



General Assembly

Sixty-fifth session

40th plenary meeting

Friday, 29 October 2010, 10 a.m.

New York

Official Records

President: Mr. Deiss (Switzerland)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Badji (Senegal), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda items 13 and 115 (continued)

Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields

Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit

Draft resolution (A/65/L.7)

Ms. Anderson (Ireland): The co-facilitators — Ambassador Baso Sangqu of South Africa, Ambassador Claude Heller of Mexico and myself — warmly welcome today's debate, and we hope that the draft resolution (A/65/L.7) as circulated will be adopted at the conclusion of our discussion. We trust that Member States will have had the opportunity over the past three months or so to reflect on the contents of our report (A/64/868, annex), and we look forward to hearing views today. On behalf of the co-facilitators, I would like to present some brief comments on process, content and the way forward.

First, with regard to process, it seems to us that the way in which the membership engaged itself in this exercise represents the United Nations at its most constructive. We felt throughout a true sense of common purpose. There was extensive participation at each of the open-ended consultative meetings. Inputs from other stakeholders, in our various seminars and in

our engagement with the Geneva community, were also impressive. Throughout, interventions were thoughtful and detailed, with views cogently set out and opposing viewpoints listened to with respect.

The co-facilitators tried both to encourage that approach and to reflect it in our work. In framing our analysis and recommendations, we sought to distil the experience and good sense of the full range of interlocutors. As we have made clear, our purpose was to define approaches that could keep the membership together, while meeting the essential test of strengthening the peacebuilding architecture. Finding a consensual approach, without sacrifice of honesty or clarity, is not easy. If we fell short, we hope Member States will accept that this was the spirit that inspired our work.

As regards content, we would like to highlight just a few brief points in relation to the four principal chapters of the report. Following the identification of key issues, we begin our analysis in the field. We cannot overemphasize the importance of that perspective. In our consultations, we found it sobering to see the lack of understanding on the ground of what is being attempted in New York. The New York-field connection simply has to work better. And we also felt it essential to underline again the imperative of national ownership. That works both ways. The international community must understand the limits of its role as midwife to a national birthing process, and national authorities in turn must recognize the responsibilities that ownership confers.

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.

10-61032 (E)



Please recycle

Our second major focus is on the role and performance of the Peacebuilding Commission at Headquarters. In that chapter, we try to work systematically through the issues arising, including in particular the relationship between the Organizational Committee and the country-specific configurations. We define the challenge in that relationship as the need to combine innovation and vibrancy with weight and solidity.

Amid the generally very positive reactions to the content of this chapter, some delegations expressed disappointment at not seeing a fuller embrace of their positions on certain specific aspects. Such a reaction is always understandable, but we would say to those delegations that if their views were not fully embraced, it was because there were countervailing views that also had validity and deserved to be taken into account. That was in the nature of the exercise.

Our third major area of focus is on key relationships, both within the United Nations — with the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council — and with other partnerships. As we make clear, the Commission's relationship with the Security Council is critical in shaping the Commission's agenda and in determining its relevance within the United Nations architecture. We are conscious of the view of some that the report shows insufficient circumspection in treading on that sensitive ground. In all honesty, we do not think we could have said less. There has already been an opportunity for discussion in the Security Council; today, we would want only to emphasize that the emergence of the new dynamic we envisage — between a more forthcoming Security Council and a better-performing Peacebuilding Commission — is essential, if peacebuilding is to assume its proper place in United Nations priorities.

Together with the Security Council, the General Assembly is also, of course, a co-parent of the Peacebuilding Commission. The Assembly's co-parenting responsibilities have not been exercised as fully as they could have been, and our report tries to suggest possible ways to achieve a more structured and interactive relationship. Already in this session and under our current President, we hope that those avenues will begin to be explored.

Our fourth area of focus is the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund. We look at

changes necessary within the Support Office, including staffing issues, but also at the role and weight of the Support Office across the Secretariat as a whole. In that regard, we particularly underline the importance of a clear and unequivocal message from the Secretary-General that peacebuilding is central to United Nations priorities, and the need for his support of organizational arrangements that reflect this.

Finally, a word about the path from here on: the co-facilitators extend our thanks to the President of the Assembly, the President of the Security Council and their respective teams for their work in framing a resolution that could command consensus in both bodies. It is consistent with the way this exercise has been conducted from the outset that there should be a consensual text; any other outcome would fracture the sense of common purpose that it is so important to safeguard. Even if the draft resolution before us does not in every word reflect the preferences of everyone, we trust and believe it has sufficient strength and clarity to ensure that the recommendations in the report are appropriately taken forward and implemented.

Our report concludes with a sense of urgency and the hope that it will serve as a wake-up call. It would be very easy to lose that sense of urgency, to feel — now that we have a report and a draft resolution, and with a new country, Liberia, on the Commission's agenda — that all is basically well, and that we can revisit the subject in five years' time. There is no room for any such complacency. The *World Development Report*, to be issued shortly, will again set out the grim realities and remind us of how corrosively conflict eats away at developmental gains. The needs remain very great; our report will have value insofar, and only insofar, as it leads us to respond to them more effectively.

Mr. Momen (Bangladesh): I have the pleasure to speak today on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) on the review of the Peacebuilding Commission.

At the outset, the Movement would like to express its sincerest appreciation to the co-facilitators of the review process, the Permanent Representatives of South Africa, Ireland and Mexico, and commend them on their transparent, all-inclusive and objective efforts, which resulted in the present report and recommendations (A/64/868, annex).

The Non-Aligned Movement would also like to express its appreciation for the President's efforts and those of Uganda in negotiating the draft resolution under consideration by the General Assembly (A/65/L.7), with a view to its adoption by both the General Assembly and the Security Council today.

The United Nations has developed and improved its peacebuilding efforts in post-conflict situations through an integrated system established by the General Assembly to play the pivotal role in the coordination of those United Nations peacebuilding efforts. In the meantime, the international community came to realize the importance of the decision of the 2005 World Summit to establish the Peacebuilding Commission, which has contributed significantly to peacebuilding through its achievements over the past five years of its operations.

In that context, the Movement has supported United Nations peacebuilding efforts through the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, established by resolution 60/180, where the operations and activities of the latter are becoming increasingly important as a result of its accumulated expertise, the lessons learned over the past years and its important role in coordinating international efforts to prevent post-conflict countries from relapsing into conflict.

Today's adoption of the draft resolution by the General Assembly is a commitment towards taking forward the final recommendations of the review process and reaffirming our willingness to develop the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, with the Peacebuilding Commission at its centre, by taking advantage of more opportunities for countries to be included on the Peacebuilding Commission's agenda, a clearer sense of how the engagement of the Commission should contribute to peacebuilding processes in the field, a stronger relationship being forged between the Commission and the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, and a more enabled Peacebuilding Support Office.

While the Movement welcomes the recommendations in the report, it is of the view that certain elements should have been included in that comprehensive review process in order to strengthen the role of the Commission. Those elements include, inter alia: providing the needed funding jointly from

the General Assembly and the Security Council, in consultation with the Commission, to peacebuilding field missions and field visits; negotiating a set of clear, efficient and flexible rules of procedures for the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission; redefining the relationship between the Commission and the Fund, where the Commission should play a principal role in setting the general policy for the Fund and in developing an accountability framework for the Fund's operations in consultation with its Advisory Group; identifying appropriate ways for international financial institutions to finance the critical economic activities needed to consolidate peace directly by eliminating the roots for economic and social inequalities most often identified as major causes for unrest and conflict; and establishing a greater balance between the roles of donor and non-donor countries in the Commission's activities.

The Movement reiterates the central role expected from the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission in implementing the draft resolution and the recommendations of the review process, in full cooperation and coordination with the principal bodies of the United Nations and all relevant actors, in order to achieve the expectations of the international community in a more effective peacebuilding approach.

The Movement stresses that the Commission must focus on the implementation of the review's recommendations, with a view to achieving the following objectives.

First, the Commission must ensure that national ownership underpins the entire peacebuilding process from the initial phases of early peacebuilding, in particular the planning stage and negotiations on peacebuilding strategies. A stake for national actors must be built into those phases to enable the transfer of the management and implementation of peacebuilding strategies and projects to the concerned Government and its national partners, including parliament and civil society.

Second, it must reaffirm the necessity of national capacity-building by developing the needed mechanisms, ensuring continued political support and providing the required technical and financial resources, and ensuring that all actors, including political parties, parliaments and civil society, are in a

position to engage meaningfully in the peacebuilding process.

The third objective is to develop the institutional relationship between the Commission and the principal bodies of the United Nations, including through innovative exchange frameworks, in particular the establishment of early peacebuilding components in peacekeeping operations during the consultations on the establishment or renewal of a peacekeeping mandate, as well as regular exchanges among the Organizational Committee, the country-specific configuration and the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

Fourth, the Commission must intensify the nexus between development and peace by prioritizing development and ensuring its full integration into peacebuilding efforts in countries emerging from conflict. It is crucial that peacebuilding strategies address and respond to the range of development challenges faced by the country concerned.

Fifth, it must strengthen gender mainstreaming into the priorities of peacebuilding strategies and their activities. The potential contribution that women can make to peace processes hardly needs reiteration. Furthermore, the success of any peacebuilding process rests also on its ability to ensure gender equality and the empowerment of women within the political, economic and social spheres. In that context, it is important that the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission study and evaluate the report of the Secretary-General on women's participation in peacebuilding (A/65/354) and the seven priorities underlined in the proposed action plan.

Sixth, the Commission should develop multiple forms of engagement that are appropriate to the special circumstances of different countries, on a case-by-case basis, thus encouraging countries in post-conflict situations to be included on the Commission's agenda.

The seventh objective is to strengthen the role of the Commission in providing political support to United Nations peacebuilding missions, which, in turn, should reflect United Nations peacebuilding principles and priorities in their operations, and to ensure the full integration of the work of United Nations actors on the ground, based on joint planning and clear inventories of actions to avoid duplication.

