



GLOBAL  
GOVERNANCE  
INSTITUTE

---

**LEADING THE PEACEBUILDING COMMISSION:  
*AN INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY IN THE MAKING***

**BY**

**EJEVIOME ELOHO OTOBO**

**DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY HEAD  
UNITED NATIONS PEACEBUILDING SUPPORT OFFICE**

**GGI ‘Views from Practice’ No. 1/2013**

---

March 2013

The Global Governance Institute  
Pleinlaan 5,  
1050 Brussels, Belgium  
Email: [info@globalgovernance.eu](mailto:info@globalgovernance.eu)  
Web: [www.globalgovernance.eu](http://www.globalgovernance.eu)

**GGI 'View from Practice' Paper Series**

Peace & Security Section

© The Global Governance Institute (GGI)

March 2013

[www.globalgovernance.eu](http://www.globalgovernance.eu)

[info@globalgovernance.eu](mailto:info@globalgovernance.eu)



GLOBAL  
GOVERNANCE  
INSTITUTE

*Copyright by the Global Governance Institute, Brussels. Citations and comments are welcome, however, the content of this publication may not be copied or reproduced except for personal, non-commercial purposes.*

*For any other use, the written consent of the Global Governance Institute is required.*

## Abstract\*

In this second GGI ‘Views from Practice’ Paper, Ejeviome Eloho Otobo (Director and Deputy Head of the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office) provides a detailed inside overview of the main milestones and crucial developments in the evolution of the main bodies of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). Based on the author’s own experience and a wide range of conversations and interviews with PBC Chairs, the paper provides in-depth insights into the young organization’s institutional adaptations, core changes as well as the main contributions of all of the serving Chairs. The analysis is predicated on the belief that the growth of any new intergovernmental institution critically depends on the creative adjustments that are made by successive leaders, as the institution evolves. Such adjustments are necessarily incremental borne out of persistent experimentation. Finally, the paper provides some reflection on the PBC’s future challenges, related both to the issues of funding and a deeper relationship with the Security Council. Addressing these challenges will be vital for continuing the young institutional history and wider field impact of this unique UN body.

## About the Author

**Ejeviome Eloho Otobo** is the Director and Deputy Head of the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) at the United Nations Headquarters in New York. Prior to joining PBSO, he served as Deputy Director for Policy Analysis and Monitoring in the UN Office of the Special Adviser on Africa (OSAA); and has worked at the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs in New York; and at the UN regional Economic Commission for Africa, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Mr. Otobo joined the United Nations after a distinguished career in the FEDERAL PUBLIC SERVICE of Nigeria, during the course of which he served on the Policy Planning Staff of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and represented his country in several countries and participated in various bi-lateral political and multilateral economic negotiations.

Mr. Otobo’s areas of research interests and writings include peace building, public service and institutional reforms, regulatory policy and management, international trade, regional cooperation, economic and corporate governance.

Mr. Otobo is widely published and has contributed articles on a wide range of issues and chapters to various books. He was a contributor to the 2007 African Development Report on the theme of Natural Resources for Sustainable Development in Africa and the 2001 African Development Report on the theme of Fostering Good Governance in Africa. Some of his most recent book chapters have appeared in *Nachbar Afrika: Dimensionen eines Kontinents* (Vienna: Austria Prassagen Verlag, 2010); *United Nations Reform and the New Collective Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 2010); *Administrative Culture in a Global Context* (de Sitter Publications, Toronto, Canada, 2005); *African Development and Governance Strategies in the 21st Century* (Zed Publishers, London 2003); *Better Governance and Public Policy: Capacity Building and Democratic Renewal in Africa* (Kumarian Press, Connecticut, USA 2002); and *Public Administration in Africa: Main Issues and Selected Country Studies* (Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, USA 1999 which was revised and re-published by Evan Brothers (Nigeria) in 2011). Mr. Otobo earned his Bachelors of Science degree from University of Lagos and his Masters of Public Administration (MPA) degree from the J.F.Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

---

\* The author wishes to express his gratitude to his colleague Ihab Awad Moustafa for his helpful comments and to the past Chairs of the PBC for their support, interest and suggestions. The views expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the United Nations or the Peacebuilding Support Office.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. Laying the Foundation: June 2006- June 2007</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. Pushing the Envelope: July 2007 – December 2008</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Broadening the PBC’s Outreach &amp; Improving its Engagement Process: 2009</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. The First Quintennial Review and its Follow-up: 2010</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>5. Taking Forward the 2010 Review: Developments in 2011</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>6. The Implementation of the 2010 Review Enters Its Second Year: 2012</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Conclusions: Some Major Institutional Issues</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Annexes</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>About the Global Governance Institute</b>	<b>20</b>

## Introduction

The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) will mark its seventh anniversary in June 2013<sup>1</sup>. As the work of the PBC has evolved, a frequently encountered question has been: ‘What role does the Chair of the PBC play?’ A simple answer to this question is that the Chair, at his or her best, serves as “the conductor of a symphony orchestra” – an orchestra that consists of what the founding resolution describes as the ‘PBC configurations’. These include the organizational committee, the country-specific configurations (they are currently six, one for each of the 6 countries on the agenda of the PBC) and the Working Group on Lessons Learned. The Organisational Committee is the body that serves, more or less, as the plenary of the PBC. The country-specific configuration is the forum where issues pertaining to the individual countries are discussed. The origin and functions of the Working Group on Lessons Learned (WGLL) are discussed in the next section.

