United Nations A/64/PV.49



Official Records

49th plenary meeting Friday, 20 November 2009, 10 a.m. New York

President: Mr. Ali Abdussalam Treki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Agenda item 52

Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the 2002 International Conference on Financing for Development and the 2008 Review Conference

Report of the Second Committee (A/64/419)

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, may I take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the report of the Second Committee that is before the Assembly today?

It was so decided.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The Assembly will now take action on the draft decision recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. The Second Committee adopted the draft decision. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I now give the floor to the representative of Sweden, who wishes to speak in explanation of position on the decision just adopted.

Mr. Lidén (Sweden): The European Union was able to go along with the decision just adopted, but not without some regrets. We think it is highly unfortunate that we are put in a situation where we have to postpone a high-level event at such short notice, and

we think that this is not good for the credibility of the United Nations. We understand that we have been promised a written explanation from the Secretariat on what went wrong in preparing for the event. That will certainly help our capitals to better understand why the high-level dialogue had to be postponed.

We would also like to underline the importance of not ending up in the same situation once more. The European Union is ready to engage in consultations on new dates for the dialogue, but we have to prepare this decision on new dates carefully so as to ensure the high quality of the meeting and its preparations.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 52.

Agenda items 10 and 108

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission (A/64/341)

Report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/64/217)

Report of the Secretary-General (A/63/881)

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): Members will recall that the General Assembly, by its decision 63/517 of 14 September 2009, deferred to the sixty-fourth session its consideration of the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881) under the agenda items entitled "Report of the Peacebuilding Commission" and "Report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund".

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.





In recent years, peacebuilding has come to be recognized as an essential and integral component of a comprehensive approach to peace and development. The challenge of assisting countries emerging from conflict to move towards sustainable peace and the imperative of preventing a relapse into conflict was duly acknowledged by the 2005 World Summit. The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund as the new United Nations institutional architecture was a logical outcome, responding to the need for a more coherent systemwide approach and strengthened capacity for successful peacebuilding.

This joint debate, now in its fourth year, provides a useful opportunity to the general membership to assess the performance of the new peacebuilding architecture and to suggest ways and means of improving it further. We need to reflect deeply on how and to what extent the vision and objectives of peacebuilding have been put into practice. We should always keep in mind that for the millions of people struggling to win back their future from a past shattered by conflict and devastation, what matters most is the tangible benefits on the ground and the improvement in their daily lives brought about by peacebuilding. These people are the best judges of their priorities and interests. Their voices should be heard first and foremost. That is why the principle of national ownership is the cornerstone of an effective peacebuilding partnership.

Such a partnership must also address the complex underlying issues — the interlinked military, political, development, humanitarian and other dimensions of conflict situations. Sustained integrated strategies backed by adequate resources are required to respond to these challenges. Such strategies also entail a more effective and operational interface between peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities. It is a serious undertaking, and its success depends on the commitment and collective political will of Member States.

It is this commitment and support that the Peacebuilding Commission must continue to enjoy, given its important mandate, which it has carried out quite admirably since 2006. The upcoming review of the Peacebuilding Commission, mandated by the founding resolutions — Assembly resolution 60/180 and Security Council 1645 (2005) — will, I hope, provide an opportunity not only to renew our

commitment to the cause of peacebuilding but also to ensure that the peacebuilding architecture is adequately equipped and adapted to perform its core mandates.

I have been in consultation with the President of the Security Council regarding the process for this review. We have agreed that the review needs to be conducted in an open and inclusive manner. To that end, I intend to appoint two facilitators.

I hope this review will prioritize the effective delivery of political and economic support to countries emerging from conflict and that Member States will combine their energies to reach an outcome that meets the high expectations of people around the world for more responsive, effective and efficient peacebuilding by the United Nations.

I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Chile to the United Nations, who is also the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Mr. Muñoz (Chile): On behalf of the members of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), I am pleased to present the report of the Commission on its third session (A/64/341).

The annual debates on peacebuilding in the General Assembly and the Security Council not only provide a platform for reviewing and guiding the work of the Commission by its parent organs. Most important, they provide for broader engagement of the United Nations membership in addressing the critical challenge of post-conflict peacebuilding.

This year, the General Assembly and the Security Council were also presented with an additional report by the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of a conflict (A/63/881). The report, which received significant input from the PBC, highlighted the increasing emphasis that the United Nations is placing on securing a coherent and integrated global response to the challenges in post-conflict situations.

As the Secretary-General mentioned in that report, while it is not the only actor in post-conflict situations, the United Nations is increasingly expected to play a leadership role in the field, facilitating engagement between national and international actors and among international actors. The PBC is the central intergovernmental body of the United Nations that is mandated to ensure that the Organization indeed leads

the way towards alleviating the suffering of populations in post-conflict situations.

Along with the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) and the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), the Peacebuilding Commission continues to promote the nexus between security and development and a strategic vision for sustaining and consolidating peace, avoiding a relapse into violence, strengthening the rule of law and ensuring respect and promotion of human rights.

With its unique membership and its flexible approach to engaging assisting and potential actors and partners, the Commission continues to be a viable instrument to improve the United Nations response to the needs and priorities of post-conflict countries.

The report of the PBC on its third session represents a collective effort by the members of the Organizational Committee to highlight the most important facts and analysis pertinent to the activities undertaken by its various configurations. It also provides observations on the possible way forward.

The report reflects the ongoing progress made by the PBC in engaging the countries on its agenda. Moreover, the Commission addressed a number of critical policy questions and lessons learned of particular relevance to its overarching mandate as an institutional mechanism dedicated to addressing the special needs of post–conflict countries.

As indicated in the conclusions of the report on its third session, the Commission has consolidated its core advisory role and demonstrated increasing support for the countries on its agenda. In doing so, the Commission has continued to broaden and deepen its partnership with critical actors. This is an essential step forward as the Commission strives to ensure the operational relevance of its advice and promote the coherence of peacebuilding strategies.

First and foremost, the PBC continued to strengthen its linkage with the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Indeed, the reporting period witnessed an important breakthrough in efforts to deepen the relationship with the Economic and Social Council through the participation of the PBC Chairperson in the Council's 2009 substantive session and an exchange of views with Council members on the important nexus between security, recovery from conflict and

development. In addition, the Economic and Social Council and the PBC jointly organized a special event, in collaboration with the World Food Programme, on the food and economic crisis in post-conflict countries. The event was testimony to the Commission's continued concern with the challenge of providing for the basic needs and economic needs of populations emerging from conflict.

The Chair of the Commission also met with the Presidents of the General Assembly at its sixty-third and sixty-fourth sessions in order to apprise the Assembly of the most important developments in the activities of the Commission. The engagement of the wider membership through the Assembly is crucial to ensure broader ownership and contribution of Member States with respect to the evolving United Nations peacebuilding agenda.

The PBC also continued to expand partnerships with numerous national, regional and international actors, including United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, international financial institutions, regional organizations, the private sector and civil society.

In mentioning essential partnerships for peacebuilding, I wish to highlight the recently concluded visit to African Union headquarters in Addis Ababa, in which I was accompanied by my colleagues the Vice-Chair, the Chairs of the country-specific configurations and the Chair of the Working Group on Lessons Learned, and supported by the PBSO and the United Nations Liaison Office to the African Union.

I paid similar outreach visits to the Organization of American States, the international financial institutions headquartered in Washington, D.C., and the European Commission's headquarters in Brussels. These visits contributed to deepening and strengthening dialogue with those key regional and international partners, whose contributions and support to peacebuilding in countries on the Commission's agenda, and globally, are crucial.

With regard to the activities of the various configurations of the PBC, it is important to underscore that the Organizational Committee, representing the core group of PBC members, continued to address possible approaches to enhancing its capacity to implement its core mandates and adapt to prevailing global realities and evolving approaches to critical peacebuilding priorities. To this end, the Committee

convened a number of meetings and discussions, which are enumerated in the report.

I wish to underscore the important discussions that the Committee convened on the following subjects: enhancing the capacity of the PBC to fulfil its resource mobilization mandate; employment and income generation, as well as private sector development post-conflict countries: in implications of the financial crisis on countries emerging from conflict; the United Nations rule of law coordination strategy in countries emerging from conflict; and, most recently, the prospects for the mandated 2010 review of the United Nations for peacebuilding architecture and improving engagement with countries seeking the Commission's advice.

In addition, the Chair of the Commission undertook a number of activities to raise global awareness of the challenges facing countries emerging from conflict. To this end, our participation in numerous seminars, workshops, public media interviews and special events served as an important platform for advocacy on behalf of the countries on the PBC agenda and on general peacebuilding challenges.

Recently, these activities resulted, among other things, in a unique contribution to the PBF from proceeds of a commemorative digital version of John Lennon and Yoko Ono's classic song "Give Peace a Chance". I invite members to download it from iTunes, because this will support peacebuilding activities.

The linkage of United Nations peacebuilding activities to the world of celebrities is deemed to be important in raising awareness and encouraging contributions to noble United Nations causes at the level of the general public. To that end, the PBC is also working on appointing an ambassador peacebuilding from among a number of possible sports and arts celebrities. In addition, the country-specific configurations continued to lead the design and monitoring of the progress in the implementation of the strategic frameworks for peacebuilding in the four countries on the PBC agenda.

On Burundi, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone, the Chairs of the four configurations regularly visit the four countries and interact with high-level national officials, civil society, partners and senior United Nations officials at the country level. In the four countries, the PBC

membership collectively continues to promote inclusiveness and national ownership of the peacebuilding processes. While facing a number of country-specific challenges in the areas of resources, capacity, political commitment and coherence, the Commission provided a viable political platform to address these challenges and seek the partnerships that are needed to help drive the coherence of activities and deliver tangible dividends on the ground.

Finally, the Working Group on Lessons Learned continued to provide an informal platform for the Peacebuilding Commission to draw on the expertise of practitioners from within and outside the United Nations system, as well from countries with certain experience in post-conflict peacebuilding. The Working Group also continued to seek useful ties with the work of the Commission's configurations, the United system and the larger peacebuilding Nations community. To this end, the discussions on rule of law assistance, sustainable reintegration, regional approaches to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, and the role of national dialogue in peacebuilding address critical priorities for one or more countries on the PBC agenda.

Throughout its various configurations, the PBC received substantive support from the PBSO. The Office continues to provide the PBC with essential linkage with the operational entities within and outside the United Nations system. The PBSO continued to give regular quarterly briefings to the Organizational Committee on the activities and operations of the PBF. These briefings continued to deepen the strategic linkage between the Commission and the PBF and provided the Commission with regular opportunities to provide overall policy guidance on the use of the Fund in support of the strategic objectives of peacebuilding in the countries under PBC consideration. The synergy between the PBC and the PBF is something to strengthen even more.

As the United Nations peacebuilding agenda and its ties with other peacebuilding actors expand, the Office's scope and areas of support will continue to expand as well. The Office's human and substantive resources will thus need to be further enhanced.

The recent appointment by the Secretary-General of Judy Cheng-Hopkins as Assistant Secretary-General and head of the PBSO brings capable leadership with significant field experience to manage the support

provided to the PBC on the one hand, and the operations of the PBF on the other.

Three years since the operationalization of the milestone decision of the 2005 World Summit to establish the PBC, the PBF and the PBSO, the United Nations peacebuilding agenda is expanding in scope and depth. Peacebuilding is an area that may contribute to further defining the image of the Organization in the coming years. Peacebuilding is unique in that it serves as the nexus among security, rule of law and development while it supports the laying of the foundation for sustainable peace and development. That is, undoubtedly, its primary strength.

At the same time, with multiple actors involved in a range of humanitarian, security and development activities, the challenge of ensuring a coherent and integrated response is daunting. Likewise, the principles of national ownership and inclusiveness have been pivotal in the work of the Commission during these past years.

