

**INTER-AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP  
4 June 1996, Washington, D.C.**

**SANCTIONS  
Follow-up to IASC Decisions**

**Background**

1. At the meeting on 19 April 1996, the IASC endorsed the following three recommendations of the Working Group regarding the impact of UN sanctions on humanitarian assistance:
  - a) "The ERC will, on behalf of the IASC, seek the approval of the Security Council for a generic exemption for humanitarian requirements in sanctions situations. DHA, in consultation with IASC members, will draw up a list of humanitarian relief items comprising such an exemption."
  - b) "It was agreed that DHA should be the focal point within the Secretariat regarding the humanitarian consequences of sanctions. DHA will elaborate, in consultation with the IASC members, on the necessary arrangements for such information to be put together particularly at the field level for transmittal to the Council. These papers should also include suggestions on staffing, financial needs and other requirements. The IASC Working Group should review these proposal papers and submit its recommendations to the IASC."
  - c) "DHA will, in consultation with the members of the IASC, continue its work on the development of methodology and indicators for assessing the impact of sanctions on vulnerable groups and will work on the possibility of establishing a monitoring mechanism. With the support of, and in consultation with the IASC members, DHA will work with selected research institutions to move as expeditiously as possible on this matter."
2. In order to expedite the follow-up to these decisions, DHA initiated a number of informal consultations with selected members of the Security Council, members of the IASC as well as colleagues in the Department of Political affairs in charge of sanctions matters. It also followed and benefitted on the deliberations of the Sub-Group on Sanctions of the

informal working group on the Agenda for Peace that was convened on 7, 8 and 10 May 1996.

#### **A) Generic Exemptions for Humanitarian Assistance**

3. There has been so far no clear trend in the Security Council's handling of such exemptions. This is reflected in the fact that, in principle, major Western Powers prefer to work on a case-by-case basis and are not inclined to grant blanket authorizations. While Council members were flexible in some sanctions situations such as in the Sanctions Committee for the Former Yugoslavia, they pursued a more vigorous approach policy in other cases such as in the Iraqi Sanctions Committee. Still, the non-aligned UN Members States favour such general exemptions for humanitarian items and actually have proposed a more inclusive list of humanitarian goods adding medical equipment and educational materials.
4. It should be noted that in the case of the Former Yugoslavia, the Sanctions Committee agreed to an arrangement to grant exemptions on a long-term basis (up to six months) for humanitarian requirements based on internationally recognized assessments, such as Consolidated Appeals. As a step towards more expeditious arrangements for the processing of humanitarian exemptions, DHA will explore the application of such "long-term" arrangements in future sanctions.
5. In the meantime, DHA will request inputs from the IASC members for the compilation of a core list of critical humanitarian goods and services that could be considered by the Security Council for generic exemptions or to be considered by the Sanctions Committee on a case by case basis under "notification" arrangements.

#### **B) Information for the Security Council Concerning Humanitarian Impact of Sanctions**

6. On the basis of consultations with members of IASC and colleagues of the Department of Political Affairs, DHA will prepare a proposal on arrangements and mechanisms for the collection and analysis of information concerning humanitarian impact of sanctions for submission to the Security Council. DHA intends to submit such a paper to the IASC-WG at its next meeting.
7. The findings of the study on methodology and indicators, and the decisions of the IASC thereon will determine, to a large extent, the scope and content of information to be

collected and analyzed, and the organizations that should be tasked to undertake such activities. At the same time it is clear that such activities should in the first instance take place at the field level. It must be borne in mind that such information and analysis must be put together in time before the decision of the Security Council on sanctions. Relevant UN organizations and NGOs will therefore be expected to ensure that the necessary capacity is available in-country to undertake such tasks. In order to expedite the process, regular monitoring and updating of information on relevant indicators would be desirable. Agencies should also consider, as and when required, to reinforce the capacity of the field.

8. In countries where there is no humanitarian coordinator, the resident coordinator should be entrusted with the responsibility to act as the team leader to integrate such information and analysis. In some instances, DHA should determine, in consultation with the IASC, whether Headquarters assessment missions would be required.
9. Once forwarded to Headquarters, the data and analysis prepared in the field could be reviewed by an Inter-Agency group before its submission to the Security Council through the Secretary-General.
10. In the context of the above, the question of the extent of the involvement of local governments and authority in the compilation of such information should be examined. It has also been pointed out that monitoring and periodic reporting to the Council on the humanitarian consequences of sanctions imposed by the Security Council would be desirable. Such information could either be provided to the Sanctions Committee by relevant agencies or submitted in a consolidated form.
11. The IASC-WG could return to the discussion of those matters on the basis of a DHA paper at its next meeting.

## **Recommendations**

### **C) Development of the Methodology and Indicators for Assessing the Humanitarian Impact of Sanctions**

12. In pursuance to the decision of the IASC, DHA discussed with the consortium of Brown University, University of Notre Dame and the Fourth Freedom forum which have a research project on "economic sanctions and humanitarian actions". This project will involve four (4) field case studies (Iraq, Haiti, Former Yugoslavia and South Africa) and is scheduled to be completed by the end of 1997. The consortium agreed to adapt their

studies in order to address specific requirements as decided by the IASC. On the basis of their case studies, they will provide to the IASC a synthetic document composing of two parts:

- i) a suggested methodology to measure the humanitarian impact of sanctions, including indicators; and
- ii) an assessment of the capacity of the UN system to monitor the humanitarian impact of sanctions.

13. While the study will take fifteen (15) months to produce solid findings, the consortium will provide the IASC with an interim presentation of its findings in mid-1997.
14. In pursuance to this discussion, DHA has subsequently received a letter from Messrs. David Cortright and Thomas G. Weiss on behalf of the consortium confirming their willingness to undertake the study for IASC as part of their project and request financial support to that end. The total cost for the project will be \$185,000 and DHA has been approached to consider providing half of this amount.
15. DHA is of the view that the study requested by the IASC could best be carried out in conjunction with the proposed studies of the consortium, since the study on the methodology and indicators can draw on the specific case studies mentioned. DHA therefore recommends that IASC-WG endorses this course of action. DHA will continue to consult with members of IASC to support this project on a cost-sharing basis. In this connection, it may be recalled that the Kulesa and Von Braunmuhl study was commissioned with financial support of the members of IASC. For this study, FAO, WFP, WHO, UNDP, UNHCR, and UNICEF contributed \$12,000 each, while DHA contributed \$25,000