

1 abstention (China), as resolution 1207 (1998),<sup>227</sup> which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* all its previous relevant resolutions concerning the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, in particular resolution 827 (1993) of 25 May 1993,

*Recalling also* the statement by its President of 8 May 1996,

*Recalling further* the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the annexes thereto, in particular its article IX of the Agreement and article X of annex 1-A,

*Having considered* the letters dated 8 September, 22 October and 6 November 1998 from the President of the 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 addressed to the President of the Security Council,

*Deploring* the continued failure of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to cooperate fully with the International Tribunal, as described in those letters,

*Reaffirming* the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia,

*Acting* under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. *Reiterates* its decision that all States shall cooperate fully with the International Tribunal and its organs in accordance with resolution 827 (1993) and the statute of the Tribunal, including the obligation of States to comply with requests for assistance or orders issued by a Trial Chamber under article 29 of the statute, to execute arrest warrants transmitted to them by the Tribunal, and to comply with its requests for information and investigations;

2. *Calls again upon* the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and all other States which have not already done so, to take any measures necessary under their domestic law to implement the provisions of resolution 827 (1993) and the statute of the International Tribunal, and affirms that a State may not invoke provisions of its domestic law as justification for its failure to perform binding obligations under international law;

3. *Condemns* the failure to date of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to execute the arrest warrants issued by the International Tribunal against the three individuals referred to in the letter dated 8 September 1998, and demands the immediate and unconditional execution of those arrest warrants, including the transfer to the custody of the Tribunal of those individuals;

---

<sup>227</sup> For the vote, see S/PV.3944, p. 3.

4. *Reiterates its call* upon the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the leaders of the Kosovo Albanian community and all others concerned to cooperate fully with the Prosecutor in the investigation of all possible violations within the jurisdiction of the International Tribunal;

5. *Requests* the President of the Tribunal to keep the Council informed about the implementation of the present resolution for the further consideration of the Council;

6. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

## **E. The situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia**

### **Decision of 13 February 1996 (3630th meeting): resolution 1046 (1996)**

On 30 January 1996, pursuant to resolution 1027 (1995), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on developments on the ground and other circumstances affecting the mandate of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP) in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and all aspects of UNPREDEP.<sup>228</sup> In his report, the Secretary-General noted that the deployment of the Force in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had played a significant role in preventing the conflict in the former Yugoslavia from spreading to that Republic and had contributed to alleviating serious concerns about external security threats. He stated that, as the continuation of the UNPREDEP mission was an important contribution to the maintenance of peace and stability in the region, he recommended that the mandate of UNPREDEP should not only be continued but that it should become an independent mission, reporting directly to United Nations Headquarters in New York, effective on 1 February 1996.<sup>229</sup> He noted that, despite its new status, the operation would have basically the same mandate, strength and composition

---

<sup>228</sup> S/1996/65.

<sup>229</sup> UNPREDEP was established as a distinct operating entity in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia pursuant to Security Council resolution 983 (1995) of 31 March 1995. However, in view of the interconnected nature of the problems in the former Yugoslavia and in order to enhance coordination, overall command and control of the United Nations presence in the former Yugoslavia was placed with the United Nations Peace Forces Headquarters and exercised by the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General and the United Nations Theatre Force Commander.

of troops. In respect of ongoing programmes, a key priority would be engineering operations, and he therefore proposed making provision for a permanent arrangement for engineering assets in an independent UNPREDEP mission, which would require an increase of the authorized strength by approximately 50 personnel. Another major priority would be the communications infrastructure.

By a letter dated 6 February 1996 addressed to the President of the Security Council,<sup>230</sup> the Secretary-General expressed his appreciation for the fact that the members of the Security Council concurred in principle with his recommendation that UNPREDEP become an independent mission with basically the same mandate, strength and composition of forces.<sup>231</sup> He stated that he intended to submit concrete proposals on the financial and administrative requirements of the proposed change in the status of UNPREDEP, in conjunction with the financial and administrative arrangements for the liquidation of the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia, the United Nations Protection Force and the United Nations Peace Forces Headquarters, as well as for the new missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia, to the relevant United Nations bodies. He requested that the Council approve the proposed increase of the strength of UNPREDEP by 50 military personnel and the appointment of a Force Commander.

At its 3630th meeting, held on 13 February 1996 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report and the letter of the Secretary-General in its agenda.

At the same meeting, the President (United States) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations,<sup>232</sup> which was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1046 (1996), which reads:

<sup>230</sup> S/1996/94.

<sup>231</sup> Letter dated 1 February 1996 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General (S/1996/76).

<sup>232</sup> S/1996/96.

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* all its previous relevant resolutions, in particular resolution 1027 (1995) of 30 November 1995 by which it extended the mandate of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia until 30 May 1996,

*Having considered* the report of the Secretary-General of 29 January 1996 and his letter dated 6 February 1996 to the President of the Council and the annex thereto,

1. *Decides* to authorize, for the duration of the present mandate, an increase in the strength of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force by fifty military personnel in order to provide for a continued engineering capability in support of its operations;

2. *Approves* the establishment of the position of Force Commander of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force;

3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to submit to the Council not later than 20 May 1996 further recommendations on the composition, strength and mandate of the Force in the light of developments in the region;

4. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

**Decision of 30 May 1996 (3670th meeting):  
resolution 1058 (1996)**

On 23 May 1996, pursuant to Security Council resolution 1046 (1996), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report giving further recommendations on the composition, strength and mandate of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force, in the light of developments in the region.<sup>233</sup> In his report, noting that UNPREDEP was the first preventive force deployed by the United Nations, the Secretary-General stated that the mere presence of a United Nations force had undoubtedly had a reassuring, stabilizing and confidence-building effect. In addition, the Force's military operations had helped to reduce tensions on the country's borders and to ensure that stability was not impaired by unintended military confrontations or by the activities of armed smugglers. He expressed his agreement that UNPREDEP had been, and continued to be, a success for the United Nations, for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and for the region as a whole. He noted that the view of the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was that there was a continued need for UNPREDEP in order to

<sup>233</sup> S/1996/373 and Add.1.

maintain stability, preserve the gains already achieved and avoid undermining the still-fragile structure of peace in the Balkans. He added that this view was shared by the leadership of other political parties and of various ethnic groups in the country, and by most of the Governments that had expressed views to the Secretariat, including the Governments of the troop-contributing nations. He expressed his belief that, at the moment, it would be imprudent to withdraw UNPREDEP, although the question of whether its mandate could be implemented with fewer resources remained. However, he noted that, while it had been suggested, he was convinced that the UNPREDEP infantry should not be replaced with military observers. He stated his intention to review questions relating to the concept and strength of UNPREDEP at regular intervals and to inform the Security Council as soon as he judged that developments in the region and/or in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia itself permitted further economies. Meanwhile, he recommended that the mandate of the Force, in its present configuration, should be extended for a further period of six months to 30 November 1996.