While we can certainly identify initial progress in linking up the advisory role of the Commission with the United Nations and non-United Nations operational entities, the Commission remains, in my view, underutilized. The Commission combines a unique link to the three principle organs of the United Nations, a unique composition of membership and a unique degree of flexibility to engage non-United Nations and non-governmental actors. Thus, the Commission could, in particular, promote a seamless transition from humanitarian to early recovery assistance, synergy between peacekeeping and peacebuilding mandates and national capacity development in critical peacebuilding priorities.

As indicated by the Secretary-General in his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881), the Commission has a critical role to play in championing and promoting the agenda outlined in the report. The Commission is certainly positioned to help realize a number of important actions recommended by the Secretary-General in that report.

In addition, the envisioned 2010 review of the Commission's founding resolutions will provide a prime opportunity to further build on the experiences gained, define its potential role in support of an expanded United Nations peacebuilding agenda and

enhance its support to countries emerging from conflict.

In taking the lead in the 2010 review, the General Assembly and the Security Council will be charting an important course for the future relevance of the United Nations in tackling post-conflict situations. That will be a challenging task for our collective capacity to deliver on the promises and ideals of the United Nations Charter and to respond to the needs of the most vulnerable people of the world.

Mr. Lidén (Sweden): I have the honour to speak today on behalf of the European Union (EU).

Turkey, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Armenia align themselves with this statement.

Supporting countries emerging from conflict is a moral obligation and responsibility of the international community. We must not fail to meet that challenge. The United Nations, with its global legitimacy and broad range of tools, has a central role and a clear added value in supporting countries emerging from violent conflict to build sustainable peace.

That is why the European Union has actively engaged in the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) since its establishment in 2005. We remain firmly committed to working with all stakeholders in making the peacebuilding architecture a success. The 2010 review is a timely opportunity to reinvigorate the vision behind the Commission and generate a common understanding on the way forward.

The Commission is mandated to bring together all relevant actors, marshal resources and to provide advice based on integrated strategies. This makes the Commission a forum for policy coordination at the strategic level among key international actors. The Commission can further play a central role in addressing critical gaps in peacebuilding efforts and contribute to increased coherence between security, development and humanitarian actors.

The Commission is also becoming an important framework for mutual accountability, under which host Governments and the international community can be held to account mutually against agreed commitments. The membership of the Commission provides international legitimacy to deliver effectively on those roles.

In order for the Commission to deliver on its potential, a higher level of commitment and ownership of the PBC agenda by its members is central. As members of the Commission, we must ensure that our commitments translate into policies and actions in the countries on the PBC agenda as well as in relevant multilateral organizations.

The European Union would welcome a more structured relationship, including increased interaction, between the Commission and the Security Council. That would facilitate the advisory role of the Commission and promote the early inclusion of peacebuilding perspectives in Security Council considerations and decisions. A central challenge is to making better use of synergies between peacebuilding and peacekeeping.

Effective support to post-conflict countries builds on national ownership. Therefore, the EU encourages the Commission to be flexible in its engagement, focusing on a limited set of priorities while building on existing capacities and strategies at the country level.

The success of the international community's support for peacebuilding is determined by our ability to support national efforts on the ground. In that regard, we call for urgent implementation of the recommendations in the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881).

Enhanced United Nations leadership in country is needed to gather international support behind early and prioritized strategies. Furthermore, strengthened operational capacity in core peacebuilding sectors is required, including by improved and timely deployment of civilian capacities.

Financing for peacebuilding and early recovery efforts needs to be predictable, timely, flexible and well-coordinated. That requires political courage as investing in post-conflict contexts involves risks. Donor practices and mechanisms need to be improved to better manage such risks.

The Peacebuilding Fund, with the potential to disburse quick and flexible funding, should play a key role in complementing existing funding mechanisms. As committed contributors to the Peacebuilding Fund, we look forward to the Fund reaching its full potential.

Let me take this opportunity to warmly welcome Assistant Secretary-General Ms. Judy Cheng-Hopkins

as head of the Peacebuilding Support Office. A strong Support Office will play a key role in bringing the United Nations system together on peacebuilding issues and in providing solid input to PBC deliberations.

We look to the Secretary-General for strong leadership in advancing the peacebuilding agenda in the United Nations and beyond. The European Union will continue to actively support efforts to better assist countries in building sustainable peace.

Mr. Wolfe (Jamaica): It is my honour as coordinator of the caucus of countries of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) that are members of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) to address the General Assembly on behalf of NAM on the occasion of the Commission's third annual report as contained in document A/64/341.

The third annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission reviews activities of the Commission for the period 23 June 2008 to 30 June 2009 and, like the two previous annual reports on the work of the Commission, reflects the multiple arduous tasks undertaken by the Commission to confront and address the many challenges faced over the period.

The report is indeed a very comprehensive document and presents an accurate assessment and a genuine record of the Commission's work over the period in question. The report makes it clear that efforts aimed at consolidating peace and laying the foundations for rehabilitation, sustained economic recovery and development must be done in a holistic manner. During the review period, the Commission was able to build on the notable progress achieved during its two previous sessions. It remained focused on fulfilling its mandate in key areas; in others, however, serious consideration will have to be given to implementing new strategies and approaches aimed at enhancing the Commission's capacity to keep abreast of prevailing global realities crucial to peacebuilding priorities in post-conflict societies, particularly those on its immediate agenda.

While the tasks remain arduous and quite challenging, the Commission, with the assistance of the Peacebuilding Support Office, has indeed produced promising and positive achievements in its operations, as confirmed in the overall assessments by Member States. We are also encouraged by the concrete steps taken to consolidate post-conflict recovery and towards

strengthening the foundations for socio-economic development in the countries under consideration.

The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) remains convinced that the Organizational Committee must play the central role in steering and providing guidance for the overall work of the Commission, and in this regard we welcome the increased frequency of the Committee's meetings over the period. Those meetings yielded tremendous added value, including building and strengthening partnerships, which are so crucial for the Commission's work, as well as creating a very useful platform for the ongoing appraisal and review of strategies addressing approaches to confronting and implementing its mandates, and for the development of the Commission's work programme. We also welcome the convening of several discussions that resulted in important recommendations aimed at improving the effectiveness of the Commission and the activities undertaken by the Chair on its behalf.

The increased interaction and collaboration between the Chair of the Commission and the Presidents of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council is indeed a very welcome step in the right direction. However, the NAM takes this opportunity to reiterate its previous request that this interaction be expanded to include the wider membership of the Commission, including the country-specific configurations. We have reason to believe that our call has not fallen on deaf ears, as we have already seen progress in that direction. Our desire, therefore, is to emphasize the need for the trend to continue, throughout and beyond the fourth session, and become a feature of the Commission's working methods.

At the same time, the NAM endorses and fully supports the various activities undertaken by the Chair on behalf of the Commission in an effort to strengthen the relationship between the relevant actors. This is line with the Commission's mandate to improve coordination of all relevant actors on the ground in peacebuilding efforts within and outside the United Nations system, regional and subregional organizations and international financial institutions.

The Non-Aligned Movement is of the opinion that, during the period under review, while ongoing efforts to increase public awareness and visibility of the Commission were satisfactory, the target audience seemed to be more academics and less the average

person. The NAM is of the view that peacebuilding and the Peacebuilding Commission are everybody's business, and in that light, every possible effort should be made to take its mandate and activities to the wider public domain, including the mainstream media, globally.

We nevertheless commend the efforts of the Chairman, who, with the assistance of a range of existing and potential actors, stakeholders and partners, took the message of the Commission, as part of the outreach and advocacy strategy, to raise awareness about it during the review period. Additionally, the Non-Aligned Movement sees the decision to appoint goodwill ambassadors as a positive, innovative step that could well result in heightened awareness and appreciation of the important work and activities of the Commission.

The Non-Aligned Movement this takes opportunity to call for the development of the Commission's own rules of procedure and working methods. We are confident that clearly defined rules in these areas will contribute to the efficacy, consistency and transparency of the work of the Commission. Every effort should therefore be made to address this anomaly in the fourth session. At the same time, the findings of the Commission's Working Group on Lessons Learned, ably chaired by the Permanent Representative of El Salvador, must at this juncture be incorporated into the overall strategy and policy of the Commission's work. It is not enough only to discuss lessons learned; the findings must also positively impact the work of the Commission.

The Non-Aligned Movement continues to lament the seeming scant regard for, or lack of sufficient attention to, the development dimension peacebuilding efforts in the country-specific configurations of the Commission. Greater emphasis needs to be placed on areas such as education and training, rural agricultural and infrastructural development, private sector reform development — with an emphasis on job creation and funding to facilitate enhanced investment activities if countries are not to relapse into conflict.

The Non-Aligned Movement looks forward to the 2010 review of the work of the Commission. This will be an opportunity not only to take stock of the Commission's work but, equally important, to make efforts to improve the pursuit and accomplishment of

its core mandate. The NAM intends to participate actively in the consultation and review processes. Those processes should continue to be based on the principle of national ownership of the peacebuilding process by the countries on the Commission's agenda, and should also include countries potentially on that agenda, as well as other stakeholders. Preparations for the 2010 review process should begin as early as possible, so as to facilitate input from all concerned parties.

Among the undoubted highlights of the period under review was the General Assembly's adoption in June of resolution 63/282, approving the revision of the terms of reference of the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), the aim of which is to serve as a flexible, responsive and focused resource for peacebuilding support. The Non-Aligned Movement looks forward to the immediate application of the revised terms of reference of the Fund, hoping that they will address the management, operational and procedural challenges encountered during the initial phase of the Fund's operation. This will help to provide a solid foundation to ensure that post-conflict countries benefit from funds approved for disbursement by the Fund in a timely manner. The quarterly briefings provided by the Support Office on the operation, utilization and project earmarks of the Fund have undoubtedly been a helpful addition to the Commission's activities during the period, keeping the Commission informed of activities relating to the Fund. The NAM looks forward to the continuation of such useful briefings.

Non-Aligned Movement opportunity to express its appreciation to Mr. Heraldo Muñoz, the Permanent Representative of Chile, for his very active tenure as Chair of the Commission during its third session. Under his chairmanship the Commission consolidated its position and enhanced its profile within the international community and developed new avenues for future growth. We also thank him for his report this morning. Permit me also on behalf of the Movement to express appreciation to various the Chairs of the country-specific configurations, and the Chair of the Working Group on Lessons Learned, for their commitment and leadership, and to the dedicated and hardworking staff of the Peacebuilding Support Office.

Ms. Juul (Norway): It is my pleasure to speak on behalf of the Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

Support for countries emerging from violent conflict and the prevention of relapse into conflict is a key international responsibility. Upon establishing the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), the international community agreed on the need to strengthen the ability of the United Nations to support sustainable democratic development in the aftermath of conflict.

The Nordic countries remain strong supporters of the Peacebuilding Commission. Now well into its fourth session, the Commission is still very much in its infancy. The Nordic countries are pleased to see how the Commission has been able to adapt to and learn from new experiences. The upcoming 2010 review process presents an important opportunity to take stock of the progress made so far and plan the next steps needed to strengthen our ability to deliver on the vision behind the Commission's creation.

Let me take this occasion to focus on four topics: national ownership, the importance of coordination and coherence, the responsibility of Member States, and the role of women in peacebuilding.

First, our yardstick of success must be the degree to which the Commission helps prevent countries on its agenda from relapsing into violent conflict. That means that it will be especially important for the PBC to build engagement for national priorities and be receptive to feedback from national authorities and local and international organizations in the field. Supporting civilian capacities in fragile States is equally vital to consolidating peace and promoting genuine national ownership. We would like to commend Commission's Sierra Leone configuration for the agile and speedy adoption of the Agenda for Change of the Government of Sierra Leone as the core strategy future national and international all development efforts. The Nordic countries would like to take this opportunity to highlight the need for ensuring that experiences and lessons from the field are incorporated into the upcoming review of the PBC.

