



Security Council

Sixty-second year

5627th meeting

Wednesday, 31 January 2007, 3.30 p.m.

New York

Provisional

<i>President:</i>	Mr. Shcherbak	(Russian Federation)
<i>Members:</i>	Belgium	Mr. Verbeke
	China	Mr. Cheng Hong
	Congo	Mr. Okio
	France	Mr. Deruffe
	Ghana	Mr. Yankey
	Indonesia	Mr. Budiman
	Italy	Mr. Mantovani
	Panama	Mr. Arias
	Peru	Mr. Ruiz Rosas
	Qatar	Mr. Al-Henzab
	Slovakia	Mr. Mlynár
	South Africa	Ms. Qwabe
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Ms. Moir
	United States of America	Mr. Miller

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. 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 C-154A.



The meeting resumed at 3.35 p.m.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I wish to remind all speakers, as I indicated at the morning's session, to limit their statements to no more than five minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously.

Mrs. Gallardo Hernández (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mr. President, my delegation welcomes your initiative to hold this open debate on peacebuilding. Countries such as El Salvador that have passed from a culture of violence to a culture of peace are committed to defining and implementing national strategies that will make it possible for us to move forward to sustainable social peace.

This month, my country is commemorating 15 years since the signing of the peace agreements. On 16 January 1992, we began a new historic stage, one ripe with achievements, but also, we have to recognize, one bringing challenges and new threats. We have a story to tell, and that is our reason for wanting to be part of the Peacebuilding Commission. The United Nations system has accumulated a great deal of experience and developed important strategies on the ground, which can now be formalized through the Peacebuilding Commission.

The mandate entrusted to El Salvador as a Vice-Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission can be found in the wording of Security Council resolution 1645 (2005) and of General Assembly resolution 60/180, which state that "countries that have experienced recent post-conflict recovery would make valuable contributions to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission ...". Those resolutions also refer to the primary functions of the Commission, namely, to provide advice, to develop integrated strategies related to the processes of peacebuilding, to integrate best practices, among others.

Formalizing lessons learned on the ground, we believe, will help in the development of global strategies in the future. We must recognize that those countries which can share their post-conflict experiences have certainly shown a courageous national will to meld the efforts of a number of actors from the political, military and humanitarian spheres, as well as from the area of sustainable development. That achievement should be recognized and shared.

Measures that allow countries with post-conflict experience to participate actively in the work of the Commission will benefit all of the members of the Commission, since lessons learned are a source of inspiration for formulating comprehensive strategies and providing advice on the ground today in Burundi and in Sierra Leone.

We welcome the decision taken by the members of the Commission to set up a working group on lessons learned. The group will meet in an open manner and will benefit from the participation of national actors and representatives of civil society, as well as key United Nations actors. The dialogue will focus on the priorities established so far for Burundi and Sierra Leone.

The purpose of the process is to enrich the discussions and the work the Commission in general and, in particular, to strengthen strategies for the benefit of those countries under consideration. The systematization of lessons learned should also be translated into action on the ground, and should lead to a greater interplay among initiatives relating to, inter alia, reform of the justice and security sectors, youth employment, the empowerment of women, governance and institutional capacity, as well as promoting respect for human rights.

As I said, the work of the group of countries interested in lessons learned will be making a contribution in Sierra Leone and Burundi. Its members will share their thoughts and recommendations with civil society organizations and national academic institutions from both countries.

El Salvador reaffirms its commitment to contributing, on the basis of its own experience, to the enrichment of the conceptualization and implementation of a comprehensive peacebuilding process. Putting an end to violence necessarily requires national will and a suitable regional and international environment. It also requires shared determination by the various actors with a view to dealing with the structural causes of the conflict.

While certain aspects of the peacebuilding process will respond to the specific causes of the conflict, we must bear in mind that there are certain factors common to all post-conflict situations. The peace processes in Burundi and Sierra Leone have particular resonance in a number of countries members

of the Commission, in particular countries that have themselves been through post-conflict situations.

The impact of El Salvador's own peacebuilding experience leads us to affirm that, while resources for, inter alia, initiating national development strategies and ensuring human security, including through implementing security policies, are important, we must not forget to heed the intangible aspects of social peace: educating for peace, promoting tolerance and citizens' confidence in new institutions and teaching respect for the rule of law, as well as encouraging the participation of civil society and the private sector in new national development projects.

The participation of women in the post-conflict decision-making process is also essential. Similarly, young people must have new opportunities for employment and recreation so that they do not themselves become elements that threaten social peace.

In conclusion, El Salvador would like to repay the international community and the United Nations by actively participating in the Peacebuilding Commission. We express our gratitude for the very valuable assistance that we received when we needed it most.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I give the floor to the representative of Senegal.

Mr. Seck (Senegal) (*spoke in French*): By holding a debate on the subject of post-conflict peacebuilding, the Security Council is tackling an issue of fundamental importance for regional and international stability and security — an issue that requires sustained special attention.

The establishment, on 20 December 2005, of the Peacebuilding Commission in an effort to increase the focus of the international community on countries emerging from conflict represents a decisive milestone in the reform process towards enabling the United Nations to meet the challenges of the new millennium. Post-conflict countries are like recovering patients who need to be closely monitored to ensure that they do not suffer a potentially fatal relapse.

In order to support such countries as they work to restore peace and stability and to help them to avoid relapsing into violence, we need to help them to put a definitive end to the root causes of such conflicts, which are essentially related to the transfer of power, problems of governance and social factors. That is why it is essential to support post-conflict countries in order

to strengthen their institutional and administrative capacities and help them to establish mechanisms to develop democratic governance, to reform their justice and security sectors and to restore their economies.

Similarly, the space for dialogue needs to be established and strengthened through the significant involvement of women and young people, who are the primary victims of conflict. The involvement of women and young people is particularly desirable because they generally constitute the majority of the populations of such countries and are necessary conveyors of information and opinion. For that reason, Senegal calls on all Member States to continue their efforts to implement resolution 1325 (2000), on women, peace and security. Six years after its adoption, that resolution, which has led to major progress, must continue to be supported by the international community.

