

some indictees were not present could not be a reason for a possible mandate extension. National jurisdiction should take over, he said. He also expressed concern over information that one of the indictees of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia seemed to enjoy protection by the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo, and that the Mission did not sufficiently cooperate with the Tribunal.¹²⁵

Many speakers addressed the issue of a residual mechanism to take over after the two Tribunals had closed down. Important aspects of such a mechanism highlighted were future prosecutions of indictees still at large, the involvement of national jurisdictions in such prosecutions, and the issue of the invaluable judicial legacy of the jurisprudence of the Tribunals. Members expressed appreciation for the proposals made by the Tribunals so far, and called for prompt and serious consideration and development of such mechanisms. The representative of Croatia called on the Council to give greater attention to the role that

¹²⁵ Ibid., p. 23.

national legal systems in the region could play in carrying out the residual functions of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.¹²⁶

The representative of Rwanda opined that court archives, documents and material of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda should be transferred to his country, since they constituted an important part of the country's history and were of critical importance to reconciliation and civic policies.¹²⁷

In response to the comments of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the representative of Serbia asserted that his Government cooperated consistently with the Tribunal to the best of its ability, and reiterated its full commitment to bring the cooperation to a successful end. While stating that all those who committed war crimes should be indicted by the Tribunal, he expressed his belief that the four remaining fugitives "will be located and apprehended in the nearest future".¹²⁸

¹²⁶ Ibid., pp. 29-31.

¹²⁷ Ibid., pp. 26-28.

¹²⁸ Ibid., pp. 28-29.

37. Children and armed conflict

Deliberations of 20 January 2004 (4898th meeting)

On 10 November 2003, the Secretary-General submitted a report on children and armed conflict,¹ in which he reported on advances made towards the protection of children affected by armed conflict and the follow-up to resolution 1460 (2003) and issued a set of recommendations. The recommendations related to systematically incorporating children's issues into peace negotiations, peace accords, post-conflict programmes and also including them in the mandate of all United Nations peace operations. He further recommended giving serious consideration to deploying child protection advisers in every operation, developing a systematic and concerted monitoring and reporting mechanism, and ending impunity. Annexed to the Secretary-General's report for the first time was a list of parties that recruit or use children in situations of armed conflict not on the agenda of the Security Council.

¹ S/2003/1053 and Corr.1 and 2, submitted pursuant to paragraph 16 of resolution 1460 (2003).

At its 4898th meeting, on 20 January 2004, the Security Council included the above-mentioned report in its agenda. The Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict and the Executive Director of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Statements were made by all Council members as well as by the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Ireland (on behalf of the European Union),² Israel, Japan, Kenya, Liechtenstein, Mali (on behalf of the Human Security Network), Mexico, Monaco, Myanmar, Norway, Sierra Leone, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda and Ukraine.

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General stated that significant and concrete progress had

² Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

been made, mainly as concerned advocacy, development of standards and innovative initiatives, but that this created a “cruel dichotomy” when contrasted to the general situation for children on the ground, which remained grave and unacceptable. He therefore urged the Council to lead the way into an “era of application”. He called in particular for the establishment of a systematic, coordinated monitoring and reporting mechanism to provide reliable reports on violations against children, which could serve as “triggers for action”. He stated that, in this regard, the Council must lead the way and was the most important destination for action because of its primary responsibility for peace and security. He stressed that, in the annexes to the Secretary-General’s report which listed parties to conflicts that continued to recruit and exploit children, the Council had before it all information necessary for action and urged the Council to respond to the lists with concrete action. This required, besides increased political and material support for field programmes, that the protection and rehabilitation of children be systematically incorporated into all stages of peace processes, and that the United Nations cooperate with regional and subregional organizations, as well as local efforts, to strengthen their advocacy and programme activities.³

The Executive Director of UNICEF explained why the United Nations efforts so far had fallen short of what was required to protect children. She reported that rights of children were not only violated by recruiting child soldiers but that sexual violence, particularly in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, had a devastating impact. UNICEF was working with various partners to provide care and support for survivors of sexual violence and to demobilize child soldiers. With regard to engaging in dialogue with groups and Governments using child soldiers, the Secretary-General’s lists of parties to conflicts that continue to recruit and exploit children as child soldiers had been a valuable advocacy tool. She also drew attention to a new tool, the *Guide to the Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict*, issued that day, which had been prepared jointly by UNICEF and the Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers. Noting that improving monitoring and reporting would create an essential foundation for pursuing justice, accountability and ultimately reconciliation, the Executive Director considered the

Secretary-General’s lists to be a vital step forward and affirmed that UNICEF, together with its partner agencies, stood ready to provide the Council with more systematic, analytical information on children in armed conflict. She also encouraged the Council to request regularly that information on child protection issues be included in all peacekeeping mandates, as well as country-specific and thematic reports.⁴

In the debate that followed, speakers welcomed the Secretary-General’s call for an “era of application” and his recommendations. Since efforts still fell short of what was needed and since there was no improvement on the ground, speakers in general made clear that implementation, not new norms, was needed. As summarized by the representative of the United Kingdom, the Council needed to establish a plan detailing practical steps to achieve measurable progress by the time the next report was written.⁵ In the words of the representative of Japan it was time to “move from advocacy to implementation”.⁶

Discussing concrete action for implementation, speakers broadly supported the creation of a monitoring and reporting mechanism. The representative of Chile recalled the proposal made in the context of implementation of resolution 1325 (2000) on women and peace and security, which suggested that every year a member of the Council be requested to monitor, together with the Secretariat, the implementation of Council decisions.⁷ The representative of Pakistan pointed out that such a mechanism should be of an intergovernmental nature and that, rather than creating a new mechanism, the existing mechanisms should be enforced.⁸

Speakers in general considered the lists provided in the annex to the Secretary-General’s report as capable of greatly improving the situation. The representative of Brazil stated that the lists must be made as precise as possible through continuous updating and refinement. This entailed the creation of institutional mechanisms capable of leading the process of engagement with the parties responsible for the involvement of children in armed conflict. Those mechanisms should also be reporting mechanisms and consist of members of the

⁴ Ibid., pp. 4-7.