Eighth, the Commission should capitalize on its current composition, in accordance with paragraph 4 of resolution 60/180, so as to draw on the competitive advantages and expertise of the diversified representation of the general membership in the Organizational Committee, in particular the representation of United Nations Charter bodies.

Ninth, the Commission must develop and strengthen the recruitment of international civilian capacities to address the specific needs and particularities of the countries concerned and communities within which such capacities will be deployed, and to support national institutional and human resources capacity-building. There is also the need to further develop the cooperation frameworks of United Nations agencies, programmes and bodies with regional and subregional organizations and institutions and developing countries that have accumulated the expertise needed to build peace within a specific country or in a specific region, as well as to promote both South-South and triangular cooperation in that area.

Tenth, the Commission must focus on maximizing benefits from the available capacities of the United Nations, the international financial institutions and the donor community, in order to support peacebuilding efforts. In that regard, it is imperative to establish a monitoring, evaluation and follow-up mechanism to ensure the implementation of all national and international commitments made within the framework of the nationally agreed peacebuilding priorities and strategies.

Finally, the Commission must focus on ensuring consistency in the priorities of international funding mechanisms, including the Peacebuilding Fund, with national peacebuilding priorities of the countries concerned and the need to consider innovative methods to strengthen the resources of such mechanisms, in particular the Peacebuilding Fund, so that such resources will constitute a cornerstone for funding peacebuilding strategies whose successful implementation and dividends on the ground would encourage further engagements and commitments from the international financial community to support comprehensive peacebuilding processes and sustainable development strategies.

The Peacebuilding Commission is uniquely positioned as the high-level platform for coordination

between the needs on the ground and the United Nations system. Its initial responsibility is to assist countries on its agenda in determining their own peacebuilding priorities. Using its knowledge and experience, the Commission must bring its political weight to bear in efforts to engage the United Nations system and the wider international community in fulfilling those priorities in the best possible way. Moreover, it must not hesitate to use its political weight to urgently address issues of mutual accountability. It is by recognizing and leveraging to the full extent the essentially political role that the Peacebuilding Commission can deliver effectively its responsibilities within its mandate.

In that regard, the Non-Aligned Movement welcomes the consensus around the current draft resolution, offers its full support for the progressive implementation of the recommendations of the review within the next five years and stands ready to support the efforts of the Peacebuilding Commission in monitoring and following up on these recommendations.

Mr. Grauls (Belgium): I have the honour of speaking today on behalf of the European Union. The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Georgia and Armenia, align themselves with this statement.

I would like to thank the President of the General Assembly and his Office for organizing this important debate concerning the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture and for preparing the draft resolution we have before us today (A/65/L.7).

From the outset, the European Union has been a strong supporter of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. As the largest donor in the five countries on the Peacebuilding Commission's agenda, the European Union has cooperated intensively within the country-specific configurations and the Organizational Committee of the Commission. The European Union has also been strongly committed to making the review of the peacebuilding architecture a success and has actively taken part in the informal consultations chaired by the co-facilitators.

The European Union would like to praise the tireless efforts of the co-facilitators and warmly welcomes their report (A/65/868, annex) as a balanced document, based on extensive consultations with the United Nations membership and other stakeholders. The report contains a thoughtful analysis of the challenges and useful recommendations for the way ahead.

In terms of next steps, the European Union fully supports the draft resolution before us today. The timely adoption of that short and straightforward resolution will allow all relevant United Nations and other actors to build on the momentum generated by the review of the peacebuilding architecture by taking forward, as appropriate, the recommendations of the report. The European Union would also like to call on the Secretary-General to play a major role by bringing the United Nations system together in order to further improve the effectiveness of the Peacebuilding Commission and the support that the Peacebuilding Support Office provides.

The European Union welcomes the recognition in the draft resolution that the peacebuilding work of the United Nations requires sustained support and adequate resources to meet the challenges. As a strong believer in peacebuilding, the European Union stands ready to redouble its efforts to help implement the recommendations of the report and enable the United Nations peacebuilding architecture to live up to the expectations which accompanied its establishment.

Mr. Bowler (Malawi): I have the pleasure of speaking today on behalf on the Group of African States on the review of the Peacebuilding Commission. At the outset, the African Group would like to express its sincere appreciation to the co-facilitators, Ambassador Sangqu of South Africa, Ambassador Anderson of Ireland and Ambassador Heller of Mexico, for the true commitment and passion with which they have executed this noble task. I would also like to thank His Excellency the President of the General Assembly and his entire office, as well as the Uganda delegation, for their leadership.

The draft resolution before us today (A/65/L.7) will not take us to heaven as desired, but may help to save us from hell. The African Group has taken note that certain members of the Permanent Five were from the outset not constructive in the review process and even adopted a selfish approach. We are extremely

grateful to the United Nations for what it represents and what it stands for as well for the opportunity for dialogue that it provides to its membership, for that very reason.

In Africa, we view the United Nations as extremely relevant. The United Nations has developed its peacebuilding efforts, but no doubt there is a very long way to go. The draft resolution before us makes a commitment towards implementing the recommendations that will contribute to strengthening the peacebuilding process.

In December of this year, we will be at the five-year mark since the adoption of the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions establishing the Peacebuilding Commission, whose review is under consideration today. When the Commission was formed in 2005 as an intergovernmental advisory body designed to specifically focus on post-conflict peacebuilding situations and, more importantly, avert relapse into conflict, the expectations of the recipients of its services were naturally raised. However, as discussed in the review report (A/64/868, annex), those expectations were not adequately met. Again, five years on, when the Commission was up for review, it was expected that the review process would enhance its effectiveness.

The review report and its recommendations carry the hopes of those people in post-conflict situations whose fate depends on our conscious and collective responsibility to salvage them from the devastating effects of conflict. Most of those people are Africans. Africans urge all of us to put our shoulders to the wheel to make peacebuilding work. The tragedy of conflict is that the most vulnerable, particularly women and children and youth, become the victims. It is not only immoral, but should be regarded as a crime, if we who are privileged to be given the responsibility of providing peace fail in our duty. Diluting the peacebuilding final draft resolution any further would be a betrayal of our responsibilities.

Conflict zones are living hell and require our committed and serious efforts to alleviate and reduce the suffering, as well as to bring about a real and meaningful peacebuilding process. At the risk of repeating what is contained in the report, I would like to emphasize the following points that could help us enhance our post-conflict peacebuilding activities.

Without prescribing to the Security Council how it should go about its work, there is a greater need to strengthen the relationship between the Council and the Commission if we are to achieve maximum results. In that relation, therefore, the Peacebuilding Support Office needs to be strengthened.

Long-term development should be at the centre of post-conflict interventions. As much as quick-impact programmes are important, long-lasting peace can only be cultivated and sustained when people enjoy the dividends of peace that are embedded in long-term development strategies. To achieve that, we need to focus on comprehensive and nationally owned interventions supported by holistic, system-wide coordination and sustained interventions.

The Peacebuilding Fund can only do so much. Post-conflict peacebuilding needs more resources, and the United Nations should devise innovative ways, in partnership with other partners, such as the international financial institutions, regional organizations and funding institutions, to sufficiently finance peacebuilding activities.

The conflict-prevention dimension of the United Nations might be the only sustainable approach to averting the challenges that come with post-conflict situations. We therefore call on the United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, to focus attention on conflict-prevention strategies, instead of expending already scarce resources resolving conflicts that could otherwise have been prevented.

It is also important to note that there is a need to sustain the attention of the international community on the agenda countries. It is vital that support is continued beyond fundamental peacekeeping and that it extends into building secure nations.

On Tuesday, 26 October, we commemorated the tenth anniversary of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000), which seeks to put women at the centre of conflict prevention, resolution and post-conflict peacebuilding activities. Accordingly, for us to achieve sustainable peace, we need to involve women as equal partners in all conflict prevention, resolution and post-conflict peacebuilding activities, including governance.

It is important, furthermore, for us to involve civil society with Governments, and our national frameworks must be people-centred.

In conclusion, we align ourselves with the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and support the adoption of draft resolution A/65/L.7, entitled "Review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture". We hope that we all will take the necessary steps to implement the recommendations of the report in our collective pursuit of sustainable peace. We also call upon the membership to embrace this draft resolution, particularly the permanent members of the Security Council. As I mentioned earlier, in the process of coming up with the draft resolution, we felt that some members might not have understood our needs in Africa, where sadly most of our efforts in peacebuilding initiatives are targeted. We call on the membership to support the draft resolution.

Mr. Staur (Denmark): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

Allow me first of all to thank the President of the General Assembly for organizing today's debate, in which we conclude the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, as mandated by the original General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

Furthermore, allow me also to stress the strong appreciation of the Nordic countries for the dedicated effort and hard work of the three co-facilitators, who conducted the review in an open, inclusive and transparent manner, allowing for all views and voices to be heard. The Nordic countries warmly welcome the report of the co-facilitators (A/64/868, annex), which we feel accurately reflects the current situation and outlines innovative means and ways to amplify the reach and relevance of the peacebuilding architecture. Most importantly, the Nordic countries feel confident that the report and its recommendations reinforce the ability of the Peacebuilding Commission to deliver added value where it counts most, which is at the country level. As we stressed at the outset of this review process, the Nordic countries strongly believe that the determining benchmark for success should ultimately be the real impact in each and every country.

The Nordic countries are firmly committed to advancing the work of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, and this review has been a welcome occasion to take stock, to reassess the efforts so far and to look at the challenges facing the wider

peacebuilding agenda. The moment has now come to transform the ideas and recommendations generated by the review into tangible advances on the ground. The recent establishment of a Peacebuilding Commission country-specific configuration for Liberia offers an opportunity to do just that, and we welcome Liberia's decision to seek the advice and support of the Peacebuilding Commission on its path towards consolidating peace.

