Security Council Elections 2017

Introduction: The 2017 Elections

The 71st session of the UN General Assembly is scheduled to hold elections for the Security Council on 2 June. The five seats available for election in 2017 according to the regular distribution among regions will be as follows:

• two seats for the African Group (currently held by Egypt and Senegal);

• one seat for the Group of Asia and the Pacific Small Island Developing States (the Asia-Pacific Group, currently held by Japan);

• one seat for the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (GRULAC, currently held by Uruguay); and

• one seat for the Eastern European Group (currently held by Ukraine).

The five new members elected this year will take up their seats on 1 January 2018 and will serve through to 31 December 2019.

In addition, Italy is committed to relinquishing the seat it has held since 1 January 2017 after serving for one year, and a by-election will thus be held for one seat for the Western European and Others Group (WEOG). Two WEOG seats are usually up for election in even numbered years, but this year's by-election will be held because Italy and the Netherlands agreed to split the 2017-2018 term. The new

member from WEOG will serve a one-year term from 1 January to 31 December 2018, completing the 2017-2018 term.

At press time, all six candidates—Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Kuwait, the Netherlands, Peru and Poland—are currently running unopposed as sole candidates for their respective regional groups.

The 2017-2018 Split Term

In the 2016 elections, three candidates—Italy, the Netherlands and Sweden—were running for the two available WEOG seats. During the first round of voting, Sweden received more than the necessary two-thirds majority of votes to be elected (134), while Italy and the Netherlands tied at 95 votes each after five rounds of voting. On 29 June, the Chair of WEOG sent a letter (A/70/964) informing the President of the General Assembly that Italy and the Netherlands had agreed to split the 2017-2018 term in view of the inconclusive results for the remaining non-permanent seat. The letter indicated that the Netherlands had withdrawn its candidacy in favour of Italy, which was consequently endorsed by WEOG as the group's only candidate. On 30 June 2016, in a stand-alone vote, Italy was elected to the seat. According to the agreement, Italy will relinquish its seat on 31 December 2017 and the Netherlands will run as the endorsed and only candidate of WEOG in a by-election, which will be held on the same day as the regular elections for non-permanent members of the Council in 2017.

Russia and Egypt, a non-permanent member for the 2016-2017 term, sent letters to the President of the General Assembly in which they outlined their concerns regarding the arrangement between Italy and the Netherlands (A/70/971 and A/70/974). Both countries stated that they viewed the agreement on splitting the term as an exceptional case which should not set a precedent. They argued that a practice of splitting the term would have a negative impact on the functionality and efficiency of the Security Council in its responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. Russia, in its letter, noted that the last time a decision was taken on splitting the term

was more than 50 years ago, following which the Council's workload has greatly increased. It said it was "gravely disappointed by the inability of the Western European and other States to designate a candidate by consensus, which has led to the current stalemate."

Article 23(2) of the UN Charter states that the non-permanent members of the Security Council shall be elected for a term of two years. Split terms started to appear in the late 1950s due to disagreements regarding regional rotation and associated Cold War politics, as well as to accommodate the aspirations of newly independent countries. Following multiple rounds of inconclusive voting, two candidates would agree to split the term. The member that was elected first would relinquish its term after one year on the Council, thus enabling the holding of a by-election to fill the vacant seat. This form of by-election is in line with Rule 140 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly which states:

Should a member cease to belong to a Council before its term of office expires, a by-election shall be held separately at the next session of the General Assembly to elect a member for the unexpired term.

The practice of splitting terms ended in the mid-1960s when the non-permanent membership of the Council was enlarged from six to ten members and regional representation was introduced. (For further background, see "Security Council Elections: Italy and the Netherlands Agree to a Split Term" in *What's in Blue* from 29 June 2016: http://www.whatsinblue.org/2016/06/security-council-elections-italy-and-the-netherlands-agree-to-a-split-term.php.)

The 2017 Candidates

Five out of the six current candidates have previously served on the Council: Poland on five previous occasions (1946-1947, 1960, 1970-1971, 1982-1983, 1996-1997), the Netherlands on five (1946, 1951-1952, 1965-1966, 1983-1984, 1999-2000), Peru on four (1955-1956, 1973-1974, 1984-1985, 2006-2007), Côte d'Ivoire on two (1964-1965, 1990-1991), and Kuwait on one (1978-1979), while Equatorial Guinea has never served.

