I. Humanitarian Exemptions in Sanctions Regimes

Introduction

Sanctions are one of the methods the Security Council uses to maintain international peace and security. They are legal measures provided for in the *Charter of the United Nations* (1945), and they can target individuals, Member States, or non-state actors that the Security Council deems as threats to the peace. Sanctions were first introduced in 1963 against the Apartheid regime in South Africa. Yet, it was not until the end of the Cold War that the Security Council increased its overall activity and sanctions saw a surge in their use as the primary mechanism for the Security Council to resolve conflicts in a non-violent manner. Since the 1960s, the Security Council has created 27 sanctions regimes, 14 of which are still currently active. There are a variety of sanctions measures the Security Council has at its disposal; the most commonly used types of sanctions measures are diplomatic sanctions, travel and commodity bans, asset freezes, and arms embargoes. None of these measures are used in isolation, but are always combined with one another within country-specific contexts. For example, the sanctions regime against the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) includes arms embargoes, travel bans, and asset freezes, whereas the sanctions regime against Iraq only consists of an arms embargo and asset freezes. It is important to note that while the Security Council is the body that imposes sanctions through binding resolutions, Member States are required to implement these sanctions in their national legislation.

Many sanctions imposed by the Security Council target countries and regions experiencing crises that require the assistance of humanitarian actors, due to a lack of state capacity to help the population. This poses a challenge for the Security Council, whose actions could have negative consequences for civilians, when humanitarian actors are prevented from effectively providing aid and development assistance to people in need. For instance, the United Nations (UN) World Food Programme (WFP) has highlighted that the economic sanctions imposed by the Security Council, which require the thorough inspection of any goods entering the country, adds an extra logistical obstacle to WFP’s supply chain, and ultimately harms food security within the DPRK. Likewise, when individuals under sanctions require humanitarian assistance, it is crucial that the Security Council offer them the possibility to be temporarily excluded from sanctioning measures. The Security Council first introduced humanitarian exemptions to a travel ban and commodity interdictions in 1968 within the Southern Rhodesian sanctions regime. Since then, most sanctions regimes have included some form of exemptions for humanitarian purposes.

Overall, the recent discussion on sanctions predominantly revolves around the reform of sanctions in order to enhance their effectiveness. This is important, as effective sanctions would also greatly increase the legitimacy of
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the Security Council and the UN as a whole.\textsuperscript{100} Going forward, it is therefore crucial that the Security Council considers some of the current recommendations for sanctions reform regarding humanitarian exemptions, in order to ensure the effectiveness of sanctions, and to help mitigate unintended harmful humanitarian consequences.\textsuperscript{101}

\textit{International and Regional Framework}

The basis for the legal framework on humanitarian exemptions in sanction regimes is laid out in the \textit{Charter of the United Nations}, international human rights instruments, International Humanitarian Law (IHL), and Security Council resolutions.\textsuperscript{102} The Security Council derives its powers to establish sanctions from Chapter VII of the Charter.\textsuperscript{103} Chapter VII, Article 41, specifically grants the Security Council the authority to “decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions.”\textsuperscript{104} While Article 41 does not explicitly mention the term “sanctions,” the intention behind this article is to allow the Security Council to impose concrete measures against Member States and other actors in order to peacefully settle conflicts.\textsuperscript{105}

While the Charter establishes the Security Council’s power to set sanctions, sanctions themselves find their constraints in international human rights instruments and IHL.\textsuperscript{106} Article 25 of the \textit{Universal Declaration of Human Rights} (UDHR) (1948) maintains that every person has a right to adequate living standards, which includes access to medical care as well as security in cases of sickness and disability.\textsuperscript{107} Similarly, IHL, in particular the \textit{Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War} (1949), asserts that humanitarian assistance to civilians should not be restricted.\textsuperscript{108} As a consequence, humanitarian exemptions are needed in order to prevent sanctions from depriving persons of their basic human rights and the right to humanitarian assistance.\textsuperscript{109} The importance of humanitarian exemptions to sanctions were further recognized by the UN in the outcome document of the 2005 World Summit, the \textit{2005 World Summit Outcome}.\textsuperscript{110} While covering a broad range of humanitarian issues, it also discussed the reform of the process for individual exemptions for persons and entities on a sanctions list.\textsuperscript{111}