Our second point, which is intimately connected to the first, is that the PBC must take care not to duplicate work already done by other organizations, agencies and actors. The strength of the PBC lies in its ability to bring together relevant actors, marshal resources and support the development of integrated strategies. The Commission's country-specific strategic frameworks must not produce new sets of priorities, but should primarily help to ensure that existing

frameworks and agreed upon priorities receive adequate international attention and are adhered to by international and national actors.

The PBC should act as a focal point for all interested parties engaged in peacebuilding in order to ensure coordination among all relevant actors. It should also seek to further improve its coordinated headquarters approach to peacebuilding in order to ensure greater coherence between the political mandate given by the Security Council and the many development and humanitarian mandates of United Nations agencies.

Thirdly, as Member States, we need to take a hard look at ourselves, too. For the PBC to be able to contribute to coherence, Member States themselves need to have coherent peacebuilding policies. That means that we must maintain a consistent approach in our bilateral and multilateral actions. We cannot expect the PBC to be able to promote coordination if we are not able or willing to be coherent. In essence, we cannot expect the PBC to be an institutional quick fix to what is essentially a problem of inadequate political will and attention. We, the Member States, must also ensure that we mobilize and maintain the political will that is needed to agree on and implement a truly coordinated peacebuilding approach.

Lastly, the Nordic countries would like to highlight the importance of adequately reflecting the key role of women in delivering sustainable peace as we renew our efforts together. The condition of women and girls is often a clear indication of how far peacebuilding efforts have come. In the past few years, we have seen a growing recognition by the international community of the importance of providing women with the opportunity to take part in their countries' peacebuilding efforts, thereby laying the foundation for a more realistic and representative perspective of what the population in question requires in order to be able to return to a peaceful existence. Through the integration of gender language in the Peacebuilding Commission's formative resolutions and continuous deliberations, the Commission reinforced the formal status of the "women and peace and security" norm. Moreover, the recently adopted Security Council resolution 1889 (2009) requires that steps be taken to ensure sufficient funding to meet women's needs in post-conflict situations and to address the participation of women in post-conflict planning. These are important steps that re-emphasize the message of Council resolution 1325 (2000): the place for women is not at the margins, but in the centre of decision-making forums.

Mr. Christian (Ghana), Vice-President, took the Chair.

In conclusion, we would like to take this opportunity to welcome Assistant Secretary-General Judy Cheng-Hopkins as the new head of the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO). She has important and difficult challenges ahead. The recent evaluation of the Peacebuilding Fund and the revision of the terms of reference for the Fund identified important challenges that required the attention of the Peacebuilding Support Office to ensure implementation of the Fund's mandate. Let me assure the Assembly that the PBSO will have our full support in addressing these issues. In this regard, we welcome as an early example of renewed efforts to play a catalytic role the recent decision to make a large disbursement by the Peacebuilding Fund to the Democratic Republic of the Congo for the purposes of combating sexual violence. Ms. Cheng-Hopkins also proved her commitment to addressing the important role of the PBSO in promoting and enhancing communication between field level and headquarters by visiting the field immediately after being appointed. The Nordic countries commend her for that and assure her of our continued support in her work.

We also welcome the strong leadership of the Secretary-General in advancing the peacebuilding agenda as we enter a process aiming to further strengthen the ability of the United Nations to deliver in this field. The Nordic countries reaffirm our continued commitment to a strong United Nations in delivering on an ambitious peacebuilding vision.

Mr. Srivali (Thailand): Thailand aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Jamaica on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Thailand welcomes the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) (A/64/341) and commends the Permanent Representative of Chile for his leadership in guiding the work of the Commission. We thank the Chairs of the country-specific configurations and the Working Group on Lessons Learned and the head of the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) for their active and constructive engagement with all stakeholders to advance the cause of peacebuilding.

Thailand also thanks the Secretary-General for his report on the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) (A/64/217) and welcomes the Fund's contributions to the advancement of peace, security and development worldwide. As one of the contributors, Thailand is pleased that the Fund, currently active in 12 countries, has been instrumental in laying a foundation for peace in countries that have recently emerged from conflict and in preventing many fragile situations from relapsing. Since its establishment three years ago, the Commission, with the assistance of the Support Office, has made commendable progress. It has been consolidating its core advisory role and support for countries on its agenda and providing lessons learned that will benefit many more countries.

As a member of the Commission, Thailand has consistently supported the Commission in its efforts to give priority to national ownership, strengthen national capacity and promote inclusive dialogue among the stakeholders. We believe that that inclusive and nationally owned approach, with strong and consistent support from the international community, will help sustain peace, security and development in post-conflict societies in the long term.

Thailand believes that security and development are closely intertwined and mutually dependent. In the pursuit of durable peace, therefore, the Commission should seek to advance both security and development in parallel. We agree that disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and security sector reform should be urgently carried out in any peacebuilding process. At the same time, we strongly believe that issues such as employment, income generation, basic needs, education and developing livelihoods should be given no less attention as an integral part of post-conflict reintegration and rehabilitation.

In that regard, youth and women have an important role to play in peacebuilding. Successfully meeting their needs in the immediate aftermath of conflict presents both opportunity and challenge for peacebuilding programmes. Youth, if exploited or neglected, can be a destabilizing factor in society. Women, meanwhile, are often highly vulnerable in conflict and post-conflict situations. Yet both groups have the potential to re-energize their economy and to heal the social fabric. That potential should be brought out and developed to encourage greater ownership in the peacebuilding process.

Thailand believes that the transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding should be seamless and their roles complementary. Peacekeepers should build upon their early presence on the ground and background knowledge about the relevant actors and the conflict. In doing so, they can serve as early peacebuilders, provided they have a clear mandate and adequate resources.

We agree with the recommendation that the Security Council should more actively utilize the advice of the Commission in the Council's consideration of post-conflict situations. In that connection, Thailand welcomes the presidential statement of the Security Council adopted on 22 July 2009 (S/PRST/2009/23), under the presidency of Uganda, which recognizes the importance of launching peacebuilding assistance at the earliest possible stage. We are pleased that the Council has affirmed, in its own deliberations, the importance of the early consideration of peacebuilding and that it has pledged coherence ensure between peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development in order to achieve an early and effective response to postconflict situations.

In any post-conflict situation it is natural to have high expectations and a great sense of optimism about the future. Thus, it is vital to ensure that stakeholders in society benefit equitably from quick peace dividends. That is essential for continued stability, which is a necessary condition for the revitalization of the political, economic and social life of a post-conflict society.

In that context, Thailand fully supports enhancing the Peacebuilding Fund to make it more effective and responsive to urgent needs on the ground. We also welcome its revised terms of reference, as endorsed by General Assembly resolution 63/282. We cannot emphasize enough the importance of a quick response and the need for timely and predictable funding to support peacebuilding work. We therefore encourage further efforts to build and strengthen the partnership between the Fund and other sources of funding, so as to bridge financial gaps and allow funding flexibility for urgent situations. Funding peace is not easy, but allowing hard-won peace to relapse into conflict is much more costly on so many levels.

In that connection, Thailand encourages Member States, especially those that have not yet done so, to

extend their support to the Fund. In-kind contributions and technical assistance through both North-South and South-South cooperation would be of immense value in assisting ongoing peacebuilding efforts, especially in the light of declining financial aid owing to the global economic and financial crisis. We also support targeted disbursement of the Fund, which would enhance its effectiveness and usefulness as a catalyst for key peacebuilding priorities identified by recipient countries. Wherever possible, efforts should be made to maximize the synergy between the Fund and the Commission.

Synergy also needs to be cultivated among various peacebuilding efforts. Efforts within the framework of the United Nations, in particular the Peacebuilding Commission, are critically important in coordinating and mobilizing system-wide assistance for post-conflict countries. At the same time, complementary efforts by other actors, individual and regional, should also be welcomed. Better coordination among those multiple efforts would allow for more efficient resource allocation. The ultimate beneficiaries would be the people of the post-conflict societies that we are trying to help.

While the Commission has made significant progress, there is always room for improvement in any complicated endeavour such as this. Areas that deserve special attention include strengthening coordination with partners, developing integrated peacebuilding strategies, addressing funding gaps for peacebuilding priorities in countries on its agenda and raising public awareness about the role of the Commission.

In that regard, we look forward to constructive consultations leading to a review of the Commission's arrangements in 2010. Our goal is to build on the experience that the Commission has gained and to further enhance the effectiveness of its support for countries emerging from conflict. As a member of the Commission's Organizational Committee, Thailand will continue to work closely with our partners in order to further improve and to strengthen the Commission.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt) (spoke in Arabic): I would like to express Egypt's appreciation to the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) for its valuable report on its work during the past year (A/64/341) and to the Secretary-General for his report on the work of the Peacebuilding Fund (A/64/217). We would like to express our thanks to His Excellency the Permanent

Representative of Chile for the report that he presented today and for the important role that he is playing in leading the work of the Commission, in parallel with the chairmanships of the regional groups. I would like to associate ourselves with the statement delivered by the Permanent Representative of Jamaica on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Egypt gave its full support to the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission in 2005, based on its firm belief in the important role that it plays in preventing countries emerging from conflict from relapsing back into conflict. Furthermore, since 2005, as a member of the Organizational Committee, we have supported the establishment and the consolidation of the concrete foundations needed for the Commission's work. We also contributed to the review of the Peacebuilding Fund in 2009, in addition to the creation of the four country-specific configurations within the Commission, all of which resulted in the reactivation and reorganization of its mandate and working methods. In that regard, we look forward to participating in the review process of the Commission in 2010 in implementation of the General Assembly resolution adopted for that purpose.

The Commission has played an increasingly important role in recent years by initiating discussions, for example on the effectiveness of the United Nations in conflict-resolution, peacekeeping and post-conflict peacebuilding, and the degree of coordination and synchronization required among the three phases, as well as the role of the principal organs of the United Nations in comprehensively addressing post-conflict situations, based on the full implementation of the provisions contained in the resolutions establishing the namely, Peacebuilding Commission, Assembly resolution 60/180 and Security Council resolution 1645 (2005).

Despite the controversy that arose during the negotiations on General Assembly resolution 60/180 possibility regarding the of synchronizing peacebuilding and peacekeeping operations, recent views advocate the need to start both operations simultaneously. Egypt believes that such views merit careful consideration and recognizes the need to comprehensively study that approach with a view to strengthening the essential link between peacekeeping, peacebuilding and overall development. The success of a peacekeeping operation depends primarily on establishing a comprehensive peace agreement to

which all the parties involved are committed in order to create the enabling environment needed to launch a peacebuilding process that aims to develop key building blocks for overall development, in accordance with the mandate of the Peacebuilding Commission, as stated in paragraph 2 (b) of General Assembly resolution 60/180:

"To focus attention on the reconstruction and institution-building efforts necessary for recovery from conflict and to support the development of integrated strategies in order to lay the foundation for sustainable development"

aimed at reaching the goals that we all wish to achieve, and to provide the necessary funding, which is an area of utmost importance for us. Taking into consideration the two reports by the Commission and the Secretary-General, Egypt would like to make a number of observations with a view to enabling the Commission to further achieve its objectives in the future.

First, we need to ensure that the Commission continues to effectively provide advice and proposals, based on in-depth studies, and in coordination with all influential actors, with a view to formulating and implementing comprehensive and integrated strategies for peacebuilding that lay the foundations for sustainable development in States emerging from conflict.

Second, we need to develop the means for the Commission to interact with countries on its agenda, through the increase of field visits by the Commission in order to create a direct channel of communication with all relevant parties and the States concerned, as well as to provide the needed financial resources to implement such visits so as to be fully aware of the situation on the ground.

Third, the Commission should continue to develop its institutional relationships with the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Those relationships still require further clarification and specification, in full respect of the institutional balance and in accordance with the respective competence of each of them as defined by the Charter.

Fourth, we need to re-evaluate the initial rules of procedure developed for the Commission in light of the developments and accumulated experiences during the first years of its operations, so as to ensure that those institutional rules are clear and that the cases under consideration by the Commission are dealt with according to specific and objective standards and criteria, free from any political or financial considerations.