At its 3670th meeting, held on 30 May 1996 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (China), with the consent of the Council, invited the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of members of the Council to the text of a draft resolution submitted by France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States, with Poland joining as a sponsor.<sup>234</sup> He further drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 11 April 1996 from the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia addressed to the Secretary-General,<sup>235</sup> transmitting the text of a letter dated 8 April 1996 from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia addressed to the Secretary-General.

---

<sup>234</sup> S/1996/392.

<sup>235</sup> S/1996/389.

The representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia stated that it was the opinion of his Government that the situation in the region had not changed to the extent that the mandate of the mission should be restructured or terminated. He noted that the Dayton Agreement had not been implemented; the threats to his country by the potential explosion of the crisis had not been overcome yet, in view of the issue of Kosovo;<sup>236</sup> the northern border had not been mutually demarcated; and his country had been left with a significantly reduced defensive capability as a consequence of the withdrawal of all armaments and military equipment following the departure of the former Yugoslav army and the Security Council resolution imposing an arms embargo. For those reasons and others, the mandate of UNPREDEP should be further extended.<sup>237</sup>

The representative of Italy, speaking on behalf of the European Union and the associated countries, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Slovakia,<sup>238</sup> stated that they were in full agreement with the assessments in the Secretary-General's report of 23 May 1996, and noted that it represented an important precedent in the preventive deployment of United Nations forces. Although the report of the Secretary-General reflected an unquestionable improvement in the situation, it was equally clear that the situation still contained troublesome elements of precariousness, and that peace and stability within the borders of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia were still largely dependent on developments in the rest of the former Yugoslavia. Therefore, the circumstances made any withdrawal of UNPREDEP forces at such a delicate stage premature and potentially dangerous and risked sending the wrong signal.<sup>239</sup>

The representative of the Russian Federation stated that, while the United Nations could be justly proud of the success of the operation, the current

---

<sup>236</sup> For purposes of this Supplement, the term "Kosovo" refers to "Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia", without prejudice to issues of status. In other instances, the terminology originally used in official documents has been preserved to the extent possible.

<sup>237</sup> S/PV.3670, p. 2.

<sup>238</sup> Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway also aligned themselves with the statement.

<sup>239</sup> S/PV.3670, p. 3.

situation in the region of the former Yugoslavia was radically different from the one that prevailed in 1992 or even a year previously. He suggested that it would be strange if UNPREDEP were to be maintained in the form in which it existed at the height of the hostilities in the territory of the former Yugoslavia and that, in that connection, it would be fitting and proper to raise the question of reconfiguring the whole structure of the operation. He noted that the report of the Secretary-General had analysed the possibility of replacing the military contingents of UNPREDEP with military observers, and that, despite certain reservations, the conclusion had been reached that this option was feasible in principle, from both technical and operational viewpoints. He went on to say that considering the fact that in 1992, at the peak of the crisis, the Security Council had established the personnel strength of the operation's military component at approximately 700, and given that the armed struggle in Bosnia and Herzegovina had ended, his delegation's belief was that it would be logical to revert at least to the original personnel strength. He also suggested that several of the functions being performed by the civilian component of UNPREDEP could be entrusted to the United Nations Development Programme and the specialized agencies of the Organization. At the same time, he recognized that the positive changes in the region were not yet irreversible and pointed out that his delegation had not raised the question of winding up or of withdrawing UNPREDEP and had taken particular account of the ongoing concerns of the Macedonian leadership. As a result, he expressed his belief that, while it would have been possible to extend the mandate in its present form for four months, so that the Security Council could come back to the issue and take a decision that would be consonant with the real state of affairs in the region, the other members of the Council had not supported these proposals and so they were not reflected in the draft resolution. As his delegation had not heard any convincing arguments in support of the view that it was the only correct decision in the current situation, he stated that his delegation would therefore be obliged to abstain from voting. He expressed his hope that, when the mandate was taken up again, account would be taken of their concerns, and, on that basis, the Council

would determine how the operation should be dealt with in the future.<sup>240</sup>

The representative of China stated that, taking into account the request of the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the situation in the region, his country would consent to the extension of the mandate of UNPREDEP. At the same time, the Chinese delegation maintained that the United Nations peacekeeping missions, including preventive deployment missions, needed to follow some established principles and be terminated upon completion of their mandates. He expressed hope that, with a continued improvement of the situation in the region, UNPREDEP would reduce its strength according to its actual needs and finally terminate its mission in "a smooth manner".<sup>241</sup>

Taking the floor before and after the vote, a number of speakers noted that, considering the fact that stability in the region remained fragile, they would support the extension of the mandate of UNPREDEP. Most speakers also noted the importance of continuing to review the composition, strength and mandate of the force in the light of the situation.<sup>242</sup>

The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention (Russian Federation), as resolution 1058 (1996),<sup>243</sup> which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* all its previous relevant resolutions, in particular resolutions 1027 (1995) of 30 November 1995 and 1046 (1996) of 13 February 1996,

*Reaffirming its commitment* to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,

*Noting with appreciation* the important role played by the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force in contributing to the maintenance of peace and stability, and paying tribute to its personnel in the performance of their mandate,

<sup>240</sup> Ibid., pp. 8-9.

<sup>241</sup> Ibid., pp. 13-14.

<sup>242</sup> Ibid., before the vote: pp. 3-4 (Germany); pp. 5 (United Kingdom); pp. 6-7 (Chile); pp. 6-7 (Indonesia); pp. 7-8 (Republic of Korea); p. 9 (Botswana); pp. 9-10 (Guinea-Bissau); pp. 10 (Honduras); pp. 10-11 (Egypt); and pp. 10-11 (Poland); after the vote: p. 12 (France); pp. 12-13 (United States); and pp. 13-14 (China).

<sup>243</sup> For the vote, see S/PV.3670, p. 12.

