

Europe

29. The situation in Cyprus

Decision of 21 April 2004 (4947th meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

At its 4940th meeting, on 2 April 2004, at which no statements were made, the Security Council heard a briefing by the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Cyprus on the Secretary-General's mission of good offices.¹ The Special Adviser recalled that on 13 February 2004 the two parties in Cyprus had agreed to resume negotiations on the basis of the Secretary-General's plan to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem through separate and simultaneous referendums before the accession of Cyprus to the European Union on 1 May 2004. To that end, the parties had committed themselves in a first phase to seek to agree on changes and to complete the plan in all respects by 22 March within the framework of the Secretary-General's mission of good offices. The parties had further agreed that, in the absence of such agreement, the Secretary-General would convene a meeting of the two sides, with the participation of Greece and Turkey, in a concentrated effort to agree on a finalized text by 29 March. As a final resort, in the event of a continuing and persistent deadlock, the parties had invited the Secretary-General to use his discretion to finalize the text to be submitted to referendums on the basis of his plan. The Special Adviser reminded the members of the Council that the process was based on the conditions laid down by the Secretary-General in his report of 1 April 2003² to resume his good offices, which had received the support of the Council in resolution 1475 (2003). That process had resulted in a finalized text ("Basis for an agreement on a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem"), which had been presented by the

Secretary-General at negotiations in Bürgenstock, Switzerland, on 31 March 2004 and would go to referendum on 24 April 2004.³

The Special Adviser emphasized that while the plan had been finalized, as a last resort, by the Secretary-General, it was not an invention of the Secretary-General. He stressed that the plan embodied the key concepts and trade-offs that had emerged from a long process of negotiation. For a detailed explanation of the main points of the plan, he referred the members of the Council to the report of the Secretary-General of 1 April 2003,² in which the Secretary-General had stated that the plan provided for a United Cyprus Republic with a single sovereignty, international personality and citizenship, which would comprise two politically equal constituent states, the Greek Cypriot State and the Turkish Cypriot State, to be joined together in a bicomunal, bizonal federation. As a constitutive act for a reunified Cyprus, the plan required the holding of separate simultaneous referendums by the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot populations.

The Special Adviser reminded the members of the Council that there were six appendices to the agreement on a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem: a foundation agreement, with annexes, including a constitution for a United Cyprus Republic; constitutions of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot constituent States; a treaty on matters related to the new state of affairs in Cyprus; a draft act of adaptation of the terms of accession of the United Cyprus Republic to the European Union; matters to be submitted to the Security Council for decision; and measures to be taken during April 2004. The Special Adviser then summarized the main improvements made to the plan since the issuance of the Secretary-General's report of 1 April 2003, which included the supervision of transfer of territory by the United Nations, the schedule for withdrawal of Greek and Turkish troops from the island and the mandate of the future United Nations operation in Cyprus.

¹ During this period, in addition to the meetings covered in this section, the Council held a number of meetings in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus, pursuant to resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sections A and B. The meetings were held on 7 June 2004 (4983rd), 8 October 2004 (5054th), 9 June 2005 (5198th), 7 December 2005 (5316th), 31 May 2006 (5447th), 8 December 2006 (5582nd), 8 June 2007 (5689th) and 7 December 2007 (5794th).

² S/2003/398.

³ The plan, in the version presented by the Secretary-General on 31 March 2004, was not issued as a document of the Security Council.

The Special Adviser also drew the Council's attention to the steps that needed to be taken in April so that the plan could enter into force on 29 April 2004 as envisioned, should both populations agree to it during the referendums. Those steps included some final technical work of the parties; the written confirmation of the guarantor Powers of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom that they agreed to the foundation agreements being submitted to referendums and that, upon approval of the foundation agreement and completion of their internal ratification procedures, they would sign the treaty on matters related to the new state of affairs in Cyprus contained in the plan; the adoption of the act of adaptation of the terms of the accession of Cyprus to the European Union by the Council of the European Union to make way for a reunited Cyprus to accede to the European Union; and the approval by the Security Council of a substantially revised mandate for the United Nations operation in Cyprus. The Special Adviser stressed that the Secretary-General believed that the plan was fair and balanced and hoped that the people on each side would agree.⁴

On 16 April 2004, the Secretary-General submitted a report on Cyprus, focusing on his mission of good offices.⁵ He recalled that, despite the fact that an opportunity to solve the Cyprus problem had been missed, the plan that he had submitted to the leaders of the two sides had remained on the table. Following communications and consultations that had led him to believe that a new effort might be warranted, he had invited the leaders of the two sides to New York to resume negotiations on 10 February 2004.