In addition, we need to enhance coordination among the different structures of the Commission so as to ensure the integration and harmonization of those efforts when it develops comprehensive strategies for peacebuilding. Putting to use the recommendations of the Working Group on Lessons Learned is also required.

Fifth, we need to reemphasize the principles of national ownership with regards to the planning and implementation of country-specific strategies, as well as in terms of the planning, coordination and termination of the work of the Commission through a national and sovereign decision and in accordance with specific political, economic, social and developmental criteria that are clear and not subject to any external pressure.

Sixth, there is also a need to maximize the Commission's benefits from the current capacities of the United Nations, international financial institutions and the donor community in support of peacebuilding efforts. There is also the importance of establishing a monitoring and follow-up mechanism to ensure implementation of all relevant national and international obligations relating to peacebuilding priorities agreed between the Commission and the State concerned.

Seventh, we need to ensure that the role of the Peacebuilding Commission is not diluted into a mere trusteeship role over countries emerging from conflict or into a facilitator bringing donor and recipient countries together under the supervision of the principal organs of the United Nations. We need to strengthen the central role and responsibilities of non-donor members of the Organizational Committee. That requires an in-depth and comprehensive assessment of the functions of the country-specific configurations and the development of common standards and criteria, in accordance with which the country-specific configurations would carry out the responsibilities of reviewing and approving projects that fall within the priority plan of the State concerned, without any conditionality and in full respect of the

sovereignty and independence of the political decisions of the Member State concerned.

Eighth, the secretariat of the Peacebuilding Commission requires our continued support and the necessary financial and human resources enabling it to play its expected role in supporting the Commission's meetings as well as the country-specific configurations meetings. Those meetings require simultaneous interpretation services, a staff increase and an increase in the coordination and cooperation between existing staff of the Peacebuilding Support Office and the new head of the Support Office, Assistant Secretary-General Ms. Cheng-Hopkins, whom we congratulate on her appointment.

Egypt welcomes the results of the review process of the Peacebuilding Fund and the pledges made by the donor community amounting to \$312.9 million, which allows the Fund to expand its operations to 52 projects in 12 countries. That reflects the commitment of Member States to continue supporting the Fund to achieve its desired objectives.

While we welcome those efforts, there is, however, an urgent need to clarify our vision with respect to the relationship between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund. Despite the independence of the Fund, under the authority of the Secretary-General, further improvements are required regarding the coordination and coherence between its activities and the funding programmes for the projects being implemented in the countries on the Commission's agenda, as well as regarding the role of the Commission in providing guidance for Fund policies, which are to be implemented under the supervision of the administrative agent.

Egypt is looking forward to the start of the 2010 review process of the Peacebuilding Commission, a process which we trust will be completed effectively and in full cooperation with all Member States, taking into consideration lessons learned and the accumulated experiences from the first years of the Commission's work, with a view to fully implement the provisions of its mandate and enhance its capacity to deal with peacebuilding issues, thus building on the success of peacekeeping efforts and laying the foundations for the launch of sustainable development processes with their varied dimensions.

Mr. Hoang Chi Trung (Viet Nam): On behalf of the Vietnamese delegation, I would like to express our

appreciation for the presentation of the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund contained in documents A/64/341 and A/64/217, respectively.

My delegation associates itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Jamaica on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).

Out of the desire to establish a coordinated, coherent and integrated approach to post-conflict peacebuilding, the 2005 World Summit operationalized the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office. Those organizations were created to help address the special needs of countries emerging from conflict towards recovery and reconstruction.

We commend the action taken by the Commission over the past three years and, through the Organizational Committee and its country-specific configurations, the implementation of its mandate and core functions, as stipulated by General Assembly resolution 60/180 and Security Council resolution 1645 (2005).

The Commission has delivered tangible results in its activities in cooperation with the United Nations principal organs, agencies, funds and programmes, as well as with regional and subregional organizations and international financial institutions. It has enhanced public awareness and outreach, capacity-building and policy guidance on peacebuilding, as well as improving procedures and working methods.

We are also heartened to note that, during the period from July 2008 to June 2009, given its revised terms of reference, the Peacebuilding Fund now has one of the broadest donor bases of any multi-donor trust fund administered by the United Nations, with a portfolio of more than \$312 million from 45 donors, and is operating 87 peacebuilding projects in 12 countries. Some of the results of the Commission's continued commitment and contributions can be seen in the achievements in reconciliation, reconstruction and reintegration by Burundi, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone and other countries on the Commission's agenda, even though their levels of progress are not yet equal nor as sustained as we could wish.

Now that the United Nations peacebuilding architecture is in place and taking on an extensive workload, the challenge is how to consolidate the achievements made thus far and generate added value in the period ahead. As the Commission enters its fourth year of operation, much remains to be done to enable the Commission to truly become one of the key international instruments coordinating peacebuilding activities. In order to achieve this, the Commission should redouble its efforts to improve its working methods and provisional rules of procedure. It should rationalize its institutional relationships with other United Nations bodies and non-United Nations entities a view to achieving better coherence, complementarity and division of labour. It should ensure that its work is closely linked to and driven by the best interests of recipient countries, particularly affected by protracted most conflict, underdevelopment or marginalization.

In view of current constraints on global resources, the Peacebuilding Fund has the difficult task of bridging funding gaps, expanding the pool of donors and recipients and accommodating local Governments' financial and institutional absorptive capabilities. Efforts should also be made to strengthen the catalytic focus of the Fund in the four designated priority areas: support for peace agreements; the promotion of coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflict; early economic recovery and immediate peace dividends; and the establishment of essential administrative services and capacity-building. The Commission may become involved in various activities within different post-conflict contexts, and thus a comprehensive, and country-specific cross-cutting approach essential. It is our firm belief that further improvements in the development agenda will help address the root causes of conflicts, nurture autonomous capacity and create a foundation for lasting peace and development. In order for peacebuilding to yield concrete and sustained results, the local people should be empowered and fully involved in all related phases and activities.

We look forward to next year's review of the Commission's activities, as established in its founding resolutions, namely, Assembly resolution 60/180 and Security Council resolution 1645 (2005). The review will provide a good opportunity for Member States to take stock, encourage new momentum and fine-tune the working methods and direction of the Commission.

Along these lines, we welcome the Commission's efforts to assess its work and come up with recommendations for how it can best participate and play an advisory role in post-conflict situations.

We hope that throughout this entire process, Member States will have opportunities to deepen their interactions with the Commission, and that valuable lessons, practices and synergies will be developed, thus helping not only to prevent the countries concerned from relapsing into conflict, but also to reinforce the early-warning capacity for anticipating potential conflicts and to engage the international community in addressing them in a timely and more effective manner.

Mrs. Wahab (Indonesia): Our appreciation goes to the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) for its report (A/64/341), as well as to the Secretary-General for his report on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/64/217). Indonesia associates itself with the statement delivered by Jamaica on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Indonesia is pleased to see the Commission continue to strive to achieve the goals of its founding mandate. The efforts of the Organizational Committee the four country-specific configurations Commission's hard work and demonstrate the dedication not only to bring improvements to the countries on its agenda but also to enhance global attention and support for peacebuilding as a key issue of our time. We are also pleased to note that the Peacebuilding Fund is now generating benefits in 12 countries and has the broadest donor base of any United Nations multi-donor trust fund. This signals the Fund's international importance, as well as its ability to fulfil expectations to contribute effectively to producing rapid peace dividends.

There are some important points in the reports that we deem necessary to highlight and that we believe need more support. Both reports point to the necessity for a comprehensive approach from an early stage. Indeed, there should be an appropriate mix of security and development, since focusing on only one such aspect cannot enable lasting peace. To encourage an even more comprehensive approach, my delegation supports the emphasis on the four priority areas identified by the Secretary-General. We hope that the Fund's disbursement in the area of early economic recovery and immediate peace dividends, which at present has the lowest priority of the four, will be increased in future in line with Governments' priority

plans. The majority of regions affected by conflict tend to fall into the lowest income category, with scarce resources. The reports correctly recognize national ownership as a key guiding principle in the work of the Commission and the Fund. The voice of a democratically elected Government that can be held accountable through a vote should be the bedrock of a nationally owned process. No matter how well-intentioned international initiatives are, the needs identified by national Governments should be considered the blueprint for all interventions.

We welcome the Commission's acknowledgement that there should be a single national peacebuilding strategy, developed through a consultative process among all relevant partners at the country level. Where such a strategy significantly facilitates coordination between the national and international concerned, will simplify monitoring it for documentation requirements post-conflict Governments. This single strategy could help the Commission develop expeditious and more focused engagement frameworks, and could help launch country support early on.

We also welcome the Commission's commitment to mobilizing financial and technical resources, which remains a core feature of its work. It is very encouraging that during the period under review the two Chairpersons and the Commission members undertook outreach to a variety of traditional and non-traditional stakeholders. Broadening the range of ways to generate resources is also important, in view of the Secretary-General's observation that the Peacebuilding Fund has yet to demonstrate its catalytic value in terms of attracting additional resources.

In this context, Indonesia, during its membership of the Commission last year, had the privilege of facilitating the first ever PBC Task Force on the private sector's role in post-conflict peacebuilding. We appreciate the various initiatives by the Commission to address critical resource gaps in the agenda countries, including seeking greater engagement with the private sector, foundations and philanthropists. Those initiatives are also encouraging and vital continuations of the Commission's previous work, and we hope they will be further concretized.

Let me now turn to two other important issues that should also be addressed by the Commission and United Nations Member States, namely, follow-through on the recommendations of the Secretary-General in his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881) and next year's obligatory review of the Commission, as called for in its founding resolutions, namely, Security Council resolution 1645 (2005) and General Assembly resolution 60/180.

The report emphasizes the need for the United Nations to have rapidly deployable civilian capacities and to strengthen national and regional capacities. It recommends that those capacities should come from the South and neighbouring regions. We should chart a detailed policy on the recruitment modalities for this United Nations civilian capacity and its operational and financial aspects through an intergovernmental process. The role of the Commission in this respect would be very important and needs to be clarified.

We note that some areas of this civilian capacity, especially relating to the rule of law and security institutions, have been developed in certain United Nations departments. A pertinent question would be how these existing mechanisms will accord with the report's recommendations. Moreover, given that in some crucial areas, such as economic recovery, civilian capacities are not directly covered by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations or the Department of Political Affairs, we should have clear information as to whether there will be recruitment for new specialist cadres or whether staff would be drawn from the United Nations Development Programme and other relevant United Nations agencies.

Engagement with pertinent regional organizations - inter alia by taking advantage of the best civilian capacities in the South and regional lessons — will also be very useful. While the United Nations should make use of regional expertise, it is critical that the United Nations also support national and regional efforts to enhance capabilities in comprehensive peacebuilding aspects, particularly where those capacities are lacking. For its part, Indonesia continues to raise awareness about those issues in its region and to explore how the countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations can contribute further in the area of global post-conflict peacebuilding. Indonesia plans to convene a regional workshop on multidimensional peacekeeping and peacebuilding to be co-hosted with Slovakia early next year.

Regarding the General Assembly's upcoming review of the Commission as mandated in its founding resolutions, this event will indeed be a vital juncture to make use of the experience of the Commission, United Nations Member States as a whole and the relevant United Nations system agencies to further streamline and institute ways to enhance the effectiveness of the Commission. The review should include exploration of a wider range of tangible methods to support the aims of the Commission and its configurations. We see important links between the review and the implementation of the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict.

Finally, the outcome of the review must enable the Commission to increase its global relevance in making comprehensive recommendations in the area of its mandate. We hope that it would also be supported in devising and promoting ways to ensure more seamless transitions from the peacekeeping to peacebuilding stages of United Nations operations.

Ms. Dunlop (Brazil): The report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its third session (A/64/341) provides an accurate account of the activities undertaken by the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) under its various configurations. Brazil is pleased to notice that much progress has been made since the establishment of the Commission in 2006. The same applies to the work of the Peacebuilding Fund.