Some of the Chairs interviewed for this paper expressed the view that they saw their role as extending beyond “the conductor of a symphony orchestra”. They also saw themselves as “pro-active leaders” taking initiative on a range of issues, facilitating various negotiations on practices adopted by the PBC, and managing the web of relationships among the PBC configurations and between the PBC and other inter-governmental bodies as well as international institutions with which the PBC developed partnerships during their tenures. Leading the various configurations of the PBC is a shared responsibility among the Chair of the PBC, assisted by the Vice-chairs and the Chair of the WGLL as well as the Chairs of the various configurations. This *GGI View From Practice*, however, focuses only on the leadership of the organisational committee (see Table Annex I for the list of past Chairs and Vice-chairs of the PBC). The role and contributions of the country specific configurations have been detailed by the author in other papers<sup>2</sup>.

This *GGI View from Practice* represents the first attempt to examine the main highlights of the Commission’s work under successive Chairs of the PBC, reflecting their individual priorities and contributions, since the PBC’s inauguration in June 2006. This is essentially an unexplored issue in the growing literature on the PBC. The paper examines the first six years of the PBC, from 2006-2012, and its approach is to highlight three main contributions of each Chair during their tenure.

The analysis is predicated on the belief that the growth of any new intergovernmental institution critically depends on the creative adjustments that are made by the successive leadership, as the institution evolves. Such adjustments are necessarily incremental borne out of persistent experimentation. This assessment draws on the insights of those who were and have been present since the establishment of the PBC, on the annual reports of the PBC and other related documents, and from conversations with the successive Chairpersons themselves.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the decision to create the PBC was agreed in the World Summit Outcome Document (A/60/1 of 24 October 2005) and the enabling resolutions establishing the body were adopted by General Assembly in Resolution A/60/180 and Security Council in Resolution S/1645 (2005) on 20 December 2005, the inaugural meeting of the PBC was held on 23 June 2006.

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, the articles by the author entitled “A United Nations Architecture to Build Peace in Post Conflict Situations” in World Bank Institute: Development Outreach Magazine devoted to the theme of Fragility and Conflict, October 2009; “The New Peacebuilding Architecture: An Institutional Innovation of the United Nations” in Peter Danchin and Horst Fischer, ed. (2010) *United Nations Reform and the New Collective Security*, Cambridge University Press; and “The UN Peacebuilding Architecture: African Countries as Early Beneficiaries” in Irene Freudenschuss-Reich & Georg Lennkh, (eds) (2010), *Nachbar Afrika: Dimensionen eines Kontinents*, Prassagen Verlag, Vienna Austria.

## 1. Laying the Foundation: June 2006 - June 2007

The first year of the PBC was devoted to laying the foundation for the work of the Commission. Much of that effort concentrated on designing the institutional processes to ensure the effective functioning of the Commission. The three most significant contributions during the tenure of the first Chair were: making a decision to admit institutional donors pursuant to paragraph 9 of the founding resolution, establishing the Working Group on Lessons Learnt, and drawing attention to the need to make funding available for PBC field visits.

In paragraph 9 of the founding resolution establishing the PBC, it was stated that “representatives from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and other institutional donors shall be invited to participate in all meetings of the Commission.” Selecting the other institutional donors was one of the major decisions of this period. The Chair led the consultations that resulted in the agreement to invite the European Union and the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation as the two other organisations that met the criteria of institutional donors and to allow them to participate in the formal meetings of the OC and the configurations, [as non-voting members].

Brokered by the Chair, the creation of the Working Group on Lessons Learned was both an act of institutional innovation and a consolation prize. It was an innovation because the Working Group was not explicitly envisaged in the founding resolution. Once created, it became a vehicle for giving practical effect to the founding resolution’s requirement “to develop best practices” for peacebuilding, a function envisioned for the Commission in paragraph I(c) and for the Peacebuilding Support Office in paragraph 23. It was a consolation prize because the decision to establish the Working Group and assign it to one of the Vice-Chairs came after that Vice-chair failed to secure the position of Chair of the country-specific configuration for Sierra Leone. Once selected, the first Chair of the Working Group held the position for three and half years (mid-2006 until the end of 2009). The issues that the Working Group focused on during that period are contained in the publication entitled ‘Emerging Lessons and Practices in Peacebuilding, 2007-2009.’<sup>3</sup>