Thus the Netherlands and Poland, having served five terms each, have the most prior Council experience, followed by Peru which has served four terms. Both the Netherlands and Poland served one-year terms, in 1946 and 1960 respectively. The Netherlands was elected for a one-year term in 1946 during the very first Security Council elections when six non-permanent members were elected: the Netherlands was one of the three members elected to serve a one-year term in line with Article 23(2) of the Charter, designed to ensure that terms of half of the non-permanent members would expire each year. Poland served a one-year term as a result of an agreement with Turkey to split the 1960-1961 term. Equatorial Guinea is one of 67 UN member states—almost 35 percent of the total membership—that have never served on the Council.

African Seats

Three non-permanent seats are allocated to Africa. One seat comes up for election during every even calendar year, and two seats are contested during odd years. Although 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, Côte d'Ivoire is running unopposed for the Western Africa seat and Equatorial Guinea for the Central Africa seat.

Côte d'Ivoire

Côte d'Ivoire, a UN member state since 1960, has served on the Council on two occasions (1964-1965, 1990-1991). It received the endorsement of the African Union (AU) and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in 2016. It would succeed Senegal.

During its campaign, Côte d'Ivoire has placed particular emphasis on promoting a culture of dialogue with the aim of achieving development through peace. It has highlighted its experience of hosting a successful UN peacekeeping operation, the UN Operation in Côte d'Ivoire (UNOCI). In this context, Côte d'Ivoire has pointed to its record in multifaceted cooperation with the UN as a valuable experience to share, together with its efforts in post-conflict stability building. On the Council, Côte d'Ivoire intends to share its extensive experience in peacebuilding activities, especially with regard to disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR); security sector reform (SSR); and national reconciliation. Côte d'Ivoire has stressed that lessons learned from its cooperation with UNOCI could be applied to ongoing efforts to improve UN peacekeeping operations in general.

As a member of ECOWAS, Côte d'Ivoire has emphasised its engagement in conflict resolution at the regional level, particularly in the cases of Liberia and Sierra Leone. As chair of ECOWAS in 2012-2013, Côte d'Ivoire played a role in raising awareness of the threat of terrorist groups in Mali as well in efforts to find a political solution there. Other issues that Côte d'Ivoire plans to focus on during its tenure on the Council include the fight against terrorism and maritime piracy, the impact of global warming on international peace and security, and the promotion of early warning mechanisms and non-proliferation of small arms.

As of 28 February, Côte d'Ivoire had eight peacekeepers deployed in two UN missions.

Equatorial Guinea

Equatorial Guinea has been a UN member state since 1968 and has never served on the Council. Its candidacy was endorsed by the AU in 2015. It would succeed Egypt.

Equatorial Guinea has placed promotion of "sustainable peace for sustainable development" at the core of its candidature. To this end, it plans to address issues of human rights and freedoms, poverty and poor governance. Equatorial Guinea has emphasised the need to support efforts to secure peace, stability and development in Africa, given that African issues occupy a significant portion of the Council's agenda. Considering its own positive experience with development, Equatorial Guinea will seek to further support the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as well as the AU's Agenda 2063.

During its tenure on the Council, Equatorial Guinea intends to promote the principles of diplomatic cooperation and the use of peaceful dialogue to address the root causes and consequences of conflicts. Equatorial Guinea has stressed its tradition of facilitating peace talks aimed at mitigating conflicts in the immediate region. It has also emphasised the importance of furthering international cooperation between regional and subregional organisations and the Council. During its campaign, Equatorial Guinea has highlighted the importance of continuing negotiations on the reform of the Security Council with an aim of achieving better representation of the African continent. Other issues of concern for Equatorial Guinea include the fight against all forms of terrorism and organised crime, the protection of human rights, and alleviating the effects of climate change.

Equatorial Guinea currently does not have any troops participating in UN peacekeeping operations.