*Noting* that the security situation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has improved, but recognizing that it is too early to be confident that stability has been established in the region, and expressing the hope that future developments in the region will not undermine confidence and stability in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia or threaten its security,

*Welcoming* the signing of the agreement between the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on 8 April 1996, and urging both parties to implement it in full, including the demarcation of their mutual border,

*Welcoming also* the progress achieved in improving relations between the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Greece on the basis of the Interim Accord of 13 September 1995,

*Welcoming further* the close cooperation between the Force and the mission of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe,

*Taking note* of the letter from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General dated 11 April 1996,

*Having considered* the report of the Secretary-General of 23 May 1996 and, in particular, his assessment of the composition, strength and mandate of the Force,

1. *Takes note with appreciation* of the report of the Secretary-General of 23 May 1996;
2. *Decides* to extend the mandate of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force for a period terminating on 30 November 1996;
3. *Calls upon* Member States to consider favourably requests by the Secretary-General for necessary assistance to the Force in the performance of its mandate;
4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Council regularly informed of any developments on the ground and other circumstances affecting the mandate and also requests the Secretary-General to review the composition, strength and mandate of the Force and to report to the Council by 30 September 1996 for its consideration;
5. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

**Decision of 27 November 1996 (3716th meeting): resolution 1082 (1996)**

On 19 November 1996, pursuant to Security Council resolution 1058 (1996), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report giving his recommendations regarding the composition, strength,

mandate and future of UNPREDEP.<sup>244</sup> He noted that, while much progress had been achieved in the region since the signing of the Dayton Agreement, it was clear that the international community's political and military involvement in the former Yugoslavia would necessarily continue for some time in order to consolidate peace and security. Moreover, it had become increasingly evident that the primary threat to the country's stability might come from internal political tensions. He stated that, as the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had requested the extension of the UNPREDEP mandate for six months beyond 30 November 1996, he would recommend that the mandate of the Force be extended for a further six months, to 31 May 1997, with a phased reduction of the military component by 300 all ranks by 1 April 1997. During the mandate period he would consult United Nations agencies and other relevant organizations on the modalities for continuing international support to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and would submit recommendations to the Council on the type of international presence that would be appropriate from June 1997.

At its 3716th meeting, held on 27 November 1996 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Indonesia), with the consent of the Council, invited the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The President then drew the attention of the Security Council to a letter dated 19 November 1996 from the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, transmitting the text of a letter dated 18 November 1996 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia addressed to the Secretary-General,<sup>245</sup> which expressed his opinion that the situation in the region had not changed to an extent that would allow either the reduction or termination of UNPREDEP. The President further drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States.<sup>246</sup>

---

<sup>244</sup> S/1996/961.

<sup>245</sup> S/1996/983.

<sup>246</sup> S/1996/979.

The representative of the Russian Federation stated that the original objective of the deployment of a United Nations preventive mission in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, averting the spillover into that country of conflicts from other regions of the former Yugoslavia, had been achieved and that the mandate given by the Security Council had been fulfilled. He expressed his belief that it was therefore right and justified to raise the question of shutting down UNPREDEP, and noted that if the Council acted out of inertia and transformed the operation into something inviolable by maintaining it, the Council ran the risk of wiping out all the earlier positive achievements of the operation and of calling into question the unique experience of preventive peacekeeping. He noted that, while the substantive reduction of the size of UNPREDEP and the draft resolution's oblique reference to the possibility for a full drawing down of the operation were definite steps forward, his delegation felt these were insufficient. Considering the evolving situation in the region and the current trend towards a further positive evolution, his country did not see the point of maintaining UNPREDEP after May 1997. For that reason, he had proposed including a clear statement in the draft resolution that the present extension of the UNPREDEP mandate was its last. He noted that his delegation's position was not reflected in the draft resolution and that, having taken into consideration the positions of the other members of the Security Council, the leadership of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the troop-contributing countries, his delegation had decided to abstain on the vote. He reiterated that the Russian Federation believed that it was the final extension of the UNPREDEP mandate, although this in no way reflected an underestimation of the real problems in the country or excluded the possibility of a further international presence to support and maintain programmes being implemented with international assistance.<sup>247</sup>

The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention (Russian Federation), as resolution 1082 (1996),<sup>248</sup> which reads:

*The Security Council,*

<sup>247</sup> S/PV.3716, pp. 2-3.

<sup>248</sup> For the vote, see S/PV.3716, p. 3.

*Recalling* all its previous relevant resolutions, in particular resolutions 1046 (1996) of 13 February 1996 and 1058 (1996) of 30 May 1996,

*Reaffirming its commitment* to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,

*Noting with appreciation* the important role played by the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force in contributing to the maintenance of peace and stability, and paying tribute to its personnel in the performance of their mandate,

*Taking into consideration* the fact that the security situation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia continues to improve, but that peace and stability in the broader region have not yet been fully achieved, and expressing the hope that developments in the region will contribute to increased confidence and stability in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, permitting the further drawing down of the Force towards its conclusion,

*Welcoming* the improvement in the relations between the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and its neighbouring States,

*Reiterating its call* on the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to implement in full their agreement of 8 April 1996, in particular regarding the demarcation of their mutual border,

*Welcoming* the continued cooperation between the Force and the mission of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe,

*Taking note* of the letter dated 18 November 1996 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Secretary-General requesting the extension of the mandate of the Force,

*Having considered* the report of the Secretary-General of 19 November 1996, and noting his assessment of the composition, strength and mandate of the Force,

1. *Decides* to extend the mandate of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force for a period terminating on 31 May 1997 with a reduction of its military component by three hundred all ranks by 30 April 1997 with a view to concluding the mandate as and when circumstances permit;

2. *Calls upon* Member States to consider favourably requests by the Secretary-General for necessary assistance to the Force in the performance of this mandate;

3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Council regularly informed about any developments and to report to the Council by 15 April 1997 with his recommendations on a subsequent international presence in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia;

4. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

**Decision of 9 April 1997 (3764th meeting):  
resolution 1105 (1997)**

By a letter dated 4 April 1997 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General stated that peace and stability in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia were intimately linked to the overall situation in the region and that recent developments in Albania and the resulting situation of lawlessness and banditry in certain parts of that country had demonstrated that stability in the Balkan region remained extremely fragile.<sup>249</sup> He noted that, while there appeared to be no imminent danger of the problems in Albania spilling over to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the current crisis was a source of great anxiety in that country. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had underlined the seriousness of the situation and requested that the reduction of the UNPREDEP military component be suspended. Considering the volatility of the situation in the region, the Secretary-General's Special Representative and the Force Commander of UNPREDEP had temporarily suspended the drawdown of the military component and had conveyed their concern to him about the timing of the downsizing of the Force. However, if it were to meet the 30 April deadline for the mandated reduction in force levels, UNPREDEP would be required to resume the drawdown in the coming days. He advised that, while UNPREDEP had been a successful mission, proceeding with the planned reduction during a period when further regional instability continued to be a possibility could put at risk the credibility of the international community's first serious effort at preventive deployment. In this light, and on the basis of the advice of his Special Representative, he recommended that the Security Council approve the suspension of the reduction of the UNPREDEP military component until the end of the current mandate on 31 May 1997.