The Secretary-General subsequently referred to the matters to be submitted to the Security Council for decision (appendix E to the comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem by which the Council would be requested to take certain decisions to enter into force upon the reunification of Cyprus. By those decisions, the Council would endorse the foundation agreement; impose an arms embargo against Cyprus; and establish a new United Nations operation to undertake responsibilities connected with the implementation of the comprehensive settlement. The Secretary-General, also provided details relating to the proposed mandate,

⁴ S/PV.4940, pp. 2-6.

⁵ S/2004/302.

composition, strength and structure of the new United Nations operation in Cyprus.

Bearing in mind the understanding of the parties as reflected in the comprehensive settlement, as well as the mode of entry into force, the Secretary-General requested the Security Council to consider taking action in advance of the referendums of 24 April. Noting that the decision to be made by the people of Cyprus on 24 April was theirs alone, the Secretary-General observed that timely action by the Council would go a long way to reassuring the people that the settlement would have the strong support of the United Nations and that its security provisions would be fully implemented.

At its 4947th meeting, on 21 April 2004, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 16 April 2004.⁵ Statements were made by the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Benin, Brazil, Chile, China, France, Pakistan, Romania, the Russian Federation, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States.

At the outset of the meeting, the President (Germany) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution that had been submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States,⁶ by which the Council would decide that the provisions set out in the annex to the resolution should take effect only upon notification by the Secretary-General that the foundation agreement had entered into force, following the free decision of the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. In its annexes, the draft resolution contained provisions (a) replacing the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) with a new operation in Cyprus, to be known as the United Nations Settlement Implementation Mission in Cyprus, with a mandate to, inter alia, monitor the implementation of the foundation agreement; (b) imposing an arms embargo against Cyprus under Chapter VII of the Charter; and (c) calling upon all parties concerned to implement faithfully and fully all aspects of the comprehensive settlement within the time frames prescribed therein.

Speaking before the vote, the representative of the Russian Federation recalled that his country had consistently supported the Secretary-General's mission of good offices and his efforts aimed at a just settlement of the Cyprus problem, on the basis of

⁶ S/2004/313.

Security Council resolutions and the express will of both Cypriot communities. He stressed that the international community, and in particular the Security Council, should help the Cypriot parties to reach arrangements themselves, but should not impose decisions upon them. He emphasized that the referendums planned for 24 April had to be held without any external interference or pressure. He held that the Council would be in a position to take a considered decision, including on the deployment of a new peacekeeping operation, after the referendums had been held. Turning to the process of negotiating the draft resolution, the representative of the Russian Federation expressed deep regret at how the work on the draft resolution had been structured. He held that a technically and legally complex decision, such as the formulation of the parameters of a new United Nations peacekeeping operation in Cyprus and the imposition of an arms embargo, would have called for the most thorough and careful analysis. Instead, he held, the sponsors of the draft resolution had submitted it for a vote after having “ignored” the views of other members of the Council. He noted that views opposed to such a precipitous adoption of a draft resolution on the eve of the referendums had been expressed by the parties directly interested in the settlement as well as by the majority of members of the Council. Under such circumstances, the Russian Federation had no other choice but to exercise a veto on technical grounds, in order to ensure conditions in the future for normal, mutually respectful work to agree upon Security Council decisions that were acceptable to all parties. He stressed that his delegation was prepared to play a constructive role in formulating a draft resolution on the issue after the referendums, on the understanding that such a draft would take into account the results of the referendums and would provide for universally acceptable ways to remove concerns on the part of the Cypriot parties.⁷