I wish to express our appreciation to the Chair of the PBC Organizational Committee, Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz, for his dedicated efforts to promote the work and visibility of the Commission over the past months.

Brazil welcomes the achievements highlighted in the report, particularly on the improvement in the working methods of the Commission and its interaction with United Nations principal organs, international financial institutions and other United Nations agencies. We also praise the initiatives to involve actors such as philanthropists and foundations in peacebuilding efforts. It is our view that the role of the private sector in peacebuilding could be further enhanced, especially in light of the Commission's mandate to mobilize resources.

Today's debate comes at a crucial time, as we consider the implementation of the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881) and begin our reflection on the 2010 review process.

A number of useful recommendations have been made, and it is our task now to envision how they can best contribute to strengthening the United Nations capacity to tackle peacebuilding challenges in an expeditious, coherent and cost-effective manner. Brazil supports the creation of high-level coordination mechanisms, the definition of clear mandates for the various actors and the consideration of innovative and flexible funding instruments.

That last aspect is essential. We all know how difficult it is to ensure adequate funding, given the many uncertainties associated with post-conflict scenarios. We therefore appreciate the support of the Peacebuilding Fund, which has been instrumental in its catalytic and complementary role in critical priority areas. The Fund's new terms of reference must be applied in a manner that allows for greater synergy and coordination with the Commission. More needs to be done to enhance the performance of the Fund in supporting early recovery in post-conflict countries.

Ideas related to the establishment of civilian rosters or the early deployment of civilian personnel are worth exploring, provided that they not only take into consideration existing local capacities but also help to build them. Tapping into the capacity of neighbouring countries and others in the global South is also critical.

Brazil welcomes the focus of the Secretary-General's report on the immediate aftermath of conflict, as an attempt to fully explore the window of opportunity to consolidate peace and avoid the relapse into conflict. Such a focus reveals the linkages between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. If peacebuilding efforts are to be successful, they must start as early as possible, in recognition of the fact that peace, security and development are different variables in the same equation.

At the same time, attention should be given to those countries where conflict ended many years ago but which nevertheless suffer from donor fatigue or have never been able to garner international support. The Commission has been playing a relevant role in some of these countries.

In the case of the Guinea-Bissau configuration, chaired by Brazil, the Commission has been able to

address the priorities set forth in the strategic framework adopted last year, despite the tragic political developments and the many challenges ahead. We are now engaged in a process of reviewing that strategy to assess the progress achieved and define the next steps for our engagement in the short term. This exercise will inform a second allocation of Peacebuilding Fund funding, in a demonstration of the synergy between the Fund and the Commission.

The 2010 review process will be a valuable opportunity to gauge the Commission's performance and see where there is room for improvement. It is fair to say that the PBC has yet to reach its full potential, as outlined in its founding resolutions. But instead of reducing the scope of its ambitious mandate, we should think of ways of strengthening its capacity to effectively deliver on its tasks.

The work on strategic frameworks, for instance, could be enriched through more regular and systematic interaction with the international financial institutions and a more thorough review of existing strategies, so that the Commission can focus on areas where its added value is most welcome. The engagement of regional actors in that process is also crucial, given the transformational nature of many peacebuilding challenges.

Coordination between the Peacebuilding Support Office and other departments of the Secretariat and other agencies is key. The Commission itself would benefit from more regular interaction with other United Nations agencies, funds and programmes involved in peacebuilding. The suggested tiered approach, or lighter touch, could also be considered, provided that we do not lose sight of the interconnection between the political, security and development dimensions of peacebuilding.

Strengthening United Nations capacity on the ground is also indispensable for the PBC. We should conceive ways of automatically enhancing the local capacity of the United Nations once a given country is included on the agenda of the Commission. In the case of Guinea-Bissau, we welcome the decision to upgrade the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office to an integrated peacebuilding mission, and we look forward to its positive consideration in the Fifth Committee.

A strengthened United Nations presence on the ground would also be important to narrow the gap between New York and the country concerned. It is a

fact that peacebuilding must be done locally, given the overriding principle of national ownership. But it is up to us here to support the Governments concerned and to mobilize resources for the full implementation of peacebuilding strategies. In combining efforts at all levels, we will succeed in our ultimate objective, namely, the delivery of concrete peace dividends to populations in war-torn societies.

Mr. Le Roux (South Africa): May I begin by associating South Africa with the statement read out on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement by the Permanent Representative of Jamaica.

As part of reforming the United Nations, and as one of the follow-up actions to the 2005 World Summit Outcome, the General Assembly adopted resolution 60/180, which established the new Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). According to the resolutions that created the PBC, its primary role is to "bring together all relevant actors to marshal resources and to advise on and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery" (resolution 60/180 and Security Council resolution 1645 (2005), paragraph 2 (a)).

South Africa welcomes the third annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (A/64/341), as well as the report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/64/217). South Africa has noted with satisfaction that during the past three years, the PBC has played a significant role in consolidating its core advisory role and in responding positively to countries emerging from conflict, although much remains to be done.

My delegation welcomes the expansion of the Commission's activities over the past three years. The PBC focused its early years on Burundi and Sierra Leone, and today it includes Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic. That is an indication that significant strides have been made in the resolution of conflicts in Africa. We have seen that those achievements have been enhanced through peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction efforts.

South Africa believes that the priorities in the post-conflict environment should centre around the important pillars of post-conflict reconstruction, namely, security, social and economic development, justice and reconciliation, good governance, and participation. In our view, the development of national integrated peacebuilding strategies based on national

ownership, mutual accountability and sustained partnership has provided the platform for donors to engage and to coordinate their support around national priorities. Similarly, the integrated strategic framework could increasingly direct the coordination and focus of United Nations agencies to particular priorities identified by the national Governments concerned. South Africa therefore welcomes the significant role played by the international community in assisting post-conflict countries overcome their challenges.

My delegation regards close cooperation between the PBC and regional and subregional organizations as critical to ensuring the coordination of post-conflict peacebuilding activities. South Africa therefore welcomes the meeting between the Peace and Security Council of the African Union and the delegation from the PBC dispatched to Addis Ababa in November 2009. The Peace and Security Council reiterated its encouragement to the PBC to pursue and intensify its efforts in order to effectively contribute to the consolidation of peace in Africa and the recovery of countries emerging from conflict.

South Africa recognizes the detrimental impact of the current financial crisis on countries emerging from conflict. The role of the PBC in marshalling and mobilizing resources is therefore critical. South Africa is pleased that the Peacebuilding Fund has not only assisted countries on the Commission's agenda but has also provided support to eight countries in similar circumstance, as designated by the Secretary-General. We therefore encourage Member States to contribute generously to the Fund. That will allow for the timely and quick injection of resources in countries emerging from conflict.

My delegation welcomes the revised terms of reference for transforming the Peacebuilding Fund's three-window architecture into two facilities. In our view, that will improve the Fund's performance through greater operational responsiveness and increased efficiency. The success of the PBC must be determined by the impact it has on the lives of ordinary citizens in terms of their safety, security, and development.

South Africa recognizes that the PBC still means different things to different people. The lack of understanding of its role underscores the need for greater visibility and more outreach. The upcoming 2010 review process of the Peacebuilding Commission

will provide an opportunity for all of us to take stock and measure the impact of the implementation of the PBC's mandate. We believe that that process will also draw from lessons learned by the PBC in previous years, while paying attention to critical peacebuilding priorities, gaps and achievements. South Africa stands ready to assist in any way possible to ensure that the objectives of the PBC emanating from the review process are implemented appropriately.

In conclusion, I wish to express our deep appreciation to the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Chairs of the country-specific configurations and to the working groups on lessons learned for their sterling work and contributions to the PBC. I also wish to also take this opportunity to pay tribute to the staff of the Peacebuilding Support Office for their supportive role in the work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Mr. Gutiérrez (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): The report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its third session (A/64/341) and the report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/64/217) enable us to evaluate the important work done to restore peace and build sustainable stability in countries that have emerged from conflict.

With regard to the Peacebuilding Commission, it is essential to point out that its work transcends mere coordination. The Commission's true importance lies in its objective of adopting integrated peacebuilding strategies that coordinate efforts of national, regional and international actors in countries recovering from conflict.

With regard to the Peacebuilding Fund, my has monitoring delegation been closely achievements by several countries in implementing projects. The timely assistance provided by the Peacebuilding Support Office in Burundi, where the project implementation rate has reached 75 per cent, should be highlighted. Another example is the case of the Central African Republic, where the Fund has contributed to demobilization and reintegration activities and where the development of the United Nations integrated strategic framework was completed last May, opening a window of opportunity for evaluating a second tranche under the Fund for that African country.

There are several other examples in the Fund's report, but the important point my delegation would

like to emphasize is that the report gives tangible examples of how the Peacebuilding Fund — to which Peru contributes — has a genuine relevance that strengthens peacebuilding processes, as indicated in the Secretary-General's report. The implementation of the various projects listed and explained in the report has led to positive results in the areas of administrative and policy management, justice and human rights, the fight against corruption, security sector reform and, especially, the empowerment of women and civil society.

The lack of a culture of peace, violence and arbitrariness in the use of power, the marginalization of the most vulnerable and of minorities and in general a tendency to act solely with a focus on survival are characteristics that become permanent and structural features in the context of prolonged conflicts. To counteract that situation, we need to reconstruct the social fabric and generate democratic values of tolerance and participation that confirm in the mind of the people the idea that only in peace can security and quality of life truly take root.

In the aforementioned reports, we see the importance of supporting the implementation of the peace agreements, encouraging coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflicts, promoting early economic recovery, reaping the benefits of peace, rebuilding infrastructures and recovering technical capacity, which are the general features that have made possible the efforts to develop projects that contribute to peacebuilding. In that connection, my delegation wishes to emphasize in particular the critical importance of the interdependence of the concepts of development and security.

Another no less relevant aspect to bear in mind is the ongoing coordination and interaction that the Commission and the Fund must maintain with the other United Nations organs. The synergy between the Commission and the Fund extends to the necessary interrelation and interaction with international and regional bodies. That requires convergence of actions and an additional coordination of efforts that should be even further strengthened.

A conclusion that can be drawn from the Peacebuilding Commission's first three years of efforts is that, immediately after a conflict ends, there is always greater pressure from the population to receive the dividends of peace, and that situation arises in a

context where capacities and resources are scarce. That reality, in the view of my delegation, leads to identifying the fight against poverty as the primary objective that every peacebuilding process must bear in mind, since poverty is the most severe problem afflicting any country that has recently suffered a conflict.

Therefore we believe that the transition from peacebuilding to State building is of the highest importance, and that is why an effective campaign against the strategic gap between weak institutional capacity and the delay in project financing is indispensable. Moreover, improving the institutional capacity of Governments is a priority, since the national actors are the real protagonists in the development of jobs and the implementation of peacebuilding processes.

In the same way, those processes need designs that improve the division of labour in order to promote effective management of project implementation and greater involvement by women as important actors in every process. They must also promote the decentralization of decision-making among staff of cooperating organizations in such a way that the project implementation rate is more effective.

Thus we believe that in the final analysis, there are three vital areas that must be worked on in a holistic manner in any peacebuilding process: development, security, and governance. We must refrain from giving pre-eminence to any one area over another, for they are all closely linked.

In areas of international cooperation, my delegation believes that priority should be given to strengthening the political system, training civilian staff and designing and implementing projects that have rapid social impact, which is crucial to winning the support of the local population. Financial institutions — including the World Bank, a natural ally in peacebuilding efforts — are essential to the success of projects.

For a society to be involved in those peacebuilding projects, it must remain clear that international cooperation is oriented towards strengthening the exercise of its sovereignty, with full respect for international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter. However, such cooperation must have a timeframe and follow a programme with

clearly defined objectives and definite goals that make it viable.

