

Member States or assuming powers” that could be considered an “usurpation” of the Assembly’s competencies.²³

The President (Denmark) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁴ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its commitment to the Charter of United Nations and international law; underscored its conviction that international law plays a critical role in fostering stability and order in international relations and in providing a framework for cooperation among States in addressing common challenges, thus contributing to the maintenance of international peace and security;

²³ S/PV.5474 (Resumption 1), p. 16.

²⁴ S/PRST/2006/28.

Emphasized the important role of the International Court of Justice, the principal judicial organ of United Nations, in adjudicating disputes among States;

Attached vital importance to promoting justice and the rule of law; supported the idea of establishing a rule of law assistance unit within the Secretariat and looked forward to receiving the proposals of the Secretariat for implementation of the recommendations set out in paragraph 65 of the report of the Secretary-General on the rule of law and transitional justice in conflict and post-conflict societies;²⁰

Emphasized the responsibility of States to comply with their obligations to end impunity and to prosecute those responsible for genocide, crimes against humanity and serious violations of international humanitarian law;

Considered sanctions an important tool in the maintenance and restoration of international peace and security; and resolved to ensure that sanctions were carefully targeted in support of clear objectives and implemented in ways that balance effectiveness against possible adverse consequences.

52. Post-conflict peacebuilding

Initial proceedings

Decision of 26 May 2005 (5187th meeting): statement by the President

At its 5187th meeting, on 26 May 2005, the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled “Post-conflict peacebuilding” and a letter dated 16 May 2005 from the representative of Denmark to the Secretary-General,¹ transmitting a discussion paper for the open debate on the item.

Statements were made by all members of the Council and the Deputy Secretary-General, the President of the World Bank and the representatives of Australia, Chile, Côte d’Ivoire, Egypt, Ghana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Luxembourg (on behalf of the European Union),² Malaysia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, Switzerland and Ukraine.³

¹ S/2005/316.

² Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine aligned themselves with the statement.

³ The representative of Sweden was invited to participate but did not make a statement.

In his statement, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Denmark elaborated on some aspects of the discussion paper submitted by his country. He referred to the nexus between security and development, issues which had both to be addressed in order to build lasting peace. He saw the greatest danger of insufficient efforts in the post-crisis phase, particularly in Africa, resulting in a relapse into conflict. He said this danger could best be reduced through action in three different fields. First, in the policy field, local ownership must be ensured since the country in question and its people carried the main responsibility for their future, and a regional perspective was indispensable to address the specifics of a conflict. He therefore welcomed and encouraged the development by which regional organizations were taking on continuously greater responsibilities. Turning to the institutional field, he called for more coordination and better knowledge management between the different United Nations actors at Headquarters and in the field. Lastly, he emphasized that ensuring long-term funding was equally indispensable for successful peacebuilding.⁴

The Deputy Secretary-General said that it was essential for the United Nations to improve upon its strategies for ending wars by also tackling the question

⁴ S/PV.5187, pp. 2-4.

of relapse, as almost half of all wars that came to an end relapsed into violence. She stressed that it was important to ensure that peace agreements were implemented in a sustainable manner. Besides the aspects addressed by the representative of Denmark such as national ownership, a coherent United Nations approach and resource issues, she called for the involvement of international financial institutions and bilateral donors. She stated that the proposed Peacebuilding Commission would fill a gap within the United Nations system and focus attention on the vital task of peacebuilding and harmonize peacebuilding activity across the multilateral system.⁵

The Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand pointed to the importance of long-term commitment if peacebuilding was to be successful. He also touched upon the need for flexibility, economic progress, cultural sensitivity including local ownership and the role of civil society. He welcomed the evolving practice of the Council to mandate “complex” missions which encompassed policing, legal, human rights, governance and development components. In a proposed Peacebuilding Commission he saw a much-needed forum to achieve greater strategic and institutional coherence.⁶

Participating via videolink, the President of the World Bank underlined that the World Bank would work closely with the Peacebuilding Commission and agreed that there was a need for such a body since it was essential to change the balance, also in financial terms, that existed between peacemaking and peacebuilding. He stressed that the World Bank recognized the interdependence it had in this regard with the United Nations. Essential for successful peacebuilding, he considered, was capacity-building, establishing a functioning legal order and financial framework and addressing the issue of corruption.⁷

Elaborating on the notion of peacebuilding, speakers agreed that peacebuilding must aim at addressing the root causes of conflicts and at preventing a relapse into conflict. Therefore, seeking a lasting settlement of conflicts and achieving

sustainable peace and stability was crucial. While representatives acknowledged the efforts of the United Nations with regard to its peacekeeping activities, the limited success of the United Nations in the area of peacebuilding was made clear by a relapse into conflict. Such a relapse could oftentimes not be prevented, because of lack of coordination of all the different actors involved in the process, including a lack of coordination within the United Nations system and the lack of a single strategy.