The draft resolution was then put to the vote and received 14 votes in favour and 1 against (Russian Federation). It was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of the United Kingdom expressed disappointment that the Council had not been able to reach consensus on the draft resolution. He noted that no delegation was

⁷ S/PV.4947, p. 2.

opposed to the general substance of the draft, while one member of the Council had voted against it for technical reasons of procedure and timing. He stressed that the fact that an overwhelming majority of the Council had voted in favour of the draft would send a strong message of support for the efforts of the Secretary-General and for his plan. That would offer the people of Cyprus reassurance that the Council would act on the obligations foreseen for it in the comprehensive settlement, including the establishment of a strengthened United Nations peacekeeping operation and the imposition of an arms embargo. He expressed his delegation’s hope that the Cypriot people would seize the historic opportunity to find a peaceful solution to the conflict in Cyprus that the plan of the Secretary-General was offering. Stating that the draft resolution stayed on the table and that his delegation would ask for the Council to take speedy action after the referendums, he stressed that there should be no doubt that the Council stood ready to fulfil its commitments.⁸

The representative of the United States also expressed disappointment that one member of the Council had not been prepared to support the Secretary-General’s request to adopt the draft resolution prior to the referendums, in order to provide assurances to the Greek Cypriots that the security structures provided for in the settlement would be in place before their vote on 24 April. He stated that it was evident that, if the settlement was approved by all Cypriots in the referendums, there would be rapid action in the Council to establish the United Nations settlement implementation mission in Cyprus as well as the arms embargo.⁹

Several other speakers stated that their delegations had voted in favour of the draft resolution to support the efforts of the Secretary-General for a resolution of the conflict.¹⁰ Some emphasized that there was general agreement among the Council members regarding the substance of the draft and stressed that, should the people of Cyprus vote for reunification, the Council stood ready to assume its responsibilities under the comprehensive settlement.¹¹

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (Benin); p. 4 (Angola, Algeria, Romania); and p. 5 (Brazil, Chile, Pakistan).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (Benin); pp. 3-4 (France); p. 4 (Algeria); and p. 5 (Chile, Spain).

Other speakers expressed their preference that a unified Cyprus accede to the European Union.¹² A number of speakers also expressed regret that consultations had not been extended in order to achieve consensus before proceeding to vote on the draft resolution.¹³

**Decision of 11 June 2004 (4989th meeting):
resolution 1548 (2004)**

Following the rejection of the comprehensive settlement plan in the referendums of 24 April 2004, the Security Council, at its 4954th meeting, on 28 April 2004, heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs on the outcome of the referendums in Cyprus; no statements were made at the meeting.

In his briefing, the Under-Secretary-General reported that, following the finalization of the foundation agreement in Bürgenstock on 31 March, the two parties had continued to work on technical matters of the comprehensive settlement plan up until the last day before the referendums and that the authenticated text had been sent to the parties on 23 April. On 7 April, the Greek Cypriot leader, in an address to the nation, had called on Greek Cypriots to reject the Secretary-General's plan and to "send a resounding no" to the plan, thereby joining the Turkish Cypriot leader. Nevertheless a number of political leaders on both sides had strongly advocated a favourable vote. One of the main political parties on the Greek Cypriot side, AKEL (Progressive Party of Working People), which had traditionally been in favour of a settlement of the Cyprus problem, however, had indicated that it would be able to support the plan only if certain unspecified security guarantees were given by the Security Council. AKEL had called for a "soft no" vote following the outcome of consideration of the matter by the Council, but had expressed the hope that it would in due time translate into a vote in favour of an eventual second referendum on the plan. Stating that it was too early to provide a detailed analysis of the amount of information that was made available to the people during the referendum campaign, the Under-Secretary-General nevertheless noted that concerns about the issue of access to the media by international personalities from the United Nations and the European Union had been raised by the Special Adviser with the Greek Cypriot leader.

The Under-Secretary-General further reported that, in the referendums, the foundation agreement had been rejected by the Greek Cypriot population by 75.83 per cent to 24.17 per cent, while the Turkish Cypriot population had approved the settlement plan by 64.91 per cent to 35.09 per cent. The foundation agreement would therefore not enter into force since the plan required approval by both sides.