General Assembly resolution 63/282, which approved the revision of the terms of reference for the Peacebuilding Fund to make it more flexible, adaptable and more responsive to urgent needs, and the upcoming review of the Peacebuilding Commission, which will seek to define the Commission's rules of procedure and working methods, both open an extraordinary window of opportunity to impart greater effectiveness and efficiency to the Commission's work with the indispensable interrelation between the Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office.

There is no lasting peace if it is not accompanied from an early phase by policies of sustainable development, democracy, social inclusion and institutional soundness. As my country has stated on various occasions, development, security and governance are closely related. That is the spirit inspiring my country in its firm commitment to strengthen the United Nations peacebuilding structure with constructive initiatives.

My country wishes to thank Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz for his work on the Peacebuilding Commission. I believe it is an example of how Latin America is seriously focusing on the work in this undertaking of the United Nations.

With that conviction Peru, which is unwaveringly committed to strengthening multilateralism and peacekeeping, hopes in the near future to contribute as an active member of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Mr. Benmehidi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank the President for having organized this debate so that together we can consider the various aspects of work carried out by the Peacebuilding Commission during its third year of existence.

We fully align ourselves with the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Jamaica on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. My delegation would like to offer a few additional comments.

The Peacebuilding Commission, three years old now, is increasingly becoming a major partner and a dynamic actor in guiding, in support of national mechanisms, strategies to support countries emerging from conflict. As a member of the Peacebuilding Commission, Algeria appreciates the work done to develop and implement strategic frameworks for peacebuilding in the four countries on the Commission's agenda by using targeted priorities and commitments adapted with a view to peacebuilding in those countries. The credit for drawing up those strategic documents goes first to the resolve of the national authorities of those countries, but also to the exemplary work of the Chairmen of the four country configurations, each of whom has managed to build a relationship of trust with all the national actors, to establish a process that brings them together and to lay the foundations for a strategy that unites their efforts.

The Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz, Permanent Representative of Chile — whom I would like to commend for his leadership and imaginative actions has just presented to us the main points of the report we are considering (A/64/341). Of course, it is an interim assessment of the work done by the young Peacebuilding Commission with the steadfast support of the Peacebuilding Support Office. In reading it, one gets a sense of the strong commitment of its member States not to strengthening a new institutional bureaucracy, but rather to progressively set up a multidimensional strategy designed to respond to the political, security, humanitarian and development challenges that interlock and overlap in the various contexts, forming a complex whole. Basically, the report describes the positive developments in the Commission's work, while acknowledging existence of certain difficulties.

The Commission has strengthened its main advisory activities and enjoys the broad support of the countries on its agenda. The international community is also paying more attention to the countries on its agenda. One notes too that the United Nations system and the regional organizations and the international financial institutions have begun to align themselves by adapting their support tools to post-conflict peacebuilding.

On the other hand, one gets a better sense of the challenges to the potential work of the Peacebuilding Commission. Indeed, after the tragic experiences in Burundi and Guinea-Bissau, the Commission is now in a position to draw lessons to prevent those same events from happening again. That has highlighted the

importance of the role played by the Working Group on Lessons Learned, chaired by El Salvador.

I also believe it important to acknowledge the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881), which is the first comprehensive analysis of peacebuilding in post-conflict situations since the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission. It also has the merit of calling for the early integration of post-conflict reconstruction in the entry strategies, realizing that that is a structural aspect that is crucial to strengthening the factors of peace as a country emerges from conflict. Moreover, I am pleased that that report inspired the negotiations that led to the review of the Peacebuilding Fund's terms of the reference, in order to improve the efficiency of its management and its ability to rapidly produce results on the ground, in accordance with the intended goals.

However, the direction of the Commission and its work are not exempt from criticism. In that regard, I believe that the perception of the problems and the obstacles remains very mixed and calls for correction.

The security approach having precedence over the development dimension, in particular implementing disarmament, demobilization reintegration programmes, is a leading example of that. While they go hand in hand to make it possible to establish lasting stability and to start a return to normalcy, one sees differences in views within the Commission on how to implement those programmes, sometimes giving the impression that there are contradictory or competing elements. Also, we consider it necessary to have an in-depth debate with a view to developing an integrated approach on that issue, an approach that would combine the security requirements with regard to the duty to disarm and demobilize the ex-combatants with the socio-economic aspect of their reintegration.

Another inadequacy observed that merits our urgent attention is the Commission's unwieldiness. In fact it needs fewer meetings, but better prepared ones. With regard to that aspect of the Commission's work, my delegation noted with interest the informal paper produced by the Peacebuilding Support Office to generate joint thinking on how to make the work of the country configurations even more effective.

The issue of adding new countries to the Commission's agenda is inseparable from its ability to

thoroughly and effectively deal with the situations on its agenda. In 2010, Algeria intends to actively participate in the consideration of that issue and all other aspects, including the Peacebuilding Fund, with an open mind by suggesting, however, that it is part of a comprehensive approach aimed at improving the Commission's working methods and its reporting cycle.

In that regard, in order to prepare well for the comprehensive review of the Commission's working methods and work in 2010, my delegation would like to make the following suggestions.

First, it is necessary to strengthen the Peacebuilding Commission's visibility and its ability to motivate and influence. Communication efforts are needed, in particular with regard to regional organizations. One could be envisage some of the Commission's meetings being held somewhere other than New York, as was the case when the Chairman of the Commission and the Chairs of the four country configurations went to Africa.

Secondly, we should encourage the efforts of the Peacebuilding Support Office, under the leadership of Ms. Cheng-Hopkins, to strengthen its own capacity to act in support of the Commission.

Thirdly, the Commission's work should be integrated as early as possible in strategies, in particular those of the Security Council and other institutional actors, to strengthen the coherence of the Organization as a whole.

Fourthly, together with the Peacebuilding Support Office, the Peacebuilding Fund is an important tool to ensure that the Commission's work focuses on immediate priorities, fills gaps and produces tangible results. In that context, it is essential to broaden the Fund's operations so as to provide strategic assistance to other countries needing urgent peacebuilding support.

Fifthly, there is a need to open up the approaches to peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development so that effective action can be taken in the immediate aftermath of a conflict. In that regard, there must be greater support for countries emerging from conflict in order to address the food, economic, financial and any other crises that seriously jeopardize the general process of stabilizing conflicts by exploring the possibility of transferring to the Peacebuilding

Commission the resources that the peacekeeping operations have at their disposal in the exit phase.

Sixthly and lastly, it is essential to maintain the basic infrastructures, to protect against the inability of countries emerging from conflict to pay their armed forces and police, and to invest in job creation projects, thereby helping to ensure greater support for United Nations activities from the local populations.

Mr. Maurer (Switzerland) (spoke in French): Five years ago, we laid the foundation for a peacebuilding structure within the United Nations system. Today, it is clear that building peace is as important a task as that of keeping it. United Nations peacekeeping has reached its limits, while we increasingly recognize the significance of strengthening our efforts to prevent conflicts and to support communities that are struggling to build a sustainable peace.

The 2010 review of Peacebuilding the Commission will be a good opportunity to ensure that the instruments developed after the 2005 World Summit are being used to their full potential. It will also be an opportunity to determine how those same instruments could be better adapted to respond to the more complex situations prevailing today. The September 2010 high-level meeting would seem to be the proper venue to decide on the next steps to be Peacebuilding requires commitment as much in terms of political and institutional investment as financial. It must be given its rightful position among our highest priorities and we must not allow it to be reduced to an easy and less costly alternative to peacekeeping.

The report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881) is leading us in the right direction. We welcome the recommendations and support the steps taken by the Secretary-General to ensure their implementation. We look forward to a progress report next year. We also welcome the intensive and inclusive consultations prompted by the preparation of the report. This process was exemplary and should guide us in the preparations for the 2010 review.

One of the main challenges identified in the Secretary-General's report and highlighted in the work of the Peacebuilding Commission in its country-specific meetings, is the need for a joint approach to conflict situations. The report also highlights the need

for more effective, coherent and coordinated action by the United Nations, the international financial institutions and Member States. To that end, we are convinced that United Nations leadership must be strengthened, in particular the authority of Resident Coordinators as the uncontested heads of United Nations country teams. We therefore call on the heads of the funds, programmes and specialized agencies to fully support the expanded authority of Resident Coordinators vis-à-vis the country teams, and to swiftly formalize this authority through an appropriate decision by the Chief Executives Board.

We are also convinced that the potential of the Peacebuilding Commission should be more fully exploited. In our view, its added value resides in its representative membership, its convening power for all stakeholders and its capacity to serve as a political interface between the actors on the ground and the various stakeholders at United Nations Headquarters. These characteristics are essential to creating effective partnerships for peace. Mutual accountability is a key principle for ensuring success. Joint strategic frameworks are useful instruments in this regard because they help develop and reinforce national ownership and also have the potential to build trust and mutual understanding among all actors involved and committed to common objectives. Ultimately, improvements must be measured by their positive impact in the field.

We believe that the 2010 review of the Peacebuilding Commission will provide it with an opportunity to fulfil its potential and to help the peacebuilding architecture to better respond to new challenges and needs. It should also help us to overcome the stumbling blocks of 2005 and to achieve peace and sustainable development with full respect for human rights.

Numerous initiatives are currently under way in that regard, and we welcome them. Nevertheless, we also believe that there is merit in conducting a more structured and inclusive dialogue among all stakeholders. We therefore call on the Secretary-General to present, by the end of April 2010, a forward-looking report with specific recommendations to the General Assembly that would serve as the basis for the review process. The report could, for example, take stock of the challenges identified in the 2004 report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change (A/59/565) and identify new challenges. It

could also highlight the complementarity of efforts towards mediation, conflict prevention, peacebuilding and peacekeeping, and operational activities for development.

In addition, it could reflect on the relevant reform processes now under way with a view to linking these areas more strategically to ensure that the contributions of the entire United Nations system, including the Bretton Woods institutions, will be more effective as part of the efforts to achieve sustainable peace. Finally, it could also make specific recommendations on the basis of a comprehensive review of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, including its country-specific meetings. Such a report by the Secretary-General would provide a sound foundation for adopting a new consensus on the Peacebuilding Commission at the highest political level on the occasion of the high-level meeting in September 2010.

One or two high-level political figures could, following the model established by the Prodi report (see A/63/666) on the relationship between the United Nations and the African Union, give stature and authority to this kind of response and thus help to orient our debates.

Mr. Ney (Germany): Let me start by thanking Ambassador Muñoz for his leadership as the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), and the Swedish European Union presidency for its statement on behalf of the European Union. We concur with and support everything that was said by Ambassador Lidén.

Germany supported the setting up of the PBC since the very beginning. The PBC is an important part of United Nations peacebuilding architecture, which is and remains of high relevance. The PBC has so far achieved encouraging results in the countries on its agenda, in particular in Sierra Leone and Burundi, where its work is already advanced.

At the end of the day, the PBC's success in the countries on its agenda will be measured alongside its capability to achieve tangible and sustainable results for the people on the ground. This is the essence of my personal experience from the time when I served as the Senior Deputy High Representative in Bosnia. If the people on the ground do not see and feel an improvement in their everyday lives, we will lose them in the process of post-conflict peacebuilding.

The upcoming 2010 review process will provide an excellent opportunity to identify ways and means to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the PBC's work. For the 2010 review, we view the following seven points as the most important to improve our common peacebuilding efforts and the work of the PBC.

First, the PBC has to fulfil its role as the platform for strategic policy coordination for international engagement in post-conflict countries among key international actors.

Secondly, the PBC should play the central role in creating cohesion among political, security, development and humanitarian actors.

Thirdly, the PBC should become a framework for mutual accountability. Governments and the international community should be held accountable to agreed commitments. Donors should orient their activities along the priorities identified by the PBC in cooperation with the host country and fulfil the commitments undertaken by the PBC.

Fourthly, we should achieve a more structured relationship between the Security Council and the PBC, including increased interaction. We should try to make better use of synergies between peacekeeping and peacebuilding.

Fifthly, the analysis of a specific situation by the PBC should result in the identification of a clear set of a limited number of priorities and the direction of resources for their implementation.