REGION	SEATS AVAILABLE IN THE 2017 ELECTION	MEMBER STATES RUNNING AND PREVIOUS TERMS ON THE COUNCIL
Africa	2	Côte d'Ivoire (1964-1965, 1990-1991) and Equatorial Guinea (never served)
Asia-Pacific	1	Kuwait (1978-1979)
Eastern Europe	1	Poland (1946-1947, 1960, 1970-1971, 1982-1983, 1996-1997)
Latin America and Caribbean	1	Peru (1955-1956, 1973-1974, 1984-1985, 2006-2007)
Western Europe and Other	1	The Netherlands (1946, 1951-1952, 1965-1966, 1983-1984, 1999-2000)

The 2017 Candidates

GRULAC Seat

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

Peru

Peru is a founding member of the UN and has served on the Council four times (1955-1956, 1973-1974, 1984-1985, 2006-2007). It presented its candidature in 2008 and was endorsed by GRULAC in 2016. It would succeed Uruguay.

Peru has emphasised its long tradition of multilateralism and its active participation within the UN system. Peru has stressed that, due to its impartiality, it could play a role in bridging the divisions within the Council. Peru will seek to strengthen the Council's conflict prevention mechanisms and support better-coordinated action by the UN. Recognising the importance of the Council for collective security, Peru will seek to support efforts to achieve greater transparency, accountability and representation within this body. During its campaign, Peru highlighted the link between development and security, and in particular the need to promote fair, peaceful and inclusive societies. Peru has placed particular emphasis on the protection of civilians in armed conflict and has promoted efforts to limit the use of the veto in situations involving war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide.

As the fifth largest troop contributor in the Americas, Peru is keen on improving the effectiveness of UN peacekeeping operations by providing them with more specific mandates as well as better financial and logistical resources. Peru has stressed that its foreign policy has been based on respect for international law and that the country will continue to promote the jurisdictions of the International Criminal Court (ICC), the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and other international tribunals. Peru will also continue to contribute to international efforts to combat terrorism and violent extremism through law and its enforcement, as well as addressing their root causes.

As of 28 February, Peru had 396 peacekeepers deployed in six UN missions. Since 1958, Peru has deployed over 8,000 peacekeepers in 22 UN missions.

Eastern European Seat

One seat on the Council is allocated to Eastern Europe. This seat comes up for election every odd calendar year.

Poland

A founding member of the UN, Poland has served on the Council five times (1946-1947, 1960, 1970-1971, 1982-1983, 1996-1997). Both Bulgaria and Poland had declared their candidacies for the 2018-2019 term in 2010. However, Bulgaria withdrew its candidature in late 2016, and Poland was subsequently endorsed by the Eastern European Group this year. Poland would succeed Ukraine.

Poland has stressed the importance of strengthening the Council's efforts in various aspects of conflict prevention, including the development of early warning and preventive action mechanisms. During its campaign, Poland has reiterated that the Security Council needs to make a more effective use of prevention tools under Chapter VI of the UN Charter. In addition, it has emphasised that the Council should not be hindered by the use of the veto in addressing situations involving war crimes or crimes against humanity. Furthermore, Poland has stressed that the protection of civilians is one of the most important issues related to peace and security. It has expressed support for prioritising the issue of women in peacekeeping missions and protection of children in armed conflict.

In order to improve the effectiveness of the Council in responding to current global challenges, Poland has stressed the importance of reforming the working methods of the Council, in addition to making the body more representative. In its campaign, Poland has emphasised that the Council should devote greater attention to sustainable development issues, given their interlinkages with international peace and security. Furthermore, it has stressed the need to address the impact of climate change especially on Small Island Developing States. Given its long tradition of participating in UN peacekeeping missions as well as missions with regional organisations, Poland has emphasised its willingness to contribute to ongoing discussions about the future of peacekeeping operations.

Since 1953, Poland has contributed over 70,000 military and police personnel to more than 30 UN peacekeeping operations. As of 28 February, Poland had seven peacekeepers deployed in five missions.

WEOG Seat

The two elected WEOG seats are usually filled during every even calendar year. Given that Italy and the Netherlands agreed to split the 2017-2018 term, Italy will relinquish its seat on 31 December 2017 and a by-election will be held this year. The Netherlands will run unopposed, as the only candidate endorsed by WEOG.

The Netherlands

The Netherlands is a founding member of the UN and has served on the Council five times (1946, 1951-1952, 1965-1966, 1983-1984, 1999-2000). It presented its candidature in 2005.

