

# **Relations between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission**

## **Taking forward the ideas emanating from the Informal Interactive Dialogue (26 April)**

Working-level meeting of  
members of the PBC that are members of the Security Council, countries on the PBC  
agenda, and members of the PBC Chairs' Group

20 June 2013

Coordinator's summary

\*\*\*\*

### **Background**

1. At the informal meeting of the Organizational Committee, which took place on 5 June, the Committee designated Rwanda (the Presidency of the Council in April 2013), as coordinator assigned to take forward the ideas and suggestions presented during the informal interactive dialogue (held under its presidency) between members of the Security Council, countries on the PBC agenda, the chairs of the PBC country configurations and the Working Group on Lessons Learned (26 April).

2. In this context, Rwanda called for a meeting on 20 June with a view to developing shared understanding on **the scope of the PBC's advisory role to the Security Council (What can the Council expect from the PBC?)**; and, consequently, explore what specific actions and concrete steps can and should be taken to take forward such understanding.

### **Suggested focus and main points from the discussion**

3. At the outset, the coordinator emphasized that the meeting should focus on the suggested topic and that discussion on issues such as the expected engagement from the Security Council, the modality of interaction between the two bodies, and the role of the joint membership of both organs should be deferred to a later stage. In this regard, the discussion focused on three questions, which have been presented by the coordinator in advance of the meetings, namely:

**a) How feasible is the scope envisaged for the PBC's advisory role to the Council under each of the three phases of its engagement (as emanated from the informal interactive dialogue of 26 April)?**

4. The coordinator noted that each of the five countries that are on the agenda of both bodies is in a different phase of its peacebuilding process and that the scope of PBC's advice rendered to the Council will thus differ from one set of countries to another. Participants agreed that the PBC's advice needed to remain flexible, pragmatic and, at times, opportunistic, about what it could offer. Its advice needed to be targeted and guided by country-specific dynamics and needs, as well as focused on areas where the Commission has a comparative advantage or where it could complement efforts by other actors.

**b) In view of the country-specific nature of the PBC's advice, should the agreed scope envisaged for the Commission's advisory role be considered indicative?**

5. The coordinator noted that the Council needed to be aware of the potential and broad scope of advisory role that the PBC may be requested to provide, but should be able to seek targeted advice depending on the situation at hand. Participants referred to the areas presented in the summary of the informal interactive dialogue as useful and indicative of what the PBC could potentially offer. Participants affirmed, however, that there is need for a strategic partnership that is based on an informal understanding between both organs as to the specific areas, as well as the most appropriate timing, of the advice needed by the Council.

**c) How concretely is the PBC planning to deliver on its advisory role?**

6. The coordinator noted that the relevant country configurations needed to consider how concretely it should engage the country concerned, relevant UN missions and other relevant actors, as it identifies and develops the areas around which it will render country-specific advice to the Council. Participants noted that members of the concerned country configurations needed to be involved in determining the content of the advice to the Council. They also noted that there is need for cross-learning between the country configurations on how best the advice could be developed and shared. In this regard, upcoming consideration and discussions in the Council on specific agenda countries presented an opportunity to put into practice the ideas discussed thus far.

**Specific next steps**

7. Participants concluded that the informal interactive dialogue of 26 April has scoped and defined the space in which the Council and the PBC should be able develop their partnership. The next step is for both organs to utilize

that space. In this regard, the following steps are expected over the course of the next three months:

1. The Chair of the Burundi configuration will share information and analysis emanating from his recent visit to the country, which could possibly feed into the Council's upcoming consideration of the situation in Burundi.
  2. The Presidency of the Security Council in September (Australia), the Council's lead countries on Liberia and Sierra Leone and the chairs of the respective country configurations will consult on areas and modality for the PBC's contribution to and engagement in the Council's upcoming consideration of the mandates of UNMIL and UNIPSIL.
8. The coordinator will invite the participants to an informal discussion in October in order take stock of how these specific steps have materialized.

\* \* \* \* \*