In its first year of work, experience showed the usefulness of PBC field visits to the countries on its agenda. Such visits not only gave the members of the Commission an opportunity to interact with the key stakeholders in the country but also enabled them to assess progress in peacebuilding. Field visits were designed to realise the objectives that the modality of video-conferencing (suggested in paragraph 19 of the founding resolution) could not. The first annual report on the work of the PBC, negotiated under the guidance of the Chair’s team at the end of the first session of the PBC, laid the foundation for the financing of PBC visits from the regular budget. It was argued that as part of its working methods, the Commission had

“decided to organize field missions to the countries under consideration, and in light of their usefulness for the work of the Commission, it intended to continue undertaking such missions...in that context, the Commission wished to bring to the attention of the Assembly the fact that the issue of the financing of such missions needed to be

---

<sup>3</sup> See Report on the Working Group on Lessons Learned of the Peacebuilding Commission, May 2010.

appropriately considered and that such consideration could include all options, taking into account the fact that the Commission was a new body.”<sup>4</sup>

The task of taking forward this proposal fell on the next Chair of the PBC.

During this year of laying the foundation for the PBC, the Chair recognized -- and emphasized -- that two considerations must guide the work of the Commission for it to be credible: strengthening the national ownership of the peacebuilding efforts by the countries on the agenda and ensuring that its work was results-oriented to build confidence of countries on the agenda and partner countries, both developed and developing, who make various contributions to support the agenda countries.

## **2. Pushing the Envelope: July 2007- December 2008**

This period, the longest served by any Chair, witnessed the pushing of the envelope, both literally and figuratively, on many fronts, namely by taking action to ensure that PBC field visits were funded from the regular budget rather than through individual contributions by chairs of configurations, as well as mobilizing resources from private organisations, and initiating discussion on developing criteria for placing more countries on the agenda of the PBC.

During this period, as a follow-up to the first annual report, the Chair of the PBC wrote to the President of the General Assembly, bringing to the latter’s attention the need for the question of financing field missions of the PBC to be allocated to the fifth committee for consideration<sup>5</sup>. This letter was referred to the fifth committee for discussion, which in turn requested the Secretary General to produce a report.”<sup>6</sup>

The Secretary-General’s note provided not only the cost estimates for the field missions for the biennium but also proposed the number and composition of the PBC field visits that have governed those visits until now. It suggested one field visit by the PBC delegation composed of seven members, including the Chair of the configuration, one member each of the five regional groups and a representative of the country on the agenda. Allowance was also made for the chairs of the country-specific configurations to undertake solo visits, as “certain circumstances may warrant”. The sum of \$676,300 was proposed in the 2008-2009 biennium<sup>7</sup> for the field visits. This opened the door to financing this core work of the PBC from the regular budget and eliminated the need to finance these by self-financing or other forms of contribution that would have considerably weakened this important modality of the PBC’s work.

As part of the effort to fulfill the PBC mandate on resource mobilisation, the Organisational Committee held a discussion on the theme “The role of the private sector in peacebuilding: contribution by the Peacebuilding Commission”. The Chair assigned a facilitator to lead a

---

<sup>4</sup> See Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its first session, (A/62/137-S/2007/458) page 15.

<sup>5</sup> This letter is contained in document A/62/493 dated 18 October 2007

<sup>6</sup> See Financing field missions of the Peacebuilding Commission: Note by Secretary-General (A/62/670) of 31 January 2008.

<sup>7</sup> The actual expenditure for the field visits for 2008-009 was US\$593,200, but in subsequent biennia, the allocations were US\$495,000 for 2010-2011 and US\$455,000 for 2012-2013 (see Supplementary Financial Information for Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Proposed Programme Budget for 2012-2013 in A/66/6(section 3) 31 May 2011, p.44

working-level discussion to “focus on tangible ways through which the Commission could contribute to strengthening the role of the private sector in post-conflict peacebuilding...with consideration given to three specific areas: microfinance, remittances and partnerships with foundations.”<sup>8</sup> The Facilitator (Indonesia) produced a report entitled “The Outcome of the PBC Task Force on Private Sector”, dated 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2008, which made a number of proposals on how the PBC could strengthen its links with the private sector with a view to attracting private capital to countries on the agenda of the PBC.

The Chair explained that his focus on the role of the private sector, as a source of resource mobilization, and his efforts in developing partnerships with international financial institutions (he was the first PBC Chair to visit the IMF on 14 February and the World Bank on 31 March 2008)<sup>9</sup> reflected his strong belief and deeply felt commitment to highlight the importance of the economic dimension of peacebuilding. This was at a time when some members of the PBC argued that the focus of its work should be on the political rather than the economic dimension.

With more countries requesting to be placed on the agenda during this period, there was a keenly felt need to further reflect on the criteria for considering such requests. In as much as paragraph 12 of the founding resolution has outlined the routes through which a country could refer to the PBC, it did not indicate which criteria should be used in making the decision on the referrals.