Sixthly, best practices, relevant knowledge and lessons learned within country-specific meetings, as well as in the wider United Nations system and beyond, need to be cross-fertilized. In this regard, the role of the Peacebuilding Support Office in bringing the United Nations system together, convening expertise and providing solid input to PBC deliberations should be strengthened.

Finally, the coordinating role of the United Nations on the ground still needs to be strengthened. Strengthening the One United Nations concept would be a step towards better coherence of the Organization's activities and might also facilitate coordination among donors.

Ms. Rovirosa (Mexico) (spoke in Spanish): My delegation warmly welcomes the opportunity for this

Assembly to jointly consider the report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its third session (A/64/341), pursuant to resolution 60/180, and the report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/64/217). Mexico acknowledges the efforts of the Chairperson of the Commission, Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz of Chile, for his promotional efforts, undertaken in fulfilling his mandate, to raise awareness and bring visibility to the work of the Commission. We also commend the work of Ambassador Yukio Takasu of Japan and the progress achieved by the Commission during his chairmanship.

My delegation also wishes to praise the work of the Chairs of the country-specific configurations for Burundi, Guinea-Bissau, the Central African Republic and Sierra Leone. Their dedication and leadership have helped the national authorities of the countries on the Commission's agenda to make progress in setting up and implementing programmes and strategies for security, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration.

One of the great merits of the country-specific configurations and their Chairs is their use of innovative working methods, including field visits and video conferences with national authorities, making it possible to obtain first-hand information on the development of national societies in various areas. We also welcome the coordinated meetings of the Working Group on Lessons Learned on matters related to issues critical to recovery.

Mexico welcomes the Commission's progress in implementing and consolidating its mandate in its three years of existence as an advisory body supporting the countries on its agenda, as well as in contributing to formulating various peace strategies. Its work in mobilizing resources is also one of its most laudable aspects. It has demonstrated the importance of involving the private sector and civil society in gathering and mobilizing resources, a contribution that is not limited to the financial area but also encompasses human capital — a powerful complement to the efforts of Governments at the local, regional and international levels, and of the United Nations system itself.

My delegation appreciates the efforts of the Chair of the Commission to encourage and strengthen relations with non-traditional donors and to forge closer links with the international financial institutions and regional and subregional entities, particularly in light of the challenges created by the world economic crisis, in a broader framework linking security and development in the transition from conflict to peace.

Next year will see the review of the mandates set forth in the Commission's founding resolutions, with a focus on its nature and the definition of its programme. My delegation is firmly determined to participate actively in the consultation process, which we trust will be flexible, inclusive, transparent and integrative. This is an ideal time to begin considering how to improve the Commission's working methods. Such an exercise should be conducted in the framework of a consultative and inclusive process.

My delegation wishes to stress that it is vital, in drawing up the various peace strategies in which the Commission participates, to take into account the external factors that may determine the success or failure of the peacebuilding process in a given country, since they may either originate in an area outside that country or have a purpose or benefit that extends beyond it. A specific example of this situation is the exploitation by organized crime and drug traffickers of countries where peacebuilding is taking place.

Furthermore, we must recall that responsibility is to be shared by all national, regional or international actors, not only by those directly involved in the reconstruction process. Hence, there must be a collective commitment to halting or controlling the illegal trade in arms and munitions that reach countries in the delicate stage of transition from a situation of war to one of peacebuilding.

With regard to the Peacebuilding Fund, Mexico welcomes the Secretary-General's intention, reflected in his report (A/64/217), to take measures to strengthen the catalytic nature of the Fund and to ensure that it provides financing at the right time. With the recent review and evaluation of the terms of reference for the use of the Fund's resources, Mexico hopes that the Fund will be more flexible, efficient and effective in tackling its two key objectives of identifying and financing in a timely manner the most immediate needs of post-conflict societies, and channelling that financing to the countries it supports in a more sustainable fashion. In this context, Mexico hopes that the Commission will play a prominent role in the strategic direction and application of the Fund's resources. We also appreciate the exercise in

transparency regularly demonstrated by the Peacebuilding Commission Support Office through its formal meetings held to present information to donors on the Fund's financial situation and performance.

It is vitally important that the Fund count on the resources it needs to comply with its mandate. My country has supported the Fund for the past two years, and will make a third contribution for 2009-2010. My delegation also hopes that, in the first quarter of 2010, the cooperation programmes that Mexico has offered Guinea-Bissau and Burundi in the areas of electoral process, the fight against drug trafficking and economic development will be implemented.

The international community continues to have very high expectations for the work of the Commission. The coming year will be crucial for cementing the scope and potential of this body. We will work together to give the peacebuilding architecture the necessary tools to make the difference between the chaos unleashed by war and the stability offered by peaceful societies.

Mr. Çorman (Turkey): At the outset, I should like to express our gratitude to the President of the General Assembly for his able leadership in guiding our discussions on issues related to international peace and security, one of which is the basis for our deliberations today.

We have examined the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (A/64/341) and the report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/64/217), the two main instruments set up by the Assembly pursuant to the call by the Security Council to respond to the challenges and complexities of post-conflict situations. We have noted with interest the conclusions and recommendations contained in these reports.

Since the Assembly established the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) when it adopted resolution 60/180 in December 2005, we have noted with pleasure that the Commission has consolidated its core advisory role and demonstrated increasing support for the post-conflict countries on its agenda by helping channel resources to critical peacebuilding priorities and supporting the strengthening of national capacities. It can be briefly stated that, though it is a relatively new instrument, the Commission is playing an essential role in the promotion of the goals inherent in its mandate.

On the other hand, the Peacebuilding Fund — the largest multi-donor trust fund under the administration of the United Nations, with 47 donor countries contributing to its work and pledges totalling more than \$310 million — continues to stand as an indispensable instrument for ensuring the immediate release of resources needed to launch peacebuilding activities and for the provision of appropriate financing for recovery, despite the financial constraints it faces.

In this respect, it would not be wrong to define the progress achieved over the past four years of the Commission's and Fund's operations as positive and promising. Yet, the increased complexity of the post-conflict reconstruction process, the evolving approaches to critical peacebuilding priorities and the need to adapt to prevailing global realities call for the continuous review of these two instruments and the reevaluation of their means of operation on the basis of lessons learned.

With this in mind, we are pleased to see that the Commission has already engaged in a process of discussions on how to improve its work, maximize its impact and mobilize sustained international attention. We are also pleased that the new terms of reference are in place for the Peacebuilding Fund. We believe that these ongoing processes will be further advanced by the 2010 review of the Commission's founding resolutions, look forward and we the recommendations on how its role can be further enhanced.

Peacebuilding, though embedded in the principle of national ownership, is mainly a collective effort undertaken by many actors and comprising many aspects of peace efforts, including conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping, humanitarian aid and development assistance. Indeed, as is often mentioned, the challenge is as much about winning the peace as stopping the war.

There are many challenging areas in which the responses should be as multifaceted as the problems themselves, from supporting political processes and reconciliation to creating safety and security; from enshrining the rule of law to providing basic services, such as water, health and education, and revitalizing economies destroyed by war. Nevertheless, the success of these responses depends on the manner in which they are applied, since such a broad agenda inevitably

09-61513 25

requires a coherent, coordinated and integrated effort from the international community.

There is no doubt that, if a peacebuilding project is to be successful, various stakeholders from the international community should act in unison with a view to empowering the post-conflict country and its citizens to start rebuilding both the structures of their State and their lives. The United Nations and the Peacebuilding Commission — as the institutional linchpin of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, together with the two other pillars, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office — undoubtedly have a significant role to play in this regard.

The efficient functioning of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture rests on its ability to deliver as one the common vision based on an agreed strategy that is well supported by financial resources and technical expertise and matches the needs of the country. In this belief, we agree with the five-point agenda set out by the Secretary-General to facilitate an earlier and more coherent response from the United Nations and the wider international community, which reflects these core elements.

I should like to underline a few points that we deem important elements to be taken into consideration during the 2010 review of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

First, we believe that priority should be given to the issue of building national institutions with a view to strengthening the national ownership of the peacebuilding process. In this framework, the focus should be on the identification and reinforcement of existing local capacities and on the transfer of expertise rather than dependence upon it. To this end, in collaboration with the national authorities and international actors, a system ought to be built for deploying "blue suits" and not only Blue Helmets.

Secondly, the transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding is an area that deserves greater attention. As was also pointed out in the thematic debate held during Turkey's presidency of the Security Council in June 2009, peacekeeping and peacebuilding are integral parts of a whole and success can come only if we treat them as such. The first two years after the end of a conflict are the most critical period, when we can sow the seeds of a lasting peace.

Thirdly, the gender perspective should be an inseparable element of the work of the Commission. The existing mandate of the PBC entrusts the Commission with integrating a gender perspective into all its work. The important role of women in the prevention and resolution of conflicts and the need for their full involvement in all efforts to maintain and promote peace and security, as well as in decision-making processes, should continue to be stressed within the work of the Commission.

Fourthly, the harmonization of policies and procedures to deliver as one should be reinforced. As Member States, we should encourage United Nations entities to implement system-wide coherence in post-conflict settings. In this regard, the capacity of the Peacebuilding Support Office should be strengthened in order to make it integral to United Nations efforts to promote a more integrated and strategic response in post-conflict countries.

Last but not least, we believe that the financing mechanism in support of peacebuilding efforts should be made more predictable, sustainable, transparent, accountable and flexible. We should explore creative ways to provide budget support in post-conflict settings on the basis of the needs of the country in question and look for ways to maximize the Peacebuilding Fund's impact, including by setting up new partnerships or extending existing ones.

Turkey stands fully behind its commitments to the Fund and makes its contributions to it without caveat. The Fund has the potential to fill a unique peacebuilding niche in the post-conflict arena, and we hope that the revised terms of reference will allow the Fund to improve its efficiency, responsiveness and effectiveness in order to ensure that post-conflict countries benefit from the sustained attention and support of the international community.

The momentum the Commission has gathered in terms of advancing the peacebuilding agenda within the United Nations and its success in promoting a convergence of views among the Member States constitute its most important added value. We believe that the upcoming mandate review, which will draw upon lessons learned in previous years, will be useful in charting the course for the future work of the Commission.

Turkey is ready to share with the members of the Commission and the Secretariat the vast experiences it

has gained through its active involvement in and support of the recovery efforts of various post-conflict countries, from the Balkans to the Middle East and from Afghanistan to Africa, and is committed to continuing its support for the enhancement of United Nations peacebuilding efforts in every possible way.

Mr. Husain (Canada) (spoke in French): Today's debate on the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the Peacebuilding Fund is an important opportunity to reflect on the incremental successes of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture and to consider what improvements can be made as we embark on the 2010 PCB review process. For Canada, the fundamental rationale behind the creation of this architecture remains clear. The United Nations needs a body mandated to work in partnership with post-conflict countries to help them to bridge the security and development aspects of peacebuilding with a view to building durable peace.

As the Peacebuilding Commission's annual report (A/64/341) attests, important progress has been made. The Commission has made significant improvements in such key areas as delivering strategic peacebuilding advice, developing adaptable and efficient working and raising public methods. awareness. Commission played an important role in the development of the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881), notably by underlining that peacebuilding is a fundamentally political activity that requires a careful integration of efforts in the spheres of mediation, peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, early recovery and development.

Significantly, the PBC is interacting more and more frequently with external actors, including the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States, the Organization of American States, the private sector and civil society. Canada welcomes these developments, which underscore the Commission's growing impact.

Recent strides towards streamlining the strategies, procedures and working methods of the Commission are particularly promising. To cite one example, the Sierra Leone configuration under Canadian chairmanship decided to align its engagement with the Government of Sierra Leone's new national strategy, the Agenda for Change. At the

High-level Special Session in June, the configuration adopted a short outcome (PBC/3/SLE/6) in which it committed itself to focusing on three key threats to peacebuilding identified in the Agenda for Change and endorsed complementary United Nations joint vision for Sierra Leone. This step reflected the Commission's willingness to adapt its engagement to the context and recognized that the needs of post-conflict countries are not static. Canada strongly supports this approach. Embracing locally produced strategic visions affirms national ownership, holds Governments accountable for their own commitments, and fulfils the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action.