The Nordic countries can support the short draft resolution before us today (A/65/L.7), and we look forward to contributing actively to its follow-up and implementation. We acknowledge that peacebuilding work requires sustained support and adequate resources, and we pledge our continued support in that regard. We join others in calling for the Secretary-General to vigorously take that agenda forward with a view to achieving more coherent and effective United Nations delivery in fragile and post-conflict States.

Our debate today in the General Assembly follows in the footsteps of another closely related debate on post-conflict peacebuilding conducted in the Security Council as recently as on the 13th of this month. Indeed, very close links exist between the review of the peacebuilding architecture and the Secretary-General's progress report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/64/866), as well as his report on women's participation in peacebuilding (A/65/354). Allow me to reiterate in this forum the Nordic countries' full support for those reports and their recommendations. Successful and sustained peacebuilding requires that a wide set of actors come together in highly complex circumstances and work coherently towards nationally owned goals. The Nordic countries are confident that this review, as well as the recent reports of the Secretary-General, has contributed positively towards this elusive but worthwhile ambition.

Mr. Kleib (Indonesia): I would like to begin by thanking the President of the General Assembly for convening this debate to discuss the review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). We commend the process and conduct of the 2010 review of the Commission under the able leadership of the ambassadors of South Africa, Mexico and Ireland as co-facilitators. My delegation associates itself with the statement delivered earlier by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Indonesia concurs with the executive summary of the report on the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture that:

“We are now at a crossroads: either there is a conscious recommitment to peacebuilding at the very heart of the work of the United Nations, or the Peacebuilding Commission settles into the limited role that has developed so far.” (A/64/868, *annex, p. 3*)

As stated in the report, the greater number of Member States, including Indonesia, strongly favours the former path. Draft resolution A/65/L.7, as it stands, reflects this conclusion and points in the right direction to that path.

The draft resolution will determine the course of actions by the Commission in the future and must thus contain elements to strengthen its role and performance. We were heartened to learn of the draft resolution’s stipulated request for all relevant United Nations actors to take forward the recommendations set forth in the report, thus reinvigorating a conscious recommitment to peacebuilding.

Our firm position in this regard is to support the spirit of the draft resolution, which also cites the report, and others, based on our experience as a member of the PBC Organizational Committee from 2006 to 2008. For example, as the first Chair of the PBC Strategy and Policy Task Force on Private Sector, in April 2008 Indonesia submitted an exhaustive set of observations and recommendations to the Organizational Committee on the important role of the private sector with respect to its contribution to post-conflict peacebuilding. That was an important task in the context of exploring ways the PBC could fulfil its mandate to marshal resources.

The outcome document set out methodologies for the PBC to strengthen concrete interactions and synergies with the private sector in a meaningful manner, especially in areas involving funding sources, microfinance and remittances. However, to date, due to certain viewpoints on the limited role of the PBC, such recommendations have not materialized. The report at hand on the PBC review highlights the urgency of resource mobilization as an entry point for the PBC to consider its potential for a greater role in engaging other stakeholders, such as the private sector.

We also note that the report of the co-facilitators reflects the current reality of the nexus between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. It serves as a wake-up call for all of us to strengthen our collective determination to deal with peacebuilding and peacekeeping in a more comprehensive manner. Peacebuilding efforts must occur in parallel to peacekeeping; it is therefore imperative that the Peacebuilding Commission engage in an early and seamless manner.

Therefore, Indonesia is of the view there is a very close connection between the review process of the PBC and the ongoing review of civilian capacity currently being conducted by the Secretary-General. The latter serves as an important strategy of the United Nations in the areas of conflict prevention, peacekeeping and the intermediate aftermath of conflict. The draft resolution on the PBC review as it stands is in line with these two important review processes.

In this regard, Indonesia is taking keen interest in the ongoing review of civilian capacity in those two important areas, and emphasizes that the PBC should have a bigger role in the process of broadening and deepening the pool of experts, giving particular attention to mobilizing the capacities of developing countries and of women. We also join others who believe that the implementation of the report’s recommendations in an integrated manner will help pave the way for a revitalized Peacebuilding Commission — one which is more relevant, more flexible, better performing, more empowered, better supported, more ambitious and better understood.

In closing, I would like to reiterate my delegation’s firm belief in the contribution that the PBC has made and will continue to make in the future to peacebuilding efforts in various parts of the world, provided that it continues to receive sustained and steadfast support from the international community. To that end, my delegation reaffirms its unwavering support to any effort to advance the work of the PBC.

Mr. Sumi (Japan): I would like to thank the President of the General Assembly for convening this important meeting to consider the outcome of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) review. I would also like to extend my gratitude to the co-facilitators, the Ambassadors of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa, for

presenting their report entitled, “Review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture” (A/64/868, annex).

Japan welcomes the report presented by the co-facilitators and urges all related United Nations organs to take forward the relevant recommendations of the co-facilitators, with the aim of further improving the impact of PBC activities on the ground. In this regard, I would like to express Japan’s support for the draft resolution (A/64/L.7) before the Assembly. In order to take forward the co-facilitators’ recommendations, I would like to raise the following three points for further consideration.

First, Japan would like to stress once again the need to diversify the approach of the PBC’s engagement in post-conflict countries. As suggested by the co-facilitators, we should consider employing lighter approaches than the current full country-specific configuration. Therefore, Japan supports the idea of seeking a multitiered approach — sectoral, regional and “light footprint” engagement — as noted in paragraph 95 of the report. The priority agenda for the PBC’s engagement in Liberia that we are now discussing through the draft statement of mutual commitments on peacebuilding should be more targeted and focused.

Another useful approach is to consider a specific focus in a cross-country and cross-sectoral manner. As the co-facilitators point out in paragraph 55 of their report, youth employment has been identified as a potential Achilles’ heel in any peacebuilding process. Japan considers that the PBC has a role to play in developing strategies based on such perspectives, which require special attention.

In this regard, I would like to recall the discussion in the working group on lessons learned on the issue of post-conflict employment. This year, the PBC should follow up that discussion and apply the lessons learned to the actual activities on the ground. In addition, as the representative of Canada proposed in the most recent meeting of the Liberia country-specific configuration, cooperation between the country-specific configurations of Liberia and Sierra Leone is also useful in promoting youth employment in the post-conflict situation in relation to the Mano River Initiative.

Secondly, I would like to stress the importance of strengthening the PBC’s advisory role to the Security Council. To that end, Japan supports the co-facilitators’

recommendation in paragraph 109 that the consultations between the Security Council and the PBC be enhanced. In that connection, I am delighted to note that the newly adopted note by the President of the Security Council on working methods (S/2010/507) echoes the co-facilitators’ recommendation. I would like to report that Japan chaired the informal working group on the working methods of the Security Council.

In paragraph 61 of the annex to presidential note A/65/507, the Council expresses its intention

“to invite the Chairs of country-specific configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission to participate in formal Security Council meetings at which the situation concerning the country in question is considered, or on a case-by-case basis, for an exchange of views in an informal dialogue”.

Japan would like to explore the possibility of having such an informal dialogue, ideally on Liberia, at an appropriate occasion before the end of the year.

Thirdly, Japan generally supports the notion that the function of the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) must be enhanced to maximize the effectiveness of PBC programmes. On the other hand, we would like to stress the need for the PBSO to clarify the division of roles and its comparative advantage in relation to other, related United Nations departments. Japan supports the co-facilitators’ recommendation, in paragraph 109, that the head of PBSO be invited to brief the Security Council in the same manner as the heads of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Department of Political Affairs and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. However, careful examination is necessary in considering the question of the ratio of core to non-core staff within PBSO, as mentioned in paragraph 149.

In addition, we should further look into creating synergy between the PBC and the Peacebuilding Fund. We have no objection to the idea that the Peacebuilding Fund should retain decision-making autonomy on the allocation of its funds, but we believe that the PBC can provide strategic guidance as well. In this context, Japan supports the strengthening of such interaction between chairs, the PBSO and the Peacebuilding Fund Advisory Group.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate our readiness to participate in the coming discussion on how we may move forward the implementation of the recommendations of the co-facilitators. Japan encourages the PBC to expedite the discussion to this end. Japan stands ready to actively take part in those efforts.

Mr. Aeschlimann (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): The creation of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) was of real benefit. Since its creation in 2005, the PBC has proven its value. Through its national configurations, it has managed to contribute to peacebuilding in the countries on its agenda. Peacebuilding nonetheless requires considerable commitment in the form of political, institutional and financial investment. We therefore need to make it one of our highest priorities.

As stressed in the co-facilitators' review (A/64/868, annex), the peacebuilding architecture deserves to be further improved and strengthened. Switzerland welcomes this worthwhile report, which, in our view, addresses the essential issues and includes appropriate recommendations in the light of the challenges ahead.

It is our firm conviction that the Secretary-General's leadership is essential to ensuring adequate follow-up for the implementation of the report's recommendations. Most of the recommendations can be implemented in their current form by the organs to which they are addressed. We believe that follow-up on their implementation should be ensured, for example, by the PBC Organizational Committee.

In our capacity as Chair of the Burundi configuration, we have drawn the following three lessons. First, countries on the PBC agenda hold the key to the success of the exercise. Their commitment and political will determine the process. This commitment must be shared by civil society and expressed through its direct involvement in the peacebuilding process. The configurations have no decision-making power; their relationship with the relevant countries is comparable to that of a client and his attorney.

A second determining factor is the shared definition of clear, realistic and tangible objectives. The PBC and the countries on its agenda must agree on the expectations and objectives for both sides.

Dialogue and monitoring should help to evaluate progress and determine the steps required.

Thirdly, the Chair needs specific support for its functions in New York and adequate support in the field, as stressed by the co-facilitators. It is important to ensure the continuity, predictability and expertise required for the work of the Chair. This could be done by strengthening the PBSO.