At its 3764th meeting, held on 9 April 1997 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the letter in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Portugal), with the consent of the Council, invited the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, at his request, to participate in

---

<sup>249</sup> S/1997/276.

the discussion without the right to vote. The President then drew the attention of the Security Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.<sup>250</sup> He further drew the attention of members of the Council to a letter dated 1 April 1997 from the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting a letter dated 1 April 1997 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia addressed to the Secretary-General, requesting that the reduction of the UNPREDEP military component be suspended.<sup>251</sup>

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1105 (1997), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolution 1082 (1996) of 27 November 1996,

*Reaffirming its commitment* to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,

*Having considered* the letter dated 3 April 1997, and the recommendation contained therein from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council,

1. *Decides* to suspend the reduction of the military component of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force referred to in its resolution 1082 (1996) until the end of the current mandate on 31 May 1997;

2. *Welcomes* the redeployment of the Force already achieved in the light of the situation in Albania, and encourages the Secretary-General to continue further redeployment of the Force taking into consideration the situation in the region, consistent with the mandate of the Force;

3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to submit to the Council by 15 May 1997 a report containing recommendations on a subsequent international presence in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia referred to in its resolution 1082 (1996);

4. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

**Decision of 28 May 1997 (3783rd meeting):  
resolution 1110 (1997)**

On 12 May 1997, pursuant to Security Council resolution 1082 (1996), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on the status of the

---

<sup>250</sup> S/1997/290.

<sup>251</sup> S/1997/267.

United Nations Preventive Deployment Force.<sup>252</sup> He stated that recent developments in Albania had demonstrated that stability in the Balkan region remained fragile. Uncertainty still prevailed and there had been doubts about the possibility of holding free and fair elections in June. He stated that the lack of a perceptible and early change in the situation in Albania could lead to another explosion of internal violence, which might have a negative impact on neighboring countries. In that regard, the large number of weapons circulating in the region posed a risk to the stability in the region that could not be neglected. He expressed his opinion that, in the light of the strong views of the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for a continued presence of UNPREDEP, and the continuation of the conditions that led to the suspension of the drawdown of the military component and the challenges in the region, it would be imprudent to recommend that UNPREDEP be terminated or to recommend any immediate changes in the mandate or size of the Force. He therefore recommended that the mandate of UNPREDEP be renewed for an additional six months until 30 November 1997 and the present strength of the Force be maintained for a period of four months. At that point, taking into account prevailing conditions, a two-month phased reduction of the military component to the 750 troop level foreseen by the Council in resolution 1082 (1996) could begin.

At its 3783rd meeting, held on 28 May 1997 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Republic of Korea), with the consent of the Council, invited the representatives of Germany, Italy and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States.<sup>253</sup> He further drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 1 April 1997 from the representative to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia addressed to the Secretary-General,<sup>254</sup> transmitting the text of a letter of the same date from

the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia addressed to the Secretary-General, which proposed extending the mandate of UNPREDEP with its full composition of troops.

The representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia noted that, in spite of the success of UNPREDEP and the stability of his country, the present negative developments in the region, particularly in Albania, had made the extension of the mandate of UNPREDEP an obvious necessity. He emphasized that the preventive tasks of the mission in the coming period would not be easier than what had been the case so far. The complex situation in the region and the difficulties in predicting precisely coming developments required the continuous and able coordination of all peace efforts. In that regard, the capacity of the mission and its ability to perform the tasks it was best qualified for needed to be utilized thoughtfully and effectively. He reiterated that the mission should continue to act as an important force for peace in the region.<sup>255</sup>

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1110 (1997), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* all its relevant resolutions, in particular resolutions 1082 (1996) of 27 November 1996 and 1105 (1997) of 9 April 1997,

*Recalling also* its resolution 1101 (1997) of 28 March 1997, in which the Security Council expressed its deep concern over the situation in Albania,

*Reaffirming* its *commitment* to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,

*Reiterating* its *appreciation* for the important role played by the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force in contributing to the maintenance of peace and stability, and paying tribute to the personnel of the Force in the performance of their mandate,

*Welcoming* the significant progress made by the Governments of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in developing their mutual relations in many areas, and reiterating its call upon the two Governments to implement in full their agreement of 8 April 1996, in particular regarding the demarcation of their mutual

<sup>252</sup> S/1997/365 and Add.1.

<sup>253</sup> S/1997/405.

<sup>254</sup> S/1997/267.

<sup>255</sup> S/PV.3783.



border in the light of the willingness shown by them to resolve the matter,

*Taking note* of the letter dated 1 April 1997 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Secretary-General, requesting the extension of the mandate of the Force,

*Having considered* the report of the Secretary-General of 12 May 1997 and the recommendations contained therein,

*Noting* his observation that recent developments in the region, in particular in Albania, have demonstrated that stability there remains fragile,

1. *Decides* to extend the mandate of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force until 30 November 1997 and to start as of 1 October 1997, taking into account the conditions prevailing at that time, a two-month phased reduction of the military component by 300 all ranks;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Council regularly informed about any relevant developments, and further requests the Secretary-General to review the composition, deployment, strength and mandate of the Force as outlined in his report, taking into consideration the situation prevailing at that time in the region, in particular in Albania, including in the context of elections in that country, and to submit a report to the Council by 15 August 1997 for its consideration;

3. *Welcomes* the redeployment of the Force already achieved in the light of the situation in Albania, and encourages the Secretary-General to continue further redeployment of the Force taking into consideration the situation in the region, consistent with the mandate of the Force;

4. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of the Russian Federation noted that the initial goal of UNPREDEP, which was to prevent conflicts in other regions of the former Yugoslavia from spreading, had been attained. Considering that the main reason for the extension of UNPREDEP was the complicated situation in Albania, he suggested that the most urgent task was to work out ways to properly restructure UNPREDEP, concentrating it in the area of Albania. He noted that a realistic analysis of the functions and tasks of UNPREDEP at this stage should include the question of a speedy reduction of its military component as soon as circumstances in Albania allowed.<sup>256</sup>

The representative of the United States expressed the belief that UNPREDEP played an important and highly effective role in promoting stability in the

---

<sup>256</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The crisis in Albania had heightened the need for the continuation of UNPREDEP, but, in his delegation's view, there were other sources of instability and tension in the region which also reinforced the current importance of UNPREDEP. He expressed full support for a message of sustained, undiminished international commitment to UNPREDEP and the region. He also expressed the belief that the resolution would strengthen the ability of UNPREDEP to carry out its difficult mission and enhance the collective efforts by members of the Council in the region.<sup>257</sup>

The representative of Japan stated that, while the situation within the country had stabilized to some degree, owing to the deployment of the multinational protection forces and to the efforts of various humanitarian agencies, it was anticipated that the restoration of political, economic and social order would take time, even after the election. Considering this, his delegation shared the views expressed in the reports of the Secretary-General.<sup>258</sup>

#### **Decision of 28 November 1997 (3836th meeting): resolution 1140 (1997)**

At its 3836th meeting, held on 28 November 1997 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the President (China), with the consent of the Council, invited the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.<sup>259</sup> He noted that, while the informal consultations were still continuing on some remaining technical aspects of the mandate of UNPREDEP, the mandate would expire on 30 November 1997. As a result of the informal consultations, the members of the Council had decided to adopt the draft resolution to allow time for the completion of consultations. The President then drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 3 November 1997 from the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia addressed to the

---

<sup>257</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

<sup>258</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>259</sup> S/1997/932.