The Netherlands has stressed the importance of UN peacekeeping in building lasting peace, while recognising the role of peacebuilding efforts and the importance of cooperation with regional partners in preventing and resolving conflicts. The Netherlands has emphasised the importance of promoting the protection of civilians agenda and advancing disarmament efforts. During its campaign, the Netherlands has devoted significant attention to development issues, such as the impact of climate change and issues related to water management. One of the main pillars of its campaign has been its emphasis on strengthening the international legal order as a means for the peaceful settlement of disputes. The Netherlands has stated its intention to enhance cooperation between the UN and international courts. Also, the Netherlands has emphasised its unique perspective as a kingdom comprising territories in Europe and in the Caribbean.

The Netherlands has participated in UN peace operations since 1947, deploying over the years more than 125,000 military and police personnel to various UN missions. As of 28 February, the Netherlands had 458 peacekeepers deployed in five UN missions. The Hague hosts the ICC, the ICJ, the Permanent Court of Arbitration, the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, and the Special Tribunal for Lebanon.

The 2017 Candidates

Asia-Pacific Seat

One of the two Council seats allocated to the Asia-Pacific Group comes up for election every year. Kuwait is running unopposed for the seat this year. It would succeed Japan, and join Kazakhstan as the two Council members from the Asia-Pacific Group. It would also fill the Arab swing seat, which alternates every odd calendar year between the Asia-Pacific Group and the African Group and is being vacated by Egypt. (The Arab swing seat is described in greater detail below.)

Kuwait

A member of the UN since 1963, Kuwait has served on the Council once (1978-1979). It announced its candidacy in 2011 and was endorsed by the Asia-Pacific Group in 2016. Kuwait has also been endorsed by the Gulf Cooperation Council, the League of Arab States, and the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation.

In its campaign, Kuwait has stressed the need to promote the Council's role in conflict prevention, preventive diplomacy, and prompt responses to emerging crises that threaten international peace and security. Kuwait hosted the peacekeeping operation, UN Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM), from 1993-2003 and paid for two-thirds of the operating budget of UNIKOM throughout its ten-year existence. It will seek to encourage the Council's role in mediation efforts with the aim of peaceful resolution of conflicts. In order to improve the Council's efficiency and ability to carry out its tasks under the UN Charter, Kuwait has highlighted the importance of reform of the Council as well as improvement of its working methods.

Kuwait will continue to support UN efforts in combating all forms of terrorism and violent extremism while promoting dialogue between religions, cultures and civilisations. Kuwait has highlighted its record in providing development assistance and its efforts at promoting international partnerships and cooperation to achieve economic growth globally, stressing the positive impact of promoting economic growth and development on peace and security. To this end, Kuwait has stressed the importance of assisting the developing and least developed countries to achieve their development goals. In addition to highlighting the impact of development assistance, Kuwait has emphasised its role in providing humanitarian assistance to populations affected by armed conflicts and natural and man-made disasters.

Kuwait currently does not have any troops participating in UN peacekeeping operations.

Council Dynamics in 2018

Current divisions within the Council over issues such as Ukraine, Syria and Israel/Palestine are likely to persist following the departure of the six current members and the arrival of the six newly elected members. Although it is difficult to assess how the Council dynamics might evolve next year, the priorities raised in the campaigns by the candidates as well as their longstanding interests, provide indication of some general patterns that might emerge.

Several candidates appear to have a strong national interest in the countries in their respective regions that are on the Council's agenda:

- Kuwait attaches great importance to the ongoing conflicts in the Middle East, especially in Syria and Israel/Palestine. It also hosted Yemen peace talks in 2016.
- Given that it shares a border with Ukraine, Poland is likely to play a role regarding that situation as well as other European issues on the Council's agenda.
- Considering its active participation on a subregional level through ECOWAS, Côte d'Ivoire is likely to prioritise the situation in its immediate region, including Liberia and Mali.

- Equatorial Guinea could be expected to play a role in the central African region, particularly regarding conflicts in the Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.
- As a member of the Group of Friends of Haiti and a country which made significant troop contributions to the UN Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH), Peru is likely to take interest in the future mission there. The situation in Colombia is also likely to feature on Peru's agenda.

Following the 2015 report by the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO) and Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon's report on its recommendations, discussions on peace operations are expected to continue to attract the attention of the Council, especially that of major troop contributors such as Ethiopia, and major financial contributors headed by the US, China, France and the UK. Given that Peru and the Netherlands are the biggest troop contributors in the group of incoming Council members, they are likely to take an interest in these discussions. Côte d'Ivoire, though not a major troop contributor, is a country that has hosted a major UN peacekeeping mission and has expressed particular interest in improving UN peace operations.