Another success over the past year was the revision to the terms of reference of the Peacebuilding Fund. The Fund will now be able to better fulfil two functions: providing rapid financing for small, highimpact projects in direct support of early recovery, and providing funding to larger, more complex programmes that support peacebuilding in areas not covered by other donors. The Fund must continue to do better to align each project with a sound strategic vision and improve the quality of project implementation and the speed of disbursements. Canada is encouraged by the development of new operational guidelines for the Fund in this regard and welcomes the revised strategic articulated by the Assistant direction recently Secretary-General.

(spoke in English)

The peacebuilding architecture has come far, yet much more work remains. The forthcoming review process must be inclusive, transparent and focused on the practical needs of post-conflict countries. For this reason, it should begin with a careful stocktaking of the record to date. At this early stage, Canada would propose three key issues for potential consideration.

First, the PBC must expand its engagement by getting involved at an earlier stage of post-conflict recovery, as called for in the Secretary-General's report. The Commission needs to consider how it can better support a wider range of post-conflict countries, while continuing meaningful engagement with countries presently on its agenda. To do so, the PBC will need to adapt its working methods and more clearly identify the value it adds to existing peacekeeping efforts.

Secondly, the PBC should adopt a multitiered agenda. This would permit differing levels of engagement depending on the stage of peace consolidation. Not all circumstances will warrant the intensive involvement that currently takes place with respect to strategic frameworks. The Commission's role may be one of monitoring or helping a country move from peacebuilding to a sound development footing.

Thirdly, the Peacebuilding Commission must improve its treatment of thematic issues and integration of lessons learned. It should be the central United Nations forum for discussing the strategic challenges and policy dilemmas that peacebuilding presents. This will require closer cooperation with the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, as well as the World Bank, the International Network on Conflict and Fragility of the Economic Cooperation Organization for Development, and others outside United Nations walls. It demands a stronger Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), capable of serving as both a centre of expertise and a clearinghouse for knowledge. There is an important role for the PBC and PBSO to play in cultivating meaningful partnerships between external and internal peacebuilding actors that is essential to long-term sustainability.

The 2010 review comes at a time when the United Nations system is reforming its approach to peacebuilding and the Peacebuilding Commission must follow up on the recommendations outlined in the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding. Canada looks forward to the further clarification of roles and responsibilities, the development of mutual accountability measures for senior United Nations leadership teams, and greater integration of United Nations efforts in the field. We also await with great interest the forthcoming report on civilian capacity.

The time is now. The recent report on the Peacebuilding Commission's work has shown not only the fledgling progress that we have made, but also the promise that needs to be realized. The 2010 review is an opportunity to realize the full ambition of the Commission's original vision. It is time for the PBC to take a hard look at its business methods, build on successes, maintain its adaptability and prove its worth. Together, let us craft the mandate and develop the tools that can make the Peacebuilding Commission

an effective partner for countries seeking a brighter future.

Mr. Grauls (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): Since their establishment a few years ago, the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund have followed an interesting and encouraging path. The reports of the work of those two elements of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture that are before us today (A/64/341 and A/64/217) are proof of that. That direction would not have been possible without the highly appreciated contribution of the Secretariat and of many Member States.

Belgium fully aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Sweden on behalf of the European Union. That statement described the point of departure of the European contribution to the five-year review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

I would like to make a few brief remarks in my national capacity, bearing in mind my experience as Chair of the Central African Republic configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission. Consideration of the Commission's achievements and future with a view to the five-year review of the Peacebuilding Commission, less than a year away, has only just begun. Belgium intends to become involved in that collective review process on the basis of three guiding principles.

First, we must draw on the vision that was at the root of the Peacebuilding Commission's establishment in 2006. That vision was clear: the Peacebuilding Commission was to become a platform for coordinating, channelling and mobilizing international efforts on behalf of countries emerging from conflict. We will make the Peacebuilding Commission an essential tool for international engagement in postconflict situations only if we are all ready to strengthen our coordination and mobilization efforts. In that regard, the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881)contains very recommendations, such as the strengthening of highlevel United Nations posts on the ground, the rapid deployment of civilian capacities and an improved coordination role for the Peacebuilding Commission.

Secondly, the Commission's work evolves and is dynamic. The Peacebuilding Commission has made great progress since its establishment barely four years ago. In the country-specific configurations, we are

almost constantly reviewing our working methods, seeking to adapt them to the challenges encountered both in New York and in the field. We should act without dogmas by adopting a flexible approach and by tailoring our actions since the reality in the countries on the Commission's agenda varies greatly. In thinking about the direction of our work, let us keep in mind its evolving nature and take into consideration the lessons already drawn from our past experience. In any case, that is what we are trying to do within the Central African Republic configuration, the latest country to have been put on the Peacebuilding Commission's agenda.

Thirdly, we should see the Commission's work as part of a whole, in particular by taking into account the developments in recent years in the context of other United Nations reforms. I am thinking especially of the link between peacebuilding and peacekeeping, two worlds that to date are still too far apart but that must be brought closer together. I am also thinking of system-wide coherence and the One United Nations concept, two objectives to which the Peacebuilding Commission can substantially contribute.

Lastly, I am thinking of cooperation efforts between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations. Within our Central African Republic configuration, we have for example helped to strengthen the links among the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad, the Economic Community of Central African States, the European Union and the African Union so as to implement both security sector reform and process of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-rebels, which has now become truly urgent. We have also worked closely with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict and with UNICEF to find solutions to the problem of child soldiers.

It is also necessary to consider the formal and informal procedures whereby the Peacebuilding Commission interacts with the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. The Commission's advisory role vis-à-vis the Security Council can without doubt be developed further, for example by consulting the Peacebuilding Commission in the immediate aftermath of a conflict or when the Security Council is preparing documents

relating to countries on the Commission's agenda. Belgium also calls for strengthening the relationship between the Peacebuilding Commission and the General Assembly, for example by organizing a second annual debate on peacebuilding in this forum in addition to the debate on the annual report.

At our five-year review, we must consider the developments beyond the United Nations system, with a view to improving the dialogue between fragile States and the international community, such as through South-South cooperation and the implementation of the Paris Principles. In that regard, I wish to stress that the Central African Republic configuration works extremely well with the European Commission, the World Bank and UNDP.

Lastly, I wish to say a word about the Peacebuilding Fund. My delegation notes with satisfaction the efforts of the Secretariat, in particular of the new Assistant Secretary-General, Ms. Cheng-Hopkins, seeking to make the Fund an instrument that can act more rapidly and more as a catalyst. In fact, those are the characteristics that will enable the Fund to stand out. It is necessary to continue to improve the synergies between the Peacebuilding Fund and the efforts of bilateral partners and of other funds in the recipient countries, as well as with the Peacebuilding Commission. However, overall, Belgium believes that the revisions and the adjustments that the Fund has made this past year are promising.

For my part and speaking in my capacity as Permanent Representative of Belgium, I wish to reiterate here that Belgium will continue its active and resolute commitment in support of peacebuilding, including through its various contributions to the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

The Acting President: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 57/32 of 19 November 2002, I now call on His Excellency Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and President of the General Assembly at its fifty-fourth session.

Mr. Gurirab (Inter-Parliamentary Union): I would be remiss if, on this happy occasion, I did not convey to my dear brother the President of the General Assembly how very pleased I was to see him occupying the post that I once occupied, at the turn of the century. The Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) is at

his service and will offer all the help it can. I wish him well

I am pleased to be back in this Hall and to address the Assembly on behalf of the Inter-Parliamentary Union as it reviews the work of the Peacebuilding Commission. The promotion of peace lies at the heart of the mandate of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. Our organization is founded on the notion that parliaments and their members have an essential contribution to make in building peace and social stability. It is in parliament that the competing and sometimes conflicting interests in society are debated. It is there that agreements are forged on public policy and national priorities. A fully representative parliament that has the requisite powers to legislate and hold Government to account is, in many ways, the best antidote to conflict.

As a melting pot of the diverse components of society, parliament has a determining role to play in the process of national reconciliation, political tolerance and peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict. Despite the undeniable progress made over the past couple of decades, many parliaments in developing countries, and those in post-conflict countries in particular, continue to face daunting challenges. Their capacities and resources are far too limited to enable them to function effectively and to promote democracy.

In the IPU, we are working to assist these parliaments by giving them sustained and practical support and thereby promote their long-term development into more credible institutions — institutions that can help build consensus and serve as a platform for open and frank debate, which can also contribute to healing the scars of conflict and averting the danger of a return to instability and discord.

We are working closely with the United Nations in the field of conflict resolution. We have a shared interest in seeing vibrant parliaments take root. They are essential to achieving the local ownership that is critical to the success of international operations in post-conflict societies.

I am pleased that the Peacebuilding Commission is paying increasing attention to the needs of parliaments in embattled countries where it is working. I warmly welcome the growing cooperation between the IPU and the Peacebuilding Commission.

In our experience, in order for parliaments in countries emerging from conflict to function effectively, dialogue is absolutely indispensable. This holds true for majority and opposition parties alike: it is necessary for them to be able to work together. In this way, they will be able to form a common vision based on shared confidence and mutual respect. For this reason, the IPU is engaged in a long-term effort to help the parliament in Burundi create a framework for ongoing dialogue, consensus-building and inclusive decision-making.

Similarly, we are helping the parliament of Sierra Leone to play a robust role in the process of national reconciliation and forging a new beginning. Currently, we are assisting in the development of a code regulating the opposition in parliament and encouraging parliamentarians on both sides of the political divide to work together for the common good.

In Kenya, we are working with the parliament to ensure that it is at the forefront of efforts being made to ensure long-term stability and development in that country. We have facilitated the finalization by parliament of an action plan to implement the overall political agreement. Furthermore, we are now accompanying the parliament as it implements all stages of the plan.

Moreover, we are in discussions with the Peacebuilding Commission and the parliament in the Central African Republic. Early next year, we will conduct a mission to that country in the context of a Peacebuilding Commission mission with a view to assessing the parliament's needs and devising a strategy for supporting its long-term development and consolidation efforts.

As we debate how best to bring peace and stability to countries affected by conflict, we must remember that this cannot be achieved without goodwill and reconciliation, and that such efforts must be a home-grown affair in all respects. This process requires the participation of all parties, and that necessarily means the participation of parliament.

I should therefore like to conclude by urging all members of the Assembly to give their full support to the parliaments in those countries — to respect their sovereignty while giving them the means to become truly representative, transparent, accountable, accessible and effective institutions. That is one of the most vital investments the international community can

make in building peace and reconstruction. This is one of the important contributions we in the IPU are making to peace and development in a growing number of countries, and I urge the Assembly to join us in this exercise in building a better common future.

Programme of work

The Acting President: I should like to consult members regarding an extension for the work of the Second Committee. Members will recall that at its 2nd plenary meeting, on 18 September 2009, the General Assembly approved the recommendation of the General Committee that the Second Committee would complete its work by Tuesday, 24 November 2009. However, I have been informed by the Chairperson of the Second Committee that, due to ongoing negotiations, the Chairperson would like to request an extension of the Committee's work until Friday,

4 December 2009. May I therefore take it that the General Assembly agrees to extend the work of the Second Committee until Friday, 4 December 2009?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: I would like now to make an announcement concerning changes in the schedule of the work of the Assembly. First, members are advised that consideration of agenda item 114, "Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit", and specific meetings focused development, scheduled for Wednesday, 25 November 2009, as well as consideration of agenda item 14, entitled "Protracted conflicts in the GUAM area and their implications for international peace, security and development", and agenda item 18, entitled "The situation in the occupied territories of Azerbaijan", scheduled for Thursday, 3 December 2009, are postponed to a later date to be announced.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.