



General Assembly Security Council

Distr.: General
24 December 2014

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-ninth session
Agenda items 13 and 115

Security Council
Sixty-ninth year

**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

Identical letters dated 23 December 2014 from the Secretary-General of the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council

I wish to refer to your letter dated 15 December 2014, in which you advised on the scope, terms of reference and modalities for the upcoming review in 2015 of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, and through which you requested, on behalf of the General Assembly and Security Council, that I:

(a) Nominate, in consultation with Member States, the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and the main political groupings and caucuses, no more than seven experts who would form an advisory group. The advisory group of experts will be tasked with undertaking five previously identified country studies in accordance with the endorsed terms of reference; and

(b) explore all possible options for the funding arrangements of the review and revert to the General Assembly at the earliest possible time.

I am pleased to note that the General Assembly and the Security Council have decided to ground the analysis that would inform their consideration of the 2015 review in case studies. This approach should help identify the structural gaps and shortcomings in our current approaches and generate practical and actionable recommendations for improvements in the functioning of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture and in our support for countries emerging from conflict.

In anticipation of your request, I initiated consultations on the composition of the advisory group of experts that are currently being finalized on the basis of well-defined parameters and selection criteria. I will revert shortly with nominations of experts based on these consultations and who will be able to achieve the high expectations expressed in your letter referenced above.



With respect to options for funding arrangements in support of the country studies and of the work of the advisory group of experts, I have explored several options which I am pleased to share herein.

1. Regular programme budget (2014-2015): while the 2015 review was mandated through resolution 65/7 and Security Council resolution 1947 (2010), the nature and scope of the review was only formally decided by the General Assembly and the Security Council through your above referenced letter dated 15 December 2014. As a result, it was not possible to submit a revised estimated budget report to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Administrative and Budgetary Committee (Fifth Committee) of the General Assembly in time for the main session, which concluded its work on 19 December 2014. The submission would have to be made and considered only at the first resumed session of the Fifth Committee, between March and May 2015, at the earliest. This option would not allow the mandated two-stage process for the review to be undertaken within the time frame stipulated in your letter referenced above.

2. Extrabudgetary funding: another option for funding the first stage of the 2015 review would be to set up a trust fund and invite voluntary contributions from Member States. Given the low cost of the first stage of the review (approximately \$1.6 million according to current estimates), I would advise against setting up a new trust fund, as this would incur significant transaction costs and time. Given the estimated low cost of the exercise, this option would also unnecessarily confine the funding of a process mandated by Member States to a few contributors.

Another possibility within this option would have been to rely on the Peacebuilding Fund. I have been advised by the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office that the Fund is currently in an appropriate fiduciary situation that would allow the immediate release of funding for the initiation of the case studies. I have been informed also that many leading donors have agreed on the practicality of the use of the Fund, and many of them have also committed part of their existing or incoming contributions to set off the cost of the review in order to ensure that the Fund's allocations for country programmes were preserved. However, I am informed that consensus among all donors on the use of the Peacebuilding Fund was not achieved. It would, therefore, not be advisable to proceed with this option in order to preserve the consensus which characterized all discussions and decisions leading up to the formal launching of the review.

3. Unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium (2014-2015): given the mandated timeframe for accomplishing the two-stage process of the review before the end of 2015, and since the review is an activity mandated by Member States whose decision on the scope and methodology materialized only late in the year, I suggest that the review be funded through unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium 2014-2015. This option would allow the advisory group of experts to begin its work as early as the end of January 2015, following a final decision on selection and completion of administrative procedures. Observing this timeline would also ensure that sufficient time is allocated for the important country studies underpinning the analysis and subsequent outcome of the 2015 review.

I look forward to continue supporting the efforts of Member States as we collectively strive to strengthen the United Nations response to the challenges of post-conflict situations and of building and sustaining peace.

(Signed) **BAN** Ki-moon