On Council thematic issues, the Netherlands could play an active role in advancing cooperation between the UN and international courts and tribunals, including the possibility of reviving efforts to establish accountability for the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight MH17 in July 2014, in which many Dutch citizens were killed. Peru could also play a role on the issue of international law and in promoting the activities of international legal mechanisms. Côte d'Ivoire, Kuwait and Peru have all stated their interest in combating terrorism and violent extremism. Poland could be expected to play a role in disarmament and non-proliferation issues. Several candidates, including Côte d'Ivoire, Kuwait, Peru and Poland, have emphasised the importance of various aspects of peacebuilding activities.

Secretary-General António Guterres has placed special emphasis on improving UN capacities in conflict prevention and sustaining peace. This issue is likely to be high on the agenda for the majority of elected members who have expressed strong interest in advancing conflict prevention and peacebuilding

Council Dynamics in 2018

measures. In the period ahead, it will be interesting to observe the effect of the change of leadership in the UN on the relationship between the Secretariat and the Council, and whether the Council will provide political support to the Secretary-General in conflict prevention activities.

Over the course of the past several years, a growing number of the Council's elected members have emphasised the interlinkages between development and international peace and security. This trend is likely to continue next year since all candidates have stressed the importance of this issue and have supported the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The increasing tendency of elected members to widen the scope of the Council's work on conflict prevention has resulted in difficult dynamics among its members. The P3 have been receptive to Council discussions of interlinkages between certain aspects of development and peace and security. However, China and Russia have been more cautious in this regard and have advocated keeping the Council's agenda more narrowly focused on issues that primarily involve situations of armed conflict.

There appears to be a strong desire among most candidates to enhance the transparency and inclusiveness of the Council's work. This is a trend that has been prominent on the agenda of candidates during recent election cycles. Although there have been some positive developments regarding the working methods of the Council, most elected members have continued to draw attention to aspects of the Council's work that need further improvement. These include inadequate time to negotiate Council outcomes, as well as the limited interactivity of Council meetings. In their campaigns, most members have pledged to listen to interested stakeholders outside the Council and to take their perspectives into account. One continuing member, Sweden, and one candidate, Peru, are members of Accountability Coherence and Transparency (ACT), an initiative launched in May 2013 by a group of member states focusing on the Council's working methods, particularly those enhancing non-members' interaction with the Council. The goals of ACT are likely to resonate with the Council members that are not part of the group but are nevertheless committed to enhancing the accountability, effectiveness and legitimacy of the Council.

The six departing Council members serve as the chairs of nine sanctions committees and five other subsidiary bodies.

Over the past few years, there has been a trend toward increased transparency in the work of the sanctions committees, including public briefings by the chairs, engagement with regional actors, and several field visits (although there has also been resistance by permanent members in some cases). This will be the second time that the elections are being held more than six months prior to the assumption of elected members' Council responsibilities. Therefore, it is likely that the process of selection of chairs will take place considerably earlier than was the case prior to the decision of the General Assembly to change the timing of the elections. After the 2016 elections, Council members agreed on a note by the president (S/2016/619) concerning transitional arrangements for newly elected Council members, which among other matters called on Council members to agree provisionally on the appointment of chairs of subsidiary bodies by 1 October. Such agreement by Council members in 2016 was only reached by 31 October, though this was still significantly earlier than in previous years. It will be interesting to observe how the process will unfold this year and what positive impact it might have on the management of the subsidiary bodies of the Council.

The Process of Election

A country must obtain the votes of 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 at least 129 votes are required to win a seat if all 193 UN member states vote. Members who abstain from voting are considered not voting. (A member state can be excluded from voting as a result of arrears in payment of financial contributions, in accordance with Article 19 of the UN Charter. Libya, Sudan and Venezuela are not permitted to vote in the General Assembly until the end of its 71st session because of their arrears.)

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 unopposed. 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 can 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 a candidate at that point 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 majority.

In theory, it is possible that a country running unopposed might not garner the required number of 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 could ultimately fail to obtain a seat. However, this is unlikely and has never yet happened.

