achieve consensus on Iraq. We had important thematic discussions on children in armed conflicts and on the protection of civilians. We touched upon many African issues — Angola, Ethiopia, Eritrea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Western Sahara, Sierra Leone and Liberia. We managed to extend the mandates of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF). We had an important discussion of the activities of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) and, of course, Kosovo and other issues on the agenda. And we are having an important wrap-up session today.

It is unfortunate that, while speaking about transparency, we do not have more representatives of Member States present here. So, maybe, as Ambassador Mahbubani suggested, we should think about it. Maybe we should lure members of the United Nations by giving them the opportunity to speak before the members of the Security Council, which was once done on another issue. Perhaps that would bring the Member States to this Chamber to participate in our discussion.

Madam President, let me quickly go through the questions raised in your note for the wrap-up meeting.

First, it should be recognized that during the month of November, the Council in general met the objectives set out in the document you distributed at the beginning of this month. The level of success was different on various issues, but that is the reality — the way things work in the Council. I agree with you,

Madam President, that there has been an improvement in the transparency of the Council's activities. I do not want to add the word "considerable", and I would pick up on what Kishore Mahbubani said. Maybe in the future, we can think about making consultations of the whole more transparent in one way or another, because, as in the past, most of the issues continue to be addressed behind closed doors, although the vast majority — though not all — of them can easily be discussed in an open format.

As to your question regarding other ways for the Council to interact with States and others, I think we have tried almost all of them. Of course, we can try to explore other ways, but in our view, frankly, this is not an issue. I think the issue is that the Council not only should try to be transparent but also should be seen as transparent by Member States. Even if after today's meeting we ask States outside the Council whether the Council is transparent or not, I am afraid that the majority of the replies will be in the negative. If the Council becomes truly transparent, the question of the Council's interaction with States and others will not be so acute as it is today.

On the procedure of receiving regular briefings from the States, organizations or groups of friends active in pursuing peace initiatives, frankly, during the two years of our membership in the Council, we have not seen any cases in which the Council refused to hear a State or organization when it asked to brief the Council on the implementation or results of peace initiatives being pursued. I believe that we should simply do this more often.

As to whether the press is the appropriate source of information for the Council on such initiatives, definitely not. It is the appropriate source of information for the public at large, but not for the Council. In our view, the Council is a body that should continue to receive information from various sources and act upon this information accordingly.

We agree with you, Madam President, that the ministerial week was one of the major highlights not only of the month but of the entire year. We think it was very successful. The Council used it to its full capacity and covered everything it could possibly within the time available. I support your view that the most important issues before the Council should continue to be discussed during such ministerial weeks if possible. I do not think it is realistic to have our

ministers come here more than once or twice a year, but I believe that this year, the ministerial week was successful. It was during the ministerial week that we had the most important meetings, on terrorism, counter-terrorism and Afghanistan, during which the Council in fact set or reinforced its policies on these matters.

It is no exaggeration to say that this month, the attention of the Council has been focused mainly on the situation in Afghanistan. An open meeting on this subject on 13 November, with the participation of more than 20 foreign ministers, launched the beginning of the peace process in that country under United Nations auspices. It was extremely important to be updated regularly on the developments in Afghanistan, and we are thankful to the Secretariat and to you, Madam President, for the operative reaction to the developments in this area.

Finally, Madam President, I wish to commend your initiative to resolve the issue of the list of speakers. I strongly encourage future Presidents to continue your initiative. Once again, let me commend you and your team for what you have achieved during this month and for allowing the Council as a whole to be successful.

**Mr. Cunningham** (United States): Madam President, I will try to be very brief given the hour, but I want to pay tribute to you and your delegation as presidency and as members of the Security Council, as others have done, and to acknowledge the contribution that you and your team have made and that Ambassador Ward has made. I should also like to recall your contribution as a prominent member of Security Council missions to Sierra Leone and Kosovo, where I remember very fondly your personal input and contribution.

Without being complacent, I think we can say that we have done a lot of good work this month. I am not going to review the agenda, but simply note the progress we have made on terrorism, Afghanistan, the oil-for-food programme for Iraq and reinforcing a growing trend towards consensus, which I think is positive. We had a good series of high-level meetings on Africa, which I think on balance were a positive factor, although we hoped that we could have achieved more of a relationship between those meetings and developments in the real world.



I want to mention two specific items out of the many that have been mentioned here this morning.

First, on transparency, I agree that we need to do a better job at this, but that does not necessarily mean holding more open meetings. For example, I am not sure that we have today's format right, as others have said. What we do need to do is find a better way, under the label of transparency, to build a stronger connection between what we do and the rest of the membership, and to be innovative in finding ways to do that. As some others have suggested, that means promoting more interaction. I think the best way to do that is through less formal, not more formal, proceedings. After a couple of years here, my conclusion is that the less formal the setting — whether for this body or for its interaction with others — the more genuine the discussion and interaction we have.