According to the Under-Secretary-General, the Secretary-General respected the outcome of the referendums, while regretting that a unique and historic opportunity to resolve the Cyprus problem and to reunite Cyprus in time for accession to the European Union on 1 May had been missed. The Secretary-General remained convinced that the plan represented a fair, viable and carefully balanced compromise. The Secretary-General hoped that the Greek Cypriot community might arrive at a different view in the fullness of time, after a profound and sober assessment of their decision and its potential consequences. At the same time, the Secretary-General applauded the decision of the Turkish Cypriots, who had approved the plan notwithstanding the significant sacrifices that it entailed for many of them and regretted that the Turkish Cypriots would not equally enjoy the benefits of European Union membership as from 1 May 2004. The Under-Secretary-General concluded that the Secretary-General had begun to give careful thought to the implications of the result of the referendums for the United Nations and the way ahead and would present a detailed written report to the Security Council with his conclusions in due course.¹⁴

On 28 May 2004, the Secretary-General submitted a report on his mission of good offices in Cyprus,¹⁵ which contained a detailed summary of efforts undertaken to resolve the Cyprus problem since the agreement to restart negotiations of 13 February 2004, including the three phases of negotiations leading to the finalization of the comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem. It surveyed the improvements in the finalized plan, and reviewed developments between the finalization of the settlement plan in Bürgenstock on 31 March 2004 and the holding of the referendums in Cyprus on 24 April.

The Secretary-General stated that the outcome of the referendums represented another missed

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 4 (France, Romania); and p. 5 (Spain).

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4 (France); p. 4 (China, Algeria); and p. 5 (Brazil, Pakistan).

¹⁴ S/PV.4954, pp. 2-4.

¹⁵ S/2004/437.

opportunity to resolve the Cyprus problem. The decision of the Greek Cypriots to reject the plan was to be respected, but he noted that the decision was a major setback to peace efforts and stated that the Greek Cypriot people might wish to reflect on the implications of the vote in the future. He added that the Security Council would be well advised to address Greek Cypriot concerns about security and implementation of the plan, which needed to be articulated with clarity and finality. At the same time, the Secretary-General welcomed the decision of the Turkish Cypriots and maintained that the Turkish Cypriot vote had undone any rationale for pressuring and isolating them and expressed his hope that the members of the Council, while in no way affording recognition or assisting secession, would give a strong lead to all States to cooperate both bilaterally and in international bodies to eliminate unnecessary restrictions and barriers that had the effect of isolating the Turkish Cypriots and impeding their development, deeming such a move consistent with resolutions 541 (1983) and 550 (1984). The Secretary-General concluded that there was no apparent basis for resuming his mission of good offices while the current stalemate continued. He announced that, given the watershed in efforts to resolve the Cyprus problem, he would conduct a review of the full range of United Nations peace activities in Cyprus, to be completed within three months, including on the mandate, force level and concept of operation of UNFICYP.

The Secretary-General observed that, during the four-and-a-half-year effort, the parties had found it difficult to agree on key points and had often left it to the United Nations to stimulate the process. He regretted that more could not be agreed between the parties themselves and that little was done by some participants in the negotiations to prepare the people for a compromise. The Secretary-General expressed concerns regarding the way in which the plan had been presented to the public, particularly on one side. While a comprehensive settlement had proved elusive, major achievements had nevertheless been made in the period of the negotiations in that the obstacles which had hitherto prevented Cyprus initiatives from getting beyond generalities had been overcome. While the plan was legally null and void in the aftermath of the referendums, the Secretary-General maintained that the plan had been a comprehensive and carefully balanced settlement proposal, which remained ready to be implemented, and which also remained the only

foreseeable basis for settlement at the disposal of Cypriots.