We are in favour of a regular dialogue between the Security Council and the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission. Moreover, we would like to see the Security Council further involve the countries concerned and invite the chairs of their respective configurations to participate in the related informal consultations. Since the PBC also draws its legitimacy from its relationship with the General Assembly, we should also explore ways to deal more substantially with peacebuilding issues in the Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. This possibility should be seriously explored. We think that economic and social questions can play a central role in efforts to adequately respond to peacebuilding challenges.

The role and identity of the Organizational Committee deserve in-depth consideration. The Organizational Committee needs to be given greater importance, for example, by strengthening its function of regular follow-up of the work of the various configurations and by using it more as a forum for exchanges of experience or good practices in the area of peacebuilding. With this in mind, Switzerland supports the report's suggestion that the working group on lessons learned be integrated into the Organizational Committee.

In conclusion, it is our view that the review of the PBC must enable the international community to recommit itself to meeting the challenges in the area of peacebuilding. We therefore support a determined effort to pursue the implementation of the recommendations of the Secretary-General and the co-facilitators' report.

Mr. Errázuriz (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): First of all, my delegation thanks the President of the General Assembly on having convened this debate on the United Nations peacebuilding architecture and the consultations that have taken place.

With draft resolution A/65/L.7 before the Assembly, an important cycle in the review of the Peacebuilding Commission has been concluded. We must now implement its recommendations with a view to improving the peacebuilding architecture and its effectiveness. I would also like to congratulate the representative of Uganda, in his capacity as President of the Security Council, on having completed the review process during his presidency.

Chile aligns itself with the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement countries. Chile would also like to congratulate the three co-facilitators of the review process of the Peacebuilding Commission — the Permanent Representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa — on the excellent work they have done and for the comprehensive and inclusive process they have undertaken, which has culminated in a comprehensive and balanced report (A/64/868, annex).

Chile, as pro tempore Secretary of the Rio Group, had the opportunity to organize a meeting of the co-facilitators with the members of the Rio Group. We would like to thank the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Peter Wittig of Germany, and the Commission's previous Chair, for the excellent work they have done.

We would also like to thank the chairs of the country-specific configurations for their dedicated work. I would particularly like to mention the participation of developing countries in the country-specific configurations. In this regard, the excellent work of the Permanent Representative of Brazil, heading the country-specific configuration for Guinea-Bissau, deserves special recognition. Liberia's recent incorporation into the agenda of the Commission, with the Permanent Representative of Jordan as Chair of that country-specific configuration, leads me to hope that we will see greater and more decisive participation of our countries in this important area of the work of the United Nations.

We would also like to express our thanks for the presentation of the draft resolution, on which we will vote shortly. We believe that it reflects the report and recommendations of the co-facilitators, and we hope that its adoption will launch a new stage in the life of the Commission, in which relationships with other United Nations departments and agencies will be strengthened, particularly those directly involved in

peacebuilding and peacekeeping activities. This new stage should at the same time be characterized by daily, regular work with the principal organs of the United Nations. In this regard, we note the co-facilitators' recommendation that there should be informal and regular dialogue in the framework not only of the Security Council, but also of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

Given the fact that gender issues are relevant to the founding resolutions of the Commission, we hope that there will be close cooperation with the recently created gender entity, UN Women. Similarly, in this second five years of the PBC's existence, we hope to see a stronger Peacebuilding Support Office to ensure the human and financial resources essential to meeting the challenges that confront the countries on the Commission's agenda. We also look forward with interest to the debate involving the members of the Commission in order to see how we can implement the co-facilitators' recommendations. Chile will continue to participate in that discussion, and will propose that meetings of the Organizational Committee be open to all States Members of the United Nations. We believe that this practical measure will allow Members to get to know the work of the Commission. We believe that the principle of national ownership should continue to be the cornerstone on which rest the peacebuilding process and its three pillars: security, development and human rights.

In conclusion, we would like to say that the recent incorporation of Liberia as the fifth country on the Commission's agenda was an important step in the right direction of incorporating a new country in a partial way and with a limited mandate, in accordance with the request of the Government concerned. It is thus the first country to implement the multitier principle.

Mr. Viločić (Croatia): My delegation aligns itself with the statement of the European Union, which we wholeheartedly support. However, allow me to take part in this timely and exceptionally relevant debate by adding a few short comments in my national capacity.

As we pointed out a few days ago during the Security Council debate (see S/PV.6396) on the Secretary-General's overview of the progress achieved in the implementation of his agenda for action, set out in his reports on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (A/64/866) and the participation of women in

peacebuilding (A/65/354), it is obvious that broad cross-regional support for stronger peacebuilding is increasing, encompassing Governments, international organizations and civil society.

It is our strong belief that, in the rapidly changing environment we live in, which constantly puts new challenges on our agenda, we have to painstakingly maintain hard-won gains and make every effort not to reopen battles we have already won. Furthermore, we are of the view that every relapse into conflict brings even more despair and disappointment than its initial outbreak, since it undoubtedly worsens existing problems, annihilates all national achievements and confirms the curse of the vicious cycle that we are trying so hard to eliminate.

As I have pointed out on previous occasions, it is our conviction that the time to establish a new balance within the United Nations peacebuilding architecture has definitely arrived and that we have to make the most of the new momentum we currently possess. In that light, Croatia welcomes the excellent report on the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (A/64/868, annex) presented by the three co-facilitators, and fully supports the recommendations contained therein, based on the field experience to date with the countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC).

The report certainly represents a sound basis for the needed renewal of our peacebuilding efforts and stronger pursuit of our peacebuilding commitments. We particularly welcome the open, transparent and inclusive process by which the co-facilitators accomplished their demanding task, as well as their efforts to achieve the widest possible participation of all relevant stakeholders in this comprehensive exercise.

In conclusion, allow me to underscore two of the main findings of the co-facilitators' report that are generally accepted and widely confirmed and, in our opinion, certainly worth repeating, and without which there can be no successful peacebuilding: first, national ownership, with all its implications, and in particular comprehensive capacity-building; and secondly, the sustainability of resources. Obviously, without the first, peacebuilding becomes an artificial, international self-centred exercise with no roots and no hope for durable success. Without the second, peacekeeping will fade away soon after its enthusiastic introduction, but long

before producing its eagerly awaited results: security, development and lasting peace.

Finally, let me finish by expressing our strong support for the draft resolution before us (A/65/L.7), as well as our conviction that the appropriate implementation of the recommendations contained in the co-facilitators' report — combined with a thorough examination of the Secretary-General's ambitious agenda for action and careful consideration of his latest requests, proposals and recommendations — will bear fruit and bring us significantly closer to our common goal — sustainable, comprehensive and cost-effective peacebuilding.

Mr. Quinlan (Australia): I would first like to thank the President of the Assembly for convening today's debate. Building the defences of peace is the most difficult work we can undertake, but of course it is also the most essential.

At the outset, I would like to very much commend the Permanent Representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa for their leadership of our efforts throughout this review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

Australia's own recent direct experience in peacebuilding endeavours in Timor-Leste, Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea have taught us a number of lessons that have come to be accepted as self-evident truths about peacebuilding and which are reflected in the co-facilitators' report (A/64/868, annex). For example, effective peacebuilding requires a long-term commitment in support of national ownership and national plans. Effective peacebuilding is a complex and challenging undertaking that demands the coordinated engagement of a range of actors from the outset to address political, security, humanitarian and development needs in parallel. Effective peacebuilding demands a continual focus on the delivery of actual outcomes on the ground and on helping countries emerge from conflict and develop as stable and prosperous nations.

Obviously, the peacebuilding architecture in New York needs to support that reality, and we therefore very much support the co-facilitators' report. It is firmly grounded in reality and, once implemented, should lead to what the co-facilitators envisage as a more relevant, flexible, empowered and better understood Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and, above all, a more ambitious one — more the kind of

Peacebuilding Commission that our own leaders had in mind in 2005. Such an outcome, of course, is in the interests of all Member States.

There are three threads to the report that I would like to touch on quickly today.

The first is the need for stronger partnerships. The report notes, unsurprisingly, that effective peacebuilding must accompany peacekeeping from the very inception. In other words, the planning of peace operations should be seen not as a military task alone, but as one that demands a multitude of voices, combining political, humanitarian and development considerations with the security dimension. Furthermore, adequate resources clearly must be allocated to address those critical activities from the beginning. If left unfunded, these things, of course, have the potential to threaten peace.

The unique composition of the PBC, bringing together engaged Member States, United Nations partners, regional organizations and international financial institutions, is vital to that endeavour. In turn, a closer and more organic relationship between the Security Council and the PBC is essential, and is needed throughout the whole process to ensure that the Council's consideration of a situation provides an avenue through which those disparate voices are heard in the planning of peace operations. That should be done, of course, in close cooperation, as I have said, organically with the PBC.

It is equally important that a strong partnership exist between the international community and the conflict-affected Member State itself. The PBC should be seen as a forum in which the international community listens not only to itself, but also to the country under consideration, to ensure that a true partnership can develop between the two.

Secondly, there is obviously a need for greater flexibility. We need to be cognizant of and able to respond to the rapidly changing political and security context in post-conflict societies. We need to equally balance the need for rapid responses to short-term issues, particularly security issues, against our steady efforts on longer-term goals. The report recommends flexibility in the modes of PBC engagement, tailoring its support to the needs of a particular situation. That does not negate the need for a holistic approach to the peacebuilding challenges in the country as a whole, but

rather it challenges us and the PBC to ensure that its engagement is really adding value.

Thirdly, the need for greater cohesiveness is well understood. The report recommends the use of a single overall planning document around which the national authorities and the international community can coalesce. That will ensure that all actors, national and international, have a shared understanding of all the factors that affect a nation's ability to build a sustainable peace and are able to align their activities to achieve the best outcome. The PBC needs to encourage our collective peacebuilding efforts in support of a single national plan and to ensure that its own activities are equally aligned to the plan.