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 as noted above resulted in a number of agreements to split terms. Despite the enlargement, extended voting has still occurred, although such situations have been solved by the

The Process of Election

withdrawal of one of the contenders or the election of a compromise candidate, rather than by agreeing on a split term. (See Annex 3 for the results of recent elections to the Security Council. A summary of the voting in the General Assembly elections for non-permanent seats on the Security Council since 1946 is available at www.securitycouncilreport.org.)

Regional Groups and Established Practices

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

Article 23 of 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 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."

The Charter does not stipulate how equitable geographic distribution should be achieved. Nor does it suggest the 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:

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

Kiribati, which had not been participating in any regional group within the UN, joined the Asia-Pacific group in 2013. 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. (Israel has announced that it plans to run for a WEOG seat on the Council in 2018.)

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's Ministerial Committee on Candidatures within the International 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 Northern 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 Western 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 which 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. However, there have been times when rival candidacies 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 of selecting a candidate in the African Group usually follows a defined path, in accordance with the AU rules of procedure cited above. 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. This committee follows its written rules of procedure in selecting candidates. The African Group and the AU are made up of the same members. (For over three decades the sole exception was Morocco, which had been a founding member of the Organisation of African Unity [OAU], the AU's precursor, but which withdrew from membership of the OAU in 1984 after the organisation admitted the Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic. In January 2017, Morocco joined the AU.) Subregional organisations may add their endorsement before the list goes to the AU Ministerial Committee. The AU Executive Committee makes the final decision during an AU Summit meeting. Despite the written rules of procedure for

Regional Groups and Established Practices

candidate selection, some countries have in the past 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 unopposed elections. There have been times when this has resulted in the election of candidates which 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 into play more 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 including 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 known as 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 to fill the two seats, one of which becomes available every year. While it has 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 contested the same seat and eight rounds of voting were needed before Pakistan finally prevailed.)

Since 1958, Japan has also been a regular presence on the Council. On completing its current term at the end of 2017, Japan will have accumulated 22 years on the Council, which will be the highest number of years on the Council of a non-permanent member. Since 1966, it has never been off the Council for more than six consecutive years. With a total of 20 years on the Council, Brazil comes in second.

The absence of a formal rotation system has meant that there is frequently competition for the Asia-Pacific seat regardless of whether a candidate declares itself far in advance or not. 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.

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

Eastern European Group

The Eastern European Group is the smallest regional group, consisting of 23 member states, with an election for one seat every odd calendar year. This is the group that has expanded the most in recent decades, with 15 new members added since 1991 due to the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the splitting of other states in the region (former Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia). Today, 11 of its countries are EU members, four are candidates for EU membership, and Bosnia and Herzegovina is considered a "potential candidate". An Eastern European seat was included in the permanent members' "gentlemen's agreement" in 1946 (see Annex 2). 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 regional group, 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 (temporary) 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 that 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), CANZ (Canada, Australia and New Zealand), and the Benelux (Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg). There are informal understandings within the Nordic countries

Regional Groups and Established Practices

and CANZ subgroups that have encouraged 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 since run for a WEOG seat.

Latin American and Caribbean Group

After the expansion of the Council and the reorganisation of the 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. 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, 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 lasted from 16 October until 7 November).

As a result of this experience, an informal understanding developed among GRULAC members to avoid contested elections, starting with the 2007 elections for the 2008-2009 term. Since then, Mexico (2008), Brazil (2009), Colombia (2010), Guatemala (2011), Argentina (2012), Chile (2013), Venezuela (2014), Uruguay (2015), Bolivia (2016) and now Peru have all been unopposed candidates for Council seats.

In the future, it is possible that larger countries in the group will negotiate to take the place of smaller countries, or will contest pre-announced candidacies by smaller countries, rather than wait until their turn comes up again by rotation.

Becoming a Candidate

Most candidate countries follow a fairly standard path in announcing and pursuing their bids for the Council, with the exception of candidates from the African Group, which has a more complex process as described earlier. If the country is a member of a subregional group, it will often first inform members of that 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 Council seat by notifying 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. Most candidate countries then prepare a circular note to all missions in New York informing them of the candidacy. Most 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 whether elections will be contested or not. This becomes a guide to help the Secretariat prepare the relevant documentation for the election process.

Campaigning for the 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 Council can involve 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 unopposed elections.)

