

C. Non-proliferation/Democratic People's Republic of Korea

During the period under review, the Security Council held six meetings under this item. Five meetings took the form of briefings and one was convened to adopt a decision.¹¹⁷⁵ The Council adopted one resolution, under Chapter VII of the Charter, by which it extended the mandate of the Panel of Experts established pursuant to resolution 1874 (2009) in support of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1718 (2006).¹¹⁷⁶ The Council failed to adopt one draft resolution due to the negative vote of two permanent members. More information on the meetings, including on participants, speakers and outcomes, is provided in the table below. In addition to the meetings, Council members held informal consultations of the whole in connection with the item.¹¹⁷⁷

During the period under review, Council members heard briefings by the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Peacebuilding Affairs and the Assistant Secretary-General for the Middle East, Asia and the Pacific of the Departments of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs and Peace Operations.¹¹⁷⁸ Their briefings were focused on the unprecedented number of ballistic missile launches by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea during the year and the risk of a significant escalation of tension in the region and beyond.¹¹⁷⁹ Also in their briefings, they reaffirmed the Secretary-General's commitment to working with all the parties for sustainable peace and a complete denuclearization of the Korean peninsula, reiterating that the unity of the Council was essential to ease tensions and overcome the diplomatic impasse.¹¹⁸⁰ Noting the negative action-reaction cycle of missile launches and military exercises, the briefers stressed the importance of strengthening communication channels, including inter-Korean and military-to-military ones, in de-escalating tensions and lowering the risk of miscalculation.¹¹⁸¹ On the grave humanitarian situation in the country, the briefers expressed the readiness of the United Nations to assist people in need and reiterated the Secretary-General's call for the unimpeded entry of international staff and humanitarian supplies.¹¹⁸² In addition to Council members, Japan and the Republic of Korea participated in all meetings of the Council, under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At those meetings, Council members held differing views regarding the approach to the actions of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. For example, at the meeting held on 21 November,¹¹⁸³ many Council members¹¹⁸⁴ considered that the continued development and testing of nuclear weapons undermined the non-proliferation regime and raised tensions in the region and beyond, posing a threat to international peace and stability. Some speakers¹¹⁸⁵ criticized the continued silence of the Council. Considering the absence of consensus on the adoption of a draft resolution on the situation, the representative of the United States expressed his delegation's intention to propose a draft presidential statement to hold the Democratic People's Republic of Korea accountable for its dangerous rhetoric and destabilizing actions. Several Council members¹¹⁸⁶ called on all parties to demonstrate restraint and to reaffirm in practice their readiness to renew dialogue. While also expressing concern over the rising tensions and intensifying confrontation on the Korean peninsula, the representatives of China and Russian Federation expressed opposition to any military activity threatening the security of the peninsula. They argued that the draft resolution proposed jointly by China and the Russian Federation would help to ease the humanitarian situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, create an atmosphere for dialogue and promote the realization of a political statement.

¹¹⁷⁵ For more information on the format of meetings, see part II.

¹¹⁷⁶ For more information on the mandate of the Committee and its Panel of Experts, see part IX, sect. I.B.

¹¹⁷⁷ See A/77/2, part II, chap. 33.

¹¹⁷⁸ See S/PV.9004, S/PV.9030, S/PV.9146, S/PV.9183 and S/PV.9197.

¹¹⁷⁹ See, for example, S/PV.9004, S/PV.9146 and S/PV.9183.

¹¹⁸⁰ See S/PV.9004, S/PV.9030 and S/PV.9146.

¹¹⁸¹ See S/PV.9183 and S/PV.9197.

¹¹⁸² See S/PV.9004, S/PV.9030, S/PV.9146, S/PV.9183 and S/PV.9197.

¹¹⁸³ See S/PV.9197.

¹¹⁸⁴ United States, Albania, Ireland, Gabon, India, Kenya, Brazil and United Arab Emirates.

¹¹⁸⁵ Albania, France, Ireland, Norway, United Kingdom, Mexico and Republic of Korea.

¹¹⁸⁶ Albania, France, Ireland, Norway, United Kingdom, Gabon, Mexico, Kenya and United Arab Emirates.