Our debate today represents only the end of the beginning of our work. We now need to turn to the early implementation of the report's recommendations. To that end, we strongly support the draft resolution (A/65/L.7) — indeed, we could have supported an even stronger resolution — that will be adopted at the end of this meeting and its mechanisms for keeping the process of implementation under annual review.

We welcome the intention of PBC Chairman Ambassador Wittig to shortly convene an in-depth discussion on the way forward in implementing the report's recommendations. We must collectively rise to the challenge of ensuring that we learn the lessons of the past five years, as distilled in this very helpful review, and improve the operation of the peacebuilding architecture to deliver better results for countries emerging from conflict.

To conclude, the report notes that a new approach to peace operations is a challenge that confronts the United Nations as a whole. It calls for a shift in mindset, away from the current predominantly peacekeeping one to a mindset in which peacekeeping is seen as only one part, albeit the most decisive and influential at the beginning, of a broader peacebuilding effort.

I know that we all agree that our key focus needs to be on helping countries emerge from conflict and develop as stable and prosperous nations. We need to let that focus be our guide and shape our New York-based structures accordingly.

Mr. Wittig (Germany): In my capacity as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), I would like to make the following brief remarks.

The Peacebuilding Commission welcomes the action expected today by the General Assembly on the draft resolution contained in document A/65/L.7. I would like to thank the three co-facilitators for their excellent report (A/64/868, annex) and their tireless efforts throughout the consultations and drafting processes.

The draft resolution before the General Assembly today clearly spells out the need to take forward the implementation of the relevant recommendations contained in the report, with the aim of improving the effectiveness of the Commission. The PBC intends to take its role and responsibility in the implementation of the relevant recommendations very seriously. Indeed, the Commission has already taken initial steps in response to a number of issues and challenges reflected in the report. Most recently, the process of engaging Liberia, the fifth country to be placed on the Commission's agenda, represents an important step in that direction.

Furthermore, the PBC intends to convene shortly an in-depth discussion on the way forward in implementing the relevant recommendations. We will rely on our collective wisdom and renewed commitment to ensure that the interests and aspirations of the countries on the Commission's agenda will remain the focus of any future actions.

To that end, we look forward to working closely with the Secretary-General, the United Nations system — the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council — regional organizations, international financial institutions and all relevant stakeholders in the countries on the PBC agenda and beyond.

The 2010 review process has generated political momentum and underscored the evolving prominence of post-conflict peacebuilding at the United Nations. Let us all capitalize on this momentum and move forward with determination and conviction.

Allow me to add some remarks in my national capacity. Germany fully aligns itself with the remarks made by the Permanent Representative of Belgium on behalf of the European Union. As a strong supporter of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, Germany welcomes and commends the most valuable work of the co-facilitators and their excellent report. Germany fully supports the recommendations of the report of the co-facilitators and is committed to

working together with all relevant actors inside and outside the United Nations system in order to take forward their implementation and to increase the effectiveness of the Peacebuilding Commission and its support provided by the Peacebuilding Support Office.

I would like to thank the President of the General Assembly and his Office for convening this important debate today and for presenting the draft resolution, which Germany fully supports. Broad support within the United Nations architecture is important for the future work of the PBC. Only with the approval and support of the Security Council and the General Assembly can the PBC fruitfully continue its work and fully contribute to the peacebuilding mechanisms of the United Nations.

Mr. Adik (India): I would like to thank the President of the General Assembly for convening today's meeting on a topic of importance and significance to all of us. Let me at the outset align my delegation with the statement delivered by my colleague from Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Because of time constraints, I will not read out the full text of my statement, which I have circulated in the Hall. I will refer only to certain parts of my statement.

I wish to begin by echoing the Secretary-General's assertion, in his report last year on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881), wherein he emphasized the imperative of national ownership and the anchoring of international peacebuilding efforts at the host-country level. My delegation recognizes the importance of post-conflict peacebuilding as the foundation for building sustainable peace, security and development in the aftermath of conflict.

Sustainable peacebuilding requires an integrated approach with coherence among activities in the realms of politics, security, development, human rights and the rule of law. Security clearly is the key peacebuilding pillar. Capacity-building also assumes significance, especially in instances where countries find it difficult to completely utilize the financial assistance they have been provided. It is equally important to focus on building economic opportunity, particularly for young people, along with political and social stability. Unemployment among the young is a major factor in the perpetuation of the underlying causes of conflict.

Economic revitalization and economic opportunity, especially among the young, are crucial in achieving sustainable peace and security.

Another key issue is that of financing. Let us be clear and acknowledge the fact that the lack of funding continues to be a major impediment to the success of peacebuilding initiatives. It goes without saying that other elements, such as human resources and technical assistance through the provision of appropriate technologies, are important as well.

Given the sensitivities of such peacebuilding tasks as security sector reform and development administration, a high degree of coordination within the United Nations is desirable. Work in the country-specific configurations has been a positive dimension. My delegation is therefore of the view that the international community, acting through the instrumentality of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), must always strive to ensure that there is a two-way dialogue between countries on the agenda of the PBC and the Commission. Of particular importance are consultations with troop- and police-contributing countries, both individually and through the instrumentality of the PBC, while formulating and revising mandates of United Nations missions.

Ever since the creation of the PBC in December 2005, India, as a member of the Organizational Committee, has engaged itself constructively with the work of the PBC. We have contributed to the Peacebuilding Fund in the spirit of supporting the Fund in achieving its task as mandated by the General Assembly and the Security Council. Further, we are of the view that the Fund should act as a catalyst for good governance. In this regard, we note with approval the creation of the Senior Advisory Group for the Review of International Civilian Capacities in fulfilment of the agenda for action outlined by the Secretary-General in his 2009 report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict.

My delegation is of the view that the international community, acting through the instrumentality of the PBC, must always strive to ensure that there is effective two-way dialogue between countries on the agenda of the PBC and the Commission itself. In this regard, it is important that the ongoing review reorient the existing peacebuilding architecture in order to enable the Organizational Committee and the PBC to play a more decisive role in formulating the

Commission's approach to post-conflict situations. Also, the country-specific configurations must not run ahead of national Governments in setting targets. National needs rather than normative prescriptions should determine peacebuilding priorities.

A mechanism should be devised to incorporate the wealth of experience that is available with the troops on the ground. No effort should be spared that might enrich the peacebuilding process in a post-conflict society. To maximize the peace dividend through peacebuilding and peacekeeping, it is necessary that mandates be mindful of the specificities on the ground. The Commission and the Organizational Committee should play an important role in this regard.

It is neither possible nor desirable to transplant models specific to one region to another context. The international community must not be unduly eager for a standard implementation to bring peace in a hurry. Sustainable peace has to be earned diligently, empathetically and inclusively. In that regard, regional and subregional approaches to crisis situations have great relevance while peacekeeping and peacebuilding mandates are being worked out at the United Nations. We believe that the peacebuilding architecture must institutionalize structures and processes to that end.

To assist the Peacebuilding Commission in carrying out the task under its mandate as an intergovernmental advisory body, it is incumbent upon all organs of the peacebuilding architecture, such as the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, to work in a coordinated and coherent manner. The Commission should not merely advise States on post-conflict peace consolidation but should rather help with the efficient harnessing of international expertise.

We must be cognizant of the fact that peacebuilding is still a concept in its infancy and is continuously evolving. The international community has taken the idea of peacebuilding on board in order to fulfil the important need of handling post-conflict situations. It is therefore imperative that we ensure that the institutions that constitute the peacebuilding architecture and peacebuilding itself are successful.

In conclusion, let me share India's unique nation-building expertise in wide-ranging and diverse settings. We have strived for a better life for our people. In the process, we as a nation have acquired capacities relevant to development and peacebuilding. We have

shared our experience with a number of countries making the transition from conflict to peace. We will continue to make our abilities available to countries in post-conflict situations and cooperate with the United Nations in its peacebuilding endeavours.

Mr. Parham (United Kingdom): I would first like to thank the President for organizing today's debate, which, along with the adoption of the draft resolution we have before us (A/65/L.7), marks an important stage in our efforts to improve the impact of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Like others before me, I would like to offer my particular thanks to the three co-facilitators for their tireless efforts in undertaking the review. The review report (A/65/868, annex) provides some useful recommendations that will sharpen the work of the Commission. I would like to highlight in particular those recommendations relating to the Commission's country-specific work. An emphasis on better analysis and a focus on the key bottlenecks to peace in a specific country and on establishing mutual commitments between the Government and the international community on how best to unblock the bottlenecks will put the Commission in much better standing for achieving results.

So too will the proposals for the Commission to take a flexible approach to its country work and the potential for the Commission's work to be chaired by a country rather than by an individual. Those proposals will also help sharpen the Commission's advice to the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. We also support efforts to forge a much more dynamic relationship between the Security Council and the Commission.

But the report is not the end of the process. We must now move quickly to the next stage of bringing these recommendations forward and ensuring that the Commission makes a real difference on the ground.

There are big challenges to be met in the coming months. In practical terms, we need to see genuine progress on issues like security sector reform in Guinea-Bissau; the elections and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration in the Central African Republic; and strengthening of the rule of law and security sector reform in Liberia. We hope that, by demonstrating results, the Commission will become a much more sought after and influential body, engaging effectively in countries on its agenda.

When we meet here again in five years' time following the next review, we shall judge ourselves against these kinds of benchmarks. The United Kingdom reiterates its firm commitment to help ensure that we do.

Mr. Pankin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation supports the work of the Peacebuilding Commission as an important instrument for enhancing effectiveness and strengthening the coordination of cooperation in international peacekeeping activities in post-conflict States with the participation of international financial institutions, while complying with the main prerogatives of the main bodies of the Organization, in particular the Security Council.