We have a couple of good examples to look at, and I am sure there will be others in the coming months. Ambassador Greenstock has set a good example in his approach to outreach and his work on the Counter-Terrorism Committee. Jamaica itself set a good example in helping to sponsor yesterday's very good meeting on peace operations and in coordinating that meeting with the Security Council's schedule. That was not in any strict sense a meeting between the Security Council and anyone else, but it brought together interested members of the Council, outside interested people and Members of the United Nations that are not Council members in what I thought was a very interesting and useful discussion. We ought to find more ways to do that. Ambassador Ward deserves credit for trying to find ways to improve the way in which the Security Council and troop-contributing countries interact and to build a way for real exchanges in that connection as well. Sometimes formal meetings and formal presentations can be useful, but my own guess is that we are too far down that path — it takes a lot of time, and they are also limited in potential and impact.

Secondly, on ministerial meetings, I agree with others who have suggested that we ought to use Security Council meetings at ministerial level sparingly. It is an important instrument, and we should not dilute the impact of it. We should also use the presence of Ministers here, whether during ministerial week or otherwise to enhance interaction between other countries and the Council members, particularly when we have the occasion to address regions in conflict,

such as we had recently with the Lusaka Political Committee. I think that we can all do a better job at preparing for those meetings and try to make sure that we get results out of them that translate into effects in the real world.

**Mr. Ocaziones** (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to extend very special congratulations to you, Madam President, and the members of the team of the Permanent Mission of Jamaica on having led the Security Council admirably during the month of November.

We value the convening of this public wrap-up meeting. In connection with the limited presence of non-members of the Council at this meeting, we would like to suggest that in addition to regretting that fact, we should also think about what we perhaps are not doing right in these meetings and why they are not being given more attention by non-members.

I would like to refer to the objectives of the month. During the month of November we managed to take an important step forward in defining the role that the United Nations can play in Afghanistan and, above all, in its reconstruction. Many questions remain about the scope of that involvement, and we certainly will have to consider this question again in the weeks to come, when the process that has begun in Bonn yields its first results. It is undeniable that the Security Council ministerial meeting held this month holds great political value. Security Council resolution 1378 (2001) sets forth some general principles that should serve to synchronize and harmonize the response of the various actors of the international community that intend to meet the humanitarian, political, security, reconstruction and development challenges in Afghanistan.

Likewise, in November we took satisfactory steps in dealing with various African conflicts on the Council's agenda. The meetings with the ministers and representatives of African countries that are involved in the peace processes both in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in Burundi made it possible for us to encourage further commitment from the actors to the attainment of peace in the Great Lakes region. In addition, our meetings with the Ministers of Ethiopia and Eritrea were also very useful in connection with the presence of the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) in that region. In connection with West Africa, the consideration of the application

of the sanctions regime against Liberia enabled us to familiarize ourselves with the Council's political options at the present time, given the violations reported, the humanitarian impact of the sanctions regime and the possible economic repercussions of additional sanctions.

At the ministerial level we also reaffirmed our solid commitment to the strategy to combat and eliminate international terrorism. Finally, we continued to move towards the establishment of a better-targeted sanctions regime in the case of Iraq.

We recognize your leadership, Madam President, in all these achievements.

I would like to make a few suggestions in connection with our work. The first of these results from the meeting that we held with the Presidents of the Tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. We want to say that at that meeting it became clear that there is a need to evaluate more carefully the work of these Tribunals, the results they have attained and their power of deterrence. The work of the Tribunals is a concrete measurement of the performance of the Security Council itself, and therefore we must not let that item become marginal. The very fact of sending strong messages to the masterminds of the massacres is a valuable result that we must duly appreciate.

My second suggestion relates to the handling of the results of the thematic debates. We agree with you, Madam, that we must be innovative in taking advantage of the contents of the relevant resolutions. Perhaps the best path would be, in situations that are under consideration in the Council, to apply them through a consultation process with other agencies of the United Nations and organizations of civil society. For example, Security Council resolution 1325 (2000), on women, peace and security, is a source of guidance from the Security Council that has a life of its own because various agencies of the United Nations system, such as the United Nations Development Fund for Women and the United Nations Children's Fund, and several States and non-governmental organizations have made it an important reference point in order to make a difference on the ground. This experience shows us that it is not necessary to routinely adopt annual resolutions — as we did, for example, regarding the situation of children in armed conflict — for Security Council action to be strengthened and for its agenda to retain its timeliness. In this respect, we agree

with Ambassador Greenstock's comment about the need to avoid the inclusion of excessive thematic debates on our agenda.

I wish to conclude by commenting on some of the challenges for December. We are confident that in the month to come we will manage to adopt a note by the President that will contain the new guidelines for the preparation of the annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly. It is also our hope that under Mali's leadership we will be able to take a fresh regional look at West Africa, particularly now that the Secretary-General has notified us of his decision to create a United Nations office in Dakar in order to take a regional approach to the political instability and the conflicts of that region.