⁵ Ibid., p. 22.

⁶ S/PV.4898 (Resumption 1), p. 17.

⁷ S/PV.4898, p. 26.

⁸ Ibid., p. 16.

³ S/PV.4898, pp. 2-4.

Special Representative's office, UNICEF and other field presences and child protection advisers.⁹ The representative of Norway also called for updating and refinement.¹⁰ The representative of Fiji noted that the lists needed to reflect yearly feedback from the parties listed.¹¹ The representative of the United States supported the request that the Secretary-General submit another list to the Council the following year and supported the active monitoring of Governments and armed groups that already were on the lists.¹² The representative of Spain cautioned that criteria for the inclusion of groups in the lists must be studied in detail,¹³ and the representative of Egypt pointed out that the lists required further study in order to ascertain the way to deal with parties that violated the rights of children.¹⁴

A number of speakers were in favour of applying targeted sanctions with regard to parties that failed to adopt measures to end violations concerning children and armed conflict.¹⁵ Some speakers reiterated that such measures must rely on precise information and must be finely tuned.¹⁶ The representative of Germany suggested that parties that did respond positively should be rewarded by technical and other assistance.¹⁷ Several representatives maintained that sanctions would be effective only when complemented by parallel measures, such as increasing resources for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes and monitoring mechanisms.¹⁸ The representative of Colombia, explaining that in his country most violations of children's rights were perpetrated by illegal armed groups that recruited child soldiers, requested that "gradual and targeted pressure" be exerted on those groups.¹⁹

Representatives encouraged the integration of child rights protection into peacekeeping missions and making children's issues essential components of post-conflict programmes, peace negotiations and agreements or demobilization and reintegration plans.²⁰ Stating that there was no conflict that did not affect children, the representative of Germany called for examining every conflict on the Council's agenda from a child rights perspective.²¹

While the issue of child soldiers was at the centre of the debate, some speakers reminded the Council that other egregious violations and abuses in conflict situations must also be addressed, specifically referring to sexual violence and killing and maiming, kidnapping or attacks against schools and hospitals.²² Some speakers therefore justified the extension of the list to other egregious violations.²³ Others emphasized that the proliferation of small arms and light weapons had aggravated the use of children in armed conflict.²⁴

As his country was among those listed in an annex to the Secretary-General's report, the representative of Colombia informed the Council of the positive results of his Government's "democratic security policy" to protect the human rights of all Colombians, particularly children.²⁵ The representative of Myanmar, affirming that procedures were in place in his country for preventing the recruitment of child soldiers, disputed allegations made against the Myanmar army in the Secretary-General's report, stating that it was insurgent groups that were recruiting

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

¹⁰ S/PV.4898 (Resumption 1), p. 21.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹² S/PV.4898, p. 18.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹⁴ S/PV.4898 (Resumption 1), p. 14.

¹⁵ S/PV.4898, p. 8 (Brazil); p. 9 (Algeria); and p. 26 (Chile); S/PV.4898 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Ireland, on behalf of the European Union); p. 8 (Sierra Leone); p. 18 (Costa Rica); p. 19 (Fiji); p. 24 (Germany); and pp. 25-26 (Azerbaijan).

¹⁶ S/PV.4898, p. 8 (Brazil); and p. 17 (Philippines).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

¹⁸ S/PV.4898, p. 9 (Algeria); S/PV.4898 (Resumption 1), p. 8 (Sierra Leone); and p. 22 (Canada).

¹⁹ S/PV.4898, p. 28.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Algeria); p. 11 (Benin); p. 12 (Angola); p. 17 (Philippines); p. 19 (Spain); p. 22 (United Kingdom); and p. 30 (Ukraine); S/PV.4898 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Bangladesh); pp. 7-8 (Sierra Leone); p. 6 (Ireland, on behalf of the European Union); p. 14 (Egypt); p. 18 (Costa Rica); p. 21 (Norway); p. 26 (Indonesia); and p. 29 (Armenia).

²¹ S/PV.4898, p. 24.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 15 (Pakistan); p. 21 (France); p. 24 (Germany); and p. 26 (Chile); S/PV.4898 (Resumption 1), p. 15 (Mali, on behalf of the Human Security Network); p. 17 (Costa Rica); p. 21 (Norway); p. 22 (Canada); and p. 31 (Kenya).

²³ S/PV.4898, p. 24 (Germany); and p. 26 (Chile); S/PV.4898 (Resumption 1), p. 21 (Norway); and p. 31 (Kenya).

²⁴ S/PV.4898, p. 10 (Benin); S/PV.4898 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Sierra Leone); p. 11 (India); p. 20 (Ecuador); p. 21 (Norway); p. 22 (Canada); p. 24 (Mexico); and p. 31 (Kenya).