We think that the review of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission that has been conducted this year will make it possible for us to continue work on further improving and enhancing the impact of the work of the Commission. We think that the fact of conducting this review has already led to increased interest and attention to the peacebuilding efforts of the United Nations and the work of the Commission in particular, which is something that is very positive.

We would like to thank the co-facilitators of the process of reviewing the Peacebuilding Support Office, namely the Permanent Representatives of Mexico, Ireland and South Africa, for preparing the report (A/64/838, annex). The report highlights a host of problems that the Commission encounters in its work. What is important is that it confirms the advisory and coordinating function of the Commission and the primacy of the principle of national responsibility and the priority of strengthening the national capacity of countries that find themselves in the post-conflict phase of their development.

Many of the proposals contained in the report prepared by the co-facilitators deserve to be supported. However, they need to be examined in detail, along with the appropriate bodies of the United Nations on the basis of their competence and mandates, before implementing the proposals, if indeed they are found to be acceptable. That is what the draft resolution before us urges us to do. We are ready to adopt it..

Mr. Barton (United States of America): The United States of America would like to thank our colleagues from Ireland, Mexico and South Africa for

their fine work. We welcome their comprehensive report (A/64/838, annex).

The review of the Peacebuilding Commission provides many important recommendations on how to move peacebuilding forward, from greater coordination between New York, the field and the United Nations system overall to how to truly incorporate gender into ways to build national ownership. The United States strongly supports the Peacebuilding Commission's work and this review, as promoting sustainable peace lies at the heart of the United Nations mission.

Former Secretary-General Annan used to speak of the missing middle between peacekeeping and sustainable development. The Commission is striving to meet that commitment by linking ambitions in New York with programmes in the field, coordinating better with international institutions, running programmes and assessing needs in post-conflict countries. The Commission should encourage actors to support coherence in the field through more inclusive dialogue, greater innovation, stronger best practices and better resource delivery and capacity-building. We urge the Commission to more systematically and substantively engage women in peacemaking and post-conflict planning processes and to commit to implementing the action plan proposed in the Secretary-General's report on women's participation in peacebuilding (A/65/354).

In the end, the success of peacebuilding depends on leadership from the country emerging from conflict itself and on its own leaders and communities. The United Nations must make that its top priority.

The Peacebuilding Commission review marks an important milestone as we all assess the role that the Commission — and the United Nations as a whole — can and should play in helping post-conflict societies find their footing on the path to lasting peace and prosperity.

Mr. Travers (Canada): Draft resolution A/65/L.7, which is now before the General Assembly, and the draft resolution that will be presented in the Security Council later today demonstrate the commitment in both bodies to strengthening the United Nations contribution to peacebuilding. The two draft resolutions also represent an important reaffirmation of the role that the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) can and should play within the United Nations.

Canada welcomes the co-facilitators' report on the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (A/64/868, annex). The co-facilitators have made a major contribution by detailing the way forward, and must be commended for their unflagging efforts. Equally important, the comprehensive and inclusive nature of the review process has created much-needed momentum towards an increasingly effective United Nations peacebuilding architecture. While Canada commends the consensus that the review has built, the real test now lies with the implementation of its concrete recommendations. In this light, allow me to briefly speak to four areas that deserve particular attention.

First, Canada endorses the report's assessment that the PBC needs to maintain a flexible, multitiered approach. The country configuration model has proved to be an effective means of engaging with countries recovering from conflict. The inclusion of Liberia on the Peacebuilding Commission's agenda not only demonstrates progress but also further underscores the need to adjust to each post-conflict context. The Commission must continue to innovate in this manner, including by adopting lighter forms of engagement. This will allow greater flexibility in its responses to particular needs and at different points in the peacebuilding process.

Secondly, Canada stresses the importance of closer cooperation with field-level peacebuilding. The Commission's engagement must be aligned with existing national strategies and be complementary to the work of relevant peacebuilding actors on the ground. In this respect, Canada welcomes proposals to more effectively draw on the national resources available within the full membership of the country configurations.

Thirdly, the proliferation of peacebuilding actors reinforces the need for a thematic focal point to bring coherence to broader peacebuilding efforts. The Peacebuilding Commission can productively enhance its role as a forum for supporting reform processes, sharing best practices and debating outstanding institutional challenges. This will require an increased willingness to draw on expertise resident within the wider peacebuilding community. As its experience builds, the Commission will also be better placed to systematize the lessons learned from its own work.

Finally, the Commission must continue to develop stronger partnerships with other peacebuilding actors, including regional organizations, the international financial institutions and civil society. This is also true within the United Nations, where there is an enduring need for closer relationships with the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council. In our view, enhanced cooperation between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission holds particular promise. A more effective working relationship between the two bodies, based on a clearer mutual understanding of the Commission's role and increased use of informal linkages, should be explored.

(spoke in French)

Canada welcomes the conclusion of the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. Now the hard work begins. Canada encourages all relevant United Nations actors to move forward on the recommendations of the review. In particular, Canada looks to the Peacebuilding Commission to work closely with actors in the field, to adopt a more flexible, multitiered approach and to focus greater attention on its potential thematic role within the United Nations system. Canada stands ready to play an active part in advancing this agenda.

Mr. Chabi (Morocco) *(spoke in French)*: My delegation would like to commend the President of the General Assembly on his facilitating role in negotiating the draft resolution under consideration by the Assembly today (A/65/L.7). We also wish to strongly commend Ms. Judy Cheng Hopkins and the Peacebuilding Support Office for their excellent management of that important area of United Nations work.

While we align ourselves with the statement made by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, my delegation would like to make the following additional points.

The challenges of peacekeeping and peacebuilding are permanent. The international community must realize in concrete terms and through a coordinated response the principle of collective security. In that context, the Kingdom of Morocco, as a member of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), underlines the importance of enhancing the Commission's role and of taking measures to bolster its

structural, organizational and operational effectiveness, including by financing the Peacebuilding Fund.

We note with interest the content of the co-facilitators' report on the review of the peacekeeping architecture (A/64/868, annex). The report's recommendations deserve serious attention, especially those relating to the coordination of local and international actors, the financial and qualitative strengthening of the Support Office within the Secretariat and the creation of new cooperative dynamics between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission.

Five years after the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission, which stirred a lot of enthusiasm in the international community, much has been accomplished in this area, despite the lack of means. Peacebuilding occupies a special place in the United Nations agenda. Moreover, activities in its sphere are bound to intensify, especially in the light of the increased role of civil society in peacekeeping. As a result, the clothes designed for the Peacebuilding Commission five years ago have grown too tight, if I may use that figure of speech. For that reason we should re-examine the parameters of our global approach to peacebuilding.

On the operational front, the Peacebuilding Commission will gain efficacy by two principal measures: tightening the link between the Organizational Committee and the country-specific configurations and improving the functioning of the country-specific configurations. The Organizational Committee should thus continue to focus primarily on strategic questions and on expanding partnerships within and outside the United Nations. On the matter of the country-specific configurations, it is important for them to include a strong national component so as to increase ownership and permit a smooth transition from the United Nations mandate to the host country taking charge of the primary sectors. The establishment on the ground of country-specific configuration liaison committees will allow better interaction among members of the Commission, the host country and the Peacebuilding Support Office.

The Peacebuilding Commission is struggling to find its bearings within the United Nations peace and security architecture. The links it has developed with the principal organs of the United Nations — the General Assembly, the Security Council and the

Economic and Social Council — remain notably weak. We must enhance the Commission's interactions with those bodies and clear the way for balanced relationships, especially with the Security Council, which is charged by the Charter with matters that threaten international peace and security. That requires integrating a regional perspective in the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, notably through a strategic dialogue with the Community of West African States and the countries of the Mano River Union.

The Peacebuilding Support Office plays a leading role in the implementation of integrated peacebuilding strategies. Given the diversification of the agenda of the PBC and in order to maintain the quality of the work of the Office, it is important to provide it with the necessary human, financial and operational resources. It is also important to increase the cooperation between the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations in order to develop strategic platforms in peacebuilding.

It is well known that the prevention of conflicts and the development of United Nations capacities in the fields of early warning, mediation and the peaceful settlement of disputes could contribute to significantly reducing the horrors of conflicts. Peacebuilding, as an instrument for change and resolving conflicts, has an important preventive dimension that we should take advantage of. That goal can only be achieved if we take full stock of the collective nature of this challenge and of the minimal cost of peacebuilding as compared to the cost of dealing with conflicts.

A Chinese saying has it that the best is the enemy of the good. The Peacebuilding Commission is an excellent instrument that could be improved but that plays an important role in the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. Collectively, it is up to us to improve its effectiveness, expand its interactions with the other main United Nations organs and diversify its partnerships.

Mr. Kim Bonghyun (Republic of Korea): At the outset, I would like to express my delegation's support for the adoption of draft resolution A/65/L.7. I would also like to take this opportunity to join other members in commending the work of the co-facilitators and their extensive and in-depth report (A/64/868, annex) on the review of the United Nations peacebuilding

architecture. We take note of the many valuable observations and recommendations it contains.

As mentioned in the report, peacebuilding is a complicated process that takes time. However, this simple truth should not hinder the concerted efforts that are being made towards the realization of peace in the aftermath of conflict. In that regard, I am glad to note that the report clearly states that effective peacebuilding must not follow peacekeeping operations, but accompany them from their inception. The task ahead will be to come up with an effective organizational approach that complements and further enhances the role of both peacekeeping and peacebuilding. In addition, my delegation shares the view that coordination and coherence among the various United Nations bodies and organizations, especially with the Security Council, is a key element in effectively carrying out peacebuilding initiatives. Promoting more structured interaction with other institutions, such as the World Bank and regional organizations, is also of crucial importance.

With regard to the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), we underscore the call for the strengthening of the Office in order for it to adequately perform its mandated role. It is indeed unfortunate that there are only 41 posts in the PBSO, of which about 70 per cent are either temporary, seconded or extrabudgetary posts or funded by the Peacebuilding Fund.