Also at those meetings, Council members discussed the role of sanctions in addressing the peace and security issues on the Korean peninsula. Some Council members affirmed the effectiveness of sanctions in slowing advancements by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in connection with weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles,¹¹⁸⁷ and some underlined the importance of sanctions compliance by all Member States and the full implementation of relevant Security Council resolutions.¹¹⁸⁸ Some Council members expressed concern regarding the evasion of sanctions by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea allowing continued funding to its illegal weapons of mass destruction programmes, including through cyberactivity,¹¹⁸⁹ and some opined that all reasonable measures should be taken to prevent evasion, that the current sanctions regime should be updated to cover the new areas and that stricter sanctions should be imposed.¹¹⁹⁰ At the meeting held on 11 May, the representative of China, stressing that sanctions were only a means to an end, stated that sanctions should not be equated with, or used to replace, diplomatic efforts and that furthering sanctions by means of a resolution, as proposed by the United States, was an inappropriate way to address the situation.¹¹⁹¹ At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation asserted that seeking mutually acceptable political and diplomatic solutions was the only way to peacefully resolve the issues concerning the Korean peninsula and expressed regret that the Council had only tightened the sanctions while ignoring positive signals from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the past few years. His delegation believed that the further strengthening of sanctions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea exceeded the scope of the measures needed to cut off channels for funding nuclear missile programmes and exposed its people to unacceptable socioeconomic and humanitarian turmoil. At the meeting held on 5 October, the representative of Brazil called on the Council to seriously explore alternative avenues to reducing tensions on the peninsula and breaking the deadlock.¹¹⁹² He expressed the view that, while multilateral sanctions might be part of a comprehensive response, they alone could not address the peace and security issue of the peninsula.¹¹⁹³

In their deliberations, Council members also addressed the grave humanitarian situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Some Council members expressed the belief that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea itself had worsened the situation of its own people, by diverting resources from humanitarian needs to illegal military and ballistic missile programmes, and called upon the country to prioritize the needs of its people over costly military ventures and to allow the entry of relief organizations and the flow of humanitarian aid into the country.¹¹⁹⁴ In response to the concern that sanctions exacerbated the humanitarian situation, the representative of Norway, who chaired the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1718 (2006) in 2022, stated at various meetings that sanctions were not intended to have adverse humanitarian consequences for the civilians and that members of the Council continued to show that they had taken the humanitarian situation in the country seriously, with requests for humanitarian exemptions swiftly processed by the Committee.¹¹⁹⁵

In addition, in 2022, the Council convened two meetings to adopt decisions in connection with the item. On 25 March, under Chapter VII of the Charter, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 2627 (2022), by which it extended the mandate of the Panel of Experts established pursuant to resolution 1874 (2009) for a period of 12 months, until 30 April 2023.¹¹⁹⁶ After the adoption of the resolution, several Council members made statements, in which they noted with concern the leaks of the 2021 interim and final reports of the Panel of Experts and the potential damage to the credibility of the work of the Committee and stressed the need for the Panel to improve its working methods.¹¹⁹⁷ The representative of Mexico expressed regret that Council members could not reach agreement on explicit instructions to the

¹¹⁸⁷ See [S/PV.9030](#) (United States); and [S/PV.9183](#) (Norway and United Arab Emirates).

¹¹⁸⁸ See [S/PV.9030](#) (United Arab Emirates and India); and [S/PV.9146](#) (United States, Albania, Ireland, Norway, India and United Arab Emirates).

¹¹⁸⁹ See [S/PV.9030](#) (Albania, Ireland, United Kingdom, France and Norway); and [S/PV.9183](#) (France).

¹¹⁹⁰ See [S/PV.9030](#) (France and United States); and [S/PV.9183](#) (France and United Arab Emirates).

¹¹⁹¹ See [S/PV.9030](#).

¹¹⁹² See [S/PV.9146](#).

¹¹⁹³ For more information on the imposition of sanctions by the Council, see part VII, sect. III.

¹¹⁹⁴ See [S/PV.9146](#) (Albania, France, United Arab Emirates and Republic of Korea); [S/PV.9183](#) (United Kingdom and United Arab Emirates); and [S/PV.9197](#) (Ireland, Kenya and United Arab Emirates).

¹¹⁹⁵ See, for example, [S/PV.9183](#) and [S/PV.9197](#).

¹¹⁹⁶ Resolution 2627 (2022), para. 1.

¹¹⁹⁷ See [S/PV.9004](#) (United States, Norway, China and Russian Federation).

Panel of Experts to investigate and report, in a timely manner, on incidents relating to the launch of ballistic missiles, in addition to its interim and final reports. Despite having voted in favour of the resolution, the representative of China expressed regret and discontent that the concerns of his delegation, which had been supported by a large number of Council members, had not been taken on board by the penholder.

On 26 May, the Council voted on a draft resolution¹¹⁹⁸ submitted by the United States. As penholder of the draft resolution, the representative of the United States made a statement before the vote, in which she affirmed that the launch of six intercontinental ballistic missiles since the beginning of 2022, including on 25 May, constituted a threat to the peace and security of the entire international community.¹¹⁹⁹ She noted that the Council had not issued a response to any of the six intercontinental ballistic missiles launches, despite the commitment made in resolution 2397 (2017). With regard to the argument by some Council members that a presidential statement was the appropriate response, she recalled that her delegation had proposed press elements and a statement to the press following many of those launches, but had been told that any such statement could lead to escalation or could destabilize the Korean peninsula. She argued that the exact opposite had happened, and that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had taken the Council's silence as a green light to act with impunity and escalate tensions on the peninsula. With the adoption of the draft resolution, a message could be sent to all proliferators that Council members would not stand for any actions aimed at undermining international peace and security. She added that, if adopted, the resolution would restrict the ability of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to advance its unlawful weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missile programmes, streamline sanctions implementation and further facilitate the delivery of humanitarian aid. The draft resolution was not adopted due to the negative vote of two permanent members.¹²⁰⁰