At its 4986th meeting, on 8 June 2004, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General dated 28 May 2004.¹⁵ At the meeting, at which no statements were made, the Council heard a briefing by the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Cyprus. Introducing the report of the Secretary-General, the Special Adviser stated that, although the ultimate outcome of the good offices mission had not been a success, major achievements had nevertheless been made and needed to be built upon to keep alive the prospects of reconciliation and reunification in the future, and that the Council had an important role in that regard. The Special Adviser also said that the Secretary-General had the previous day received a letter from the Greek Cypriot side,¹⁶ containing comments on the Secretary-General's report.¹⁷

At its 4989th meeting, on 11 June 2004, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus dated 26 May 2004,¹⁸ which the Secretary-General stated that, in the absence of a comprehensive settlement, the presence of UNFICYP on the island continued to be necessary. He recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, while the Secretariat would conduct a review of the mandate, force levels and concept of operations of UNFICYP.

Statements were made by the representatives of Algeria, Chile, Pakistan, Romania, the United Kingdom and the United States. The President (Philippines) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom.¹⁹ The President noted that he had met with representatives of the parties, who had confirmed that they maintained their well-known positions vis-à-vis the item on the Council's agenda. The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1548 (2004), by which the Council, inter alia:

¹⁶ See S/2004/464. The Secretary-General responded to the President of Cyprus by a letter dated 15 June 2004 (S/2004/493), stating that he stood fully by his report.

¹⁷ S/PV.4986, pp. 2-3.

¹⁸ S/2004/427.

¹⁹ S/2004/484.

Decided to extend the mandate of UNFICYP for a further period ending on 15 December 2004 and to consider the recommendations of the Secretary-General in his review of UNFICYP and to act upon them within one month of receiving them;

Urged the Turkish Cypriot side and the Turkish forces to rescind without delay all remaining restrictions on UNFICYP, and called on them to restore in Strovilia the military status quo which existed there prior to 30 June 2000;

Requested the Secretary-General to submit a report on the implementation of the resolution.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of the United Kingdom welcomed the unanimous adoption of the resolution and supported the Secretary-General's decision to conduct a comprehensive review of the role of UNFICYP.²⁰ The representative of the United States welcomed the fact that, by adopting the resolution, the Council had set a timeline for acting upon the recommendations of the Secretary-General, in particular in view of changed circumstances and limited resources for peacekeeping operations. The representative of the United States also spoke on the Secretary-General's report on his mission of good offices in Cyprus,²¹ expressing his delegation's regret at the results of the referendums on the comprehensive settlement plan. He also expressed wholehearted support for the conclusions of the report, including its analyses of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot votes. He agreed with the recommendation of the report that the Security Council, while in no way affording recognition or assisting secession, should give a strong lead to all States to cooperate to eliminate unnecessary restrictions and barriers that had the effect of isolating Turkish Cypriots and impeding their development, and concurred with the assessment of the Secretary-General that such a move was consistent with resolutions 541 (1983) and 550 (1984).²² Other speakers also supported the Secretary-General's recommendation to eliminate unnecessary restrictions on the Turkish Cypriot population, with due regard for resolutions 541 (1983) and 550 (1984).²³

The representative of Pakistan expressed serious reservations with regard to the adopted resolution, stating that the Council should have voted for a mere technical extension for only three months, in order to

enable the Council to act on the review of the Secretary-General. Moreover, he held that the inclusion of a paragraph urging the Turkish Cypriot side and the Turkish forces to rescind all remaining restrictions on UNFICYP and to restore the military status quo in Strovilia changed it from a procedural to a substantive proposition and that the Council should have taken a more balanced approach. He urged actions by the international community to take concrete steps to end the economic isolation of the Turkish Cypriot community and held that the inclusion in the resolution of a provision to welcome the report of the Secretary-General would have been one way to indicate even-handedness.²⁴ The representative of Algeria stated that his delegation also would have preferred that the draft resolution be a purely technical text.²⁵

**Decision of 22 October 2004 (5061st meeting):
resolution 1568 (2004)**

At its 5061st meeting, on 22 October 2004, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus dated 24 September 2004.²⁶ In his report, in accordance with the findings of the review of the mandate, force levels and concept of operations of UNFICYP by the Secretariat, the Secretary-General recommended a reduction of the strength of the UNFICYP military component by about 30 per cent to reflect the changed circumstances. In addition, he recommended that the number of civilian police should be increased, while remaining within the current authorized strength, and that the political and civil affairs component of the mission should be strengthened. The Secretary-General also announced his intention to conduct a further review before the end of the next mandate period in mid-2005.