As stressed in draft resolution A/65/L.7, my delegation hopes that the relevant United Nations actors will take forward the appropriate recommendations contained in the review report. The task ahead is to streamline the various recommendations with a realistic goal in mind. We hope that members will henceforth be able to engage in productive discussions on priorities and, in turn, implement the urgent recommendations in an expeditious manner. To that end, the Republic of Korea will strive to render its constructive support.

Mr. Sefue (United Republic of Tanzania): I should like to begin by expressing our gratitude to the Permanent Representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa for facilitating this important review on behalf of the entire membership of the United Nations. We commend them for their hard work and for engaging and consulting with a wide range of interlocutors, within and outside the United Nations system. The present report (A/64/868, annex) and its

recommendations have therefore benefited from the kind of comprehensive and inclusive approach we have always called for.

We would like also to extend our deepest appreciation to the President and to Uganda for their leadership and efforts in negotiating draft resolution A/65/L.7 with a view to its adoption by both the General Assembly and the Security Council today.

My delegation aligns itself with the statement read out by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. As co-chair with Denmark in facilitating the negotiation of the resolutions that established the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in 2006, I want to say how happy we are to witness the adoption of the report (A/64/868, annex) on the review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission and architecture and today's draft resolution by both the General Assembly and the Security Council.

The Peacebuilding Commission is a relatively recent addition to the United Nations family. Yet, it embodies the hopes of many and bears a unique legitimacy and authority from both the General Assembly and the Security Council. This dual blessing gives the PBC a strong mandate, which we are all being called upon to support if it is to deliver according to our expectations — especially those of the people who count on us to help them build on and sustain their newly found peace.

It is in that regard that my delegation welcomes the report presented by the co-facilitators, entitled "Review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture". As I said earlier, that report is based on extensive consultations within the United Nations membership and with other stakeholders. Likewise, my delegation welcomes the upcoming adoption of the draft resolution by the General Assembly, which reaffirms the importance of the peacebuilding work carried out by the United Nations and the role of the PBC in addressing the needs of countries emerging from conflict and nurturing them towards sustainable and irreversible peace. In adopting the draft resolution, we will be making the necessary commitment towards the implementation of the final recommendations of the review process and reaffirming our readiness to develop the United Nations peacebuilding architecture with the Peacebuilding Commission at its centre.

My delegation recognizes the important role and the central task of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission in implementing the draft resolution and the recommendations of the review process. Looking forward, we would like to emphasize the following three goals we envisage for them.

The first goal is to prevent a relapse into conflict by working with the people in addressing the root or structural causes of a previous conflict in a given country, in collaboration with other organs in the United Nations system and regional organizations.

The second goal is to achieve national ownership of the peacebuilding process, which should be emphasized in the PBC at Headquarters in New York and in country configurations. National ownership should include the participation of other national stakeholders, such as national parliamentarians and relevant civil society organizations. Women and youth must be part of that process.

The third goal is to achieve a clear relationship between the Peacebuilding Fund and the PBC as a non-operational entity. That could be achieved if the decision-making procedures regarding disbursement, targeting and implementing partners were clearly defined to permit timely and effective funding interventions. Flexibility should also be exercised in the interpretation of the non-operational role of the PBC, as situations vary from one country to another and the PBC's presence on the ground remains periodic and diffused.

Tanzania welcomes a consensus adoption of today's draft resolution and looks forward to the successful implementation of the recommendations of the review report. The United Nations cannot impose lasting peace on a people. It is the people themselves who can ensure that the seeds of peace germinate, take root, grow and thrive through an inclusive and participatory process that must involve women and youth. Our duty is always to be there, lending a helping hand and nurturing a tree of peace that is suitable and specific to each situation. For many years, the United Nations developed the capacity and competence to put out the fires of conflict. Now we must develop the capacity, the system-wide competence and the wherewithal to build peace and prevent the recurrence of conflict. As always, Tanzania stands ready to do its part and pledges its full support to the PBC in New

York and at the country level in the process of implementing the recommendations.

Mr. Wang Min (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to thank the President for convening today's meeting.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) marked an important milestone in the reform of the United Nations. The current five-year review is clearly significant in taking stock of the PBC's work, drawing on lessons learned and strengthening the role of the Commission. We express our appreciation to the co-facilitators, namely, the Permanent Representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa, for their fine work. We also wish to thank President Deiss and Ambassador Rugunda, Permanent Representative of Uganda, who holds the rotating presidency of the Security Council for this month, for their efforts to facilitate reaching consensus on the outcome of the review among the parties concerned.

Over the past five years, the PBC has achieved much in its work, but it still faces numerous challenges. There is therefore still room for improvement in its work. The report on the review (A/64/868, annex) made many useful recommendations that merit thorough consideration by Member States and relevant agencies. Today, I would like to emphasize the following four points.

First, the country in question is primarily responsible for post-conflict peacebuilding in that country. All stakeholders should fully respect country ownership. All assistance should therefore be focused on capacity-building and providing the necessary resources and support. The international community and the United Nations, including the Peacebuilding Commission, mainly have the task of providing recommendations and assistance, rather than of substituting for the efforts of the country in question. In developing national peacebuilding strategies, we should fully take into account the views of the country in question and respect the priorities that it has identified.

Secondly, peacebuilding requires unanimity. The relevant international agencies and regional organizations should take an integrated approach to enhancing coordination, synergy and efficiency. The PBC should work harder to set straight its relations with other major United Nations agencies, while bringing into play its unique influence and promoting

both the separate roles of and coordination among the PBC, the World Bank and regional organizations in the areas of peacebuilding.

Thirdly, the PBC should improve its working methods and increase the efficiency of the Organizational Committee and the meetings of country-specific configurations. We support the PBC in strengthening its relations with the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, in accordance with the mandates of the General Assembly and the Council, and in making more targeted recommendations on peacebuilding.

Fourthly, it is necessary to find a prompt solution to the current difficulties in mobilizing financial resources for peacebuilding. While it is important to develop viable peacebuilding development strategies, the crux should be to mobilize greater financial support for post-conflict peacebuilding efforts by the countries in question. The PBC could play a greater coordinating role by integrating bilateral and multilateral funding sources and facilitating the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and other financial institutions making larger contributions. China calls on more countries to contribute to the Peacebuilding Fund, while also hoping that the Fund will continue to improve its work and increase its supervision and, consequently, its efficiency in resource utilization.

China has always supported the United Nations in playing a crucial role in peacebuilding and the work of the PBC. We are confident that the current five-year review on the work of the PBC will provide a new starting point for improving the PBC's work and enhancing its efficiency and role.

Mr. Wolfe (Jamaica): Let me start by thanking the co-facilitators for producing a very comprehensive and analytical report on the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (A/64/868, annex). Their assessments and recommendations for the future enhancement of United Nations engagement in the area of peacebuilding are critical as we move forward.

Allow me also to thank the President for convening this debate within the General Assembly. Indeed, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is a creation of both the Security Council and the General Assembly. It is therefore fitting that the wider United Nations membership is also able to provide an assessment of the report and of the functions of the

peacebuilding architecture five years after its establishment.

As one of the original members of the PBC, Jamaica is committed to a strengthened and enhanced PBC that is able to fulfil the vision and hopes vested in it five years ago by Member States and the five countries currently on the PBC agenda.

Jamaica associates itself with the statement delivered earlier by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. As time does not allow for a detailed presentation of our views, I will limit my focus to three main areas: first, the role of the Organizational Committee; secondly, the place of the PBC within the Secretariat; and, thirdly, the development dimension of peacebuilding activities.

First, allow me to make a brief comment on the issue of national ownership. Jamaica agrees that national ownership of the peacebuilding process is the main element for success in the area of peacebuilding. National ownership begins with the respective Governments being able to have significant input in developing peacebuilding strategies, including in the respective strategic framework documents. We cannot continue to pay lip service to that key principle in the context of peacebuilding or any other area of activity. National ownership also necessitates that all segments of the community be allowed to shape the future of the respective countries.

While the report takes note of the important contribution to be made by women and civil society and the shortcomings of the PBC in that area to date, we would have liked to see more substantive recommendations on involving all segments of society of the countries on the PBC agenda.

We have taken due note of the recommendations of the co-facilitators in the area of capacity-building, which is an essential element of national ownership. At the same time, however, more substantive recommendations on measures to improve national ownership of the peacebuilding process would have been important in entrenching this element in the Commission's activities.

Another key issue is that of an exit strategy for the PBC with respect to the countries on its agenda. As we have noted, that issue has been given substantive treatment in the report. This is an area in which national ownership is very critical. Countries on the

PBC agenda must have a significant say in determining the benchmarks for success on the path towards sustainable growth and development.

The distance between New York and the countries on the PBC's agenda will always pose a problem and a challenge. To that end, we see potential in establishing a PBC-focused body at the local level. At the same time, however, that should not serve as a substitute for full engagement between the membership in New York and the Government representatives on the ground. We would therefore encourage the increased use of modern technology, specifically video-conferencing, as a means of ensuring a constant level of engagement. At the same time, however, there is no substitute for face-to-face engagement and interaction. We would therefore encourage, to the extent possible, increased field visits by the PBC to the countries on its agenda, which should be funded through the Peacebuilding Support Office.

Let me now make a few comments on the role of the Organizational Committee. Jamaica shares the view that the PBC Organizational Committee has been relegated to a peripheral role. A strengthened and enhanced PBC requires a more proactive role for that body. We also firmly believe that in its capacity as committee of the whole, the Organizational Committee on the PBC should hold quarterly meetings with all chairs of the country-specific configurations and the general membership to review benchmark targets, challenges faced and the progress achieved on the ground in all of the countries under consideration. That will be useful especially for smaller delegations that are members of the PBC. We believe that such quarterly interactions by the committee of the whole are critical to ensuring that a comprehensive, real-time understanding and review of the work under way in the countries on the PBC agenda is taking place.

