

**Peacebuilding Commission  
Working Group on Lessons Learned**

**“Transition of the PBC’s forms and instruments of engagement”**

**and**

**“The partnership between the PBC and the Security Council”  
14 December 2011**

Chairperson’s Summary

**I. Introduction**

1. The Peacebuilding Commission’s (PBC) Working Group on Lessons Learned (WGLL) convened on 14 December 2011 in New York its final meeting of the year. It addressed two topics, namely: **a) Transition of the Peacebuilding Commission’s forms and instruments of engagement;** and **b) Partnership between the PBC and the Security Council.** The meeting was chaired by H.E. Mr. Tsuneo Nishida, Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations and Chair of the WGLL. For each of the two topics identified for this meeting, the Chair invited a panel of speakers to make introductory presentations as follows:

**II. Panel 1: Transition of the PBC’s forms and instruments of engagement**

2. In his opening remarks under this topic, the Chair noted that the meeting aims to examine the lessons and highlight the experiences of the Country Configurations with respect of the evolution of the PBC’s forms and instruments of engagement with Burundi and Sierra Leone over the past six years. In this regard, the Chair noted that the PBC moved from designing its distinct instrument of engagement (the Strategic Frameworks) and gradually moved towards aligning the instruments with the newly developed and more peacebuilding sensitive strategies (second generation PRSPs). The Chair, therefore, invited the Chair of the Burundi Configuration, **Ambassador Paul Seger, the Permanent Representative of Switzerland, and Ambassador Shekou M. Touray, Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone** in order to gain first-hand insights into the topic.

3. Ambassador Seger noted that following the 2010 elections, **Burundi** entered a new phase in its transition towards long-term and sustainable peace and that the PBC is expected to refocus its engagement on fewer peacebuilding priorities that are most crucial at this stage. He, however, indicated that the PBC face a number of challenges in this respect, namely the divide between the perspectives of the stakeholders at the Headquarters and those in the field. In this connection, he underlined the important role which the PBC needs to play in bringing greater coherence among the field-based partners, such as the UN mission, the UNCT and the World Bank, as well as to ensure that actors at the Headquarters are aligned behind and supportive of the developments in

the field. To this end, he underscored that the challenge for the PBC, as a New York-based body, is to find appropriate mechanisms for engaging national stakeholders, as well as international partners within and outside the UN actors. He noted that field visits continue to be an effective mechanism to keep the PBC closely linked and engaged with field-based actors. In addition, the recent establishment of a country configuration steering group at the Headquarters serves as a platform for closer and more regular and focused engagement with the range of field and Headquarters actors. He also emphasized that members of this steering group are invited to lead by example and to make specific commitments in support of the peacebuilding priorities in Burundi.

4. Going forward, the Chair of the Burundi Configuration noted that while the PBC's instrument of engagement with Burundi will expire in 2012, Burundi expects the PBC to keep accompanying its peacebuilding process, yet through a much lighter approach. In this regard, he mentioned that it will be important for the PBC to maintain an institutional linkage with the country as the engagement through the traditional country configuration structure is scaled down. The steering group mechanism may represent an option to be explored.

5. The Permanent Representative of **Sierra Leone** recalled the original priority areas identified by his country and the PBC at the start of their partnership which have been subsequently reflected in the instrument of engagement. He also recalled that this instrument resulted in heavy reporting requirements and frequent reviews. In 2009, the PBC decided to align its instrument of engagement with the nationally-owned Agenda for Change and the UN lead-response to it, the Joint Vision. Since then, the reporting requirement and periodicity of the review was considerably streamlined. At the same time and while decreasing in number and periodicity, PBC meetings became more effective, focused and linked to the progress made in or challenges faced at the field. Field visits continue to be extremely important in order to bridge the perspectives divide between the Headquarters and the field.

6. The Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone underlined the strength of the PBC's engagement in the areas of: a) integrated approach to the complex political and socio-economic aspects of peacebuilding; b) support to national ownership, including through support to strengthening state capacity; and c) response to emerging challenges such as in the area of combating organized crime. He also underlined the PBC's adaptability to changing circumstances and need as commendable. Ambassador Touray also drew attention to the role played by the PBF in support of peacebuilding in his country and as a crucial complement to existing funding mechanisms.

**Key recommendations and ideas emerging from the discussion:**

7. During the ensuing discussion, Members shared the following ideas and recommendations:

- a) The PBC's capacity to place additional countries on its agenda will be strengthened through innovative and lighter approaches to its engagement. The

PBC need to also develop sufficient knowledge to determine the extent to which a country would benefit from being placed on the agenda.