Building peace also requires the establishment of programmes aimed at reintegrating former combatants and finding solutions to issues relating to employment for young people, who are easy prey for unscrupulous warlords. However, none of this will be possible if the Peacebuilding Commission does not possess the means to support the efforts of post-conflict countries, which continue to be in a vulnerable position long after the resolution of the crisis. My country therefore appeals to the traditional donors and international civil society partners to make the Peacebuilding Fund a viable and effective tool to meet the urgent needs of post-conflict countries. We need to provide the Commission with the tools that will enable it to pursue its actions by giving it the financial and technical support that it needs so as to ensure that millions of children emerging from darkness will have an opportunity to go to school without fear of being felled by a mine.

In conclusion, I would like to commend the Commission Chairman, Ismael Abraão Gaspar Martins, and the other members of the Peacebuilding Commission, which has already reviewed the cases of Sierra Leone and Burundi — two African countries that have gone through many years of conflict but which, thanks to the genius of their peoples and the support of the international community, have made their way back to the path of peace and stability.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I give the floor to the representative of Japan.

Mr. Oshima (Japan): The Japanese delegation expresses its appreciation to you, Mr. President, for your timely initiative to organize this important open debate. This meeting, together with the forthcoming General Assembly debate on the same subject scheduled for 6 February, will mark the first significant step towards setting the peacebuilding agenda in the broader United Nations system-wide context, which will, in turn, certainly contribute to improving the work of the Peacebuilding Commission itself.

The Peacebuilding Commission has been established as an intergovernmental advisory body to address issues which encompass the mandates of the principal organs, including the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, as well as of numerous other bodies within the United Nations system. This means, obviously, that there must be ways to ensure meaningful interface and interaction between the Commission on the one hand and those relevant principal organs and bodies on the other, if the work of the Commission is to be useful and effective. As a sitting member of the Commission and a past member of the Security Council through the end of last year, Japan has emphasized that point, advocating the importance of improving the cooperation among United Nations organs — especially between the Commission and the Security Council — and presenting some practical suggestions to that end.

That said, the core task of the Peacebuilding Commission is to bring together, under one roof, a post-conflict country under consideration and its international partners to discuss and bring into being an integrated peacebuilding strategy, appropriate to that country, that is sensible, coherent and workable. Through that process, the Commission is expected to contribute to effective peace consolidation in the country in question by bridging the gap between the post-conflict recovery phase and the development phase.

When it comes to matters related to the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council bears primary responsibility in supporting peace consolidation through actions falling under its purview — for example, by deploying United Nations peacekeeping operations and integrated offices. In that process, it is important to ensure that there are ways in which both the substantive and the procedural aspects of cooperation between the

Commission and the Council can be developed. In more specific terms, here are some ideas for consideration.

First of all, the Peacebuilding Commission has done some good work in identifying the specific needs for peacebuilding in Sierra Leone and Burundi. It has established the priority areas that are essential to sustain peace in those two post-conflict countries, and further efforts in that area of work will need to be strengthened. However, the key task of formulating an integrated peacebuilding strategy for the two countries has yet to be tackled. The Commission should accelerate its work on developing an integrated strategy, in consultation with the host Governments and involving all the relevant stakeholders, such as bilateral donors, the United Nations country team, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and civil society.

Secondly, any peacebuilding strategy to be developed will be useful only if it is implemented and delivered effectively on the ground. To that end, the establishment of an on-site coordination and monitoring mechanism would contribute significantly to the implementation of the strategy and should be considered.

In that regard, although Afghanistan has not been selected as a target country for the purposes of the Peacebuilding Commission, the Joint Coordination and Monitoring Board (JCMB) in Afghanistan offers an interesting model. The JCMB consists of 28 members and is co-chaired at a high level by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and a special adviser of President Karzai. The members include the major financial and military contributors, neighbouring countries and international organizations, as well as key ministers of the Afghan Government. The JCMB is also a political body that provides strategic advice and coordinates international and national efforts aimed at the effective implementation of the Afghanistan Compact, which is, in effect, the living comprehensive peacebuilding strategy for Afghanistan. During the visit by the Security Council mission to Afghanistan last November, which I had the honour to lead, we had the opportunity to observe the functioning of that body. I believe that the replication of this model in other country situations, as appropriate, will serve a very useful coordination and monitoring function on the ground, involving all players in the peacebuilding effort.

Thirdly, if the integrated peacebuilding strategy is to contribute to promoting a transition from conflict to stability, it will have to ensure the seamless transfer of responsibilities from the post-conflict phase to the reconstruction and development phase. One of the model processes may be the transition from a peacekeeping operation to an integrated office and eventually to a United Nations country team, as we foresee in the cases of Sierra Leone and Burundi. In other words, we believe that the peacebuilding strategy of the Peacebuilding Commission, if it is properly formulated, should incorporate the exit strategies of peacekeeping operations and integrated offices. It is the Council's mandate to decide on the timing of the withdrawal of such missions. My delegation hopes that, through the consideration and implementation of an integrated strategy, the Peacebuilding Commission will provide valuable advice to the Council on when and how to exit these missions and hand over the tasks to the follow-up United Nations teams.

Before concluding, I wish to touch upon some procedural aspects. It is important to find ways to enhance synergy between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council by systematically streamlining the flow of information between them. Several steps will need to be considered for that purpose. First, the Chairs of the Commission's Organizational Committee and/or those of its country-specific meetings should make a timely report to the Council on their deliberations, in the form of a letter or a briefing. Secondly, the President of the Council and the Chairs of the Commission should have regular meetings. Thirdly, the Chair of the Organizational Committee or of the country-specific meeting should be invited to the public meeting of the Council on the situation in the country under consideration. Fourthly, the Council, after receiving reports from the Commission, should consider issuing its reaction in the form of a presidential statement or other statements, as appropriate, to encourage synergy and interaction in the process of formulating and implementing an integrated strategy.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate Japan's strong commitment, as a member of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission, to contribute to the work of Commission and to the relevant discussions in the Security Council. I am also happy to announce Japan's intention to hold a peacebuilding seminar on Timor-Leste in Tokyo this

March. I hope that the Commission and the Council will further advance the deliberations on the issue that we have discussed today.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now call on the representative of Canada.