Security Council resolutions play the most central role in establishing humanitarian exemptions in sanctions regimes.\textsuperscript{112} Through its resolutions, the Security Council creates sanctions regimes and sanction committees, and also establishes appropriate exemptions therein.\textsuperscript{113} For example, with resolution 2374 (2017) on the “The situation in Mali,” the Security Council authorized sanctions against individuals in Mali, incorporated humanitarian exemptions in paragraphs 2 and 5, and instituted the most recent sanctions committee.\textsuperscript{114} Since sanctions regimes are time-limited, they are in need of constant renewal through Security Council resolutions, if determined necessary.\textsuperscript{115} Security Council resolutions also require reporting mechanisms within sanctions regimes, which can be exemplified by the annual reports of sanctions committees, such as the 2016 report of the 2140 Sanctions Committee regarding Yemen.\textsuperscript{116}
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Role of the International System

Aside from the Security Council, the work within the international system regarding sanctions is led by a variety of actors.117 For each sanctions regime, Article 29 of the Charter enables the Security Council to create subsidiary organs to help administer the sanctions regime.118 These subsidiary organs are called sanctions committees, and they are usually named after the resolution that established the particular committee.119 Corresponding to the 14 active sanctions regimes, the Security Council currently maintains 14 different sanctions committees.120 The actual implementation of sanctions and their measures ultimately falls upon Member States, but the committees are the sole entities responsible for monitoring this implementation and managing exemptions.121 Additionally, sanctions committees are usually supported by monitoring groups or panels of experts who assist the committees in their monitoring and reporting processes.122 Within the mandate provided by the Security Council, sanctions committees adopt their own rules and guidelines for administering sanctions regimes.123 Sanctions committees also regularly present annual reports on their activities, including their decisions on exemption requests, to the Security Council.124 In order to ensure that humanitarian exemptions to sanctions are implemented correctly, the work of sanctions committees is crucial.125 For example, the 2127 Sanctions Committee, responsible for the sanctions on the Central African Republic, authorized three exemption requests to the asset freeze applied in the country in 2016.126

Throughout the past 25 years, Member States and the Security Council itself have attempted to review and reform sanction processes.127 In the 1990s, sanctions shifted from indiscriminate comprehensive sanctions towards individual states, to an increasingly targeted approach, in which sanctions focused predominantly on political leadership, rather than on the general population.128 This transformation process took place primarily because comprehensive sanctions were more likely to have unintended negative consequences for civilians and humanitarian action than targeted ones.129 All of the 14 active sanctions regimes are to some degree targeted in their approach.130 Between 1998 and 2003, three initiatives set out to reform and develop the targeted approach of Security Council sanctions regimes: the Interlaken Process, the Bonn-Berlin Process, and the Stockholm Process.131 The main discussion points of the Interlaken Process were targeted financial sanctions, and how to counteract the adverse effects they can have on humanitarian actors.132 One suggestion of the Interlaken Process was to create model clauses for humanitarian exemptions to financial sanctions, which were intended for the Security Council to draw upon when drafting its resolutions.133 The Bonn-Berlin Process focused on arms embargoes, travel bans, and aircraft-related sanctions.134 Within this context, the 2001 report of the Bonn-Berlin Process also recommended model clauses for humanitarian exemptions to these types of sanctions.135 Lastly, the Stockholm Process
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concentrated its efforts on the implementation of targeted sanctions. Some of the recommendations that emerged from this process call for a strengthened role of sanctions committees in administering sanctions regimes, and for clearer definitions of humanitarian exemptions to sanctions within Security Council resolutions. The findings of the Stockholm Process were eventually presented to the Security Council in February 2003. While no decisive action was taken in the aftermath of the reform processes, they did provide an impulse for reform in the procedure for exemptions.