Most speakers considered peace and development to be interlinked, and stated that actors in several fields like disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, eradication of poverty, sustainable development, human rights and strengthening the rule of law were involved in the peacebuilding process. At the same time, speakers conceded that every conflict had specific characteristics and agreed that regional organizations must be fully involved in the process since they had the best expertise in a region. Speakers therefore supported a further strengthening of United Nations cooperation with regional organizations. The representative of Norway called for basing the division of labour between the United Nations and regional organizations on the principle of subsidiarity.⁸

Most speakers called strongly for encouraging local ownership since, according to some, the primary responsibility for peacebuilding lay with the country and the people emerging from conflict.⁹

Speakers also agreed that peacebuilding as a long-term process required not only coordination among all United Nations entities and regional and subregional organizations, but also with affected States, troop-contributing and donor countries and international financial institutions. The representative of France referred to programmes of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration included in previous Council resolutions which often had lacked coordination between the various actors and therefore had not yet achieved the hoped-for results.¹⁰ Speakers in general stated that the need for coordinating the work and the strategies could best be addressed by a future peacebuilding commission which would, as the Secretary-General had stated in his report entitled “In larger freedom”,¹¹ fill an institutional

⁵ Ibid., pp. 4-5. For a discussion concerning the scope of the activities of the Council and the Economic and Social Council in post-conflict situations, see chap. VI, part II, sect. B, case 12 (f).

⁶ S/PV.5187, pp. 5-6.

⁷ Ibid., pp. 6-8.

⁸ S/PV.5187 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

⁹ S/PV.5187, p. 12 (France); and p. 18 (United Kingdom).

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 12.

¹¹ A/59/2005.

gap. With regard to the role of the Council in the peacebuilding process, several speakers made it clear that peacebuilding activities, due to their mixed nature, were not to be the Council's sole responsibility and pointed to the role of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.¹²

Some representatives made different proposals concerning the relationship between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly as well as the functions of the Commission. The representative of Morocco called for the Peacebuilding Commission to be attached to the Council and the Economic and Social Council and possibly to the General Assembly.¹³ The representative of Egypt held that the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council should be entrusted with monitoring the work of the Commission.¹⁴ The representative of Algeria wanted the Commission to be an intermediary organ between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council that was to be "created, set up and given a mandate by the General Assembly".¹⁵ The representative of Ghana called for the Commission to be established by the General Assembly but to be put under the joint authority of the Council and the Economic and Social Council to which it should report sequentially and not jointly in order to avoid duplication. He further held that the Commission should be of an advisory nature and not have decision-making powers.¹⁶ The representative of the United States considered the Peacebuilding Commission as an advisory body operating on a consensus basis to provide expertise and a coordination capacity to the principal United Nations bodies. He opined that as long as the security of a country was on its agenda, the Security Council should be the body that invoked the Commission's structure, wisdom and capacity, and that once the Council determined that a post-conflict situation no longer required its oversight, the Commission could so inform other agencies and

organs.¹⁷ On the other hand, according to the representative of India, it was essential that the Commission be made accountable to the General Assembly, a body with general membership. He further stressed that criteria on the basis of which a particular country under the Commission would move from the Council to the Economic and Social Council needed to be formulated, pointing out that setting the transition from the Council to the Economic and Social Council after the removal of that agenda item was somewhat unrealistic since a country at times remained on the Council's agenda for several years before it was removed.¹⁸

Many speakers agreed that peacebuilding required long-term, predictable and more rapid disbursement of funding and that therefore coordinating resource mobilization was crucial. Some delegations called for a discussion to distinguish between activities funded by voluntary contributions and those funded by assessed contributions.¹⁹ Some representatives of African States called for a funding of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration activities through the regular United Nations budget.²⁰ The representative of Norway expressed the view that all post-conflict peacebuilding activities included in mandates of peace operations should be financed by assessed contributions.²¹ The representative of the United States stated that simply increasing assessed contributions would be overly simplistic and was contrary to its national budgeting process. The representative of Japan added that financing all peacebuilding activities through assessed contributions would hinder local ownership. Therefore, both speakers advocated analysis on a case-by-case basis.²² Other speakers proposed the establishment of a voluntary revolving fund²³ or a standing fund for peacebuilding.²⁴

¹² S/PV.5187, p. 8 (Switzerland); p. 14 (Algeria); p. 21 (Philippines); p. 29 (India); S/PV.5187 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Morocco); p. 7 (Egypt); pp. 7-8 (Ukraine); p. 9 (Malaysia); pp. 10-11 (Ghana); and p. 19 (Republic of Korea).

