27. International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

In 2019, the Council held two meetings related to the work of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals.⁵⁴¹ The two meetings took the form of debates and no decisions were adopted by the Council under this item in 2019.⁵⁴² More information on the meetings, including participants and speakers, is given in the table below.

On 17 July 2019, the Council heard the first semi-annual briefing by the President of the Mechanism and by its Prosecutor,⁵⁴³ at which they presented their progress report on the work of the Mechanism, submitted pursuant to paragraph 16 of Council resolution 1966 (2010).⁵⁴⁴ At the meeting, both the President of the Mechanism and the Prosecutor highlighted the positive developments in the Karadžić and *Mladić* cases and emphasized their commitment to the efficient and timely conclusion of the judicial proceedings at the two branches of the Mechanism, in Arusha and The Hague. The President also reflected on his role in the management of post-conviction matters, such as the enforcement of sentences and the safeguarding of the rights of detainees, to which, as he noted, less attention was paid. The Prosecutor highlighted the challenges faced by his office in terms of State cooperation, including the search for transnational fugitives. He also expressed concern about the continued trends in genocide denial and the glorification of war criminals. The Council discussed the progress achieved by the Mechanism during the reporting period. Several speakers highlighted the conclusion of the Prosecutor v. Radovan Karadžić case in The Hague on 20 March 2019.545 Some Council members also expressed support for the commitment of the President of the Mechanism and its Prosecutor to better examine requests for the early release of persons convicted, in accordance with the recommendation contained in paragraph 10 of resolution 2422 (2018).⁵⁴⁶ With regard to the challenges to the implementation of the mandate of the Mechanism, most Council members urged States to intensify cooperation with the Mechanism, particularly in relation to the remaining eight fugitives indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and suspected to be at large, as outlined in paragraph 10 of resolution 1966 (2010) and in paragraph 4 of resolution 2422 (2018).⁵⁴⁷ Echoing the Prosecutor, some Council members expressed their concerns regarding the continued denial of war crimes and genocide and the glorification of war criminals.⁵⁴⁸

On 11 December 2019, the Council heard the second semi-annual briefing by the President of the Mechanism and its Prosecutor.⁵⁴⁹ At the meeting, the President and the Prosecutor provided an update of the main developments regarding the judicial activity in Arusha and The Hague and reiterated their commitment to meeting the deadlines in order to complete most of the Mechanism's judicial caseload by the end of 2020. They also focused on the need for greater cooperation from Member States regarding the enforcement of sentences, the search for and arrest of the eight remaining fugitives indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, a permanent solution for the nine persons acquitted or released by the Tribunal, and support for the budgetary requirements. Mechanism's Council members welcomed the efforts displayed by the Mechanism in meeting the deadlines and the overall progress that the Mechanism had achieved in terms of best practices during the reporting period. More specifically, Council members commended the efforts of the President to harmonize practices and procedures across the two branches, as previously recommended by the Office of Internal Oversight Services⁵⁵⁰ and

⁵⁴¹ In a note by the President of the Council dated 2 February 2018 (S/2018/90), the Council agreed that issues pertaining to the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, which was established by resolution 1966 (2010), would be considered under an item entitled "International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals", under which the Council would also henceforth consider issues pertaining to the items entitled "International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991" and "International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994". For more information on the mandate of the tribunals, see part IX, sect. IV.

⁵⁴² For more information on the format of meetings, see part II, sect. I.

⁵⁴³ See S/PV.8576.

⁵⁴⁴ See S/2019/417, annex.

⁵⁴⁵ See S/PV.8576 (France, Kuwait, United States, Belgium, United Kingdom, Dominican Republic and Croatia).

⁵⁴⁶ Ibid., (Peru, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Poland, Kuwait, United States, Belgium, China and Equatorial Guinea).

⁵⁴⁷ Ibid., (Côte d'Ivoire, France, Indonesia, Poland, Germany, Kuwait, United States, Belgium, United

Kingdom, Dominican Republic and Equatorial Guinea).

⁵⁴⁸ Ibid., (France, Germany, Belgium and United Kingdom).

⁵⁴⁹ See S/PV.8681.

⁵⁵⁰ See S/2018/206.

reiterated in paragraph 8 of resolution 2422 (2018), so as to further enhance the efficiency and transparency of the Mechanism's working methods. Some Council members continued to welcome the changes in the practice followed by the President to decide on requests for early release of the persons convicted, as well as the updating of the Practice Direction on the procedure for the determination of applications for pardon, commutation of sentence and early release of persons convicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, the International Tribunal for the Yugoslavia or the Mechanism.⁵⁵¹ Former The representative of the Dominican Republic expressed concern about the fact that specific regulations in that regard had not yet been put in place to allow for the participation of victims and affected States or communities. Most Council members continued to call for improved cooperation and assistance by Member States with the Mechanism, including adequate financing and political support to ensure its success.

⁵⁵¹ See S/PV.8681 (China, France, Belgium, Cote d'Ivoire and Equatorial Guinea).

Some speakers specifically called for improvements in judicial cooperation among the States of the former Yugoslavia in the search for and arrest of perpetrators of war crimes and in the processing of cases by national courts.⁵⁵² In that context, speakers continued to regret the resurgence in the denial of war crimes and historical revisionism both in the former Yugoslavia and in Rwanda.⁵⁵³

In addition, during the period under review, the Council took note of the intention of the Secretary-General to appoint the nominated judges to fill the vacancies resulting from the resignation of two judges of the Mechanism.⁵⁵⁴

Meetings: International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

Meeting record and date	Sub-item	Other documents	Rule 37 invitations	Rule 39 and other invitations	Speakers	Decision and vote (for- against- abstaining)
S/PV.8576 17 July 2019	Letter dated 20 May 2019 from the President of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2019/417)		Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Rwanda, Serbia	President of the Mechanism, Prosecutor of the Mechanism	All Council members, all invitees ^a	
S/PV.8681 11 December 2019	Note by the Secretary-General on the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals (S/2019/622)		Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia	President of the Mechanism, Prosecutor of the Mechanism	All Council members, all invitees ^b	
	Letter dated 18 November 2019 from the President of Mechanism addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2019/888)					

^a Croatia was represented by its State Secretary for Political Affairs; and Serbia was represented by its Minister of Justice.

^b Serbia was represented by its Assistant Minister of Justice.

⁵⁵² Ibid., (Poland, Belgium, United Kingdom and Cote d'Ivoire).

⁵⁵³ Ibid., (Poland, France, Belgium, United Kingdom and United States).

⁵⁵⁴ See S/2019/107, S/2019/108, S/2019/999 and S/2019/1000. For more information on actions of the Council concerning judges of the Mechanism, see part IV, sect. I.D, and part IX, sect. IV.