Parallel to the three reform processes led by Member States, the Security Council started its own review process of sanctions in 1999, leading to the creation of the Informal Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions in 2000. Their tasks included reviewing the working methods of sanctions committees, examining the unintended impacts of sanctions, and improving humanitarian exemptions. In its final report, the working group recommended that the Security Council use standardized language for humanitarian exemptions in all of its sanctions regimes. However, the only substantive outcome of the report was the creation of the Focal Point for Delisting as per Security Council resolution 1730 (2006) on “General issues relating to sanctions.” The Focal Point is part of the UN Secretariat and responsible for removing designated individuals from sanctions lists. As a central point of contact for individuals seeking to be delisted, the Focal Point’s goal was to simplify the process for delisting designated individuals. Prior to the Focal Point, designated individuals had to initiate the delisting process through their respective Member State who then contacted the respective sanctions committee. Still, the decision-making power on delisting remains with the sanctions committees. Following its final report, the mandate of the informal working group ended in 2006.

More recently, the High-Level Review of Sanctions was initiated in 2014 by several Member States and intended to change the current sanctioning process. The goal was to survey the current state of Security Council sanctions and provide recommendations in order to make them more effective. The High-Level Review is structured into working groups, out of which Working Group 3 issued a report in 2015 on “UN Sanctions: Humanitarian Aspects and Emerging Challenges,” which made several suggestions for the reform of humanitarian exemptions. It recommended that the Security Council review all humanitarian exemptions currently in place and allow the Focal Point for Delisting to receive exemption requests directly. Also, the group proposed that the Security Council establish standing humanitarian exemptions for all sanctions regimes where this was applicable, and highlighted the need to make information regarding the processes for exemptions easily accessible to those who are eligible. In June 2017, an assessment report of the High-Level Review presented the Security Council with templates for exemption requests to asset freezes and travel bans within the 1267 Sanctions Regime against Al-Qaeda and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and the 1988 regime against Afghanistan. While the High-Level
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Review was lauded for its recommendations at the Security Council meeting on “General issues relating to sanctions” in August 2017 and the Egypt-led Arria-formula meeting of July 2017, the implementation of said recommendations is still pending due to a lack of political commitment.155

**Humanitarian Exemptions: A Current Overview**

Two types of humanitarian exemptions exist: individual and sectoral exemptions.156 There are some issues with both types of exemptions, such as unifying the processes for individual exemptions across all sanctions regimes, or communicating the exemptions and their procedures to humanitarian organizations, Member States, and listed individuals more clearly.157 The most recent efforts to reform sanctions regimes focus on these specific issues.158

**Individual Humanitarian Exemptions**

Individual humanitarian exemptions are “designed to allow listed individuals (individuals listed on a designation list of a specific sanctions regime) to receive assistance in response to specific humanitarian needs.”159 This means that individuals who, for instance, would not be allowed to travel or access their bank accounts under a sanctions regime, could be temporarily excluded from these measures in order to receive humanitarian or medical assistance.160

Individual humanitarian exemptions are granted on a case-by-case basis after requests for exemption have been sent to be approved by the respective sanctions committee.161 Depending on the guidelines of the sanctions committee, individual exemption requests, such as the lifting of travel bans, can only be transmitted by Member States, whereas exemptions to asset freezes can be requested by either a Member State or the designated individual.162 In order to attempt to communicate the process of requesting exemptions more clearly, sanctions committees have provided guidelines on what information and details formal exemption requests need to contain.163 In the past few years, the procedure for individual humanitarian exemptions has become increasingly standardized across most sanctions committees, based on the exemption request form provided by the 1267 Sanctions Committee relating to Al-Qaida and ISIL.164 Nonetheless, the templates, such as the ones presented in the annex of the assessment report of the High-Level Review of UN Sanctions from June 2017, are not yet formally incorporated into the guidelines of other committees, which presents an opportunity for further standardization.165