¹³ S/PV.5187, p. 3.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁶ S/PV.5187 (Resumption 1), pp. 10-11.

¹⁷ S/PV.5187, p. 16.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (United Republic of Tanzania); and p. 12 (France).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 20 (Benin); S/PV.5187 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (South Africa).

²¹ S/PV.5187 (Resumption 1), p. 9.

²² S/PV.5187, pp. 16-17 (United States); and p. 26 (Japan).

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 21 (Philippines).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (United Republic of Tanzania); p. 29 (India); S/PV.5187 (Resumption 1), p. 11 (Ghana); and p. 20 (Pakistan).

With regard to regional priorities, some speakers called for Africa to become a focus of the peacebuilding activities of the United Nations and pointed to the relevance of the proposed Peacebuilding Commission especially for Africa²⁵ or referred to the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration activities which needed to be consolidated.²⁶ They supported a wider strategy of conflict prevention, crisis management and peacebuilding with regard to spillover effects which conflicts in African countries had experienced in the past.²⁷

At the end of the meeting, the President made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁸ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Reaffirmed its commitment to the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and recalled its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security;

Acknowledged that serious attention to the longer-term process of peacebuilding in all its multiple dimensions was critically important and that adequate support for peacebuilding activities could help to prevent countries from relapsing into conflict;

Underlined the fact that for countries emerging from conflict, significant international assistance for economic and social rehabilitation and reconstruction was indispensable;

Recognized the crucial role of regional and subregional organizations in post-conflict peacebuilding and their involvement at the earliest possible stage;

Stressed the special needs of Africa in post-conflict situations and encouraged the international community to pay particular attention to those needs.

Decisions of 20 December 2005 (5335th meeting): resolutions 1645 (2005) and 1646 (2005)

At the 5335th meeting, on 20 December 2005,²⁹ at which the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Brazil and the United States made statements, the President (United Kingdom) drew the attention of

the Council to two draft resolutions which were then put to the vote. The first draft resolution³⁰ was adopted unanimously and without debate as resolution 1645 (2005), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided, acting concurrently with the General Assembly, to establish the Peacebuilding Commission as an intergovernmental advisory body;

Also decided that the following should be the main purposes of the Commission: (a) to bring together all relevant actors to marshal resources and to advise on and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery; (b) to focus attention on the reconstruction and institution-building efforts necessary for recovery from conflict and to support the development of integrated strategies in order to lay the foundation for sustainable development; (c) to provide recommendations and information to improve the coordination of all relevant actors within and outside the United Nations;

Further decided that the Commission should meet in various configurations;

Decided that the Commission should have a standing Organizational Committee, responsible for developing its own rules of procedure and working methods;

Decided that members of the Organizational Committee should serve for renewable terms of two years, as applicable;

Decided that the Organizational Committee should establish the agenda of the Commission;

Also decided that the Commission should make the outcome of its discussions and recommendations publicly available as United Nations documents to all relevant bodies and actors, including the international financial institutions;

Decided that the Commission should submit an annual report to the General Assembly and that the Assembly should hold an annual debate to review the report;

Decided that the Commission should act in all matters on the basis of consensus of its members;

Requested the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly on the arrangements for establishing the peacebuilding fund during its sixtieth session;

Decided that the arrangements set out above would be reviewed five years after the adoption of the resolution.

The second draft resolution³¹ was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (Argentina, Brazil), as resolution 1646 (2005), by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Decided, pursuant to resolution 1645 (2005), that the permanent members listed in Article 23 (1) of the Charter should

²⁵ S/PV.5187, p. 23 (China); S/PV.5187 (Resumption 1), p. 11 (Ghana); and p. 19 (Pakistan).

²⁶ S/PV.5187 (Resumption 1), p. 18 (Nigeria).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 11 (Ghana); p. 17 (Nigeria); and p. 21 (Indonesia).