- b) As a New York based intergovernmental body, the PBC has a clear advantage in terms of its political clout. The PBC's proximity to decision-making processes at the UN Headquarters should be further utilized by exerting influence at and help align UN actors around the country's peacebuilding priorities.
- c) In order for its engagement to have a real impact, the PBC need to consider a range of engagement tools with the various actors in the country concerned. A workplan that clearly identifies how each CSC will engage with stakeholders around specific peacebuilding priorities and objectives is needed.
- d) The PBC need to continue to utilize various working methods ranging from meetings, to tele-conferencing, and from steering groups to field visits. Working methods need to help the PBC disseminate its messages to wider stakeholders.
- e) Establishing an institutional linkage with a field-based mechanism is also considered to be a possible way for the PBC to enhance its communications with and impact in the field
- f) The PBC could consider more focused thematic engagements with key stakeholders in order to delve deeper into the specific priorities and challenges (perhaps with the facilitation of external experts). As a result, the PBC can advise on immediate, medium and long term actions and identify the stakeholders who will take these actions forward.
- g) The PBC should consider how the evolving measures endorsed through the "New Deal" which emerged from the most recently held Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan would be aligned to its instruments of engagement in the countries on the agenda. Dialogue with the g7+ group of conflict-affected countries will help such consideration.
- h) The PBC needs to consider conditions under which a country should transition off its agenda, while maintaining a residual watching brief by the PBC OC.

### **III. Panel 2: Partnership between the PBC and the Security Council**

8. In presenting the topic, the Chair recalled that at the time of the PBC's establishment, it has anticipated that the Commission would strengthen the Security Council's ability to contribute to lasting peace. He also noted that the Report on the 2010 Review argues that the natural synergy with the Council's work is yet to materialize. In this connection, the Chair informed about an informal working luncheon hosted by Japan hosted the previous week and aimed at keeping the communications channels between the PBC and the Council open and dynamic. He also indicated that the discussion which took place over the luncheon emphasized the following areas for partnership between the two bodies:

- a) The Council and the PBC should have more frequent consultations on transition of peacekeeping and peacebuilding missions.
- b) The Council should engage the Chairs of country configurations in consultations on the situations in the countries on the agenda.

- c) Council's presidential statements and resolutions should reflect stronger peacebuilding perspective.
- d) The Council and the PBC should create opportunities for informal, yet regular, interactions and exchanges, including through a possible annual retreat.

9. The Chair further noted that the discussion in the WGLL should further elaborate on some of these areas and others which require particular focus and attention by both bodies. To this end, he invited Mr. Lansana Gberie, an expert from the Security Council Report, to make an introductory presentation.

10. Mr. Gberie noted that there is a general recognition that peacebuilding is an area on which the Security Council should place more emphasis and the PBC is the natural platform upon which the Council could draw. He saw the need for the Council to tap into a deeper thematic perspective provided by the PBC on critical peacebuilding priorities of socio-economic and political dimensions. In this regard, he insisted on the need for strengthening the institutional linkages between the two bodies, including by inviting the Chairs of country configurations to informal consultations and dialogues around key peacebuilding opportunities and challenges in the countries concerned.

**Key recommendations and ideas emerging from the discussion:**

11. During the ensuing discussion, Members echoed the importance of the points shared by the Chair (Paragraph 8 above) and made the following additional points:

- a) There is gradual progress in establishing stronger linkages and more regular interactions between the Council and the PBC. The role of member states enjoying the joint membership of the two bodies will continue to be crucial in this regard, including through the organization of thematic debates which further examine the linkages between peacekeeping and peacebuilding, as well as the linkages between security and socio-economic development in post-conflict countries.
- b) Existing and potential modalities for informal and dynamic dialogue between the two bodies need to be further examined and developed, including through ensuring that occasions for such dialogue are well-planned and result-oriented. The participation of Council members in PBC field visits is a practice which started in 2011 and need to continue.
- c) PBC should further emerge as a key component in the triangular relationship between the Secretariat, Troop Contributing Countries and the Security Council with respect to the role of peacekeepers as early peacebuilders. Deeper analytical contribution by the PBC to the Security Council's consideration of UN missions' peacebuilding-related mandates is also encouraged. PBSO should possess a stronger analytical capacity to support the PBC's work in this area.

12. The Chair concluded by reiterating that the Security Council and the PBC share the same ultimate objectives of helping the populations in countries affected by or emerging

from conflict in their efforts to sustain peace and lay solid foundations for long-term development. The Chair also announced that this meeting was the last of the WGLL under his Chairmanship and, in this connection, extended his appreciation to all members for their contributions and collegiality.

\*\*\*\*\*