Statements were made by the representatives of Pakistan, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States. At the outset of the meeting, the President (United Kingdom) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom.²⁷ The President noted that he had met with representatives of the parties, who had confirmed that they maintained their well-known positions vis-à-vis the item on the agenda of the Council. The draft

²⁰ S/PV.4989, p. 2.

²¹ S/2004/437.

²² S/PV.4989, p. 3.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (Chile); and p. 5 (Algeria, Romania).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

²⁶ S/2004/756.

²⁷ S/2004/829.

resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1568 (2004), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Endorsed the Secretary-General's recommendations for the amendment of the concept of operations and force level of UNFICYP, as outlined in his report of 24 September 2004;

Decided to extend the mandate of UNFICYP for a further period ending on 15 June 2005;

Urged the Turkish Cypriot side and Turkish forces to rescind without delay all remaining restrictions on UNFICYP, and called on them to restore in Strovilia the military status quo which existed there prior to 30 June 2000.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of the United States noted the strained resources for peacekeeping operations and welcomed the fact that the resolution endorsed the Secretary-General's recommendation for a 30 per cent force-level reduction.²⁸ The representatives of the United States and Pakistan expressed their disappointment that the Security Council had so far not endorsed the Secretary-General's report on his good offices mission in Cyprus²⁹ and his recommendation to eliminate unnecessary restrictions on the Turkish Cypriot population.³⁰ The representative of Pakistan maintained that the resolution unnecessarily singled out resolution 1251 (1999), and held that the resolution should have reflected the fact that the review team of the Secretariat had consulted with all relevant parties on the island, as well as the guarantor Powers on the concept and proposal to extend the mandate of UNFICYP.³¹ The representative of the Russian Federation, agreeing on the importance of establishing a favourable environment for the renewal of the negotiation process, including through economic relations between the two Cypriot communities, held that in that regard the Council should strictly observe the provisions of resolutions 541 (1983) and 550 (1984).³² The representative of the United Kingdom expressed his disappointment that, having voted for a settlement, the Turkish Cypriots had so far seen little benefit and stated that his Government remained committed to ending the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots and to reducing the economic gap between the two communities.³³

²⁸ S/PV.5061, pp. 2-3.

²⁹ S/2004/437.

³⁰ S/PV.5061, pp. 2-3 (United States); and p. 3 (Pakistan).

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

Decision of 15 June 2005 (5202nd meeting): resolution 1604 (2005)

At its 5202nd meeting, on 15 June 2005, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus dated 27 May 2005,³⁴ which contained, together with a description of the situation and the activities of UNFICYP, the findings of a review of the restructuring of UNFICYP. The review found, *inter alia*, that the amended more mobile concept of operations allowed UNFICYP to maintain the same level of mandate implementation with a reduced troop strength. The Secretary-General recommended that the Security Council extend the mandate of UNFICYP for a further period of six months with the current authorized strength and concept of operations.

The President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom.³⁵ The President noted that he had met with representatives of the parties, who had confirmed that they maintained their well-known positions *vis-à-vis* the item on the Council's agenda. The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1604 (2005), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided to extend the mandate of UNFICYP for a further period ending on 15 December 2005;

Called on the Turkish Cypriot side and Turkish forces to restore in Strovilia the military status quo which existed there prior to 30 June 2000.

Deliberations of 22 June 2005 (5211th meeting)

At its 5211th meeting, on 22 June 2005, at which no statements were made, the Council heard a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs. The Under-Secretary-General briefed members of the Council on his consultations in Cyprus, Greece and Turkey on the future of the Secretary-General's mission of good offices in Cyprus. Assessing the developments, the Under-Secretary-General noted on the positive side that all parties wanted to see some sort of resumption of active United Nations good offices and accepted that the comprehensive settlement plan should serve as the document on which the negotiations would resume. On the negative side, he noted that the gap between the stated positions of the

³⁴ S/2005/353.