²⁸ S/PRST/2005/20.

²⁹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. V, part I, sect. G. See also chap. VI, part II, sect. B, case 12 (f), with regard to relations with the Economic and Social Council.

³⁰ S/2005/803.

³¹ S/2005/806.

be members of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission and that, in addition, the Council should select annually two of its elected members to participate in the Organizational Committee;

Decided that the annual report referred to in resolution 1645 (2005) should also be submitted to the Council for an annual debate.

In their statements, the representatives of Brazil, Argentina and Algeria said that the composition of the Peacebuilding Commission lacked representativeness and legal equality of States. The representative of Brazil held that the resolution failed to adequately reflect the role of the Economic and Social Council in peacebuilding activities.³² The representative of Benin said that it was inappropriate to have submitted the resolution under the current agenda item since it did not adequately reflect the mandate of the Commission, which encompassed both conflict prevention and post-conflict peacebuilding. He felt that the current agenda item might prejudice the implementation of the conflict prevention mandate.³³

Deliberations of 31 January 2007 (5627th meeting)

At its 5627th meeting, on 31 January 2007, the Council heard briefings by the President of the Economic and Social Council, the Chairman of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission, the Assistant Secretary-General in the Peacebuilding Support Office, the representative of the World Bank, and the representative of the International Monetary Fund. Statements were made by all members of the Council and the representatives of Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Burundi, Canada (on behalf also of Australia and New Zealand), Chile, Croatia, Egypt, El Salvador, Germany (on behalf of the European Union),³⁴ Guatemala, Jamaica (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Japan, the Netherlands,

³² S/PV.5335, p. 2 (Brazil); and p. 3 (Argentina, Algeria).

For more information on the discussion concerning interaction between the Peacebuilding Commission and United Nations organs and the composition of the Commission, see chap. VI, part I, sect. G. For more information about resolutions 1645 (2005) and 1646 (2005), see chap. V, part I, sect. G.

³³ S/PV.5335, p. 3.

³⁴ Albania, Croatia, Iceland, Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine aligned themselves with the statement.

Nigeria, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Uruguay.

The President of the Economic and Social Council, the Chairman of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Assistant Secretary-General elaborated on the relationship of the Commission with the Economic and Social Council or the Security Council.³⁵ Referring to the issue of funding, the Chairman of the Organizational Committee emphasized that a long-term commitment was needed and, while being pleased with recent contributions to the Peacebuilding Fund, made clear that they were not sufficient to meet the needs of the two assigned countries, Burundi and Sierra Leone.³⁶ The Assistant Secretary-General said that the Fund was an extremely useful start but that it could only act as a catalyst. She stated that her Office would support the Commission by extracting lessons learned and becoming the repository for peacebuilding advice within the Secretariat. According to her, in the long run, peacebuilding must not be another layer of work for Governments, the United Nations or donors on the ground but should define the way in which all different actors framed their interventions.³⁷

The representative of Norway, in his capacity as Chairperson of the Burundi configuration, pointed out that successful peacebuilding — besides national ownership — required sustained political and material support from all the different actors, which included the United Nations system, the international financial institutions, donors, civil society and regional actors.³⁸

The representative of the Netherlands, in his capacity as Chairperson of the Sierra Leone configuration, also regarded it as essential to ensure local ownership and close coordination between New York and national actors as well as to involve all stakeholders.³⁹

The representative of the World Bank expressed the full support of the World Bank to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission and underlined its

³⁵ See S/PV.5627. For more information on the discussion concerning interaction between the Peacebuilding Commission, the Security Council and other United Nations organs, see chap. VI, part I, sect. G.

³⁶ S/PV.5627, p. 5.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.

commitment to cooperate even more closely both at Headquarters and in the field. He saw the Commission as a useful and effective instrument to deepen the engagement of both institutions in a coordinated manner.⁴⁰

The representative of the International Monetary Fund also affirmed the usefulness of the Peacebuilding Commission as a forum where all aspects of peacebuilding could be addressed comprehensively and expressed readiness to actively cooperate with the Commission.⁴¹

In their first assessment of the Peacebuilding Commission, speakers conceded that it was still in its “teething phase” but commended the two country-specific meetings and considered that it had widely ensured local ownership in practice.