In order to ensure fair procedures for individual exemptions, the Working Group 3 of the High-Level Review also recommended that requests for individual exemptions be received through the Focal Point for Delisting for most sanctions committees.166 Initially, the Focal Point was only mandated to support sanctions committees in processing delisting requests from designated individuals.167 As per resolutions 2083 (2012) and 2255 (2015) on “Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts,” however, the Focal Point’s mandate now includes receiving individual exemption requests for the 1267 and 1988 Sanctions Regimes.168 Yet, the remaining regimes still receive exemption requests through their sanctions committee.169
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The only exception for the expansion of the Focal Point’s mandate would be the 1267 Committee, for which the Office of the Ombudsperson would become responsible for receiving exemption requests. 170 The Office of the Ombudsperson was established specifically for the 1267 Sanctions Regime regarding ISIL and Al-Qaida in Security Council resolution 1904 (2009) on “Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts,” in order to have an independent actor within the committee responsible for the delisting process. 171 Its mandate entails outsourcing the delisting process to an impartial person outside of the UN Secretariat. 172 By allowing the Ombudsperson to receive exemption requests, the Focal Point would be completely replaced by the Ombudsperson in the case of the 1267 Sanctions Regime. 173 For now, however, the mandates of the Focal Point and the Ombudsperson are intertwined for the 1267 Sanctions Regime, as the Focal Point continues to receive exemption requests from designated individuals, while the Ombudsperson reviews their delisting requests. 174

**Sectoral Humanitarian Exemptions**

Sectoral humanitarian exemptions refer to exemptions for “humanitarian organizations and their actors […] who constitute the sector of principled humanitarian” action. 175 They therefore allow humanitarian actors to be excluded from any sanctions measures in order for them to effectively deliver aid. 176 Sectoral exemptions are implemented through standing exemptions to sanctions regimes, i.e. exemptions that are incorporated directly into the resolution of a sanctions regime and thus do not require approval from a sanctions committee. 177 This can best be exemplified by the standing exemption within the sanctions regime for Somalia. 178 Therein, only UN humanitarian actors and humanitarian organizations that have observer status at the UN General Assembly are currently exempted from the asset freezes, as established in paragraph three of Security Council resolution 1844 (2008) on “The situation in Somalia.” 179 However, other humanitarian organizations are not exempted. 180 Nonetheless, this allows some humanitarian actors in Somalia to deliver aid without any obstructions or delays resulting from sanctions. 181 In the 2016 report of the Monitoring Group of the Somalia sanctions regime, this standing exemption was deemed effective in enabling efficient humanitarian action in areas where civilians would not otherwise receive enough humanitarian assistance due to legal constraints stemming from sanctions. 182 At the High-Level Review of UN Sanctions, humanitarian actors recommended that the standing exemption be implemented in all other relevant sanctions regimes against countries in which fast and efficient humanitarian assistance is needed. 183

However, regarding the standing exemptions for humanitarian actors, one major concern is the diversion of aid. 184 This issue concerns the possibility that exemptions could be abused under the guise of humanitarian assistance in order to support terrorists and other actors that pose a threat to international peace. 185 This was at the center of a controversy between UN humanitarian actors and the Monitoring Group of the Somalia Sanctions Regime in March

---

176 Ibid.
177 Ibid.
180 Pantuliano, Counter-terrorism and humanitarian action: Tension, impact and ways forward, 2011, p. 9.
181 UN Security Council, Report of the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator (S/2016/827), 2016, p. 11.
184 Ibid.
185 Ibid.
2010. The 2010 report of the Monitoring Group highlighted several instances of diversion of aid to Al-Shabaab-related militia and businessmen. However, according to then-UN Humanitarian Coordinator and Resident Coordinator for Somalia, Mark Bowden, these instances were merely allegations without any evidence. When incorporating standing exemptions for humanitarian actors into other sanctions regimes, the Security Council has to consider the problem of diversion and allow for structures that prevent it from happening.