Mr. McNee (Canada): We thank the Russian Federation for convening this important debate today.

I have the honour to speak today on behalf of the delegations of Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

At the outset, I would like to express our appreciation for the very effective work of Assistant Secretary-General Carolyn McAskie and her team in supporting the Peacebuilding Commission in its crucial early phase.

The delegations of Canada, Australia and New Zealand strongly support the Peacebuilding Commission. It has a critical role to play in coordinating and integrating post-conflict peacebuilding activities. A strong Commission will move the international community past an ad hoc response to peacebuilding and on to a more coherent response embodying what needs to occur in a post-conflict setting to achieve lasting peace.

In the year since the creation of the Peacebuilding Commission, in December 2005, good progress has been made in establishing this new institution. Representation on the Peacebuilding Commission's Organizational Committee has been agreed, and a dialogue has been started to clarify the Commission's specific functions within the United Nations system. We were also gratified to see Burundi and Sierra Leone referred to the Commission by the Security Council in June of last year.

Despite that progress, the delegations of Canada, Australia and New Zealand have been disappointed by the overemphasis placed on procedural matters by some members of the Commission at the expense of substantive peacebuilding issues, which are indeed the core mandate of the Commission. Our delegations urge the Commission to find new ways of working that befit the challenges before it. That includes working informally when possible in order to maximize progress during this formative phase, refocusing on its core mandate of advising United Nations organs on integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding, giving attention and resources to reconstruction and institution-building efforts, and serving as a focused

forum for political discussions related to transitions from war to peace.

That mandate needs to be approached in an action-oriented, flexible manner, with results identified that can be realistically achieved. Our delegations also urge the Commission to develop modalities to ensure the active participation of civil society and other Governments in all areas of the Commission's work, since their input and participation are critical to the success of the peacebuilding process.

While we recognize that building peace is a long-term process, the delegations of Canada, Australia and New Zealand continue to believe that the Peacebuilding Commission should focus on those cases where it can have the greatest and most transformative impact, and which can be viewed as immediate positive contributions to kick-start a longer-term peace process.

Our Governments were very pleased to see the Peacebuilding Support Office undertake missions to Burundi and Sierra Leone to identify gaps in the peacebuilding process and to identify areas where the Commission could have the greatest impact. We were also pleased that the Governments of Burundi and Sierra Leone were able subsequently to identify key priorities for the Commission during the fall sessions of the Peacebuilding Commission. Now that those two countries have been declared eligible to benefit from the Peacebuilding Fund, we are hopeful that there will be early disbursements and early results from the investment made.

As Burundi and Sierra Leone make the transition from the fragile post-conflict period towards lasting peace, international support remains critical for consolidation of the gains realized so far. Sustainable recovery and peace cannot be achieved without addressing a country's needs in the political, social and economic spheres, as well as the interlinkages among them. The Governments of Canada, Australia and New Zealand were therefore pleased to see that the December sessions of the Peacebuilding Commission identify several cross-cutting thematic issues, including support for political dialogue for Burundi and strengthening democratic governance and gender mainstreaming for Sierra Leone. Our Governments view that as very important work to ensure that whatever activities are undertaken by the Commission do not duplicate efforts already under way, and that they genuinely advance international coordination to

ensure a positive contribution to the peacebuilding process.

While better coordination by the donor community and the international financial institutions is a key objective for the Peacebuilding Commission, our delegations view the Commission's work as more than just a location for pledging assistance. We hope that the work that the Commission is doing in relation to the national peacebuilding strategies of Sierra Leone and Burundi will begin to build the basis of an expertise for identifying and addressing in an integrated manner thematic areas that require attention in all post-conflict peace-building situations.

(spoke in French)

As Assistant Secretary-General McAskie pointed out, that task will require a new investment of intellectual capital aimed at developing a strategic peacebuilding framework. Needless to say, the Peacebuilding Commission will not be able to achieve its full potential until we are able to articulate that basic vision of its objectives and output.

That will require that such issues as security sector and justice sector reform, the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants into society, gender equality, children and armed conflict, refugees and internally displaced persons be taken up on a thematic basis, both within the Organizational Committee and in the country-specific meetings. In that regard, we were particularly encouraged when, at the first country-specific meetings on Burundi and Sierra Leone, the Commission reaffirmed the centrality of resolution 1325 (2000), on women, peace and security, for the implementation of peacebuilding strategies. That work needs to be expanded to other areas of cross-cutting significance as the Commission seeks to design a strategic framework within which the Peacebuilding Commission can frame its advice and its interventions.

The Peacebuilding Commission is a vital component of the wider United Nations reform agenda. The transition from war to peace requires major concerted effort to prevent a relapse to violence. We look forward to helping the Peacebuilding Commission in the coming months and years to clarify its role and make a positive contribution to the very important task of building durable peace in countries emerging from conflict.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Nigeria.

Mr. Wigwe (Nigeria): On behalf of the Nigerian delegation, I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month, and especially on the admirable way you have been conducting the affairs of the Council.

I should also express my delight to be able to address this body on the issue of post-conflict peacebuilding, with particular reference to the Peacebuilding Commission. In that regard, Nigeria fully aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Jamaica on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

My delegation wishes to express confidence in the leadership of Angola as the Chair of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission, as well as in the members of its Bureau. In the same vein, we wish to commend the Peacebuilding Support Office for its commitment.

The Commission has performed well in the circumstances, given that, as a new body, it was bound to pass through initial difficulties. It successfully organized two country-specific meetings, which identified an agreed set of priority areas in the two countries under consideration. The country-specific meetings proved enriching and rewarding both for the members of the Commission and for the relevant actors.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission raised the hope that the international community had at last found the appropriate device to fill the gap between the end to conflict and consolidation of peace in countries emerging from conflict. Six months after the establishment of the Commission, we can look back with a sense of satisfaction that the body has fared well and produced the kind of outcome most delegations looked forward to. The countries under consideration assumed ownership of the set of priority areas identified and, in the end, have become beneficiaries of the Peacebuilding Fund. However, we would like to highlight the following points in order to improve on the gains and experience of the past six months.