The representative of Sierra Leone considered the Commission to be a “supplementary but effective instrument for facilitating the process of early post-conflict recovery”. He emphasized how crucial funding was to ensure that his country would not relapse into conflict.⁴² The importance of financial contributions was also pointed out by the representative of Burundi, who announced his country’s intention to organize a donor round table.⁴³ The representative of Qatar stressed that the Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund together constituted an integrated mechanism and appealed to the international community to donate generously.⁴⁴ Other speakers also renewed appeals for funding.⁴⁵ While making clear that the Commission was not a donor agency, some speakers pointed to the importance of distributing available funds in a flexible and quick manner to situations with which the Commission was dealing.⁴⁶

Speakers saw the added value of the newly established Peacebuilding Commission in coordinating activities and resources in a comprehensive and

concentrated manner⁴⁷ by “linking the United Nations peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities as seamlessly as possible”;⁴⁸ promoting national capacities;⁴⁹ and identifying common priorities of all actors;⁵⁰ development of a viable peacebuilding strategy bringing together all actors in the field;⁵¹ and providing early warning to the Council drawing attention to setbacks and risk factors in countries on the Council’s agenda.⁵² The representative of Guatemala emphasized that the Commission must go beyond physical rebuilding and support comprehensive changes that would eliminate practices of social, economic and political exclusion and transform State institutions so that citizens could participate in them.⁵³

Some speakers called for the Council to make better use of the Peacebuilding Commission as a source of advice, and stressed the importance of the timing of the request for advice not only after a peacekeeping operation was discontinued but also before a mandate renewal and the establishment of a peacekeeping operation.⁵⁴

The representative of China called for coordination, first, among the different plans and framework documents for reconstruction; secondly, among the different players; and, thirdly, among different organs of the United Nations.⁵⁵

The representative of Japan, who defined the core task of the Commission as bringing together the country under consideration with international partners to formulate an integrated peacebuilding strategy, stated that this task still needed to be tackled for Sierra Leone and Burundi. In order to implement such a strategy, he proposed the establishment of an on-site

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 9.

⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 9-10.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 11-12.

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 10-11.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 18.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 19 (Congo); S/PV.5627 (Resumption 1), p. 3 (Senegal); and p. 8 (Republic of Korea).

⁴⁶ S/PV.5627, p. 24 (South Africa); p. 25 (Ghana); and p. 32 (Jamaica, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement).

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 13 (Panama); p. 14 (Peru, France); p. 19 (Congo); p. 21 (United States); p. 26 (Indonesia); p. 29 (Russian Federation); p. 33 (Chile); S/PV.5627 (Resumption 1), p. 5 (Canada).

⁴⁸ S/PV.5627 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Republic of Korea).

⁴⁹ S/PV.5627, p. 14 (Peru).

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 15 (France, Belgium); and p. 22 (United Kingdom).

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 16 (Italy); p. 20 (Slovakia); p. 23 (South Africa); p. 30 (Germany, on behalf of the European Union); S/PV.5627 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Japan).

⁵² S/PV.5627, p. 22 (United Kingdom).

⁵³ S/PV.5627 (Resumption 1), p. 11.

⁵⁴ S/PV.5627, p. 20 (Slovakia); p. 22 (United Kingdom); p. 24 (South Africa); S/PV.5627 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Brazil).

⁵⁵ S/PV.5627, pp. 27-28.

coordination and monitoring mechanism. For such a strategy to ensure a smooth transfer of responsibilities from a post-conflict to a reconstruction and development phase, he considered, echoed by the representative of Croatia,⁵⁶ the transition of a peacekeeping mission to an integrated office and eventually to a United Nations country team as a good option. He hoped that through an implementation of an integrated strategy, the Commission would provide valuable advice to the Council regarding the exit of a mission.⁵⁷

The representative of Italy called for the Peacebuilding Commission to elaborate benchmarks to monitor progress achieved, and also to develop objective criteria for phasing out its involvement in a country as well as to think about its possible new involvement.⁵⁸ The expansion of the Commission's agenda was also proposed by the representative of Slovakia.⁵⁹

The representative of Canada, speaking also on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, expressed his disappointment about some members of the Commission having overemphasized procedural matters at the expense of substantive peacebuilding issues, and called for refocusing on its core mandate which needed to be approached in an action-oriented and flexible manner.⁶⁰

Deliberations of 17 October 2007 (5761st meeting)