²⁵ S/PV.4898, p. 28.

child soldiers.²⁶ The representative of Uganda, stating that the policy not to recruit anyone under the age of 18 into its armed forces was strictly observed, expressed its outrage about allegations against the Uganda People's Defence Forces and alleged that the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict had a "hostile attitude", relying on hearsay information.²⁷ The representative of India questioned the usefulness of the Council's debate on the issue of children and armed conflict while the Council did not discuss the vulnerability of children with regard to other issues such as malaria or AIDS. He emphasized that in the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other relevant norms no role was envisaged for the Council in promoting their implementation. He also was against the inclusion of child protection advisers in peacekeeping operations since an assessment of their work undertaken so far was missing. He was hesitant about establishing a monitoring and reporting mechanism since such a new mechanism could duplicate and overlap with existing mechanisms. He stated that "by taking a continuously expansionist role for itself", the Council would overlap its functioning with that of other mandated United Nations bodies.²⁸ The representative of Liechtenstein, on the other hand, pointed out that it was exactly the Council that, given its primary role in the area of international peace and security, had a special responsibility for setting up an effective system of monitoring and follow-up action by coordinating all players at Headquarters and in the field.²⁹

Some speakers voiced the need for training of peacekeeping personnel in child protection in order to prevent sexual violence against children practised by peacekeeping personnel.³⁰

**Decision of 22 April 2004 (4948th meeting):
resolution 1539 (2004)**

At its 4948th meeting, on 22 April 2004, the Council included again in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on children and armed conflict.³¹ The President (Germany) drew attention to a draft

resolution;³² it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1539 (2004), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Strongly condemned the recruitment and use of child soldiers by parties to armed conflict in violation of international obligations applicable to them;

Decided to continue the inclusion of specific provisions for the protection of children in the mandates of United Nations peacekeeping operations, including, on a case-by-case basis, the deployment of child protection advisers, and requested the Secretary-General to ensure that the need for and the number and roles of child protection advisers were systematically assessed during the preparation for each United Nations peacekeeping operation;

Reiterated its request to the Secretary-General to ensure that, in all his reports on country-specific situations, the protection of children was included as a specific aspect of the report, and expressed its intention to give its full attention to the information provided therein when dealing with those situations on its agenda, and in this regard stressed the primary responsibility of United Nations peacekeeping missions and United Nations country teams, consistent within their respective mandates, to ensure effective follow-up to the resolution and other resolutions.

**Decision of 23 February 2005 (5129th meeting):
statement by the President**

On 9 February 2005, the Secretary-General submitted a report on children and armed conflict,³³ in which he provided information on compliance and progress in ending the recruitment and use of children in armed conflict by those parties mentioned in his earlier report,³⁴ including information on other grave violations and abuses according to paragraph 15 (a) of resolution 1539 (2004). He recommended that the Security Council take targeted and concrete measures where insufficient or no progress had been made by parties named in the lists annexed to his reports, in accordance with its resolutions 1379 (2001), 1460 (2003) and 1539 (2004). Such measures should include the imposition of travel restrictions on leaders and their exclusion from any governance structures and amnesty provisions, the imposition of arms embargoes, a ban on military assistance and restrictions on the flow of financial resources to the parties concerned. Furthermore, in response to the request of the Council in paragraph 2 of resolution 1539 (2004), the report

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.

²⁷ S/PV.4898 (Resumption 1), pp. 9-10.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-12.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

³⁰ S/PV.4898, pp. 13-14 (Russian Federation); p. 14 (Romania); S/PV.4898 (Resumption 1), p. 27 (Indonesia).

³¹ S/2003/1053 and Corr.1 and 2.

³² S/2004/314.

³³ S/2005/72, submitted pursuant to resolution 1539 (2004).

³⁴ S/2003/1053 and Corr.1 and 2.

contained an action plan for a systematic and comprehensive monitoring, reporting and compliance mechanism.

At its 5129th meeting, on 23 February 2005, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report.³⁵ The Council heard briefings by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, the Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF and the Special Adviser on Child Protection to the Executive Secretary of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Statements were made by all members of the Council,³⁵ as well as by the representatives of Canada, Gabon, Guinea, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg (on behalf of the European Union),³⁶ Mali, Myanmar, the Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Senegal, Sri Lanka and Uganda.

Introducing the report, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General stated that, following the adoption of resolution 1539 (2004), the heads of United Nations field teams had monitored its implementation and coordinated the United Nations response to concerns related to the issue of children and armed conflict. The field teams had, therefore, been the primary sources of information for the present report. He noted, however, that they had encountered a number of constraints including security problems, lack of access, non-cooperation of the parties and, most significantly, the absence of a functioning monitoring and reporting mechanism at the country level. He considered the present report as “turning point” in the campaign for the “era of application”, instituting a structured “compliance and enforcement regime” consisting of the following key components: review of the conduct of parties to conflict, resulting in the naming and listing of offending parties; ensuring accountability for those offending parties, particularly through the imposition of concrete and targeted measures; and the establishment of a monitoring and reporting mechanism. The Special Representative informed the Council that 54 parties had been held responsible for the recruitment and use of child

soldiers in the report. He encouraged Council members to “make good” on their promise to take targeted measures against them, including the imposition of travel restrictions and arms embargoes. He proposed a “four-pronged” response to ending impunity, through, first, the imposition of targeted sanctions; secondly, the establishment of a committee of the Council to review and oversee the imposition of specific measures; thirdly, a demand that the parties prepare, in collaboration with United Nations field teams and within six months, time-bound action plans to end the violations; and fourthly, an endorsement of the monitoring and reporting mechanism to enable it to become operational quickly. On allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse by United Nations peacekeeping personnel, he called for a fundamental and comprehensive review. Regarding the monitoring and reporting mechanism, he pointed to the importance of the compilation of information as a trigger for action, and called upon the Security Council to be the primary “destination for action” in this regard.³⁷

The Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF emphasized the ability of the Council to take decisive action by translating the commitments of international legal and other standards into action and considered the targeted measures mentioned in the Secretary-General’s report to be helpful to the realization of that objective. She considered it crucial to better address accountability, and for that, the development of a monitoring and reporting mechanism was a significant step. Regarding the recruitment of children into the armed forces, she stated that disarmament, demobilization and reintegration was important to end their recruitment. She called for two immediate actions to be taken to ensure the protection of children whose rights had been violated, namely, the referral of the situation in Darfur to the International Criminal Court and the inclusion of child protection in all aspects of peacekeeping operations, including the operation to be established in Darfur.³⁸

The Special Adviser on Child Protection to the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS briefed the Council on the experiences of ECOWAS in the field of child protection. He noted that children continued to be used in armed conflict, including on the front lines. He stated that ECOWAS had adopted a number of

³⁵ The United Republic of Tanzania was represented by its Minister for Community Development, Gender and Children.