First, country-specific meetings, by their composition and nature, offer the best forum to bring the Commission closer to the beneficiaries of its work.

Consequently, the Commission should encourage greater interaction with relevant actors on the ground.

Secondly, the Organizational Committee should meet more regularly to ensure that decisions taken are promptly pursued.

Thirdly, the Peacebuilding Commission should devote more time to resource mobilization.

Fourthly, members of the Commission should undertake visits to countries under consideration. In that connection, we note that, obviously, the political significance of such visits cannot be overemphasized.

Finally, the Commission should be results-oriented, especially as its success will be measured against the difference it makes to the lives of people in countries emerging from conflict.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Choi Young-jin (Republic of Korea): Post-conflict peacebuilding is a major challenge to the responsibility of the United Nations for ensuring global peace and security. In war-torn countries around the world, peace, development, human rights and democracy are threatened by the possibility of recurring or rekindled conflicts. Those conflicts can spill over all too easily into neighbouring countries, damaging regional peace and stability. In our interdependent world, Member States have an ever higher stake in curbing instability and mitigating the human tragedy brought on by recurrent conflicts.

That is why the States Members of the United Nations, in a manifestation of their collective will and wisdom, created the Peacebuilding Commission — to improve the coordination of all relevant actors within and outside the United Nations in helping post-conflict societies to successfully navigate the often treacherous path from conflict to sustainable peace. The Commission is thus designed to fill a critical gap by linking the United Nations peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities as seamlessly as possible.

My delegation notes with satisfaction that, since the creation of the Commission, two country-specific meetings have already been held, on Burundi and Sierra Leone, at which guidelines were developed for the allocation of Peacebuilding Fund resources to those two States. My delegation believes that those outcomes demonstrate the value and viability of the Commission.

Going forward, we expect the Commission to continue to grow its role in the development of holistic, synergistic strategies to coordinate the work of the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and other actors.

It goes without saying that effective peacebuilding requires adequate financial resources. Currently available resources should be used as efficiently as possible, but greater resources are clearly needed. My delegation hopes that, as the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund fulfil their mandates and prove their worth, Member States will recognize their achievements by increasing their contributions to the Fund. The Peacebuilding Fund should also play a catalytic role in responding to the initial needs of post-conflict societies, sustaining international attention and initiating inflows of financial resources from the international community to help with rebuilding and development.

National ownership is another crucial element of post-conflict peacebuilding efforts, which should serve the needs of the people on the ground. Nevertheless, as has often been pointed out, there are sometimes post-conflict situations in which national authorities are not able to participate meaningfully in peacebuilding efforts. While national ownership should be ensured as much as possible, peacebuilding efforts should also address situations where there is a lack of competent national authority.

The Republic of Korea has demonstrated its support for peacebuilding through its participation in United Nations activities in East Timor and other post-conflict situations. As a further demonstration of that support, we have contributed \$3 million to the Peacebuilding Fund. We are hopeful that the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund will have a significant impact on international peacebuilding efforts, and we pledge to continue to contribute to the peacebuilding work of the United Nations in the years ahead.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Croatia.

Mrs. Mladineo (Croatia): At the outset, let me thank you, Sir, for organizing this meeting to discuss our experience in the work of the Peacebuilding Commission and explore ways of cooperation between the work of the Commission and the Security Council.

I would also like to say that Croatia aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Germany on behalf of the European Union. However, as Croatia has been elected to the Peacebuilding Commission from among those countries that have considerable peacekeeping and peacebuilding experience on the recipient side, I would like to say a few words from that particular angle.

The Peacebuilding Commission was established by resolutions of both the General Assembly and the Security Council in order to fill a gap in the peacebuilding area of the United Nations system. Croatia strongly supported that effort as, in our view, improvement in that respect is much needed. Therefore, we have to bear in mind that the Commission is a new body which is not meant to proceed in the business-as-usual way, but is supposed to adopt innovative ways to resolve post-conflict recovery. We consider it to be a work in progress.

The Peacebuilding Commission, as stated in Security Council resolution 1645 (2005) and General Assembly resolution 60/180, was established to bring together all relevant actors to marshal resources and to advise on and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery. It is aimed at helping reconstruction and institution-building efforts and at laying the foundation for sustainable development. It also needs to provide recommendations and information to improve the coordination of all relevant actors within and outside the United Nations. Those are very concrete tasks. The country-specific meetings on the two countries that are currently on the Commission's agenda have so far shown that the Commission is on the right track in that regard. However, more needs to be done. The Commission needs to make sure to contribute to the further stabilization of peace in other fragile States as well.

In that regard, we believe that there should be a stronger connection between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Therefore, cooperation between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission is of the utmost importance. The establishment of United Nations Integrated Offices, similar to those established in both Burundi and Sierra Leone, is an important step in the right direction. There should not be a gap between peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts in the peace consolidation process. Some peacebuilding

activities can be undertaken even while a peacekeeping mission is still in place.

However, we have to bear in mind that each country is a unique case and that in-depth knowledge of a situation on the ground is a crucial prerequisite for our actions. We are therefore very much encouraged by the fact that the Peacebuilding Support Office has started to fully function. Its support is indispensable to the members of the Peacebuilding Commission in providing them, among other things, with in-depth information from the ground that will enable substantial and knowledgeable discussions about countries in question.

To that end, we believe that discussions on peacebuilding activities both in the Security Council and the General Assembly are exceptionally useful. They have to ensure effective and productive bases for programmes that should guarantee that a country in question will successfully emerge from conflict and be put on a sound and irreversible path to recovery and sustainable development as soon as possible.

This debate in the Security Council is particularly useful to the two countries that are on the agendas of both the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council. We believe that the Commission needs to produce a strategy and a road map with concrete, achievable and realistic benchmarks. National ownership of the peacebuilding process by the countries in question is of the utmost importance and should be the basis for that strategy. We believe that continuous contact with those countries is an extremely important feature of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission. In that regard, the Security Council may judge the Commission's findings useful to its own consideration.