Secretary-General,<sup>260</sup> which expressed the belief that UNPREDEP should be extended with the current mandate and composition for a period, which could be for the following 12 months.

The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1140 (1997), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* its resolution 1110 (1997) of 28 May 1997,

1. *Decides* to extend the mandate of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force for an additional period terminating on 4 December 1997;

2. *Decides* to remain actively seized of the matter.

**Decision of 4 December 1997 (3839th meeting):  
resolution 1142 (1997)**

On 20 November 1997 pursuant to Security Council resolution 1110 (1997), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on UNPREDEP covering developments in the mission area since his last report.<sup>261</sup> The Secretary-General stated that UNPREDEP had successfully contributed to preventing the spillover of conflicts elsewhere in the region into the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, promoting dialogue among the various political forces and ethnic communities, and providing humanitarian assistance. However, he noted that peace and stability in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia continued to depend largely on developments in other regions. He noted that there were concerns over the uncertainty of the outcome of the presidential elections in Serbia and the possible repercussions that it could bring to the area. Increased violence in Kosovo had also raised fears of a spillover effect on ethnic Albanians in the host country. Similarly, the slow progress in implementing the civilian aspects of the Dayton Peace Accords in Bosnia and Herzegovina had underscored the need for a longer-term commitment by the international community in that country. Within the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the effects of inter-ethnic relations on long-term stability remained a matter of concern. He noted that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had requested an extension of the

UNPREDEP mandate for a period of 12 months, citing his Government's concern at the continued sources of destabilization in the region. The Secretary-General suggested that the reduction of the military component by 300 all ranks, which had been initiated, could be viewed as the commencement of a phased exit in response to the improved situation in the region. He also suggested that the Council might wish to observe the effectiveness of the initial reduction before contemplating its next step. He stated his intention to revert to the Council in due course with appropriate recommendations for further reductions on the basis of a careful assessment of the situation in all its relevant aspects. He then recommended that the mandate of UNPREDEP be extended for an additional period of six months with the strength and configuration he had outlined. His Special Representative and the Force Commander would monitor the situation closely so as to be in a position to advise him as soon as conditions permitted a further reduction.

At its 3839th meeting, held on 4 December 1997 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the President (Costa Rica), with the consent of the Council, invited the representatives of Germany, Italy and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by Costa Rica, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States.<sup>262</sup> He further drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 3 November 1997 from the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia addressed to the Secretary-General,<sup>263</sup> stating his views in connection with the need for extending the stay of UNPREDEP in the Republic of Macedonia after 30 November 1997.

The representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia expressed the view that the situation would not improve as much as his delegation wished in the coming nine months. For that reason and with the aim of preventing new conflicts, implementing the Dayton Agreement, developing better good-neighbourly relations among Balkan States and

<sup>260</sup> S/1997/838 and Corr.1.

<sup>261</sup> S/1997/911 and Add.1.

<sup>262</sup> S/1997/948.

<sup>263</sup> S/1997/838 and Corr.1.

integrating them in the European structures, determined efforts by the international community and the United Nations were needed and had to continue. He stated that those were the main reasons for his Government's view that a 12-month extension would be appropriate. He emphasized that the extension of the UNPREDEP mandate represented an important contribution of the Security Council to the effort to maintain peace and security in the Balkans.<sup>264</sup>

The representative of Germany noted that the mission had started out as a preventive effort to prevent a spillover from conflicts in the other parts of the former Yugoslavia and its focus had shifted first towards the civil unrest in Albania and then to the situation in the Kosovo region of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which gave rise to fears of destabilization also in the area of operations of UNPREDEP. He noted that, with preventive missions, of which UNPREDEP was a model, it was always particularly difficult to gauge the degree of success and it was similarly difficult to decide when a preventive mission had satisfactorily completed its task. Noting that there seemed to be general agreement that UNPREDEP had been a success story, he expressed his belief that the Council should take no chances by ending the international military presence in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia before a sufficient degree of stability was achieved throughout the surrounding region.<sup>265</sup>

Speaking before the vote, several delegations expressed their support for the extension of the mandate of UNPREDEP and looked forward to receiving the Secretary-General's recommendations. A number of speakers maintained that significant risks remained in the region, particularly in Kosovo and Albania, which made the extension of UNPREDEP necessary. Several delegations also mentioned the importance of an appropriate successor mechanism that would ensure that the gains made by UNPREDEP were not jeopardized.<sup>266</sup>

---

<sup>264</sup> S/PV.3839, pp. 2-3.

<sup>265</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

<sup>266</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5 (Italy); pp. 5 (Portugal); p. 5 (China); p. 6 (Japan); p. 6 (France); p. 7 (Sweden); p. 7 (Poland); pp. 7-8 (Kenya); pp. 8-9 (Egypt); p. 9 (Republic of Korea); pp. 9-10 (Chile); p. 10 (United States); and pp. 10-11 (Costa Rica).