The Chair convened two informal discussions on the subject on 16 October and 19 November 2007 and subsequently produced an informal paper<sup>10</sup> for discussion at the Organisational Committee. The paper outlined two sets of criteria: procedural considerations and country-specific considerations. Concerning the former, the paper suggested that the number of countries that the PBC places on its agenda should be based on the capacity of the PBC and PBSO; the PBC should be kept fully apprised by the referring bodies mentioned in paragraph 12 of the founding resolution; and each referral should focus on specific peacebuilding challenges appropriate for each country. In so far as country-specific considerations are concerned, the paper proposed that the requesting country demonstrate willingness, ownership and determination to work with the PBC, and the expectations of the requesting countries concerning the nature and scope of PBC support (value-added) should be mutually agreed upon and spelt out in the instrument of engagement between the PBC and the requesting country.

### **3. Broadening Outreach and Improving its Engagement Process: 2009**

The three most significant highlights of this year were developing the PBC’s partnerships with regional organisations; extending its outreach to philanthropic foundations and improving the country engagement process of county-specific configurations.

The main initiative on broadening partnerships related to the Chair’s visits to three regional institutions: the Organisation of American States in March 2009, the European Commission in May 2009, and the Chair’s Group visit to the African Union in November 2009. Each of

---

<sup>8</sup> Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its second session (A/63/92-S/2008/417) of 24 June 2008, page 5

<sup>9</sup> Ibid page 4

<sup>10</sup> This paragraph draws on the Chairman’s Non-paper entitled “Points to be considered for adding a new country to the Peacebuilding Commission agenda”, 26 November 2007.

these visits marked the first time that the Chair of the PBC or the Chair's Group travelled to those institutions for policy dialogue. The main message by the PBC leadership in all of those policy dialogues was similar, namely to advocate with leaders and senior officials of those institutions to work closely with the PBC on advancing the cause of peacebuilding.

In the case of the visit to the African Union (AU), the Chair's Group held a formal meeting with the AU Peace and Security Council (AU-PSC). At that meeting, the member states of the AU-PSC, while expressing appreciation for the inclusion of four African countries – at that time - on the agenda of the PBC, called on the PBC to take on more African countries. Thus, in the Press Statement issued at the end of the meeting, the AU-PSC “reiterated its encouragement to the Peacebuilding Commission to pursue and intensify its efforts in order to effectively contribute to the consolidation of peace in Africa and the recovery of countries emerging from conflict...and encouraged the PBC to consider expanding its activities to other African countries in post-conflict situations”.<sup>11</sup> The meeting also produced an agreement on holding “an annual joint meeting of the Commission and the Peace and Security Council of the African Union [which] would be held back-to-back with the annual consultative meetings between members of the Security Council and the Peace and Security Council”<sup>12</sup>

The idea that the PBC should work with and benefit from philanthropic foundations began to take hold during this period. The seeds of those efforts were sown when the Chair made contact with prominent individuals in the arts. Foremost were his several meetings with Yoko Ono, whom he met on 3 March and 3 December 2009. The Chair stated that “following his conversations with artist and pro-peace activist Yoko Ono, she had partnered with EMI Music, Sony/ATV Music Publishing and iTunes to donate to the Peacebuilding Fund all proceeds from the sale, in the last quarter of 2009, of a commemorative fortieth anniversary digital single of the song Give Peace a Chance, written by her late husband, John Lennon”<sup>13</sup>.

Four countries had come on the agenda by this year: Burundi (2006), Sierra Leone (2006), Guinea-Bissau (2007), and the Central African Republic (2008). The inclusion of more countries on the PBC's agenda prompted a reflection on how to reduce the transaction costs of their international engagement. In response, the PBCSO prepared a paper<sup>14</sup> on improving the process of PBC engagement for discussion at the Organisational Committee. The paper focused on four key issues aimed at reducing the transaction costs of engagement to both the PBC and the countries on its agenda; reducing the frequency and number of meetings of the PBC and especially of the country configurations (see table annex II for the declining trends in number of meetings); reducing the timeline for developing and completing the instrument of engagement; simplifying the instrument of engagement by focusing on a few, selected peacebuilding priorities; improving the sequencing of some of the activities of the country-specific configurations, for example, between the allocation of the PBF and the development of the instrument of engagement.

The discussion on these issues, conducted under the leadership of the Chair, subsequently resulted in the first round of changes to the process of engagement between the PBC and the countries on its agenda. The changes included, for example, replacing the strategic framework for peacebuilding with the statement of mutual commitments, as the instrument of

---

<sup>11</sup> See AU PSC Press Statement (PSC/PR/BR/CCVIII) issued at the end of its 208th Meeting, 9 November 2009.

<sup>12</sup> Report of the Peacebuilding Commission, 4th session (A/65/701-S/2011/41) of 28 January 2011, page 22.

<sup>13</sup> Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its 3rd session (A/64/341-S/2009/444) of 8 Sept. 2009, page 4 and Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its 4th session (A/65/701-S/2011/41) of 28 Jan. 2011, page 5.