³⁵ S/2005/382.

parties on substance appeared to be wide and that confidence between them did not seem to be high. He concluded that the Secretary-General believed that launching an intensive new process prematurely would be inadvisable and that nothing positive would be served by a new effort that again ended in high-profile failure or in a frustrating stalemate. The Secretary-General therefore considered it prudent to proceed very carefully and intended to reflect on the future of his mission of good offices in the period ahead, taking into full account the reaction of the Council to the briefing.³⁶

Decisions of 14 December 2005 to 14 December 2007: resolutions 1642 (2005), 1687 (2006), 1728 (2006), 1758 (2007) and 1789 (2007)

At its 5324th, 5465th, 5593rd, 5696th and 5803rd meetings,³⁷ the Council adopted resolutions,³⁸ unanimously without debate, extending the mandate of UNFICYP for a period of six months, based upon the recommendations contained in the reports of the Secretary-General on UNFICYP.³⁹

In his reports, the Secretary-General reported that the situation in Cyprus remained stable. Nevertheless, he believed that only the achievement of a comprehensive settlement would bring an end to the Cyprus problem. In the absence of such a settlement, the presence of UNFICYP continued to be necessary and the Secretary-General therefore recommended an extension of the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months. The Secretary-General also regularly included in his reports an overview of his activities in the framework of his mission of good offices. In his report dated 1 December 2006, he reported on an agreement reached between the two sides on 8 July 2006 to begin a two-track process involving discussion by technical committees of issues

affecting the day-to-day life of the people and, concurrently, consideration by working groups of substantive issues, both of which would contribute to a comprehensive settlement.⁴⁰ In subsequent reports, the Secretary-General deplored the lack of progress made in implementing the agreement.⁴¹

At each meeting, the President noted that he had met with representatives of the parties, who had confirmed that they maintained their well-known positions vis-à-vis the item on the Council's agenda. By the resolutions adopted, the Council, in addition to extending the mandate of UNFICYP for consecutive periods of six months, called on the Turkish Cypriot side and Turkish forces to restore in Strovilia the military status quo which had existed there prior to 30 June 2000. Starting with resolution 1728 (2006) of 15 December 2006, the Council expressed full support to the process initiated by the agreement of 8 July 2006,⁴² and called for early completion of the preparatory phase so that a fully-fledged good offices process could resume as soon as possible. In resolutions 1758 (2007) of 15 June 2007 and 1789 (2007) of 14 December 2007, the Council noted with concern the lack of progress in that process and called upon all parties to immediately engage constructively with the United Nations efforts. The Council also reaffirmed that the status quo was unacceptable and that negotiations on a final political solution to the Cyprus problem had been at an impasse for too long. The Council also called on both sides to engage in consultations with UNFICYP on the demarcation of the buffer zone.

At two of the meetings, statements were made by the representative of Greece. At the 5465th meeting, the representative expressed his regret that resolution 1687 (2006) did not convey a sufficiently clear and strong message as to the basis, the scope and the objectives of United Nations efforts for a fair and lasting settlement of the problem of Cyprus.⁴³ At the 5593rd meeting, he expressed the appreciation of his country to UNFICYP and the Secretariat for their contribution to maintaining stability on the island.⁴⁴

³⁶ S/PV.5211, pp. 2-5.

³⁷ Held on 14 December 2005, 14 June 2006, 15 December 2006, 15 June 2007 and 14 December 2007.

³⁸ Resolutions 1642 (2005), 1687 (2006), 1728 (2006), 1758 (2007) and 1789 (2007). The draft resolutions corresponding to resolutions 1687 (2006), 1728 (2006) and 1758 (2007) were submitted by China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States (S/2006/393, S/2006/978 and S/2007/353). The other draft resolutions were prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

³⁹ S/2005/743 and Corr.1, S/2006/315, S/2006/931, S/2007/328 and S/2007/699.

⁴⁰ S/2006/931.

⁴¹ S/2007/328 and S/2007/699.

⁴² See S/2006/572.

⁴³ S/PV.5465, p. 2.

⁴⁴ S/PV.5593, pp. 2-3.