At its 5761st meeting, on 17 October 2007, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its first session.⁶¹ In its report, the Commission summarized its activities during its first year of existence: it had met in country-specific configurations to consider the cases of Burundi and Sierra Leone, adopted workplans and sent field missions to both countries to collect information and analysis from the ground. It also identified four critical priority areas for peace consolidation in each of the two countries. Processes for the development of integrated peacebuilding strategies had been launched. The

Commission had adopted provisional rules of procedure which, in order to keep them current and effective, would continue to be reviewed through an expert group. Standing invitations had been extended to the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the European Community and the Organization of the Islamic Conference to participate in all meetings of the Commission. The provisional guidelines on the participation of civil society, including non-governmental organizations, had also been adopted. The Commission reported that it had established a working group on lessons learned in order to accumulate best practices and lessons on critical peacebuilding issues. The Commission concluded that the main challenge it was now facing was to maximize its impact on the ground to make the United Nations peacebuilding architecture an effective instrument of international collaboration in support of countries emerging from conflict. The Commission's future work would need to focus on ensuring that peacebuilding processes remained on track and that challenges and gaps were addressed in a timely and coherent manner by all relevant actors and in accordance with the integrated peacebuilding strategies.

Statements were made by all members of the Council, the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and the representatives of Burundi, El Salvador, the Netherlands, Norway and Sierra Leone.⁶²

The Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission said that, during its first year of operation, the Commission had held approximately 50 formal and informal meetings and briefings in various configurations and had addressed critical organizational, methodological and thematic issues, as well as the country-specific issues of Burundi and Sierra Leone. He believed that the Commission had contributed significantly to the promotion of integrated post-conflict peacebuilding strategies in Burundi and Sierra Leone by deepening the dialogue with all relevant stakeholders, and reported that the Commission intended to further strengthen the effectiveness of its engagement with those two countries. While stating that the United Nations peacebuilding structure was fully in place, he identified the following challenges which the Commission was facing: the development of monitoring and tracking mechanisms, working

⁵⁶ S/PV.5627 (Resumption 1), p. 8.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁵⁸ S/PV.5627, pp. 16-17.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

⁶⁰ S/PV.5627 (Resumption 1), pp. 5-6.

⁶¹ S/2007/458.

⁶² For the discussion concerning non-issuance of invitations to this meeting, see chap. III, part I, sect. D, case 6.

methods, advocacy, the Peacebuilding Fund and relationships with other relevant bodies.⁶³

Speakers in general said that the result of the first year's work of the Peacebuilding Commission was positive and that important work had been done in Burundi and Sierra Leone. They noted that the Commission faced a number of challenges, as shown in its report, and highlighted the need to create a clear consensus on the Commission's conceptual design, operational methods and relationship with entities both within and outside the United Nations system.

With regard to future work, delegations called on the Commission to effectively implement peacebuilding strategies on the ground. The representative of Indonesia stated that this could best be fulfilled if the Commission received backing from all the principal organs of the United Nations, the agencies of the United Nations system and the non-United Nations institutions concerned.⁶⁴ Speakers also noted that the Commission should continue to develop its working methods, work with flexibility and transparency, strengthen the effectiveness of integrated peacebuilding strategies and establish tracking and monitoring mechanisms to help identify gaps and allow for more efficient use of resources. The representative of France stated that the Commission was an essential instrument for conflict prevention and thus for the implementation of the responsibility to protect, a key concept that the Security Council needed to put into practice.⁶⁵

Speakers generally highlighted the need for the Commission to strengthen or clarify its cooperation with bodies within the United Nations and with international partners, including financial institutions and regional and subregional organizations, in order to avoid duplication of programmes. The representative of the United States looked forward to a stronger engagement of the Commission with the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.⁶⁶ The representative of the Russian Federation considered it particularly important to strengthen the Commission's link with the Council so

as to ensure a timely exchange of information. He also called for the Council to take the Commission's recommendations into account, in its work on Burundi and Sierra Leone.⁶⁷ Some representatives said that the Commission could take on an important role in advising the Council before the establishment or mandate renewal of a peacekeeping operation.⁶⁸ The representative of Indonesia stressed that the Council should continue to work closely with the Commission in the development of a well-functioning peacebuilding architecture.⁶⁹ The representative of China called for a reinforced communication between the Commission and the Council so that the latter could guide the work of the Commission and solicit its recommendations.⁷⁰ The representative of the United Kingdom held that there should be regular interaction between the Council presidency and the Chair of the Commission, adding that it should be a two-way relationship, with a specific division of labour, the Commission doing its work on the ground and providing the Council with concrete advice from that experience.⁷¹