<sup>14</sup> The paper was entitled “Improving the Country Specific Meetings: A new approach for new countries coming on the agenda of PBC”, dated 9 October 2009

engagement between the PBC and the countries on its agenda; the reduction in the number of peacebuilding priorities in the statement of mutual commitments; increasing the timeline for the periodic review of the instrument of engagement; and significantly reducing the time devoted to developing and adopting the instrument of engagement. The progress made on the last component is reflected in annex table III, which shows that for the last two countries that came on the agenda (Liberia in 2010 and Guinea in 2011), it took about a third of the time to complete the development of instruments of engagement than it took for the first four countries. Taken together, these changes represented the first steps in moving the PBC towards what is now commonly referred to as a “light PBC engagement”. Even so, there is growing recognition that more is needed to be done in improving the process – a theme that the co-facilitators of the 2010 Review highlighted in their report.

#### 4. The First Quintennial Review and its Follow-up: 2010

The PBC annual report covering this period put it best when it said that 2010 “coincided with the mandated five-year review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. While the review process was distinct from the ongoing work of the Commission, the latter focused its activities on key issues which have been subsequently highlighted [in] the review recommendations”<sup>15</sup>.

The 2010 Review of the UN peacebuilding architecture was led by a team of three facilitators – consisting of the three Permanent Representatives to the United Nations from Ireland, Mexico and South Africa – appointed jointly by the UN General Assembly and the Security Council. They submitted their report to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council in a letter dated 19 July 2010<sup>16</sup>. By the time the report was submitted in July 2010, the Commission was half way through its work for the year. Nonetheless, the orientation of the Commission’s work not only cohered with the main findings of the 2010 Review, but was also subsequently inspired by the recommendations of 2010 Review.

The three major highlights of the Commission’s work included a policy discussion on partnerships for peacebuilding, strengthening interaction with the Security Council, and developing an annual roadmap for the implementation of the 2010 Review.

On 23 March, the PBC Chair convened a policy discussion on Partnerships for peacebuilding to which it invited the African Union, the European Union, the International Monetary Fund, the Organisation of Islamic Conference, and the World Bank. “The discussion centred on four types of partnerships, namely a partnership for a common vision for engagement in a country; a partnership for improved coordination; a partnership for advocacy and political support; and a partnership for financial resource mobilisation. On 23 June, the Chair followed up by convening a discussion with the World Bank ...to address a number of critical issues on the basis of which the Commission and the bank could build on their evolving partnerships in the countries on the agenda”<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fourth session (A/65/701- S/2011/41) 28 January 2011, page 1.

<sup>16</sup> Review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (A/64/868-S/2010/393 of 21 July 2010)

<sup>17</sup> Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fourth session (A/65/701- S/2011/41), 28 January 2011, page 3.

The Chair also devoted much time and effort to cultivating its ties with the Security Council and the General Assembly. Thus, the Chair was invited to address the Security Council during the debates on transition and exit strategies (12 February), post-conflict peacebuilding (16 April), and the Secretary-General's progress report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (13 October). He also participated in an informal Security Council retreat hosted by the Government of Turkey and the International Peace Institute on the theme "At Crossroads of Peacekeeping, Peacemaking and Peacebuilding", held in Istanbul on 25 and 26 June. The Chair also participated in the high-level thematic debate organised by the General Assembly to mark the tenth anniversary of the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (Brahimi Panel report) on 22 June 2010.<sup>18</sup> These efforts anticipated and were consistent with one of the recommendations of the 2010 Review relating to strengthening relationships with the principal organs of the UN.

Recognising the importance of taking forward the recommendations from the 2010 Review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, the Chair suggested, towards the end of that year, developing an annual Roadmap of Actions for their implementation beginning in 2011. The recommendations emanating from the Review were wide-ranging, covering such issues as national capacity building; intensifying resource mobilization efforts; lightening the administrative burden of PBC engagements; focusing on the developmental aspects of peacebuilding; enhancing coherence and coordination among various actors; improving the working methods of the organizational committee; clarifying the rationale for discussions in the working group on lessons learned; developing approaches for multi-tiered engagement; articulating entry and exit criteria for PBC engagement; strengthening key relationships with the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council; and enhancing partnerships with key regional and international actors, etc. The articulation of an annual Roadmap of Actions for implementing the recommendations of the 2010 Review not only gave a sharper focus to the work of the Commission but also imposed a stricter prioritisation in the annual programme of the Commission's work. In many important respects, 2010 was a turning point in the work of the PBC because the issues that it addressed that year - from defining partnerships to strengthening relationships with principal organs and developing an annual Roadmap of Actions for 2010 - have become the touchstone of the PBC's work in subsequent years.

## **5. Taking Forward the 2010 Review: Developments in 2011**

The 2011 Roadmap of Actions<sup>19</sup> marked the beginning of what would be a multi-year effort to implement the recommendations of the 2010 Review. The 2011 Chairperson focused on three key issues, namely: national capacity building, sharing experiences in lessons learnt in post-conflict peacebuilding, and building partnership and resource mobilisation.