The recommendation to hold meetings of the Organizational Committee on thematic issues is an interesting dimension that merits further consideration. We have also taken note of the co-facilitators' decision not to reopen discussions on membership. Dare I say, I fully understand the reasons. However, while we respect that decision of the co-facilitators, as more countries are placed on the Commission's agenda — and I think this was mentioned in the statements of the representatives of Morocco and Tanzania — the ability of the limited membership of 31 States is a question that must be squarely confronted. From Jamaica's

perspective, consideration must be given in particular to expanding the membership from the General Assembly category. For a majority of Member States, like my own country, the General Assembly category is the only means by which membership on the PBC is currently accessible.

With respect to the place of the PBC within the Secretariat, there is general recognition among the membership of the importance of the peacebuilding function to the overarching goals of international peace and security. Jamaica fully shares the views expressed in the report that the PBC and the Peacebuilding Support Office must become a resource centre for generating knowledge and interest on a broad range of issues that impact peacebuilding activities.

In order to generate the necessary buy-in and give greater prominence to the Organization's peacebuilding activities in the field and among Member States, it must begin to be streamlined throughout the entire gamut of United Nations activities. Peacebuilding activities are not and cannot be undertaken in a vacuum, removed from other aspects of the Organization's work. Delivering as a whole is critical to generating real change on the ground. The only sure means to accomplish that is by ensuring that peacebuilding is viewed as a top priority. Political support and a record of achievements are critical factors to achieving this end.

The debate concerning the place of the PBC within the Organization is an important one. Has the PBC carved out a place for itself, or must it be accorded a level of prominence within the Organization? For the PBC to achieve its goals, both must take place simultaneously. In that regard, we fully agree with the need not only to strengthen the role of the Organizational Committee and enable it to further enhance its relationships with all other relevant bodies including the Economic and Social Council, Security Council and General Assembly, but to strengthen as well the capacities of the Peacebuilding Support Office to support its varied functions.

Let me quickly move to the development dimension of peacebuilding activities. Since the inception of its membership of the PBC, Jamaica has continued to advocate for a greater focus on the development dimension of post-conflict peacebuilding. We are therefore heartened to note the substantive focus placed to this aspect in the report and we

commend the co-facilitators in that regard. It is a generally understood maxim that there is no peace without development and no development without peace.

As the PBC moves forward to assist the five countries currently on its agenda, and possibly future countries, the development dimension must become more central to peacebuilding activities on the ground from the outset of the PBC's engagement. In order to ensure that this is the case, peacebuilding funds must of necessity be more flexible. Moreover, the existing gap between the commitment of funds and disbursement on the ground to ensure timely implementation of quick-impact projects needs to be urgently addressed. In that regard, we believe that the PBC, through its Organizational Committee acting as interlocutor between the donor community and the Governments of the countries under consideration, can play a very useful role. We agree with the conclusion that there must be a balance between the concerns of the donor community and the day-to-day needs on the ground in post-conflict environments. This is perhaps one of the potential areas of focus for the PBC.

In conclusion, as with any review process, the true test will be realized in the implementation of the recommendations, both on the ground and here in New York. We cannot allow the five-year review to simply be relegated to an academic exercise to simply satisfy a mandate contained in the founding resolutions.

Finally, leadership from all will therefore be critical. The Secretary-General and the PBC's parent bodies, the Security Council, in particular its five permanent members, and the General Assembly must demonstrate their commitment to peacebuilding activities and the PBC and ensure that, to the extent possible, the recommendations are implemented.

Mrs. Dunlop (Brazil): I would like to thank the President for convening this meeting and for the elaboration of the draft resolution that the Assembly will adopt today (A/65/L.7). I would also like to thank the co-facilitators of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) review process for the work they have undertaken. Their report (A/64/868, annex) is rich and comprehensive, although more could have been said about the work of the country-specific configurations. For example, the document would have certainly benefited from visits to the countries on the PBC's agenda. As I said, however, it is a good report, for

which we are grateful to the co-facilitators. The document presents valid and thoughtful recommendations, which we support in general. My delegation also supports draft resolution A/65/L.7.

We believe, however, that the process followed in the consideration of the report and the negotiation of the draft resolution could have allowed for an open debate, especially in the Organizational Committee. We also believe that an entity of the United Nations system under review must be given the opportunity to give its views to the decision-making bodies. It is our opinion that, given the wide support enjoyed by the recommendations, transparency and participation would have caused neither undue delay nor major disagreement among Member States. We hope and expect that this will remain a regrettable exception. Brazil looks forward to an active and participatory consideration of the implementation of the recommendations by the respective organs.

Mr. Sial (Pakistan): Pakistan aligns itself with the statement delivered by the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. Pakistan attaches great importance to the review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). We value the work done by the co-facilitators. Their report (A/64/868, annex) is based on oral and written statements contributed by Member States. Pakistan remained engaged with the review process and also contributed a written proposal.

In the five years since the 2005 World Summit, which established the PBC, the world has realized the importance of peacebuilding efforts. The five-year review of the PBC is a testimony to our collective commitment to refine and improve peacebuilding strategies based on important lessons learned, in a spirit of introspection. The report of the co-facilitators has rightly underscored the complexities of peacebuilding. These complexities stem mainly from constructing a consensus narrative on peacebuilding at the global level.

The concept of peacebuilding is relatively new and the international community is still creating templates for successful peacebuilding strategies. Expectations of quick dividends and the process of finding the right balance between national ownership and donors' agendas further augment the complexity. The peacebuilding architecture can address these

complexities by optimizing the interplay of various actors inside and outside the United Nations.

The report has also analysed the relationship between the peacekeeping and peacebuilding fields and how a dynamic mix can prevent relapse into conflict. The report has rightly argued that peacebuilding and peacekeeping must accompany each other from the inception of a mission. This approach requires more coordinated assessment and planning of peacebuilding and peacekeeping activities. Important milestones have already been reached in synergizing the two fields. Today, 10 out of 16 peacekeeping missions have peacebuilding components. The Peacebuilding Commission, with the unique composition of its Organizational Committee, is an ideal interface of peacekeeping and peacebuilding fields. In that context, I would like to underline the point that the equitable representation that exists among membership categories of the PBC must be preserved in the interest of closer coordination.

Pakistan supports draft resolution A/65/L.7 on the review of the peacebuilding architecture. We are happy to join the consensus on its adoption.

Mr. Touray (Sierra Leone): I would first of all like to express our appreciation to the President of the General Assembly for convening this important debate on the review of the peacebuilding architecture. It is a pleasure to make a statement on the review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) conducted in accordance with resolution 60/180, as set out in the annex to document A/64/868, which is based on extensive consultations with the United Nations membership and other stakeholders. I would like to express our appreciation and thanks to the co-facilitators, namely, the Permanent Representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa.

We wholeheartedly align ourselves with the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Malawi on behalf of the Group of African States.

The path to sustainable peace following violent conflict is an immense challenge that requires the collective and sustained effort of the international community and local stakeholders. The creation of the Peacebuilding Commission in 2005 during the sixtieth session of the General Assembly is therefore not only very relevant in coordinating and supporting programmes aimed at preventing a relapse into

conflict, but also a laudable initiative by the United Nations.

As stated in former Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali's Agenda for Peace, issued in 1992, peacebuilding largely involves "action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict" (A/47/277, para. 21). It therefore becomes imperative to achieve security and an end to hostilities, on the one hand, and, on the other, to engage in the parallel longer-term process of consolidating peace — by reconciling people and groups and reforming or rebuilding institutions, structures and economies — to diminish the possibility of a violent relapse.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund — as well as the selection of Sierra Leone and Burundi as the first two countries, together with Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic, and now our sister Republic of Liberia, on the peacebuilding agenda — has raised high expectations for peacebuilding. As highlighted in draft resolution A/65/L.7, the peacebuilding work of the United Nations requires sustained support and adequate resources to meet challenges. The comprehensive review of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission is very crucial in determining lapses and progress made and what is required to achieve its mandate.

As noted in the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council contained in document S/2010/471, a delegation of the Peacebuilding Commission visited Sierra Leone in March 2010. It recognized the progress made since the end of the war and cited our experience as a successful example of multilateral peacebuilding. The PBC delegation also reported that significant challenges remained to be addressed before Sierra Leone could fully realize its long-term sustainable development aspirations. International support for overcoming the remaining obstacles is therefore very vital, and more so as we get closer to the 2012 elections.

On 28 September 2010, my delegation submitted to the PBC a joint progress report on the implementation of the Sierra Leone Government's Agenda for Change. The report, jointly prepared by the Government in full collaboration with its international partners and civil society, acknowledges the steady progress made in the implementation of the Agenda for Change, but equally pointed out serious gaps and challenges owing mainly to the lack of funding and the need to address capacity constraints. Key among the many outstanding issues that require immediate attention are youth unemployment, implementation of the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, drug trafficking and transnational organized crime, support to the electoral process and advancing good governance reform.

The Sierra Leone Government's Agenda for Change second poverty-reduction strategy paper was prepared and adopted and is now being implemented through inclusive, broad-based and comprehensive consultations and participation. It received endorsement by the Peacebuilding Commission in June 2009. At that historic meeting, the Commission also called upon its member States and all development partners to accept the Agenda for Change as the core strategy document for Sierra Leone. There is no doubt that this implied the compelling need for the international community and development partners to support the implementation of the Agenda with sufficient resources. While my delegation continues to express its appreciation to the United Nations and our development partners for support to the implementation of the Agenda for Change, it is regrettable that the Sierra Leone Multi-Donor Trust Fund is yet to receive the level of support envisaged when it was launched. To date, only the Government of Canada has contributed to the Trust Fund.

My delegation wholeheartedly agrees with and supports the conclusions and recommendations of the peacebuilding review, including the draft resolution for its implementation.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.