Let me conclude by saying that the value-added role of the Commission will be measured, as has been already said and repeated many times in different United Nations and other forums, by its impact on the ground. It is therefore important to work further on consolidating and rounding up its practices, to which Croatia, as a member of the Commission, is fully committed.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now call on the representative of Brazil.

Mr. Sardenberg (Brazil): My delegation would like to congratulate you, Sir, and the delegation of the

Russian Federation on your presidency of the Security Council for the current month, as well as on your timely initiative to promote this debate on the Peacebuilding Commission.

Brazil would also like to express its satisfaction with the Council's decision to appoint South Africa and Panama as the new members of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission for 2007, as well as to commend Denmark and the United Republic of Tanzania for their constructive participation in the Commission over the past year.

Through you, Mr. President, Brazil expresses its satisfaction with the presentation made by the Chairman of the Commission, the Permanent Representative of Angola, Ambassador Ismael Gaspar Martins. We acknowledge the presence of Ms. Carolyn McAskie, head of the Peacebuilding Support Office, and would like to thank the Office for its efforts in assisting the Commission. We also acknowledge the unprecedented mobilization of institutional speakers for this morning's session.

More than a year has elapsed since the 2005 Summit decision that created the new Commission, and six months since the Organizational Committee started its work. Even though the Peacebuilding Commission is still in a very initial phase, we welcome the initiative to take stock of the work done thus far and to prepare for the next steps. We hope that such an exercise can also be carried out by the Commission itself, and by the General Assembly, as proposed by the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement.

It is also appropriate that, at this early stage, in reviewing the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, the Security Council seek the views of interested United Nations Members. The exchange might provide useful insight into the performance of the new body and ways to improve it, in the light of its particular situation vis-à-vis the main bodies of the United Nations system.

For over a decade prior to the proposal of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change to set up the Peacebuilding Commission, Brazil had been advocating a mechanism that would provide for a solid link between peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and sustainable development. After carefully considering the issue, we continue to hold the view that those activities are not consecutive stages in a process; rather, they embrace a set of complementary

actions that are required in order to help establish a basis on which a country in conflict, or emerging therefrom, will be able to build lasting peace and a fair and viable society.

Member States, especially those in post-conflict situations, have entertained high expectations with the launching of the new body. The Peacebuilding Commission has been widely regarded as a powerful instrument to help in the transition between conflict and sustained peace. However, even given that it is at an initial stage, the Commission has achieved very little, a situation that does not bode well for subsequent phases if circumstances do not change.

Strenuous negotiations gave birth, during the 2005 Summit, to this new member of the United Nations family. The built-in imbalance in the composition of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission generated much acrimony and can be faulted for such a shaky beginning. We believe that more focused attention must be paid to the principle of equitable regional representation.

We should be reminded that, although it is tightly related to the Security Council, the Peacebuilding Commission is not a creation of the Council alone. It is accountable to the whole United Nations membership, which has in the General Assembly the most democratic conduit to express its views.

As we have made clear in the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission on many occasions, the new body has a long way to go to improve its working methods, should it wish to operate effectively. It is a matter of concern that little attention has been given to the drafting of rules of procedure, which, in turn, has led to long and needless debates on issues of little or no relevance.

The Peacebuilding Commission is a very important organ of the United Nations and, as such, should be supported by the Security Council. For many countries undergoing the scourge of internecine conflict, the Commission can be the venue to muster the much-needed international cooperation to enable them to recover as early as possible from the problems engendered by political instability and lack of security.

We take satisfaction in the fact that two sister African countries, Burundi and Sierra Leone, have been selected for country-specific meetings. Brazil supports all efforts in the Commission to achieve a

successful outcome of those meetings, which will be critical to the future of the Peacebuilding Commission.

It is a matter of concern to my delegation that the Commission has yet to articulate short-, medium- and long-term perspectives for the process of peacebuilding in post-conflict scenarios. However, one thing is quite clear, as shown by experience: an early withdrawal of international cooperation from a country in its recovery process can be disastrous for efforts to create the foundations of lasting peace.

Brazil believes that the Security Council can help the Peacebuilding Commission to stand on its feet and gain legitimacy and authority as an advisory body in the United Nations family. In this regard, there are readily available examples of what the Council can do. It occurs to my delegation, for instance, that, when it indicates new members, the Council can help the Commission to have a more balanced membership; or, when the Council seeks its advice, it can do it in a way that would not reduce the Commission to a classical forum of donors and aid-recipient members. Also, we believe that the Security Council can join with the General Assembly in affording the Commission sufficient authority to discharge its functions properly. In addition, we believe that the Security Council should not limit itself to seeking advice from the Commission only after peacekeeping operations have been discontinued. The Peacebuilding Commission can play a useful role in countries still subject to conflict as it procures the international support necessary to put in place recovery strategies that can lay the foundations for sustainable peace and reconstruction.

By involving a wider array of actors, the reviews and discussions undertaken in the Commission should provide the Council with better-informed analyses of the possibilities of post-conflict recovery of the countries concerned, thereby improving the quality of its decision-making process. We know from experience that there is no gap between peacekeeping, recovery and development. International cooperation efforts should address all three aspects, for it is hardly imaginable that one can be lastingly secured without the others.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Guatemala.

Mr. Skinner Klee (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): As this is the last day of January, we would like to congratulate the Russian Federation on its

assumption of presidency for this month and on having convened this very important meeting on the Peacebuilding Commission. We are certain that it will contribute to our collective effort to strengthen international peace and security, making it possible to secure sustainable development for States immersed in post-conflict situations.

In August of last year, under the presidency of Ghana, we had an opportunity to discuss this item in an open debate (see S/PV.5509) on peace consolidation in West Africa, a region that is in one of the world's most vulnerable continents. It must be said that half of the countries concluding peace agreements after experiencing conflict situations relapse into conflict even after such agreements are signed.

In the light of our own experience, which taught us valuable lessons and places us in a special position to comment on this issue, we would underscore all the elements of our history that led to our multifaceted peace process. In point of fact, despite the fact that we have achieved significant progress, Guatemalan society, 10 years after signing the Peace Agreements, is not fully reconciled. We still need to set the foundation for a more equitable and participatory society, rebuild our social fabric and create opportunities for development without exclusion.