The representative of the United States said that, before adding new countries to its agenda, the Commission must be sure not to overextend itself but rather strive for solid successes and maintain a realistic agenda.⁷² Other speakers looked forward to adding new countries, explicitly naming Guinea-Bissau.⁷³ The representative of France stated that the issue of expanding the Commission's agenda was indissolubly linked to its strengthening. He hoped that the Commission would develop its activities and offer the Council its views on new cases.⁷⁴ The representative of Belgium pointed to the key role of the Council in this regard and held that the Council, instead of being solely reactive in the choice of countries, should consider the specific merits of each file.⁷⁵ The representative of Italy said that the Commission could become a kind of permanent observatory of potential new countries that were about to exit the immediate conflict phase.⁷⁶

⁶³ S/PV.5761, pp. 2-3. On the relationship of the Peacebuilding Commission with other United Nations bodies, see chap. VI, part I, sect. G. See also chap. X, part IV, with regard to the interpretation or application of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter.

⁶⁴ S/PV.5761, p. 8.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 4-5.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Peru); p. 11 (Italy); and p. 26 (Sierra Leone).

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 19 (South Africa); and p. 22 (Ghana).

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

As Chairperson of the Sierra Leone configuration, the representative of the Netherlands said that the elections could be seen as a landmark in the democratic progress of that country but that crucial challenges to sustainable peace remained in the priority areas.⁷⁷ The representative of Sierra Leone saw the elections as a solid foundation for sustainable peace and declared his country's commitment to cooperate with the United Nations and the Commission. He highlighted country ownership and resource mobilization as the foundation for the Commission's operations.⁷⁸

As Chairperson of the Burundi configuration, the representative of Norway stated that a monitoring and tracking mechanism for the strategic framework was being set up and that the security situation was still a matter of concern.⁷⁹ The representative of Burundi

summarized achievements in the work of his country with the Commission and hoped that the Council would firmly and clearly support the efforts of the facilitators in the search for final peace in Burundi.⁸⁰

The representative of El Salvador, in his capacity as Chair of the Working Group on Lessons Learned, reported that the Working Group had started to accumulate an inventory of lessons learned by the United Nations system and the international community by analysing and assembling concrete experiences in different processes that were valid for all countries under consideration. She hoped to build a historical memory that would contribute in the future to more effective United Nations participation in peacebuilding activities.⁸¹

⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 22-23.

⁷⁸ Ibid., pp. 24-26.

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 24.

⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 26-27.

⁸¹ Ibid., pp. 27-29.

53. Threats to international peace and security

Initial proceedings

Decisions of 14 September 2005 (5261st meeting): resolutions 1624 (2005) and 1625 (2005)

At its 5261st meeting, held on 14 September 2005¹ at the level of Heads of State and Government,² the Security Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Threats to international peace and security". Statements were made by all members of the Council as well as by the Secretary-General.

The President (Philippines) drew the attention of the Council to two draft resolutions. The first draft resolution³ was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1624 (2005), by which the Council, inter alia:

¹ For more information on the discussion at this meeting, see chap. IV, part I, note, with regard to procedures related to decision-making and voting; chap. VI, part II, sect. B, case 12 (f), with regard to relations with the Economic and Social Council.

² All the Council members were represented at the level of Head of State or Government, except Japan, which was represented at the ministerial level.

³ S/2005/577.

Called upon all States to adopt such measures as might be necessary and appropriate and in accordance with their obligations under international law (a) to prohibit by law incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts; (b) to prevent such conduct; (c) to deny safe haven to any persons with respect to whom there was credible and relevant information giving serious reasons for considering that they had been guilty of such conduct;

Also called upon all States to cooperate, inter alia, to strengthen the security of their international borders, including by combating fraudulent travel documents and, to the extent attainable, by enhancing terrorist screening and passenger security procedures;

Further called upon all States to continue international efforts to enhance dialogue and broaden understanding among civilizations;

Called upon all States to report to the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism, as part of their ongoing dialogue, on the steps they had taken to implement the resolution;

Directed the Counter-Terrorism Committee: (a) to include in its dialogue with Member States their efforts to implement the resolution; (b) to work with Member States to help to build capacity, including by spreading best legal practice and promoting exchange of information in this regard; (c) to report back to the Council in 12 months on the implementation of the resolution;

Decided to remain actively seized of the matter.