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1142 (1997), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* all its previous relevant resolutions concerning the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, in particular resolutions 1105 (1997) of 9 April 1997 and 1110 (1997) of 28 May 1997,

*Recalling also* its resolutions 1101 (1997) of 28 March 1997 and 1114 (1997) of 19 June 1997, in which the Council expressed concern over the situation in Albania,

*Reaffirming its commitment* to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,

*Reiterating its appreciation* for the important role played by the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force in contributing to the maintenance of peace and stability, and paying tribute to the personnel of the Force in the performance of their mandate,

*Reiterating its call* upon the Governments of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to implement in fulfilling their agreement of 8 April 1996, in particular regarding the demarcation of their mutual border,

*Welcoming* the phased reduction and restructuring of the troop strength of the Force, which has taken place pursuant to resolution 1110 (1997),

*Taking note* of the letter dated 31 October 1997 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Secretary-General, requesting the extension of the mandate of the Force,

*Having considered* the report of the Secretary-General of 20 November 1997 and the recommendations contained therein,

*Taking note* of the observation of the Secretary-General that there have been a number of positive developments in the overall situation in the area, in particular the stabilization of the situation in Albania, but that peace and stability in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia continue to depend largely on developments in other parts of the region,

*Bearing in mind* the intention of Member States and interested organizations to consider actively the instituting of possible alternatives to the Force,

1. *Decides* to extend the mandate of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force for a final period until 31 August 1998, with the withdrawal of the military component immediately thereafter;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Council by 1 June 1998 on the modalities of the termination of the Force, including practical steps for the complete withdrawal of the military component immediately after 31 August 1998, and to submit recommendations on the type of international

presence that would be most appropriate: for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia after 31 August 1998;

3. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of the Russian Federation stated that developments in the situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the region, particularly after the successful handling of the acute political crisis and the stabilization of the situation in Albania, confirmed how relevant and timely it was to restructure UNPREDEP, with the withdrawal of a military component from the operation. The mandate established in 1991, which was already successfully implemented, could not be an effective instrument for neutralizing the current risks to stability within and around the country. Therefore the centre of gravity should now shift to the civilian area, bringing into play non-military international structures. He noted that, while his Government had consistently supported this approach, it had taken into account the position of interested parties, primarily that of the host country and the recommendation of the Secretary-General, and agreed to the final extension of the mandate of UNPREDEP, with the withdrawal of the military component immediately thereafter.<sup>267</sup>

**Decision of 21 July 1998 (3911th meeting): resolution 1186 (1998)**

On 1 June 1998, pursuant to Security Council resolution 1142 (1997), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on UNPREDEP, addressing the Council's request to report on the modalities of the termination of the mission and submit recommendations on the type of international presence that would be most appropriate afterwards, as well as covering developments in the mission area since his last report.<sup>268</sup> The Secretary-General noted that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had referred to the changed circumstances in the region which mitigated against any weakening of the international presence in the country. In particular, he had expressed his Government's concern over the negative developments north of the border, especially in Kosovo, the yet unmarked border with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and the tensions along the border between

Albania and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Expressing his concern that the peace and stability of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia could be endangered, if the military component of the Force was withdrawn, the Minister had recommended an extension of UNPREDEP for an additional period of six months, with the same mandate structure and troop composition.

The Secretary-General also noted that discussions were under way within the framework of NATO and elsewhere concerning the possible need for an expanded international military presence in the region as a consequence of the situation in Kosovo. Consultations were also continuing with a view to adopting a decision on the establishment of a comprehensive regime to monitor the implementation of the arms embargo on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia imposed by Security Council resolution 1160 (1998). The outcome of either might well have implications for both the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and UNPREDEP. Therefore, he suggested that proceeding with a decision to withdraw UNPREDEP would be premature. He added that he also did not yet possess the requisite information to submit recommendations on the type of international presence that would be most appropriate after the withdrawal of UNPREDEP. He suggested that one possible option that the Security Council could consider was to extend UNPREDEP with its mandate unchanged for a further period of six months, with the Council reviewing its decisions, if the outcome of the aforementioned international discussion affected it. He also suggested that, as any further escalation of the crisis in Kosovo could have negative operational consequences for the Force at its current strength, if the Security Council wished, he would submit specific proposals on a possible strengthening of the force's overall capacity.

On 14 July 1998, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report containing specific proposals on a possible strengthening of the overall capacity of UNPREDEP, taking into consideration the situation in the region and the relevant Security Council resolutions, including 795 (1992) and 1160 (1998).<sup>269</sup> He reiterated that it seemed premature to proceed with a decision to withdraw UNPREDEP and

<sup>267</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>268</sup> S/1998/454.

<sup>269</sup> S/1998/644.

that, therefore, the Council might wish to consider the extension of the mandate of UNPREDEP for a further period of six months, until 28 February 1999. He also recommended that, in view of the constraints placed on UNPREDEP, the Council might wish to consider increasing the troop level of UNPREDEP by 350 all ranks and increasing the military observer and the civilian police elements by twelve and twenty-four personnel, respectively.

At its 3911th meeting, held on 21 July 1998 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the two reports in its agenda. The President (Russian Federation), with the consent of the Council, invited the representatives of Austria, Germany, Italy and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The President then drew the attention of members of the Council to letters dated 15 May and 9 July 1998, respectively, from the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, transmitting letters of the same dates from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia addressed to the Secretary-General.<sup>270</sup>

The representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia stated that his Minister for Foreign Affairs had reiterated that his Government had endorsed the option of an eventual increase in the military component, maintaining the same mandate structure and proportion and taking into account in particular the internal specifics of the country. He had also stated that reinforcing the civilian police could be successful and could contribute to more efficient monitoring. The representative also stressed that his delegation welcomed the recommendations of the Secretary-General in his report dated 14 July 1998.<sup>271</sup>

The representative of Austria, speaking on behalf of the European Union and associated and aligned countries,<sup>272</sup> stated that, while UNPREDEP was initially intended to prevent a spillover from conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, the focus had shifted to the conflict in Kosovo which posed a serious threat to

regional peace and security. He stated that the European Union fully subscribed to the provisions of Security Council resolution 1169 (1998), which, *inter alia*, imposed an arms embargo on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. He declared that UNPREDEP would play an important role in the monitoring of and reporting on illicit arms flows and other activities that had been prohibited under Security Council resolution 1160 (1998).<sup>273</sup>

Speaking before the vote, the representative of China emphasized that, while his delegation had always been of the view that United Nations peacekeeping operations should have both a proper beginning and a proper conclusion, China had taken into account the request by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the concern expressed by other countries of the area and would not object to the further extension of the mandate of UNPREDEP. However, his country wanted to reiterate that in assisting in the maintenance of stability and security in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the international community should respect the political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country concerned, namely the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. He expressed hope that the adjustment of the mandate of UNPREDEP to enable it to be responsible for monitoring the border areas between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Albania would help effectively contain illicit arms flows and terrorist activities in the region. On that basis and in the interest of maintaining peace and stability in the area, China would not object to the adjustment of the mandate and would vote for the draft resolution. However, he noted that such a vote did not constitute any change in China's position of principle with respect to resolutions 1101 (1997), 1114 (1997) and 1160 (1998).<sup>274</sup>

The representative of the United States stated that, despite its successes, the mission of UNPREDEP was not over. In Kosovo, Belgrade had failed to fulfil the calls of the international community to cease action against the civilian population, return forces to barracks and begin meaningful negotiations on an enhanced status and a substantially greater degree of

---

<sup>270</sup> S/1998/401 and S/1998/627.