Commitments are sought in writing, orally 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 have reneged on their pledges. 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 the country's vote to a particular 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 regard itself as committed to upholding pledges made by the preceding administration. Given the secrecy of the ballot, there are incentives to pledge to all candidates in a competitive election. Knowing that commitments are not always secure, 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.

Campaigning for the Council

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 senior 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.

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 seeking 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 a not uncommon element of the campaign process.

The promotion of candidacies by arranging trips to the candidate's capital or holding workshops on issues of interest (normally not particularly controversial issues) in attractive locations has been used by several candidates in recent years to raise the profile of their campaign and attract permanent representatives (who will cast the actual vote) to these events. "Swag bags" filled with items imprinted with the logo of the candidate that are handed out within UN circles are intended 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 an unopposed election.

As contested elections may continue for several rounds, candidates try to ensure that member states that vote for them in the first round continue to do so in subsequent rounds, while also attempting to secure votes in subsequent rounds from member states that did not commit to voting for them in the first round.

As a result of this bid to gain second or subsequent round votes, some member states have stated when they commit their vote to a candidate, that 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 or candidates do not win or obtain the higher result in the first round in a race with two or more candidates.

It should 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 is not likely to win the seat.

UN Documents on Security Council Elections

Notes by the President of the Security Council

S/2016/619 (15 July 2016) was a note by the Council president concerning transitional arrangements for newly elected Council members, which among other matters called on Council members to agree provisionally on the appointment of chairs of subsidiary bodies by 1 October.

General Assembly Documents

A/70/PV.108 (30 June 2016) was the record of the 2016 elections for the remaining non-permanent member from WEOG.

A/70/974 (30 June 2016) was the letter from Egypt expressing its understanding that the agreement between Italy and the Netherlands to split the 2017-2018 term would not lay the ground for future practice and would have no legal or procedural implications on future elections to the Security Council.

A/70/971 (30 June 2016) was the letter from Russia expressing the position that the exceptional case of the agreement between Italy and the Netherlands to split the term would not set a precedent, arguing that this practice would have a negative impact on the Security Council's efficiency.

A/70/964 (29 June 2016) was the letter from the chair of WEOG stating that Italy and the Netherlands had agreed to split the term, with Italy serving in 2017 and the Netherlands in 2018, requiring a by-election for the remainder of the term.

A/70/PV.107 (28 June 2016) was the record of the 2016 elections of the non-permanent members for the remaining candidates from WEOG when Italy and the Netherlands announced that they would split the term.

A/70/PV.106 (28 June 2016) was the record of the 2016 elections of four non-permanent members.

A/70/PV.33 (15 October 2015) was the record of the 2015 elections of non-permanent members.

A/69/PV.25 (16 October 2014) was the record of the 2014 elections of non-permanent members.

A/RES/68/307 (18 September 2014) decided that elections of the non-permanent members of the Security Council would take place about six months before the elected members assume their responsibilities.

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

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 I, 14th Plenary Session and Part II (12 January 1946) was the first election of non-permanent members.

Other

Charter of the United Nations, http://www.un.org/en/charter-united-nations/

A/520/Rev.15 and amendments 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 no. 6, Volume III on Article 23 (1979-1984).

See http://www.un.org/en/sc/repertoire/ for the online version of the Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council. (The Repertory and the Repertoire are different resources.)

Useful Additional Resources

David L. Bosco, *Five to Rule Them All: The UN Security Council and the Making of the Modern World,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

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

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and Alastair Smith, "The Pernicious Consequences of UN Security Council Membership," *Journal of Conflict Resolution,* 54 (2010): 667-686.

Terrence L. Chapman and Dan Reiter, "The United Nations Security Council and the Rally 'Round the Flag Effect", *Journal of Conflict Resolution,* 48 (2004): 886-909.

Axel Dreher et al., *The Determinants of Election to the United Nations Security Council,* CESifo Working Paper Series, no. 3902 (2012).

Jared Genser and Bruno Stagno Ugarte, eds., *The United Nations Security Council in the Age of Human Rights,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

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

David M. Malone, "Eyes on the Prize: The Quest for Nonpermanent Seats on the UN Security Council", *Global Governance,* 6 (2000): 3-23.

Norman J. Padelford, "Politics and Change in the Security Council", *International Organization,* 14 (1960): 381-401.

Ruth B. Russell, *A History of the United Nations Charter: The Role of the United Nations, 1940-1945,* (The Brookings Institute, 1958).