³⁶ Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

³⁷ S/PV.5129, pp. 2-6.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

instruments designed to ensure the protection of children and was giving training to its armed forces, as well as judges. In addition, ECOWAS was monitoring the welfare of children by visiting those who had returned to their families, as well as demobilization sites.³⁹

Speakers in general, while acknowledging the progress made in recent years in promoting the children and armed conflict agenda, particularly the adoption of clear and rigorous international child protection standards, underlined the need to move to the implementation of those standards. The measures needed to ensure the implementation of the legal framework already outlined by the Security Council, but awaited “activation”. The first of these, a monitoring, reporting and compliance mechanism, aimed at providing the systematic gathering of objective, specific and reliable information on grave violations committed against children in situations of armed conflict, was seen as crucial in making the “era of application” a reality. Speakers welcomed the Secretary-General’s plan of action for establishing such a mechanism, as requested in paragraph 2 of resolution 1539 (2004).

The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, while welcoming the Secretary-General’s report, expressed concern regarding difficulties that might be encountered in the collection of information for monitoring and reporting purposes. She therefore saw a need for United Nations country teams to have a dialogue with concerned Governments on the need to provide information.⁴⁰ The representatives of the Philippines and Myanmar expressed concern about the Secretary-General’s suggestion that the practice of initiating direct contact by United Nations actors with non-State actors be generally applied as part of the mechanism at the country level because such engagement could undermine existing peace processes and be counter-productive.⁴¹ The representative of Japan emphasized that in the compilation of information and the assessment of the situation by the future mechanism, voices on the ground must be adequately reflected.⁴² The representative of the United States believed that “greater clarity and selectivity” was needed in the partnership that formed the basis of

country-level reporting in the proposed mechanism and which included national Governments, civil society and the United Nations.⁴³ The representative of Uganda called for rigorous and transparent consultations between the Secretary-General and Member States during the collection of information.⁴⁴

Stressing that the current situation was unacceptable, the representative of France considered targeted measures to be necessary but at the same time stressed that they should be part of a comprehensive mechanism of monitoring and reporting, consisting also of reintegration of child soldiers.⁴⁵ Along the same lines, the representative of the United Kingdom noted that monitoring and review was not an end in itself and that it must lead to effective action when progress was inadequate. Extracting compliance from parties to armed conflict would require the right institutional framework, as proposed in the Secretary-General’s report. He, together with other speakers,⁴⁶ also considered disarmament, demobilization and reintegration to be a vital element of post-conflict peacebuilding.⁴⁷

While the majority of speakers were strongly supportive of the use of targeted measures, some speakers expressed concern. The representative of the United States worried about the “possible unanticipated policy and resource implications” of a new thematic sanctions committee of the Council.⁴⁸ The representative of the Russian Federation emphasized the need to determine the legally correct interpretation of the mandate of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, “to avoid any broadening of its interpretation”, and pointed to the need for appropriate coordination to avoid redundancies.⁴⁹ The representative of Canada called for the Secretary-General to encourage consolidated reporting and assessment requirements where overlap with the protection of civilians and the women and peace and security agenda was apparent.⁵⁰ The representative of Argentina urged the Council to be careful in defining the scope of implementation of the

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 8-11.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 11.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 16 (Philippines); S/PV.5129 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Myanmar).

⁴² S/PV.5129, p. 19.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 22.

⁴⁴ S/PV.5129 (Resumption 1), p. 17.

⁴⁵ S/PV.5129, p. 13.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 21 (Greece); and p. 23 (China); S/PV.5129 (Resumption 1), p. 18 (Guinea).

⁴⁷ S/PV.5129, p. 17.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 22.

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 24-25.

⁵⁰ S/PV.5129 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

proposed action plan since the categorization of violations that could be monitored might vary according to each particular situation. Furthermore, he called for a better coordination between the Council and the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council: the General Assembly could consider the follow-up and the Economic and Social Council could hold high-level sessions on the issue of children and armed conflict.⁵¹

While supporting targeted measures against non-compliant parties, the representative of Canada suggested coupling those measures with the establishment of base indicators and standards.⁵²

The representative of India believed the establishment of a reporting mechanism was the least practical of all the key components that encompassed the Secretary-General's concept of the "era of application" since the nature of situations of conflict, particularly in Africa, was such that the models of monitoring, reporting and compliance were impractical and therefore ineffective. He criticized the fact that the report did not address the fundamental and critical issue of how to hold non-State actors accountable.⁵³

Addressing the issue of fighting impunity with regard to serious crimes against children, some speakers underlined the important role the International Criminal Court could play in bringing those in violation of international norms to justice.⁵⁴ The representative of Greece noted that the Rome Statute provided a clear legal basis for the Court's involvement, stipulating that use of children under 15 as soldiers constituted a war crime. Pointing out that States already had a complete set of the necessary legal and judicial tools at their disposal, he, together with the representative of Senegal,⁵⁵ urged States to become parties to and implement the provisions of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.⁵⁶ With regard to legal standards, the representative of Benin supported a move to reclassify the use of child soldiers

from a war crime to a crime against humanity, and proposed the establishment of an open-ended working group of the General Assembly to that end.⁵⁷