Allow me to refer to the role to be played by the Peacebuilding Commission. After its initial organizational and informational meetings, it is now to contribute effectively to creating a favourable environment to strengthen institutional capacities, as well as to articulate strategies that will help to achieve sustainable peace and development in post-conflict societies.

We believe that this Commission has filled a large gap in the United Nations system. For the first time in history the Organization now has a pre-established system with an adequate mandate to deal with and eradicate all stages of conflict, that is, to prevent conflict and maintain and build international peace and security. Never before have we had such complex tools for assisting countries where peace has been violated and where there are serious violations of human rights, countries which lack human security and good governance, where people do not enjoy democracy and rule of law and are victims of food insecurity and extreme poverty, to mention just a few

of the challenges facing people when they emerge from prolonged conflict.

We must now ensure that all of these mechanisms will be effective and long-standing as well as flexible. We must ensure that they are always based on the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

We must bear in mind that building peace is not achieved only by preventing outbreaks of violence, nor by physical rebuilding, nor by establishing a legal basis for a State. The Peacebuilding Commission must go far beyond that and support comprehensive changes that will eliminate practices of social, economic and political exclusion and transform State institutions so that citizens not only have renewed faith in those institutions but also can participate in them. Those institutions must meet the greatest needs of the population, beginning with demobilization, disarmament and reintegration following with reconciliation, compensation and due process.

Bearing in mind the experience gained in the ad hoc advisory groups of the Economic and Social Council on African countries emerging from conflict, we believe that it is important for the Commission to collaborate proactively, not just in the important work of mobilizing international cooperation, but also in aiding national authorities to establish their own priorities and design realistic strategies and consistent policies appropriate to the circumstances and environment of each country.

With regard to the cooperation that the Commission can provide to the Security Council, it must be, first, of an advisory capacity, to propose integrated peacebuilding and recovery strategies following conflicts, and it must provide information to ensure predictable financing for initial recovery activities.

Secondly, it must serve as a real link between the activities carried out immediately after a conflict, on the one hand, and recovery and development activities in the long term, on the other hand, in which all actors are involved in an organized process of transition and recovery. They must be able to interact openly and transparently in this process.

Thirdly, such cooperation must also provide a follow-up mechanism to ensure that due attention is paid at the international level to countries emerging from conflicts, even when the peacekeeping forces

have stopped playing an active role. Consolidation of peace must be seen as part of the process. We must not forget the role of the Economic and Social Council in its own area, contributing to greater interaction, coordination and harmony, not just between both Councils, but also throughout the United Nations system.

International cooperation and coordination are essential, and the role of the United Nations worldwide is irreplaceable. Therefore, building peace does not just depend on the daily work of the Peacebuilding Commission, nor the work of the Economic and Social Council, nor that of the Security Council or of peacekeeping missions, nor on the support provided by agencies, funds and programmes. It depends also on establishing and strengthening the context in which dialogue, tolerance and understanding can flourish. Peacebuilding must be the result of an internal effort, complemented significantly by the United Nations and the international community, which must always work in solidarity, but never as a replacement.

Mr. Rosselli (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): Through you, Mr. President, we would like to express to the other members of the Council how important we believe today's meeting is.

For Uruguay, the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission, like the creation of the Human Rights Council, is one of the most solid and necessary achievements in the present reform process of this Organization. Throughout its history, the United Nations has played an essential and irreplaceable role for international peace and security with the goal of facilitating peaceful solutions to conflicts, within or between States, primarily through its peacekeeping operations.

Other speakers today have observed that despite those efforts, the international community has noted with great concern two trends that have gained ground in recent years. On the one hand, a vast number of countries emerging from conflict lack basic State institutions and require emergency humanitarian assistance. On the other hand, and no less disturbing, a great number of those countries that manage to emerge from situations of war and violence relapse in a short period of time. The result is well known: a resumption of hostilities, the unleashing of violence against the civilian population, economic and social chaos and the collapse of the State. Perhaps one of the most telling

examples of this can be found in our own hemisphere of the Americas.

In a few days the Security Council is to decide on the renewal of the mandate for the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH). This is the fifth stabilization mission in that country, and it is clear evidence of the high cost paid when attention and international assistance focus on ending armed violence without dealing with the other dimensions of the conflict.

For Uruguay, the Peacebuilding Commission is a direct response to the need for an institutional mechanism within the United Nations system to deal exclusively with meeting the special needs of countries emerging from conflict situations. My country is firmly committed to the consolidation of international peace and security. The fact that it is the seventh largest troop contributing country to United Nations peacekeeping operations is proof of that. We are also the country with the world's largest per capita contribution to troops. Uruguay is presently participating in 12 of the 15 peacekeeping missions deployed in Africa, America, Asia and Europe.

Since its first participation in peacekeeping missions to the present time, Uruguay has gained experience in matters related to reconstruction and the consolidation of peace in areas devastated by conflicts. We have made enormous efforts to put an end to hostilities, to ensure that societies and communities will agree to peace and to ensure national reconciliation. Uruguayan troops have also provided important assistance to States during elections as part of efforts to protect the civilian population in countries that are victims of social collapse.

We wish to express in the Security Council, as our regional group expressed in the General Assembly, our great concern at the lack of representation of Latin American and Caribbean countries in the Peacebuilding Commission. The situation is even more evident in the category of principal troop-contributing countries, where one single subregion is represented with three States while the other two members belong a single other regional group. The membership of the Commission must reflect the participation of countries in peacekeeping missions, experience gained in peacebuilding and equitable geographic representation, in order to ensure that recommendations reflect the

various points of view of the great number of actors involved in restoring peace after conflict.

Our country renews its commitment here to United Nations peacekeeping missions and to peacebuilding worldwide. We reiterate our desire to be part of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Uruguay welcomes the organizational progress achieved so far by the Commission. In its brief existence, it has already adopted rules of procedure and set up the voluntary Peacebuilding Fund, which is of particular significance given the lack of essential financial mechanisms for peacebuilding activities once agreements putting an end to hostilities have been signed.