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

Loraine Sievers and Sam Daws, *The Procedure of the UN Security Council,* Fourth Edition, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) and its website www.scprocedure.org

Bruno Simma et al., eds., T*he Charter of the United Nations, A Commentary,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Ramesh Thakur, ed., *What is Equitable Geographic Representation in the Twenty-first Century?,* International Peace Academy and the United Nations University Seminar Report, 26 March 1999.

Thomas G. Weiss and Sam Daws, eds., *The Oxford Handbook on the United Nations,* (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), African Union, (2006).

United Nations Handbook 2013-2014, New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, (2013).

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(1), specifies the number of non-permanent members to be elected, as amended in 1963:

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

Article 23(2) 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 establish the required rotational cycle or to break electoral deadlocks.

Article 23(2) 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 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(1) 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.

"Contribution…to the maintenance of international peace and security" is often interpreted in this context as the personnel or financial contributions for peacekeeping operations and peace processes. "Contribution…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 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

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

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 "any 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 1946-1947 period, split terms started to occur in the late 1950s until the Council was enlarged in 1965. This was in part driven by fallout from the disagreement over regional rotation and associated Cold War politics. But the aspirations of newly independent countries was 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 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 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 (this was 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 (this included the Caribbean); and
- two from the Western European and other states (this included 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 2015* at www.securitycouncilreport. org.

2010 UNGA65	**3 ROUNDS**	
28th 12-10-10	Round 1: 191 votes, 5 abstentions	**India** 187, **Colombia** 186, **South Africa** 182, **Germany** 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	**Portugal** 150, Canada 32

2011 UNGA66	**17 ROUNDS**	
37th 21-10-2011	Round 1: 193 votes, 2 abstentions	**Guatemala** 191, **Morocco** 151, **Pakistan** 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	**Togo** 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	**Azerbaijan** 155, Slovenia 13, Hungary 1

2012 UNGA67	**2 ROUNDS**	
27th 18-10-2012	Round 1: 193 votes, 8 abstentions	**Argentina** 182, **Rwanda** 148, **Australia** 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	**Republic of Korea** 149, **Luxembourg** 131, Finland 62, Cambodia 43

2013 UNGA68	**1 ROUND AND A SPECIAL ELECTION**	
34th 17-10-2013	Round 1: 191 votes, 5 abstentions	**Lithuania** 187, **Chile** 186, **Nigeria** 186, **Chad** 184, **Saudi Arabia** 176 (declined), Senegal 2, The Gambia 2, Lebanon 1, Croatia 1
61st 6-12-2013	Round 1: 185 votes, 4 abstentions	**Jordan** 178, **Saudi Arabia** 1

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

2014 UNGA69

3 ROUNDS

25th 16-10-2014

	Round 1: 193 votes, 10 abstentions	**Angola** 190, **Malaysia** 187, **Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela** 181, **New Zealand** 145, Spain 131, Turkey 109, Democratic Republic of the Congo 1, Brazil 1
	Round 2: 193 votes, restricted	Spain 120, Turkey 73
	Round 3: 192 votes, 1 abstention, restricted	**Spain** 132, Turkey 60

2015 UNGA69

1 ROUND

33rd 15-10-2015	Round 1: 192 votes, 14 abstentions	**Senegal** 187, **Uruguay** 185, **Japan** 184, **Egypt** 179, **Ukraine** 177

2016 UNGA70

6 ROUNDS

106th 28-06-2016	Round 1: 191 votes, 8 abstentions	**Ethiopia** 185, **Bolivia** 183, **Sweden** 134, Netherlands 125, Kazakhstan 113, Italy 113, Thailand 77, Colombia 1, Cuba 1, Belgium 1
	Round 2: 193 votes, 2 abstentions, restricted	**Kazakhstan** 178, Netherlands 99, Italy 92, Thailand 55
	Round 3: 190 votes, 3 abstentions, restricted	Netherlands 96, Italy 94
107th 28-06-16	Round 4: 191 votes, 2 abstentions, restricted	Netherlands 96, Italy 95
	Round 5: 190 votes, 2 abstentions, unrestricted	Netherlands 95, Italy 95
108th 30-06-16	Round 6: 184 votes, 6 abstentions, unrestricted	**Italy** 179, Netherlands 4, San Marino 1