The Chair convened two meetings of the Organisational Committee to focus on national capacity development. One meeting provided an opportunity for the Organisational Committee to discuss with the Senior Advisory Group on the Review of Civilian Capacity in the Aftermath of Conflict. The other provided an opportunity for a discussion between the Organisational Committee and the UNDP. In regards to the former, the PBC "expressed interest in at least one of the countries on the agenda [of the PBC] becoming a pilot for the

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid page 21

<sup>19</sup> The 2011 Roadmap of Actions was adopted by the Organisational Committee of the PBC on 25 January 2011 -- see Report of the PBC at its Fifth session (A/66/675-S/2012/70 of 30 January 2012) p.2 -

implementation of partnership arrangements that draw on the capacities from the global South”<sup>20</sup>. In discussions with the latter, PBC members “stressed the need for a United Nations system-wide approach to capacity development for peacebuilding and such an approach would give balanced attention to strengthening security and economic capacities in countries emerging from conflict”<sup>21</sup>.

Providing a platform for sharing experiences in post-conflict peacebuilding is one of the most important contributions that the PBC can make to peacebuilding. Seeking to advance this aspect of PBC work, the Chair encouraged his Government to convene a High-level Meeting on the theme of ‘Peace and Statebuilding: The Rwandan Experience’, which was held in Kigali on 8-9 November 2011. The event was organized by the Government of Rwanda, in collaboration with the PBC and the AfDB. The meeting “represented an innovative effort by the Commission to serve as a platform for promoting experience-sharing between countries that have undergone peacebuilding and statebuilding processes and those engaged in or embarking on similar processes...the meeting focused on critical peacebuilding challenges, such as inclusive ownership; innovative approaches to nation-building and socio-economic development; and strategic use of aid”.<sup>22</sup> Participants at that meeting were drawn from both countries on the PBC agenda and non-PBC agenda countries.

Another major highlight of the PBC’s work during this year was the first-ever visit by the Chair’s Group to the temporary headquarters of the African Development Bank in Tunis in November 2011. Initiated by the Chair, this visit was made possible in part because of the personal friendship between the President of the AfDB and the Chair of the PBC, who are compatriots. The major objective of the visit was to develop and “deepen collaboration between the PBC and AfDB and explore how both institutions could jointly support peacebuilding priorities in African countries on the Commission’s agenda”<sup>23</sup>. The visit was a “path-breaking” event that has produced consequential results. A key outcome of the visit was the adoption of Minutes of Consultations between the PBC and the AfDB that identified specific areas of collaboration.

In the follow-up to that visit, the AfDB and the PBC supported and participated in the Donors Conference on Burundi held in Geneva, Switzerland on 29-30 October 2012; the AfDB invited the PBSO to comment on their country strategy paper for the Central African Republic and agreed to collaborate with the PBSO in providing support to Guinea in natural resource management. In Liberia, the PBC and the AfDB agreed to collaborate in supporting decentralization, including revenue generation and public financial management at sub-national levels; disarmament, demobilization and reintegration; youth employment creation; regional integration and trade; natural resource management, transparency and accountability in extractive industries; and strengthening political dialogue for programme purposes<sup>24</sup>.

---

20 Ibid page 3

21 Ibid page 3

22 Ibid, page 5

23 Ibid page 5

24 The decisions on Guinea are reflected in the Summary of the Meeting in New York between the AfDB Vice President for country and regional programme and policy and the ASG for PBSO on 26 September 2012 and the one on Liberia are reflected in the Aide Memoire dated 19 October 2012 signed between the Chair of the PBC Liberia configuration and the First Vice-President of AfDB during the former’s visit to Tunis.

## 6. The Implementation of the 2010 Review Enters its Second Year: 2012

The 2012 Annual Roadmap for the implementation of the recommendations of the 2010 Review carried forward a number of the issues that were in the 2011 Roadmap for Actions. This reflected the emphasis that the 2010 Review had placed on such issues. For example, the Review called on the PBC to “intensify [its] overall resource mobilisation efforts”<sup>25</sup>. Thus, two of the three major highlights during this year were resource mobilisation and building partnerships with IFIs.

The first major highlight related to the effort to further develop PBC’s work in the area of resource mobilisation. Although the Organisational Committee of the PBC held discussions on some aspects of resource mobilisation in 2008 and 2009 and the Working Group on Lessons Learned had also organised discussions in 2010 and 2011, the PBC’s policy discussion on resource mobilisation on 9 July 2012 was the first time that it undertook an in-depth and comprehensive review of the topic.

The discussions, convened by the Chair, had before it a paper prepared by the PBSO<sup>26</sup> which covered a wide range of issues, including enhancing national ownership and leadership in resource mobilisation; developing new approaches to the mapping of peacebuilding financing; forging partnerships and coordination; engaging private sector; supporting local private sectors; strengthening intermediation in the role of local financial institutions; south-south cooperation; outreach to philanthropic foundations; and leveraging PBC-Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) synergy (see box on Page 15).

The actual discussion at the OC led to a “general acknowledgement of the need to map resource flows as a tool which could help identify gaps and stimulate the development of effective national aid management and coordination systems. Other areas identified included the support of the Commission for the organization of donor conferences and engagement with other donors, such as foundations and philanthropic organizations”<sup>27</sup>.