Several speakers pointed to the linkage between illicit cross-border activities such as proliferation of small arms and the recruitment of children.⁵⁸ Some speakers emphasized the need also to address the so-called "supply-side" dimension of the child soldier issue, referring to the interlinkage between security and development and the importance of tackling the root causes of conflict.⁵⁹

With regard to the conflict situations referred to in the report, the concerned countries believed it could have given a more comprehensive account of all situations, the representative of Myanmar expressing dismay over the "high degree of selectivity and double standards" contained therein and regretting the "degree of politicization" involved in drafting the lists.⁶⁰ The representative of the Philippines believed that the lists of violating parties did not "seem to be as complete and accurate" as they should have been.⁶¹ The representative of Uganda objected to the "mischaracterization" contained in the report regarding his country.⁶²

The President then made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁶³ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its strong condemnation of the recruitment and use of child soldiers by parties to armed conflict in violation of international obligations applicable to them and of all other violations and abuses committed against children in situations of armed conflict;

Urged all parties to armed conflict to halt immediately such intolerable practices;

Reiterated the crucial need for a systematic and comprehensive monitoring and reporting mechanism, and its determination to ensure compliance and to put an end to impunity;

Further reiterated its intention to complete expeditiously the process of the establishment of the mechanism.

⁵¹ S/PV.5129, p. 27.

⁵² S/PV.5129 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-12.

⁵⁴ S/PV.5129, p. 20 (Greece); p. 26 (Brazil); and p. 27 (Argentina); S/PV.5129 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Luxembourg, on behalf of the European Union); p. 7 (Iceland); p. 10 (Liechtenstein); p. 14 (Senegal); and p. 23 (Mali).

⁵⁵ S/PV.5129 (Resumption 1), p. 14 (Senegal).

⁵⁶ S/PV.5129, p. 20.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 14 (France); and p. 17 (United Kingdom); S/PV.5129 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Luxembourg, on behalf of the European Union); p. 5 (Nigeria); p. 9 (Canada); p. 11 (India); and p. 19 (Gabon).

⁵⁹ S/PV.5129, p. 23 (Denmark); and p. 28 (Algeria); S/PV.5129 (Resumption 1), pp. 4-5 (Nigeria).

⁶⁰ S/PV.5129 (Resumption 1), p. 6.

⁶¹ S/PV.5129, p. 15.

⁶² S/PV.5129 (Resumption 1), p. 16.

⁶³ S/PRST/2005/8.

**Decision of 26 July 2005 (5235th meeting):
resolution 1612 (2005)**

At its 5235th meeting, on 26 July 2005, the Council included again in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on children and armed conflict.⁶⁴ The President (Greece) drew attention to a draft resolution;⁶⁵ it was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1612 (2005), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Strongly condemned the recruitment and use of child soldiers by parties to armed conflict;

Took note of the action plan presented by the Secretary-General relating to the establishment of a monitoring and reporting mechanism on children and armed conflict;

Requested the Secretary-General to implement, without delay, the above-mentioned monitoring and reporting mechanism, beginning with its application, within existing resources;

Expressed serious concern regarding the lack of progress in development and implementation of the action plans called for in paragraph 5 (a) of its resolution 1539 (2004);

Decided to establish a working group of the Security Council consisting of all members of the Council to review the reports of the mechanism referred to above;

Decided to continue the inclusion of specific provisions for the protection of children in the mandates of United Nations peacekeeping operations, including the deployment, on a case-by-case basis, of child protection advisers;

Urged all parties concerned, including Member States, United Nations entities and financial institutions, to support the development and strengthening of the capacities of national institutions and local civil society networks for the advocacy, protection and rehabilitation of children affected by armed conflict to ensure the sustainability of local child-protection initiatives.

**Decision of 24 July 2006 (5494th meeting):
statement by the President**

On 10 July 2006, the President of the Council transmitted a letter dated 10 July 2006 addressed to him by the Chairman of the Working Group of the Security Council on Children and Armed Conflict⁶⁶ and transmitting the report on the activities of the Group since the adoption of resolution 1612 (2005). The Working Group had begun its work with consideration of the Secretary-General's first report on

a specific situation of armed conflict on the agenda of the Security Council and in which grave violations of the rights of the child were committed, namely his report on children and armed conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁶⁷ That report was presented to the Working Group by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, who noted its three main conclusions. First, it was the responsibility of all regional actors, including the neighbouring States, to bring the violations to an end; groups and individuals that totally disregarded Security Council decisions should be denied access to ways and means of continuing their crimes; their freedom of movement throughout Congolese territory and towards neighbouring countries such as Rwanda must be ended. Secondly, the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo must be supported in its efforts to discharge its obligation to protect children affected by the armed conflict, including against sexual violence; it must strengthen the military and civilian systems of justice and put an end to impunity. Thirdly, the international community must provide the resources needed to support the reintegration of children into their communities of origin.

At its 5494th meeting, on 24 July 2006, the Council included in its agenda a letter dated 6 July 2006 from the representative of France to the Secretary-General,⁶⁸ transmitting a concept paper to guide the discussion on children and armed conflict at that meeting.

The Council was briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, the Executive Director of UNICEF, the Associate Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Acting Director for Social Development and Manager of the Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Unit of the World Bank, and the representative of Watchlist on Children and Armed Conflict. Statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Benin, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Finland (on behalf of

⁶⁴ S/2005/72.

⁶⁵ S/2005/477.

⁶⁶ S/2006/497.

⁶⁷ S/2006/389.

