

hand, stated that the increased activity of the Office of the High Representative posed additional threats to the peace and stability in the country, which was in direct contradiction to the tasks originally assigned to it. The representative of China also expressed concern that the use of the Bonn powers had become rather controversial and added that they were a special arrangement out of a specific era. In addition, the representative of India stated that the disagreement over the Office of the High Representative needed to be resolved through constructive engagement, in line with the Agreement for Peace. Finally, the President of the Council expressed regret about the inability of the High Representative to participate in the meeting owing to the lack of consensus on the matter. In that connection, he stated that the collaborative exchanges between the Council and the Office of the High Representative, through the briefings of the High Representative, helped members to better appreciate the complex political situation that pertained to Bosnia and Herzegovina, and he expressed the hope that, in the future, the Council would be able to resume its established format for the meeting. Several speakers⁶²² encouraged the authorities of Bosnia and Herzegovina to continue progress on the implementation of the 5 plus 2 agenda by which the Office of the High Representative could complete its mission and the international supervision of Bosnia and Herzegovina would be no longer needed.

Meetings: the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 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.9029 11 May	Letter dated 3 May 2022 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2022/374)		Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia	High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina, Deputy Head of the Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations	All Council members, all invitees ^a	
S/PV.9179 2 November	Letter dated 25 October 2022 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2022/806)	Draft resolution submitted by Ireland (S/2022/809)	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia	Deputy Head of the Delegation of the European Union	All Council members, ^b all invitees	Resolution 2658 (2022) 15-0-0 (adopted under Chapter VII)

^a Bosnia and Herzegovina was represented by the Chair of its Presidency.

^b Ireland was represented by its Minister of State for European Affairs.

B. Security Council resolutions [1160 \(1998\)](#), [1199 \(1998\)](#), [1203 \(1998\)](#), [1239 \(1999\)](#) and [1244 \(1999\)](#)

In 2022, the Council held two meetings in connection with the item entitled “Security Council resolutions [1160 \(1998\)](#), [1199 \(1998\)](#), [1203 \(1998\)](#), [1239 \(1999\)](#) and [1244 \(1999\)](#)”. Both meetings took the form of briefings.⁶²³ More information on the meetings, including on participants and speakers, is

⁶²² Ireland, Mexico, Norway, France, United Kingdom and Kenya.

⁶²³ For more information on the format of meetings, see part II.

given in the table below.⁶²⁴ No decisions were adopted in connection with this item during the period under review.

Council members heard briefings by the newly appointed Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Kosovo and Head of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK),⁶²⁵ further to the reports of the Secretary-General pursuant to resolution 1244 (1999).⁶²⁶ In line with established practice, statements were also delivered by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Serbia and the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kosovo during the meetings.

At a meeting held on 20 April,⁶²⁷ the Special Representative gave a briefing to the Council following the elections in Serbia conducted on 3 April, noting that developments in Ukraine had inevitably influenced and would continue to influence all issues of European security. Despite the international community urging the Pristina and Belgrade authorities to agree on modalities to facilitate eligible voters' participation in Kosovo, a solution had not been identified to permit that. The Special Representative expressed regret about the polarizing effects of that decision, since it had divided public opinion sharply along ethnic lines. Nevertheless, the election process had gone smoothly and without incident.

The Special Representative drew attention to the incidents of serious concern in northern Kosovo, with attacks directly targeting Kosovo police patrols, and called upon the leaders of both Pristina and Belgrade to be very judicious in their actions and their rhetoric at the political level and in the public arena, recalling that those leaders bore the main responsibility for reducing tensions. Even on extremely technical subjects, progress remained tentative and slow, and she reemphasized the principle that, however difficult the path towards agreements and solutions, unilateral actions by any side had the potential to damage the real interests of the people of both sides. Dramatic shocks to the economy of Kosovo and to other regional economies had been building up well before the onset of events in Ukraine. In that context, finding practical modes of economic cooperation among Belgrade, Pristina and all the neighbours of the region assumed greater urgency. Any region-wide initiatives that could help towards promoting that objective should be welcomed.