The second major highlight was deepening the partnership between the PBC and the World Bank. Although two of the previous chairs of the PBC and most of the chairs of the PBC country configurations had visited the World Bank to hold discussions with senior officials at that institution, the Chair successfully pressed for a meeting between the PBC Chair’s Group and selected Executive Directors on 13 September 2012 at the World Bank in Washington D.C., which was the first time that the PBC and the World Bank met at the level of their inter-governmental bodies. The meeting agreed on several specific measures to deepen collaboration between the PBC and the World Bank, most notably to strengthen policy-level dialogue between the PBC and the World Bank management and Board of Directors at headquarters level; identify specific examples of existing collaboration which could be further scaled-up; explore ways to strengthen alignment between the PBC’s Statement of Mutual Commitments and the World Bank’s Country Assistance Strategy<sup>28</sup>.

---

25 Review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (A/64/868-S/2010/393 of 21 July 2010)

Page 18

26 An updated version of the paper entitled “Resource Mobilisation for Peacebuilding Priorities: The Role of the Peacebuilding Commission” is available at <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pdf/resource-mobilisation>

27 See Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its sixth session, A/67/715 – S/2013/63 of 29 January 2013 page 4.

28 The issues of agreement highlighted in this paragraph draw on the Summary of the discussion and outcome of the PBC Chairs Visit to the World Bank on 13 September 2012.

Reflecting the shared commitment to strengthen policy-level dialogue between the two institutions, a follow-up meeting that brought together the PBC Chair's Group and selected World Bank Executive Directors was held in New York on 3 December 2012. The New York meeting agreed on a few specific actions to take the collaboration forward, including developing a joint calendar of events and activities; undertaking follow-up actions on a range of sector-specific issues in Liberia (youth employment, mining and public finance management), Sierra Leone (addressing gaps which might emerge after the prospective draw-down of the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Mission in Sierra Leone), and Guinea (extending the pilot work on Global Employment Facility to this country).<sup>29</sup>

The third major highlight was the Chair's decision to convene a High-level Event on 25 September 2012 in the margins of the 67th session of the United Nations General Assembly under the theme "Peacebuilding: The way towards sustainable peace and security". The theme of the meeting had been foreshadowed in the inaugural speech of the Chair of the PBC in January 2012, when he said that "we look forward to meeting your expectations and more importantly, to achieving sustainable peace and stability on the ground"<sup>30</sup>.

When the Chair first mooted the idea of a High-level Event, it encountered some scepticism regarding its value and purpose. However, the meeting eventually attracted the participation of a number of Heads of State and governments, and several Ministers of Foreign Affairs as well as senior officials from the capitals. The meeting achieved its two stated objectives: to engage political leaders and high ranking officials from capitals in peacebuilding efforts and to provide a platform for UN Member States to re-affirm their political commitment to peacebuilding and to encourage their active participation in the PBC. Thus, in the Political Declaration adopted at the end of the meeting, the leaders "re-affirm[ed] [their] commitment to addressing the short- and long-term needs of post-conflict countries towards achieving sustainable peace through security and development"<sup>31</sup>. The Declaration also underlined the need to adhere to a number of key principles, which experience has shown are essential to successful peacebuilding efforts in order to avoid costly relapse into conflict. Equally important, the convening of the High-level Event has opened the door to the possibility of holding an annual session of the PBC with senior officials' participation from capitals, an idea that is gaining ground among some members of the PBC.

---

<sup>29</sup>The issues of agreement highlighted in this paragraph draws on the Summary of the discussion and outcome of the Executive Directors Visit to the UN Headquarters on 3 December 2012.

<sup>30</sup> Speech by Ambassador Abulkalam Abdul Momen of Bangladesh to the Organisational Committee of the PBC on 25 January 2012, page 1.

<sup>31</sup> See PBC Declaration on Peacebuilding: The way towards sustainable peace and security (PBC/6/OC/6) of 25 September 2012.

## Improved Synergy between the PBC and PBF

Synergy between the PBC and PBF has improved considerably over the years. In the 2009 revision of the PBF Terms of Reference, automatic eligibility for PBF funding by countries on the PBC agenda was agreed<sup>1</sup>. More recently, the PBSO has worked to more closely align peacebuilding priorities in the PBC's instruments of engagement and PBF programme support. The extent of progress in the improved synergy is highlighted by their on-going work in Liberia. There, the PBF and the PBC experimented with a new approach, which was to encourage the design of a larger Peacebuilding Programme, to which the PBF would provide catalytic support. The Liberia Peacebuilding Programme mirrors the priorities in the PBC's Statement of Mutual Commitments. Similarly in Guinea, the PBF's strategy followed closely on the heels of the Statement of Mutual Commitments produced in mid-2011. The PBSO is also improving its standard operating procedures to increase synergies. For example, in its new guidelines, the PBF has added systematic consultation of the PBC Chairs of Country-specific Configurations on programme decisions, and opportunities have been sought for PBF staff to accompany the Chairs of Configurations on their country visits. A new dimension for strengthening PBC-PBF synergy is the growing recognition of the need to empower Chairs of the PBC country configurations to discuss with missions the peacebuilding priorities that the PBF can fund in the countries on the agenda. To date, the six countries on the agenda of the PBC have received 60 percent of the cumulative allocations from the PBF.