⁶⁸ S/2006/494.

the European Union),⁶⁹ Guatemala, Israel, Liberia, Myanmar, San Marino, Slovenia (on behalf of the Human Security Network), Sri Lanka, Uganda and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and the Permanent Observer of Palestine.⁷⁰

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict welcomed the adoption of resolution 1612 (2005) as a landmark in the field of protection of children. However, she noted that despite the groundswell of support for the resolution, children continued to suffer. She said that more than 250,000 children continued to be exploited as child soldiers by armed forces and groups around the world, while since 2003 more than 14 million had been forcibly displaced within and outside their home countries and abductions were becoming more widespread and systematic. Noting that the first phase of the implementation of resolution 1612 (2005) was coming to an end, she stressed that it was time to broaden the geographical scope of the monitoring and reporting mechanism to all situations of concern. In addition, she called on the international community to begin looking at long-term solutions for children affected by armed conflict.⁷¹

The Executive Director of UNICEF reported that, despite the Council's active involvement in the issue over the years, much remained to be done. In addition to the need for an effective monitoring and reporting mechanism, she cited three areas of particular concern that were directly relevant to resolution 1612 (2005): the use of children by armed forces and groups, gender-based violence, and small arms and light weapons. She emphasized that comprehensive prevention, demobilization and reintegration needed to be comprehensive by also providing children with education and protection against persecution or exploitation.⁷²

The Associate Administrator of UNDP reported about initiatives undertaken by UNDP to encourage

young people to contribute to lasting peace through various projects of reintegration.⁷³

The Acting Director for Social Development and Manager of the Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Unit of the World Bank stated that the World Bank, over the past 10 years, had considerably expanded its work on armed conflict. He reported about analytical work undertaken by the Bank, indicating that in recent studies it had sought to provide guidance on the demobilization and reintegration of child soldiers in Africa. He also discussed operations of the World Bank related to children in conflict and immediate post-conflict situations, such as in Côte d'Ivoire and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.⁷⁴

The representative of Watchlist on Children and Armed Conflict reported that in the eastern region of the Democratic Republic of the Congo grave violations of children's rights continued and were even intensifying. He stated that monitoring and reporting of abuses was an essential starting point for protection but that violations needed to be prosecuted by the Security Council and the United Nations system as a whole. He equally called on the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to ensure implementation of the sanctions imposed by the Council.⁷⁵

Speakers in general pointed to the significance of resolution 1612 (2005) and stressed the importance of its timely implementation. They welcomed the establishment of the Working Group on Children and Armed Conflict, the appointment of the new Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict and the ongoing implementation of the monitoring and reporting mechanism. As stated by the representative of the Russian Federation, it was now necessary to ensure the effective functioning of those combined instruments and to guarantee the reliability and integrity of the information being received by the Security Council through the multi-tier mechanism from elements of the reporting and monitoring mechanism on the ground.⁷⁶

The representative of Denmark emphasized that with the adoption of resolution 1612 (2005) the Council had managed to achieve what many had already discarded as impossible: to propel the subject

⁶⁹ Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine aligned themselves with the statement.

⁷⁰ The Democratic Republic of the Congo was represented by its Minister for Human Rights; the representative of India was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

⁷¹ S/PV.5494, pp. 2-4.

⁷² Ibid., pp. 4-5.

⁷³ Ibid., pp. 5-6.

⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

⁷⁵ S/PV.5494 (Resumption 1), pp. 15-16.

⁷⁶ S/PV.5494, p. 24.

of a thematic debate from an issue of general, if somewhat uncommitted concern to a matter with very concrete and operational implications for the work of the Security Council. She, together with the representative of Canada,⁷⁷ hoped that the determination the Council had shown on the topic would be present on other related issues, such as the protection of civilians and women and peace and security.⁷⁸ The representative of the Congo stated that the direct role of the Security Council in the area of the protection of children as part of its responsibility to maintain international peace and security was now well established.⁷⁹ The representative of San Marino, referring to Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations, stated that he could not think of a more compelling duty for the Council.⁸⁰ On the other hand, the representative of Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) stressed that the work of the Council was complementary to the primary role of the General Assembly in the overall handling of the situation of children in the world.⁸¹

While the representative of the Russian Federation stressed that resolution 1612 (2005) provided for the priority establishment of the monitoring and reporting mechanism in situations on the Council's agenda,⁸² some speakers said that further extending the work of the mechanism to countries not on the Council's agenda should be considered.⁸³ With regard to the work of the Working Group, the representative of Sri Lanka called for it to put its primary focus on non-State actors, in order to ensure that States were not burdened with multiple reporting responsibilities and that non-State actors were brought under a punitive regime.⁸⁴ The representative of Egypt demanded that the Council immediately take a decision to broaden the scope of the work of the Working Group to include children in the occupied Palestinian territories and Lebanon.⁸⁵

A number of speakers called for an end to impunity for those who abused children.⁸⁶ The representatives of Argentina and Qatar urged the Working Group to work closely with the sanctions committees to consider the possibility of imposing sanctions against those responsible for the most flagrant violations against children.⁸⁷ The representative of Ghana stressed the need to "isolate and apply sanctions" against those who abused children, arguing that compilation of information would be of little relevance if it did not serve as a trigger for action.⁸⁸ The representative of Finland, speaking on behalf of the European Union, held that in order to end impunity, grave and persistent violations must lead to targeted and concrete measures in response.⁸⁹ According to the representative of France, the Council must be ready, as explicitly stated in its resolutions, to use the full arsenal of available measures to punish those who defied its authority by refusing to comply with its resolutions.⁹⁰ This was also encouraged by the representative of Canada.⁹¹ Some speakers furthermore emphasized the important role of the International Criminal Court in bringing abusers to justice.⁹²

Many speakers urged the Council to give special attention to affected children in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes. A number of speakers stressed the importance of reunification of families, medical support, education and vocational training.⁹³ The representative of France pointed out that without reintegration, children were potential factors in the resurgence of crises.⁹⁴

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁸⁰ S/PV.5494 (Resumption 1), pp. 3-4.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁸² S/PV.5494, p. 24.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); p. 12 (Slovakia); p. 14 (United Kingdom); p. 24 (Qatar); p. 26 (Denmark); S/PV.5494 (Resumption 1), p. 16 (Benin).