At the outset of her mandate, the Special Representative wished to clarify two important points. First, she indicated that her responsibility was to provide objective information to the Secretary-General and the Council, and in that regard, the contents of the Secretary-General's reports were not the subject of negotiation. Secondly, she referred to inaccurate perceptions regarding the mandate of UNMIK, namely that the Mission, in and of itself, represented either an obstacle or a vehicle for the outcome preferred by one or the other side or that the Mission harboured a particular agenda to forward or favour outside the bounds of its mandate. Neither of those inaccurate perceptions contained any demonstrable truth, yet both had too frequently been allowed to gain currency in local public discourse. Accordingly, the Mission would continue its work in the areas where it was genuinely able to help advance the common objectives held by the authorities, communities and institutions in Kosovo, and the Mission's legacy of institutional support, its trust among communities and political actors and its work with the full spectrum of multilateral and bilateral actors would drive the agenda. The Council's support to the Mission remained essential, as was its attention to the state of relations between Pristina and Belgrade.

Following the briefing by the Special Representative and the statements by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Serbia and the representative of Kosovo, Council members discussed the latest developments as reported by the Secretary-General. Council members noted the slow progress in a constructive Belgrade-Pristina dialogue and urged all actors to engage fully and constructively. Most representatives expressed support and appreciation for the work of UNMIK and underlined its important role in promoting peace and security, stability and respect for human rights. Some Council members, however, differed in their views on the role of the Mission. The representative of Brazil underlined that substantial autonomy for Kosovo had been generally achieved, but the conditions for a peaceful and normal life for all communities in the region had not yet been accomplished, and the main objective of UNMIK remained unfulfilled. The representative of China said that, given the standstill in bilateral talks and the ongoing tensions on the ground, maintaining the Mission's presence was crucial. The representative

⁶²⁴ See also [A/77/2](#), chap. 7.B.

⁶²⁵ See [S/2021/963](#) and [S/2021/964](#).

⁶²⁶ [S/2022/313](#) and [S/2022/739](#).

⁶²⁷ See [S/PV.9019](#).

of the United Arab Emirates argued that the support for the important role played by the United Nations in Kosovo should continue, as it undertook many activities and projects that supported Government institutions as well as initiatives aimed at building trust between religious and ethnic communities and providing economic empowerment and support for the search for missing persons. Similar support to UNMIK was expressed by the representatives of Gabon, France and Ghana. Nevertheless, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that conditions on the ground were unrecognizable from 1999, and a review of the Mission's role and responsibilities was needed. The representative of Norway affirmed that, while the Mission pursued important work in various areas, his delegation would support a close look at possible efficiency improvements. Finally, the representatives of Albania and the United States expressed the view that UNMIK had already fulfilled its mandate. The representative of the United States added that it was time to reduce the frequency of briefings to an annual basis.

Following the statements by Council members, the representatives of the Russian Federation and Albania took the floor twice to make further statements. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Serbia and the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kosovo took the floor three times.

At the meeting held on 18 October, the briefing of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General was focused on the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK and the latest developments on the ground.⁶²⁸ She reported that there had been several escalations in political rhetoric between Pristina and Belgrade, as well as a few moments of acute tension on the ground. Amid all challenges, there had been positive examples of leadership and cooperation. Her goal was for UNMIK to focus on those areas where the continued presence, in concert with the entire United Nations family – as well as other partners in Kosovo – contributed consistently, with positive effects. That included participating in and promoting effective communication across ethnic and political lines at all levels of society, redoubling the Mission's commitment to supporting trust-building actors from across all parts of Kosovan society and helping to promote broad awareness about the interdependence and shared problems and interests of people across Kosovo and throughout the region.

Following the briefing by the Special Representative and the statements by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Serbia and the representative of Kosovo, Council members discussed the latest developments as reported by the Secretary-General. In their statements, many Council members focused on the increased tensions in northern Kosovo and reiterated their concern at the slow progress in dialogue between Kosovo and Serbia.