It seems to us that we must also continue to examine the situation in Afghanistan with the same promptness and degree of interest with which we have been responding thus far to that situation. Lastly, in December we must prepare ourselves to begin the process of reviewing the reports that the Member States of the United Nations will send to the Committee on Counter-Terrorism, in fulfilment of Security Council resolution 1373 (2001).

**Mr. Strømme** (Norway): Let me also commend you, Madam President, for the manner in which you have conducted the work of the Security Council during the month of November.

I will limit my comments to a few issues. First, we welcome the high degree of openness exercised during the month, for non-permanent members in particular. Openness and transparency in the way the Security Council conducts its business is of high importance.

Secondly, we regret that on certain occasions background documentation continues to be made available late in the process leading up to a meeting, allowing little or virtually no time for proper preparation of the subject matter at hand.

Thirdly, the thematic issues considered during this month, relating to children and armed conflict, as well as protection of civilians in armed conflict, contributed importantly to the needed comprehensiveness in the design of peacekeeping operations. Let me also take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Ward for his efforts with regard to the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations.

Last but not least — and this will not come as a surprise to any member of the Council — Norway maintains its position that brief interventions, as opposed to long ones, facilitate the way we conduct business.

**Mr. Kassé** (Mali) (*spoke in French*): Madam President, I, too, would like to express our deep gratitude to you and to your delegation for having convened this wrap-up meeting. You have discharged your duties very well during this busy and eventful month, during which we considered in open meetings many important subjects, particularly for Africa.

Despite all of the difficulties, you were able to resolve all of the specific problems raised during the month of November. We believe also that you have achieved the objectives that Jamaica set out in the note you circulated at the beginning of your presidency. You have also succeeded in improving our relations with our partners, as borne out by African ministerial week, with the Lusaka signatories, the Regional Peace Initiative on Burundi, the memorable meeting with Madiba Mandela, and meetings on Angola and Ethiopia and Eritrea.

We have no definite position on the formalization of the ministerial meetings. However, we believe that these meetings should be well prepared and that the decisions emanating therefrom should be followed up and implemented properly. In this respect, we urge that the necessary pressure be brought to bear in order to implement the various decisions taken during African ministerial week.

You have succeeded in enhancing transparency in the work of the Council, particularly by organizing a drawing of lots for the list of speakers. You have also improved relations with Member States, the troop-contributing countries and countries that are interested in a particular situation, as well as agencies within the United Nations family. You have also made progress on the question of parity and on the protection of civilians, particularly that of women and children in armed conflict.

Finally, you have introduced an innovation by including thematic debates during the consideration of conflict situations. This is all very good and totally in keeping with the evolution of the means available to the Security Council to carry out its Charter-mandated responsibilities.

I cannot conclude without reiterating heartfelt congratulations to Ambassador Ward of Jamaica, who so ably conducted the work of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations and whose excellent work made possible the adoption of resolution 1353 (2001). We eagerly await the submission of the upcoming report of that Working Group during Mali's presidency of the Security Council.

I thank you, Madam President, for having made us work so hard this month, and I thank you especially for having made us work so effectively.

**The President:** We have reached the end of our list of speakers, and, in view of the lateness of the hour, I will certainly adopt the Norwegian formula.

Let me first of all thank all of the participants in this very useful wrap-up meeting. I recognize that it has been very difficult for non-members of the Council to be present here today, in view of the many other activities that are taking place and of the fact that our meeting had to start much later than anticipated, since we had to have earlier consultations, the consultations having proved extremely useful on the situation in Afghanistan.

I wish at this time to express my deep appreciation to the members of the Council for the considerable cooperation which the Jamaican delegation received this month. The fact that we were able to adopt several resolutions on the Democratic Republic of the Congo; counter-terrorism; Afghanistan; children and armed conflict; Western Sahara; the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force and the Iraq oil-for-food programme, as well as presidential statements on Burundi, Kosovo and Angola and a statement of appreciation to former President Nelson Mandela certainly indicates the amount of work that we put in during this month and the fact that all delegations worked so well together to ensure the outcome that we had.

I wish to express our appreciation in particular to the delegations that helped us in coordinating resolutions and presidential statements and in providing elements for press statements. This has always been a cooperative effort, and never more so than this month.

I also wanted to express our deep appreciation to the Security Council Secretariat, headed by Assistant Secretary-General Joseph Stephanides. They provided

tremendous support to the delegation as well as to the members of the Council.

As far as today's wrap-up session is concerned, there are many threads which support improving transparency. I certainly hope that the ideas that have been expressed in reaction to the note that we circulated will provide a basis for further action by the members of the Council. We will certainly take on board the suggestion of Ambassador Mahbubani that

we do a short analysis of the suggestions and the recommendations coming out of this meeting, and we will pass them on to the representatives of Mali when they take up the presidency tomorrow.

Again, I thank you all very much.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

*The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.*