⁸⁴ S/PV.5494, p. 31.

⁸⁵ S/PV.5494 (Resumption 1), pp. 13-14.

⁸⁶ S/PV.5494, p. 16 (Peru); p. 17 (Ghana); p. 22 (Greece); p. 25 (Russian Federation); and p. 27 (Congo); S/PV.5494 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (San Marino); p. 4 (Slovenia, on behalf of the Human Security Network); p. 6 (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of); and p. 7 (Guatemala).

⁸⁷ S/PV.5494, p. 15 (Argentina); and p. 24 (Qatar).

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 17 (Ghana); and p. 29 (Canada); S/PV.5494 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Slovenia, on behalf of the Human Security Network); and p. 17 (Benin).

⁹³ S/PV.5494, p. 20 (China); p. 23 (Greece); p. 24 (Qatar); and p. 31 (Sri Lanka); S/PV.5494 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of); p. 7 (Guatemala); p. 12 (Liberia); and p. 14 (Colombia).

⁹⁴ S/PV.5494, p. 28.

Some speakers reiterated the importance of development in addressing the question of war-affected children,⁹⁵ the representative of Brazil calling for a comprehensive approach encompassing social, economic, security and human rights perspectives.⁹⁶ The role of conflict prevention in this context was emphasized by several speakers.⁹⁷

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo stated that the latest report of the Secretary-General on children and armed conflict in her country⁹⁸ objectively described the situation there, and pointed out that the violations highlighted in the report were mainly perpetrated by elements of armed groups. She reported on progress that the Government had made in the fight against the use of children in armed conflict.⁹⁹

The President made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹⁰⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Welcomed the appointment of a new Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, Ms. Radhika Coomaraswamy;

Welcomed the ongoing implementation of the monitoring and reporting mechanism on children and armed conflict, and invited the Secretary-General to accelerate it in accordance with resolution 1612 (2005);

Welcomed the activities of its Working Group on Children and Armed Conflict, as outlined in the report submitted by its Chairman;

Called for a reinvigorated effort by the international community to enhance the protection of children affected by armed conflict;

Looked forward to the next report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1612 (2005) and its previous resolutions on children affected by armed conflict.

Decision of 28 November 2006 (5573rd meeting): statement by the President

On 26 October 2006, the Secretary-General submitted a report on children and armed conflict,¹⁰¹ in

⁹⁵ S/PV.5494 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of); and p. 17 (Benin).

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁹⁷ S/PV.5494, p. 8 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); p. 20 (China); p. 29 (France); S/PV.5494 (Resumption 1), p. 12 (Myanmar); p. 14 (Colombia); and p. 17 (Benin).

⁹⁸ S/2006/389.

⁹⁹ S/PV.5494, pp. 8-10.

¹⁰⁰ S/PRST/2005/33.

¹⁰¹ S/2006/826 and Corr.1, submitted pursuant to resolution 1612 (2005).

which he, *inter alia*, reported on progress made in the implementation of the monitoring and reporting mechanism and progress made in the development and implementation of action plans called for in paragraph 5 (a) of resolution 1539 (2004). The report contained a number of recommendations, *inter alia*, that the Council consider expanding its focus and give equal care and attention to children affected by armed conflict in all situations of concern; and give equal weight to all categories of grave violations beyond the recruitment and use of child soldiers to include the killing and maiming of children, rape and other grave sexual violence, abductions, attacks against schools or hospitals, and denial of humanitarian access for children.

At its 5573rd meeting, on 28 November 2006, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report. It heard briefings by the Secretary-General, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, the Executive Director of UNICEF and the representative of Save the Children. Statements were made by all members of the Council as well as by the representatives of Australia, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Egypt, Finland (on behalf of the European Union),¹⁰² Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Uganda.¹⁰³

The Secretary-General stated that the protection of children in armed conflict, while remaining among his main priorities, had gained greater visibility since 1998. Important gains had been made in the elaboration of international legal standards, and the Council had played a crucial role in that progress by highlighting the six categories of grave violations against children. With these legal standards in place, the Secretary-General noted that now the international community was shifting its focus to providing real protection to children, including targeted measures against offenders. He urged the international community to sustain the political and practical momentum and hoped that the Council would

¹⁰² Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Iceland, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine also aligned themselves with the statement.

¹⁰³ The representative of Afghanistan was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

consolidate the gains that had been made and would move forward to cover all situations of concern and all grave violations.¹⁰⁴

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict reported a number of successes since the last report of the Secretary-General, including the fact that peace agreements signed over the past years had included provisions for child protection and frameworks for child demobilization. Still, she acknowledged that implementation on the ground was not satisfactory and that the issue needed proper mainstreaming within the United Nations system. She called for expanding the focus to all situations of armed conflict so that there was equal treatment of children regardless of where they lived. She considered several grave violations to be of particular concern, including sexual violence as an instrument of war and the migration of child soldiers and their “recycling” within conflict zones.¹⁰⁵