The Commission has begun to consider the situations in Sierra Leone and Burundi. Uruguay also took part in peacekeeping operations in both of those countries. Our delegation continues to follow closely the work of the Commission on Sierra Leone and on Burundi, and we encourage the adoption of recommendations that will make it possible to rebuild and consolidate peace in both those nations.

The Peacebuilding Commission must be the main focus of international efforts in defining concrete actions to make progress towards the recovery, reintegration and reconstruction of countries emerging from armed conflict and thus set the foundation for their sustainable development.

In this task, it is essential to have the active participation of all States members of the Commission. The Commission must have the valuable support of those nations whose experience has been won on the ground through a sustained commitment to world peace. It is also essential to ensure effective coordination with United Nations specialized agencies, multilateral financial bodies and other actors involved.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): Mr. President, I wish to thank you for organizing this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. Egypt hopes it will further enhance the interaction and integration of the roles played by the principal organs of the United Nations in order to achieve the stability and development that the States emerging from conflict aspire to, and that it will accomplish the desire of the

international community to help prevent those States from relapsing into conflict.

I wish to express my full support for the statement on this issue made by the ambassador of Jamaica on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The principal objective for the adoption of two parallel resolutions by the Security Council and the General Assembly establishing this pivotal organ was to ensure ongoing involvement of the international community in conflict situations without interruption. Accordingly, the Security Council would deal with these considerations when they constitute threats to international peace and security until peace and stability are re-established. Then a larger role for both the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council and their relevant subsidiary bodies would evolve more vigorously and effectively, in order to deal with the requirements of the reconstruction and rehabilitation phase and move towards economic and social development in coordination with the other United Nations bodies and the international finance institutions and donor States.

The resolutions establishing the Peacebuilding Commission do not delineate clear-cut definitions of the roles of each of the principal organs in this regard. Hence, and in light of the lack of provisions on this issue in the Commission's rules of procedures, the complementarity of the roles of the three principal organs becomes essential to achieve the objectives behind establishing the Commission, without any of them attempting to encroach on the prerogatives of the other organs, which were delineated and maintained by the Charter since the foundation of the United Nations.

As it is too early to assess the role of the Peacebuilding Commission, whether in the Security Council or the General Assembly, our meeting today would only be useful in considering the lessons learned from the Commission's activities in the past six months, not in order to criticize or commend them, but rather to prepare a joint foundation with the General Assembly for a real take-off on solid grounds. Such an exercise would surely support the assessment now being conducted by the working group established specifically for this purpose within the Commission, under the chairmanship of the Permanent Representative of El Salvador.

The past few months have shown that the consensus rule is a double-edged weapon. They have

proven that there is a dire need for detailed rules of procedure governing the Commission's activities in the absence of any precedents. They have also confirmed that enhancing the functioning of the Commission needs institutional improvement, through the establishment of the desired balance between the role of the Organizational Committee, the country-specific configurations and the Peacebuilding Support Office, and to guarantee that all members of the Commission are able to perform the roles for which they were elected or appointed, without discrimination between donor and non-donor countries. There should be no special relationship between the donor countries, the State whose case is under consideration and the Peacebuilding Support Office in charting the plans and in their implementation.

Our position vis-à-vis peacebuilding is unchanged, and it will remain unchanged. It rests on the principle of national ownership of post-conflict strategies, in terms of planning and implementation equally. It rejects changing the Peacebuilding Commission into a trusteeship council that controls the future of the States emerging from conflicts. It rejects the transformation of the Commission into a mere broker or mediator that brings together the donor and recipient countries under the supervision of the Secretary-General.

Our approach to peacebuilding is based on transparency and accountability, on the common responsibility of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, without allowing any of them to prevail over the other. It is based on the responsibility of every State joining the Peacebuilding Commission to perform its role with objectivity and integrity, to rally all possible support for the States emerging from conflicts, enabling them to cement the peace and stability they have achieved. It is based on the need to make the role of the Commission visible on the ground in these States, in order to reaffirm the international community's continued attention and support.

The cases of Burundi and Sierra Leone are examples of what can be achieved in terms of progress. Egypt hopes that we can benefit from their experiences, and that we assess our performance towards them in a correct and sound manner that would allow us to support the peace in these two sisterly countries and to realize their aspirations to peace and

development, and would allow us at the same time to perform better in dealing with other cases in the future.

Mr. García Moritán (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mr. President, first of all, I would like to congratulate you and your delegation on the way in which you have been leading the debates during your presidency of the Security Council. Likewise, I thank you for the timely holding of this open debate on an issue of such importance.

The creation of the Peacebuilding Commission is the result of our Organization's need for an institutional mechanism that could assist countries emerging from conflict situations or that are at risk of relapsing into conflict, with a view to helping them achieve peace as an indispensable step towards their development.

From the beginning of negotiations leading to the establishment of the Commission, the delegation of Argentina has participated actively in the discussions of the different structural aspects, which led to resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Those resolutions defined the main objectives of the Peacebuilding Commission, focusing on reconstruction and on consolidation of the institutions necessary for post-conflict recovery, and laying the foundation for sustainable development. In our view, the Peacebuilding Commission is a fundamental instrument that will in future allow us directly to address actions leading to reconstruction and institutional recovery of States after suffering conflicts.

Likewise, the subsequent establishment of the Peacebuilding Fund must be considered as the ideal way for the international community to obtain foreseeable financing for initial recovery activities and to extend the period for post-conflict recovery. Thanks to the Fund, we will be able to set out emergency plans on the basis of predictable funding.

Responding to the appeal of the Security Council, the Peacebuilding Commission has already held its first formal meetings to consider the situations of Burundi and Sierra Leone, with the Governments of both countries participating. In this regard, we would like to underline the significance of the participation of those countries in the assessment of their own situations. Presentations by Governments or local representatives to the Commission make detailed analysis possible and allow for a more complete picture to be painted. Such

information will make it possible to identify priorities with greater precision, taking into account requirements and resources. In that connection, a calendar of short-, medium- and long-term objectives could be set out, on the basis of what we believe must be clear and precise rules, established by the Commission, which must be in keeping with the spirit of the Organization and respond to the wishes of the international community.

At the same time, we believe that the report to be produced by the Commission, with recommendations, should also include mechanisms for achieving goals and implementing plans, as well as provisions for supervision so as to prevent the funds from being diverted.