Several delegations⁶²⁹ welcomed the meetings held between the parties in Brussels in August and the agreement reached on free movement between Kosovo and Serbia. The representative of Ireland added that the agreement was a positive step in the right direction and proof that acceptable, pragmatic solutions were possible when leaders engaged openly and constructively in the Belgrade-Pristina dialogue. The European Union-facilitated dialogue was the channel through which to resolve tensions between Serbia and Kosovo. Similarly, the representative of the United States underlined that the European Union-facilitated dialogue continued to be the principal mechanism for reconciling issues. The representatives of the United Kingdom and Kenya urged both parties to uphold their commitments made in the framework of the dialogue, while the representative of Ghana called upon both sides to recommit to the full implementation of their respective obligations under previous and future agreements to be reached in the context of the European Union-facilitated dialogue.

Concerning the role of UNMIK, Council members expressed overall praise and support for its work on different fronts and specifically on confidence and trust-building efforts,⁶³⁰ women and peace and security and youth and peace and security agendas,⁶³¹ the return of missing persons,⁶³² strengthening of the rule of law⁶³³ and the promotion of social cooperation and cohesion in Kosovo.⁶³⁴ As in April, Council members discussed the continuity of the Mission and the continued value of its mandate.

⁶²⁸ See [S/PV.9155](#). See also [S/2022/739](#).

⁶²⁹ Ireland, Brazil, Ghana, India, China and France.

⁶³⁰ Ireland, Kenya, Ghana and Gabon.

⁶³¹ Ireland, United Arab Emirates, Kenya, Ghana and Gabon.

⁶³² Ireland, India and Gabon.

⁶³³ Norway, Kenya, Brazil, France and Gabon.

⁶³⁴ Ireland, United Arab Emirates and Ghana.

While representatives of Albania, the United Kingdom and the United States advocated a thorough review of UNMIK given the change of circumstances in Kosovo and its institutions, other Council members⁶³⁵ supported the continuity of the Mission and its mandate. The representative of the United States expressed disappointment that the Council had not moved towards sunseting UNMIK, including by developing a plan to close the Mission. Briefings were no longer needed on a six-month basis and should be reduced to annual meetings, as the Council had far more pressing priorities to address, and its resources were limited. The representative of Albania also expressed the view that it was time to reduce Council meetings to only one a year in recognition of the progress made and as encouragement for the parties to pursue dialogue with more determination. By contrast, the representative of the Russian Federation expressed full support for UNMIK, as the most important guarantor of security in the province. While understanding the difficult circumstances in which the Mission must operate, his delegation expected UNMIK to make realistic rather than neutral rosy assessments of the situation in the province. The representative of China affirmed that the Special Representative and UNMIK should continue to work actively in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999), effectively carrying out its mandates and playing a constructive role in maintaining regional stability, promoting national reconciliation and facilitating dialogue between the two sides. Following the statements by Council members, the representatives of Serbia and Kosovo took the floor to make further statements.

Meetings: Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999), 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.9019 20 April	Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) (S/2022/313)		Serbia	Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Kosovo and Head of UNMIK, Donika Gërvalla-Schwarz	All Council members, all invitees ^a	
S/PV.9155 18 October	Report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK (S/2022/739)		Serbia	Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Donika Gërvalla-Schwarz	All Council members, all invitees ^a	

^a Serbia was represented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs.

19. Items relating to Ukraine

A. Letter dated 28 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council ([S/2014/136](#))

During the period under review, the Council held eight meetings under the item entitled “Letter dated 28 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council ([S/2014/136](#))” and adopted one resolution.⁶³⁶ Resolution 2623 (2022) was the first resolution of the Council in 40 years in which the Council decided to call an emergency special session of the General Assembly.⁶³⁷ In addition, the Council failed to adopt one draft

⁶³⁵ Mexico, Russian Federation, Ghana and China.

⁶³⁶ Resolution 2623 (2022).

⁶³⁷ For more information regarding the relations between the Council and the General Assembly, see part IV, sect. I.C. For more details on the discussion, see part V, sect. I.