The Executive Director of UNICEF stated that, by naming the parties that continued to recruit or use child soldiers, the Security Council had demonstrated its determination to match words with deeds. She remained deeply concerned about the ongoing conflicts in several countries highlighted in the recent report of the Secretary-General, in particular referring to the occupied Palestinian territories, Chad and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. She reported that UNICEF, working closely with many partners, continued to negotiate for humanitarian access and to engage in dialogue with parties to end the recruitment and use of children associated with fighting forces. She furthermore emphasized the major role of education, pointing out that experience in countries where demobilization exercises and justice-sector reforms had neglected to include children had shown a negative effect on young people themselves, and could also undermine the peacebuilding effort.¹⁰⁶

The representative of Save the Children also pointed to the importance of education, which should be funded and programmed as part of every humanitarian response. More generally, he stated that three themes had been neglected in international responses: stronger pressure for humanitarian access; special attention to girls; and better response to reports

of violations against children. He said that with the knowledge gained through the monitoring and reporting mechanism came increased responsibility and that appropriate and concrete responses to the reports should be the next step.¹⁰⁷

Speakers welcomed the progress made in implementing resolution 1612 (2005), particularly the work of the monitoring and reporting mechanism and the Working Group, as well as the advances in formulating time-bound country-specific action plans. At the same time, they expressed concern at the continuing recruitment and use of children by parties to armed conflict and agreed that a great deal remained to be done.

The representative of France said that since 1999 no other thematic issue on the Council’s agenda had been the subject of such sustained and operational attention. Summarizing the existing tools, he stated that these were initial encouraging signs that should motivate States to redouble their efforts to narrow the gap “between our actions here and the concrete results of those actions in conflict situations”.¹⁰⁸

Speakers in general expressed support for the recommendations contained in the Secretary-General’s report. Specifically, the majority of speakers supported expanding the Council’s focus to all categories of grave violations against children, including killing and maiming of children, rape and other sexual violence, abductions, denial of humanitarian access to children, and attacks against schools and hospitals.

A number of speakers said that equal attention and weight should be given to all situations of concern, the representative of Denmark stressing that the scope of both the monitoring and reporting mechanism and the Working Group must, as envisaged in resolution 1612 (2005), be “truly thematic in nature”.¹⁰⁹ However, other speakers believed that the Council should remain focused on the situations on its agenda.¹¹⁰ The representative of China stated that the

¹⁰⁴ S/PV.5573, pp. 2-3.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 3-5.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., pp. 5-7.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., pp. 8-10.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 14 (Denmark); p. 18 (Argentina); pp. 20-21 (Congo); p. 24 (United Republic of Tanzania); p. 27 (Liechtenstein); p. 28 (Finland, on behalf of the European Union); S/PV.5573 (Resumption 1), pp. 7-8 (Slovenia, on behalf of the Human Security Network); and p. 12 (Canada).

¹¹⁰ S/PV.5573, p. 12 (China); S/PV.5573 (Resumption 1), pp. 3-4 (Colombia); and p. 10 (Sri Lanka).

Council should follow a different approach in dealing with the situations on its agenda and those that were not, since they were “essentially different” from each other. The Council should try to allay the concerns of countries not on the agenda by engaging them in dialogue and cooperation.¹¹¹ The representative of the Russian Federation considered it necessary to clarify whether the report’s recommendations applied to the annexed lists only, or also to all conflict situations worldwide.¹¹² The representatives of Sri Lanka and Nepal were of the view that certain recommendations could be ideally taken up by other bodies and mechanisms of the United Nations, not by the Council itself.¹¹³ The representative of Uganda stated that the mandate of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict should not extend beyond situations that appeared on the agenda of the Council.¹¹⁴

Many speakers stressed that the Council must take action against parties that continued to violate children’s rights and hold them accountable if violations did not stop. To that end, several speakers called for applying targeted sanctions.¹¹⁵ At the same time, the representative of China reiterated however that China had always advised against the frequent resort to sanctions or threats of sanctions by the Security Council, and considered caution to be especially necessary with regard to the question of children and armed conflict. Since every conflict situation was different, there could be no generalizations or one-size-fits-all approach.¹¹⁶

¹¹¹ S/PV.5573, p. 12.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹¹³ S/PV.5573 (Resumption 1), p. 9 (Sri Lanka); and p. 16 (Nepal).

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 17 (Slovakia); p. 19 (Argentina); p. 20 (Congo); p. 24 (United Republic of Tanzania); p. 25 (United Kingdom); p. 27 (Liechtenstein); and p. 29 (Finland, on behalf of the European Union); S/PV.5573 (Resumption 1), p. 11 (Canada).

¹¹⁶ S/PV.5573, p. 12.

The representative of Greece said that by adopting six resolutions since 1999, the Council had contributed to the international recognition of the responsibility to protect the human rights of children in armed conflict.¹¹⁷ As to covering all situations of concern and other types of violations than the recruiting of child soldiers, the representative of the Congo referred to the responsibility to protect.¹¹⁸

A number of delegations reiterated the importance of taking into account the interlinkage between security and development when dealing with the issue.¹¹⁹

The President then made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹²⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Commended the work carried out by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, Ms. Radhika Coomaraswamy, including her field activities in situations of armed conflict;

Also commended the work carried out by UNICEF and the child protection advisers of peacekeeping operations in cooperation with other relevant United Nations entities;

Strongly condemned the continuing recruitment and use of children in armed conflict in violation of applicable international law, the killing and maiming of children, rape and other sexual violence, abductions, the denial of humanitarian access to children and attacks against schools and hospitals by parties to armed conflict;

Reiterated its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security;

Reiterated its invitation to relevant States affected by armed conflict that were not yet involved in the implementation of the monitoring and reporting mechanism to join it on a voluntary basis, in cooperation with the Special Representative and UNICEF.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (France); p. 11 (China); and p. 14 (Denmark).

¹²⁰ S/PRST/2006/48.