To those two elements to which we have just referred — clear and precise rules and supervision — we would like to add another, which we believe is vital for the orderly and predictable functioning of any organization: the establishment of rules of procedure. We know that such rules have been outlined by the Commission, and we trust that their prompt definition will help to improve its functioning, leading to a fruitful outcome.

Before concluding, my country would like to congratulate the two new States members of the Peacebuilding Commission, elected by the Council: Panama and South Africa. Argentina particularly welcomes the inclusion of Panama in the Commission, as that allows for the correction of the imbalance in terms of regional representation, which is an underlying principle of this Organization and one on which my country, together with other Latin American nations, has put great stress.

I would also like to note that my country continues to be convinced of the wisdom of establishing the Commission, which will allow for the completion of the final phase of post-conflict situations and the reconstruction and the strengthening of institutions, so that conflict can be left behind for good. We know from experience that it is not possible to resolve conflicts by means of military operations alone.

Finally, I would like to say that while security is the first pillar upon which peace can be achieved in any conflict, the role of the United Nations must be directed towards fostering development and ensuring respect for and defending human rights. We therefore

believe that the work of the Peacebuilding Commission must also be directed towards those goals.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I give the floor to the representative of Afghanistan.

Mr. Tanin (Afghanistan): I should like to begin by commending you, Mr. President, for the able manner in which you have led the work of the Council during the month of January. Allow me also to express my delegation's appreciation to you for having convened today's open debate on the important topic of post-conflict peacebuilding. The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission on 20 December 2005 marked a major step forward towards achieving a more efficient and effective Organization. It also marked a turning point in the efforts of the United Nations to promote peace, stability and development in post-conflict countries and in countries emerging from conflict.

The Islamic Republic of Afghanistan notes with great satisfaction the launch of the Peacebuilding Fund on 11 October 2006 and the subsequent convening of four country-specific meetings, on Burundi and on Sierra Leone, as a clear indication of the international community's determination to achieve long-term peace and stability in countries emerging from conflict.

As a country emerging from more than two decades of armed conflict, Afghanistan is well aware of the challenges associated with post-conflict peacebuilding. In a relatively short period of time, we have made significant gains towards a stable and democratic Afghanistan. The convening of the emergency loya jirga, the adoption of a new constitution and the holding of presidential and parliamentary elections are just some of our major accomplishments.

We managed to attain those achievements against the backdrop of numerous challenges posed to our peacebuilding efforts. We attribute those successes to two primary factors: first, the determination of the Afghan people to live in peace and tranquillity; and, secondly, the sustained support of the international community, in particular the United Nations.

On the basis of our experience, we have come to realize that effective peacebuilding requires a comprehensive and multifaceted strategy encompassing the essential components of social and economic development, good governance, human rights, the rule

of law and national reconciliation, as well as the proactive and sustained engagement of the international community. In this context, we also underscore the importance of the leadership role of the country concerned in the process.

As His Excellency Mr. Kofi Annan, the former Secretary-General, stated on the occasion of the launching of the Peacebuilding Fund,

“Although peacebuilding is a collective effort, involving the international community, it is the Government of the country concerned that carries the main responsibility for setting priorities in ensuring that a peace process can be sustained. National ownership is the core principle of peacebuilding, and the restoration of national capacity to build peace must therefore be at the heart of our international efforts.”

We are also of the view that the creation of mechanisms with a mandate to coordinate and monitor peacebuilding efforts will be crucial to the overall process. As mentioned earlier by His Excellency Mr. Kenzo Oshima, the Joint Coordinating and Monitoring Board in Afghanistan, comprising representatives of the Afghan Government and the international community, has proved effective as such a mechanism.

The initial stage of post-conflict peacebuilding necessitates altering the conditions that gave rise to a particular conflict. Adopting a passive stance in dealing with dominant threats will not only complicate the situation but also jeopardize the process in its entirety. As in the case of Afghanistan, continuing terrorist attacks in the south and south-eastern parts of the country constitute the main threat to Afghanistan’s peacebuilding process. Those attacks have drastically affected the daily lives of the people and have hampered the reconstruction and rehabilitation process. It is therefore essential to address both internal and external factors that contribute to insecurity in a particular country. In that regard, we also stress the need to enhance the capacity of national security institutions to effectively address prevailing security challenges.

Equally important is the need to accelerate the pace of social and economic development, as security and development are not only interconnected, but also mutually reinforcing. We have come to realize that improving security in post-conflict countries will not

be achieved by military means alone; it will also require sustained economic development.

The successful reintegration of ex-combatants in post-conflict countries will depend largely on the launching of quick-impact reconstruction projects and the creation of employment opportunities. That will encourage former combatants to reintegrate fully into civilian life and to refrain from joining illegal armed groups.

National reconciliation can be vital to a successful peacebuilding process and can enhance dialogue among all segments of society and the peace processes necessary to achieve national peacebuilding goals. An inclusive political process — one that ensures equal representation and participation by all national actors and stakeholders — will lead to greater confidence-building. In that regard, allow me to mention that the full participation of all of Afghanistan’s ethnic groups in main political parties and the political process was one of the key factors that contributed to the successful implementation of the Bonn Agreement of 2001.

Finally, Afghanistan emphasizes the need for the international community to maintain an adequate level of aid, including the provision of financial assistance, to countries emerging from conflict with a view to facilitating a smooth transition from conflict to lasting peace and stability. The political presence of the United Nations through its country team, the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan, together with the active role of development agencies under the umbrella of the United Nations Development Programme Resident Coordinator, will contribute significantly in that regard.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate Afghanistan’s full support for the work of the Peacebuilding Commission. We stand ready to share with the Commission our experience and the lessons learned in our peacebuilding efforts. We also remain confident that this newly established Commission will spare no effort in carrying out its important and noble task of securing peace and tranquillity in post-conflict countries.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): On behalf of the presidency and the delegation of the Russian Federation, I wish to sincerely thank all participants in this debate for their interesting statements and their active cooperation in today’s Security Council meeting,

which considered the important issue of enhancing the effectiveness of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.