Challenges to Requesting and Following Exemptions

In general, there are two challenges regarding requesting and following exemptions. First, there is a lack of understanding of what type of actions are allowed within the constraints of humanitarian exemptions. Second, information on the procedure for requesting exemptions is a challenge concerning both types of humanitarian exemptions, as it is often not easily accessible. For instance, misunderstanding the extent of humanitarian exemptions can lead to either unintentional violations of sanctions by humanitarian actors or over-compliance, that is, adhering to an overly strict interpretation of exemptions in fear of violating sanctions. Thus, humanitarian actors run the risk of either being punished for violating sanctions or not being able to be as efficient as they could in delivering aid. For example, in 2016, financial institutions, out of fear of violating sanctions, withheld funds for humanitarian organizations working in the DPRK. Similarly, if information on the procedure and criteria for granting humanitarian exemptions was clearly transparent to sanctioned individuals, the decision-making process could be optimized, since the amount of unjustified exemption requests (requests that would evidently be rejected by sanctions committees) could be reduced.

Therefore, a possibility to prevent these problems would be a consideration by the Security Council and its sanctions committees to make information regarding exemptions widely and easily accessible to all relevant actors. Most sanction committees are already required by their corresponding Security Council resolutions to provide access to information on exemptions and their processes. The 1267 Sanctions Committee against ISIL and Al-Qaeda can function as a role model, as it meticulously codified its committee guidelines, has provided sample forms for exemptions to asset freezes on its website, and is generally proactive in its communication with external actors, such as designated individuals or humanitarian organizations.

Conclusion

Humanitarian exemptions to sanctions are crucial in order to ensure that the work of humanitarian actors is not negatively affected by sanctions, and that individuals that have been placed on sanctions lists still have access to humanitarian assistance. While there have been many reform and review processes for sanctions that also touched upon humanitarian exemptions, the standardization of individual exemptions in sanctions regimes has not reached its
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full potential in ensuring fair and transparent procedures for listed individuals. Similariy, incorporating standing exemptions for principled humanitarian actors across all relevant sanctions regimes could guarantee that humanitarian action is not impeded by sanctions. Finally, a lack of adequate access to information on the availability and extent of exemptions to both listed individuals and humanitarian actors can be detrimental to the effectiveness of humanitarian exemptions. Thus, Security Council action to resolve these issues is necessary.

Further Research

When researching this topic, delegates should consider the following questions: Why have not all recommendations on reforming the process for sanctions been implemented by the Security Council and into relevant sanctions regimes? To what extent have the governments of Member States implemented humanitarian exemptions to sanctions into national legislation? What are best practices of national implementation of sanctions and humanitarian exemptions? What are the lessons learned from the Sanctions Regimes against Somalia, ISIL and Al-Qaïda, and the DPRK? How can the processes of receiving exemption requests be streamlined? Which sanctions regimes could benefit from standing exemptions for humanitarian actors? Lastly, delegates should consider how they want to approach this complex topic: Should particular sanctions be revised or should mechanisms be implemented in general resolutions, similar to how the Ombudsperson and the Focal Point reformed the UN sanctions system?
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In June 2017, the Security Council presented its assessment report of the High-Level Review of United Nations Sanctions process. The report assesses progress made since the launch of the High-Level Review, and highlights areas where further action is needed. Thus, this report provides delegates with the latest insights into the current state of sanctions regime reform. Additionally, this document also suggests further improvements to exemption processes, such as sample forms for exemption requests or standardized exemption language.

This page on the Security Council’s website presents a short and concise overview of sanctions. It lists all currently active sanctions regimes and highlights the institutions of the Focal Point for Delisting and the Ombudsperson. In preparation for the conference, it will be crucial for delegates to have gained an understanding of all current sanctions regimes. The website functions as an excellent starting point for delegates to research each sanctions regime and their respective committees, as the links to the websites of each Sanctions Committee can be found on this website.
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These committee guidelines represent the most recent update to the rules of procedure for the 1267 Sanctions Committee. They cover all aspects that are relevant for administering the Al-Qaida/ Da’esh sanctions, ranging from the mandate of the committee to the procedure for exemption requests. Since the 1267 Sanctions Committee is regarded as a best-case example for codifying criteria for exemption requests, delegates can refer to these guidelines to understand how exemption processes can be streamlined further across all sanctions regimes.
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