After the vote, 13 Council members made statements.¹²⁰¹ The representative of China stated that, with regard to the peninsula issue, the Council should play a positive and constructive role, and its actions should help to de-escalate the situation and prevent it from deteriorating and even spiralling out of control. He added that reliance on sanctions would not help to resolve the issue, as they would not only fail to resolve the problem but would lead to further negative consequences and an escalation of the confrontation. His delegation had repeatedly expressed the hope that the United States would consider issuing a presidential statement instead, as the best way to garner consensus among Council members and avoid confrontation. Explaining his country's vote, the representative of the Russian Federation said that the penholder had ignored the frequent clarifications made during the drafting process and that his delegation's appeals for it to be issued as a presidential statement instead had gone unheeded. According to the representative, strengthening the sanctions pressure on Pyongyang was not only futile, but extremely dangerous, considering the humanitarian consequences of such measures. The quest for mutually acceptable political and diplomatic solutions was the only possible way to reach a peaceful solution to the Korean peninsula question and establish robust security mechanisms in North-East Asia. Other speakers¹²⁰² stated that the continued launches by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of ballistic missiles, including of intercontinental range, had been a clear violation of Security Council resolutions and of the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime and expressed regret that the draft resolution had not been adopted because of the veto by two permanent members. Some speakers¹²⁰³ expressed concern that the veto would send a wrong signal of impunity and embolden the authorities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In that connection, several Council members¹²⁰⁴ called for the swift issuance of a special report by the Council to the General Assembly explaining the veto, in accordance with Assembly resolution 76/262 of 26 April 2022.

¹¹⁹⁸ See S/2022/431.

¹¹⁹⁹ See S/PV.9048.

¹²⁰⁰ Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 76/262, the Council submitted a special report to the Assembly on the use of the veto at the meeting (see A/76/853). For more information on such reports, see part IV, sect. I.F.

¹²⁰¹ See S/PV.9048.

¹²⁰² Kenya, Mexico, Albania, Ireland, Ghana, Norway, Brazil, United Kingdom, Gabon, France, United States, Japan and Republic of Korea.

¹²⁰³ Brazil, United Kingdom, France, United States and Republic of Korea.

¹²⁰⁴ Mexico, Ireland and Norway.

Meetings: non-proliferation/Democratic People's Republic of Korea, 2022

<i>Meeting record and date</i>	<i>Sub-item</i>	<i>Other documents</i>	<i>Rule 37 invitations</i>	<i>Rule 39 and other invitations</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Decision and vote (for-against-abstaining)</i>
S/PV.9004 25 March		Draft resolution submitted by United States (S/2022/263)	Japan, Republic of Korea	Under-Secretary-General for Political and Peacebuilding Affairs	All Council members, all invitees	Resolution 2627 (2022) 15-0-0 (adopted under Chapter VII)
S/PV.9030 11 May			Japan, Republic of Korea	Assistant Secretary-General for the Middle East, Asia and the Pacific	All Council members, all invitees	
S/PV.9048 26 May		Draft resolution submitted by United States (S/2022/431)	Japan, Republic of Korea		13 Council members, ^a all invitees	Not adopted 13-0-2 ^b
S/PV.9146 5 October			Japan, Republic of Korea	Assistant Secretary-General for the Middle East, Asia and the Pacific	All Council members, all invitees	
S/PV.9183 4 November			Japan, Republic of Korea	Assistant Secretary-General for the Middle East, Asia and the Pacific	All Council members, all invitees	
S/PV.9197 21 November			Japan, Republic of Korea	Under-Secretary-General for Political and Peacebuilding Affairs	All Council members, all invitees	

^a Albania, Brazil, China, France, Gabon, Ghana, Ireland, Kenya, Mexico, Norway, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, United States.

^b For: Albania, Brazil, France, Gabon, Ghana, India, Ireland, Kenya, Mexico, Norway, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States; against: China, Russian Federation; abstaining: none.

33. Peacebuilding and sustaining peace

During the period under review, the Council held two meetings under the item entitled “Peacebuilding and sustaining peace” which took the form of a briefing and an open debate.¹²⁰⁵ More information on the meetings, including on participants and speakers, is provided in the table below.¹²⁰⁶ In 2022, no decisions were adopted in connection with this item.

On 27 July, the Council held its annual briefing to discuss the report of the Peacebuilding Commission. At the meeting, the Council heard briefings by the representative of Egypt in his capacity as former Chair of the Commission for 2021 and by the representative of Bangladesh, in his capacity as Chair of the Commission for 2022.¹²⁰⁷

¹²⁰⁵ For more information on the format of meetings, see part II.

¹²⁰⁶ See also A/77/2, part II, chap. 27.

¹²⁰⁷ See S/PV.9101.