<sup>271</sup> S/PV.3911, pp. 2-3.

<sup>272</sup> Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Slovakia; and Cyprus, Iceland and Norway.

---

<sup>273</sup> S/PV.3911, pp. 2-3.

<sup>274</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

autonomy for Kosovo, which had led to a deteriorating situation in Kosovo that threatened regional stability. He emphasized that the current crisis in Kosovo reinforced the need for an increase in and extension of the current mandate of UNPREDEP. Noting that the strength of UNPREDEP would be increased by 300 troops, he stated that his delegation had not excluded consideration of a further increase, if the situation in the region required it.<sup>275</sup>

The representative of the Russian Federation stated that his delegation shared the view expressed by the Secretary-General that the continuing complex situation in Kosovo, Serbia, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia made it advisable to extend the mandate of the operation. He remarked that it was clear that the direct reason prompting the members of the Security Council to adjust the Council's decision on terminating UNPREDEP after 31 August related to resolution 1160 (1998), which authorized the imposition of an arms embargo and called for the cessation of external support for "the Kosovar terrorists". He expressed his belief that UNPREDEP could and should make a useful, practical contribution to carrying out monitoring functions in line with resolution 1160 (1998), and noted that an appropriate provision had been included in the draft resolution.<sup>276</sup>

Also speaking before the vote, several speakers expressed their support for the extension and expansion of the mandate of UNPREDEP.<sup>277</sup>

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1186 (1998), which reads:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling* all its relevant resolutions concerning the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, in particular resolution 795 (1992) of 11 December 1992, in which it addressed possible developments which could undermine confidence and stability in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia or threaten its territory, and resolution 1142 (1997) of 4 December 1997,

*Recalling also* its resolutions 1101 (1997) of 28 March 1997 and 1114 (1997) of 19 June 1997, in which it expressed its concern over the situation in Albania, and its resolution 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998, in which it decided that all States

shall prevent the sale or supply to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including Kosovo, of arms and related materiel of all types and shall prevent arming and training for terrorist activities there,

*Reiterating its appreciation* for the important role played by the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force in contributing to the maintenance of peace and stability, and paying tribute to its personnel in the performance of their mandate,

*Commending* the role of the Force in monitoring the border areas and reporting to the Secretary-General on any developments which could pose a threat to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and by its presence deterring threats and preventing clashes, including monitoring and reporting on illicit arms flows within its area of responsibility,

*Reiterating its call* on the Governments of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to implement in full their agreement of 8 April 1996, in particular regarding the demarcation of their mutual border,

*Taking note* of the letters dated 15 May and 9 July 1998 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Secretary-General, requesting the extension of the mandate of the Force and endorsing the option of an increase in its troop strength,

*Having considered* the reports of the Secretary-General of 1 June and 14 July 1998 and the recommendations contained therein,

*Reaffirming its commitment* to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,

1. *Decides* to authorize an increase in the troop strength of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force up to 1,050 and to extend the current mandate of the Force for a period of six months until 28 February 1999, under which the Force would continue by its presence to deter threats and prevent clashes, to monitor the border areas, and to report to the Secretary-General any developments which could pose a threat to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, including the tasks of monitoring and reporting on illicit arms flows and other activities that are prohibited under resolution 1160 (1998);

2. *Expresses its intention* to consider further the recommendations of the Secretary-General in his report of 14 July 1998;

3. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

#### **Decision of 25 February 1999 (3982nd meeting): rejection of a draft resolution**

On 12 February 1999, pursuant to Security Council resolution 1186 (1998), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report covering developments in the mission area of UNPREDEP since

<sup>275</sup> Ibid., pp. 6-7.

<sup>276</sup> Ibid., pp. 7-8.

<sup>277</sup> Ibid., p. 4 (Sweden); pp. 4-5 (Slovenia); p. 5 (Japan); and pp. 5-6 (Brazil).

his reports of 1 June and 14 July 1998.<sup>278</sup> In his report, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had presented arguments for an extension of the mandate of UNPREDEP for an additional six months, with its existing composition and structure. He also drew attention to the fact that the Contact Group on the former Yugoslavia was engaged in seeking a political solution to the Kosovo crisis and discussions were continuing within the framework of NATO concerning the deployment of an international military presence in the region. Considering these developments, he suggested that the Security Council might wish to consider extending the presence of UNPREDEP, with its existing mandate and composition, for a further period of six months until 31 August 1999, on the understanding that it would review its decisions should the aforementioned international discussions result in developments which would affect the role and responsibilities of UNPREDEP.

At its 3982nd meeting, held on 25 February 1999 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Canada) with the consent of the Council, invited the representatives of Bulgaria, Germany, Italy and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The President then drew the attention of members of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Slovenia, the United Kingdom and the United States.<sup>279</sup> He further drew the attention of members of the Council to a letter dated 2 February 1999 from the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting a letter dated 29 January 1998 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia also addressed to the Secretary-General.<sup>280</sup>

The representative of Argentina stated that, since the situation in Kosovo had not yet been resolved, the presence of UNPREDEP, which was a preventive

force, constituted an irreplaceable reassurance. Equally important was the mandate that the Council gave to UNPREDEP to monitor illicit flows of arms and other activities prohibited under resolution 1160 (1998). In light of these issues, his delegation supported the extension of the mandate of UNPREDEP for a further six-month period, until 31 August 1999, with its existing composition and mandate.<sup>281</sup>

The representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia emphasized that it could be argued that the contributions of the United Nations were more necessary than when the Security Council decided to extend the mandate of the UNPREDEP the previous year. The situation continued to be very difficult, dangerous and unpredictable, and it could be safely considered a serious threat to the peace and security of the Balkans. The possibility of a new bloody war in the Balkans needed to be considered a real one. He reiterated that extension of the mandate of UNPREDEP needed to be seen as providing important support to the peace forces in the region. Prevention of a new war in the Balkans was of utmost urgency and a very serious obligation of the Security Council under the Charter of the United Nations, in particular under Article 24, in which the Council was requested to act on behalf of the Member States. He asserted that Member States fully supported the extension of the mandate of the first successful preventive peacekeeping mission of the United Nations. He noted that the main argument against the use of the veto was that the Security Council acted on behalf of all Member States, not of an individual Member State. In the case of UNPREDEP, he stressed that the extension of its mandate was supported by all Member States except one, and that was because of bilateral considerations, something that his delegation considered to be in full contradiction of the Charter of the United Nations.<sup>282</sup>

Speaking before the vote, the representative of the Russian Federation stated that his position was that the tasks of UNPREDEP regarding the monitoring of compliance with the arms embargo and with the injunctions established by resolution 1160 (1998) should become the main component of its activities, and that this should have been more clearly highlighted

---

<sup>278</sup> S/1999/161.

