

NOTE OF THE FACILITATOR

On June 13, 2008 Ambassador Gert Rosenthal, Permanent Representative of Guatemala, in his capacity as facilitator of the review process of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, held an informal meeting in Conference Room 2. The meeting was open to all Member States and Observers, intended to be a preliminary exchange of views on the expected outcome of the September 4 meeting convened by the PGA in compliance with Resolution 60/288.

In his introductory remarks the facilitator sought views on any matter, but in order to better organize the discussion he enumerated four issue areas of particular relevance:

1. Whether delegations felt that the four substantive pillars of the Strategy merited further discussion or, rather, they were susceptible to a broad reaffirmation.
2. What further steps are required to improve implementation and to give the Strategy further impetus.
3. What institutional issues require further clarification, which includes the role of the Task Force, its budgetary implications, the manner in which it interacts with the General Assembly, and what further steps are required to marshal all the resources at the disposal of the United Nations to implement the Strategy.
4. As to process, delegates might want to address the type of outcome document that would presumably be adopted at the September 4 meeting.

As to the assessment of progress since 2006, which was the main item mandated for the 2008 meeting, the Facilitator added that he had been informed by the Secretariat that the note/report of the Secretary General concerning what has been done since the adoption of the Strategy would be available by the second half of July.

Preliminary comments, views and concerns were presented by the following delegations: Pakistan, who spoke on behalf of the OIC and also on behalf of its own delegation; Slovenia, on behalf of the EU; Egypt; Canada, on behalf of CANZ; Qatar, Japan, Panama, Switzerland, Norway, Liechtenstein, Cuba, Mexico, Indonesia, Israel, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom, Colombia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Turkey, United States, Peru and Syrian Arab Republic.

Most delegations expressed that their comments were preliminary and that more concrete views would be forthcoming once the report of the Secretary General would be available. There was a clear pattern in the interventions. Virtually all speakers recognized the singular achievement that the 2006 Strategy represented, and the vast majority favored a general reaffirmation, rather than a new debate on the contents. Much concern was expressed, however, on two matters, and most speakers addressed them: the first was the importance of adopting further steps to implement the Strategy at the national, regional and global level; the second referred to the institutional aspects. On the latter, there were differing points of view on how to make the Secretariat's work more transparent and accountable, as well as regarding the mechanisms that should be implemented for interaction between the inter-governmental machinery and the Secretariat.

Regarding the matter of progress achieved in the past two years, delegations indicated they were looking forward to receiving the Secretary General's report. Some indicated that future review processes would be necessary.

Many comments were made on the matter of institutionalization of the Task Force. Although delegations commended the work of the Task Force, they constantly commented on the need to strengthen the relationship with Member States. Different ideas on mechanisms to meet more frequently to share information and provide guidance were mentioned. Furthermore, remarks on the need to implement the Strategy in an integrated, comprehensive and more balanced manner were raised. In the view of some delegations additional aspects of the Strategy required more attention such as root causes, development, cooperation, information sharing and capacity-building.

On the expected outcome, there was broad support to adopt a resolution, although some delegations found it too early to decide on such a matter. For those who supported the idea of a resolution, some of the recurrent and common elements that were mentioned were: having a short, substantive and focused document; reaffirming the Strategy, enhancing the Strategy to allow an effective and full implementation; outlining the future course of the Strategy, and clarifying the institutionalization of the Task Force regarding its interaction with Member States and resource requirements.

With regard to the resource requirements of the Task Force several delegations stressed the importance of resolving this matter before the September 4 meeting. In addition, comments were made concerning the need for more support and cooperation with the Security Council counter-terrorism bodies.

Some views on the format of the meeting of September 4 were also presented, indicating the wish to have an interactive debate to hear from missions and experts from capitals on the steps taken by Member States to implement the Strategy, including best practices.

Two delegations raised the question of the side event on victims of terrorism. In response, at the end of the meeting the Secretariat distributed a document containing information on such event.