<sup>279</sup> S/1999/201.

<sup>280</sup> S/1999/108.

---

<sup>281</sup> S/PV.3982, pp. 2-3.

<sup>282</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

in the mandate of the operation. Guided by that approach, his delegation had proposed corresponding amendments to the draft resolution on the extension of the mandate of UNPREDEP. He stated that, as these amendments were unfortunately not duly reflected in the final text of the draft resolution, his delegation would not be able to support the draft resolution.<sup>283</sup>

At the same meeting, the Council proceeded to vote on the draft resolution. Under the preambular part of the draft resolution, the Council would, *inter alia*, have underlined the continuing importance of the role of the UNPREDEP in monitoring the border areas and reporting to the Secretary-General on any developments which could pose a threat to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and, by its presence, deterring threats and preventing clashes, including monitoring and reporting on illicit arms flows within its area of responsibility. The resolution received 13 votes in favour to 1 against (China), with 1 abstention (Russian Federation), and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Security Council.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of the United States stated that very real regional threats to the security of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia remained. He emphasized that his delegation's vote to extend the mandate of UNPREDEP was a vote of confidence in a mission that was needed as much as ever. He expressed regret over the decision of one member of the Council to exercise its veto. He expressed his belief that the overall interests of security in the region should have been sufficiently compelling to outweigh other considerations and that the role of UNPREDEP was indispensable. His delegation therefore hoped to begin work with members of the Security Council to find a way to allow the international community to continue to meet this critical need, without disruption.<sup>284</sup>

The representative of Slovenia expressed regret that the Council was unable to adopt the necessary decision to extend the mandate of UNPREDEP. He stated that the situation around the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was fraught with instability and potential threat, which called for an array of international responses, among them the preventive deployment of the United Nations peacekeeping force

in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. He stressed that it was essential that Council members dealt with specific situations from the standpoint of ensuring peace and security in the world and from the perspective of the Organization as a whole. That was essential for the realization of the responsibility conferred upon the Council by the United Nations Member States and enshrined in Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations. He stated that the situation in the immediate vicinity of Kosovo continued to represent a threat to peace and security in the region and gave additional importance and urgency to the role of UNPREDEP. Therefore, Slovenia strongly supported the idea of continued consultations among the Security Council members and with the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to lead to an arrangement acceptable to all, which could ensure the continued pursuit of the tasks which made UNPREDEP necessary.<sup>285</sup>

The representative of China, explaining the vote against the draft resolution, stated that his delegation had always maintained that United Nations peacekeeping operations, including preventive deployment missions, should not be open-ended. As the situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had apparently stabilized and the Secretary-General had clearly indicated that the original goal of the Security Council in establishing the preventive mission had been met, there was no need to extend further the mandate of UNPREDEP. He also reiterated that as Africa and other regions were still plagued by conflict and instability and needed greater attention, it would be neither reasonable nor fair to continue to assess Member States for UNPREDEP.<sup>286</sup>

Several speakers expressed support for the extension of the mandate of UNPREDEP, their regret that the Security Council was unable to do so, and their concern over the possible escalation of the crisis in Kosovo.<sup>287</sup>

The representative of China took the floor a second time to reply that he had taken note of the statements made by several representatives and expressed the belief that deciding one's own position on the merits of a matter was

<sup>283</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>284</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

<sup>285</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

<sup>286</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 6-7.

<sup>287</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Canada); pp. 7-8 (Germany, on behalf of the European Union and the associated and aligned States: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Slovakia; and Cyprus, Iceland and Norway); and p. 8 (Bulgaria).



the right of every sovereign State. He also stated that the accusations that some countries had made against China were totally groundless.<sup>288</sup>

## **F. Items relating to the situation in Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia**

**Letter dated 11 March 1998 from the Deputy Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council**

**Letter dated 27 March 1998 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council**

### **Initial proceedings**

**Decision of 31 March 1998 (3868th meeting): resolution 1160 (1998)**

By a letter dated 11 March 1998 addressed to the President of the Security Council,<sup>289</sup> the representative of the United Kingdom transmitted the text of a statement on Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia,<sup>290</sup> agreed by the members of the Contact Group<sup>291</sup> at their meeting in London on 9 March 1998. The Contact Group expressed their dismay that, although they had called upon the authorities in Belgrade and the leadership of the Kosovo Albanians to join in a peaceful dialogue, rather than taking steps to reduce tensions or entering without preconditions in dialogue towards a political solution, the Belgrade authorities had applied repressive measures in Kosovo. They stressed that their condemnation of the actions of the Serbian police should not in any way be mistaken

for an endorsement of terrorist actions by the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) or any other group or individual. In the light of the deplorable violence in Kosovo, they felt compelled to take steps to demonstrate to the authorities in Belgrade that they could not defy international standards without facing severe consequences. The Contact Group welcomed the continuation of consultations in the Security Council, in view of the implications of the situation in Kosovo for regional security. Owing to the gravity of the situation, they endorsed the following measures, to be pursued immediately: consideration by the Council of a comprehensive arms embargo against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including Kosovo; refusal to supply equipment to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which might be used for internal repression, or for terrorism; denial of visas for senior Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Serbian representatives responsible for repressive action by security forces of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in Kosovo; and a moratorium on government-financed export credit support for trade and investment, including government financing for privatizations, in Serbia. The Contact Group further noted that the Russian Federation could not support the last two measures mentioned above for immediate imposition. However, if there was no progress towards the steps called for by the Contact Group, the Russian Federation would then be willing to discuss all the measures. The Contact Group also called upon President Milosevic of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to take rapid and effective steps to stop the violence and engage in a commitment to find a political solution to the issue of Kosovo through dialogue. If President Slobodan Milosevic took those steps, they would immediately reconsider the measures they had adopted. If he failed to take those steps, and repression continued in Kosovo, the Contact Group would move to further international measures, and, specifically, pursue a freeze on the funds held abroad by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Serbian Governments. The Contact Group stressed that they supported neither independence nor the maintenance of the status quo. As they had set out clearly, the principles for a solution of the Kosovo problem needed to be based upon the territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and in accordance with the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) standards, the Helsinki Principles, and the Charter of the United Nations. A solution also had to

---

<sup>288</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>289</sup> S/1998/223.

<sup>290</sup> For purposes of this Supplement, the term "Kosovo" refers to "Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia", without prejudice to issues of status. In other instances, the terminology originally used in official documents has been preserved to the extent possible.

<sup>291</sup> The Contact Group was composed of France, Germany, Italy, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States.