1. *This is based on the Terms of Reference of the PBF; see (A/63/818; 13 April 2009, TOR 3.1 page 6).*

## Conclusions: Some Major Institutional Issues

This paper would be incomplete if it did not highlight some current, or anticipate possible, institutional challenges that lie ahead. The term institutional challenge is used here in a very broad sense – to refer to any issue that will affect the effectiveness, functioning and impact of the PBC. Following the pattern adopted in this paper, I want to identify three such challenges, in no particular order of priority, in this concluding section.

It is now standard cliché that an important measure of the PBC's effectiveness will be its impact in the field – that is, in the countries on its agenda. There are many ways that the impact of the PBC can be created or magnified. One such way is by working with the Joint Steering Committee – an institutional mechanism that will help the PBC to achieve policy coherence and programme coordination in the countries on its agenda. Although the first generation of JSCs was established as tools for managing PBF-funded projects, they have increasingly become mechanisms for broad-based discussion on peacebuilding priorities. The JSC mechanisms have proven to be important local counterparts to the PBC in some country contexts. In so far as the JSC is typically co-chaired by the ranking UN representative in the country, it is also another vehicle for deepening the interface between the PBC country-configurations and the Secretary-General's most senior representative in the specific country.

A JSC can also serve as a useful forum for reflecting on evolving peacebuilding priorities and monitoring the performance of PBF projects as well as developing progress reports on PBC instruments of engagement.

Financing is key to peacebuilding. Several representatives of the governments of countries on the agenda and Heads of UN missions have underlined that well-articulated peacebuilding strategies are meaningless if not adequately funded. The PBC, however, faces a two-fold financing challenge: being able to mobilise adequate financial resources for the agreed peacebuilding priorities for countries on its agenda, well beyond what the PBF can provide, and coping with the dwindling regular budgetary outlays for its field visits (see footnote 7 of this paper). Without much success with the former, progress in peacebuilding will be limited. Without adequate funding for the latter function, the ability of the PBC to interact with key national stakeholders, assess progress in peacebuilding and bring its support to bear on national efforts will be reduced. The onset of the global economic and financial crisis in 2007, so soon after the PBC was established in 2006, has created an unfavourable backdrop for the PBC to fully realise its full potential in mobilising resources for countries on its agenda. At the same time, the severe budgetary constraints under which the United Nations is now operating might make it increasingly difficult for the PBC to perform some of its mandated functions, in particular the field visits to countries on the agenda and to international financial institutions.

Of all the principal organs of the United Nations, the Security Council is the one with which the PBC has historically sought to deepen its relationship. The PBC needs to sustain those efforts. There is a very practical reason for this: thus far, five of the six countries on the agenda of the PBC were referred through the Security Council. The sixth -- Guinea -- applied directly to the PBC. There is an additional consideration which was articulated in the 2010 Review, when it noted that “there is a widely-held view that Security Council deliberations would benefit from the Commission’s advice at an early stage in the framing of peacekeeping mandates, on relevant aspects during the lifetime of missions and as drawdown approaches”<sup>32</sup> This is in line with the role envisaged for the Commission in paragraph 16 of the founding resolution.

As this paper has shown, since the 2010 Review, the PBC has intensified its efforts to actively cultivate the Security Council. The Security Council has reciprocated that gesture by inviting the Chair of the PBC as well as those of the country configurations to its formal deliberations on relevant themes and countries. As peacebuilding issues increasingly loom on peacekeeping missions and special political missions, the Security Council should assign specific tasks to the PBC for which it needs the advice of the PBC. This approach of specifically tasking the PBC to report on particular issues in countries on its agenda, which was applied during the German presidency in September 2012 in the invitation to the Chairs of Liberia and Sierra Leone, is a model that holds much promise in fulfilling the mutual expectations of both bodies.

---

<sup>32</sup> Review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (A/64/868-S/2010/393 of 21 July 2010), page 27.

## Annexes

**Annex Table 1:  
Chairpersons and Vice-Chairs of the PBC 2006-2012 in chronological order**

<b>Chairpersons and Vice Chairs</b>	<b>Term</b>
<b>Chair:</b> H.E. Mr. Gaspar Martins (Angola) <b>Vice –Chairs:</b> H.E. Mrs. Carmen Gallardo Hernandez (El Salvador) H.E Mr. Johan Løvald (Norway)	23 June 2006 - 22 June 2007
<b>Chair:</b> H.E. Mr. Yukio Takasu (Japan) <b>Vice Chairs:</b> H.E. Mrs. Carmen Gallardo Hernandez (El Salvador) H.E. Mr. Leslie Kojo Christian (Ghana)	23 June 2007 - 31 December 2008
<b>Chair:</b> H.E. Mr. Heraldo Muñoz (Chile) <b>Vice Chairs:</b> H.E. Mr. Park In-kook (Republic of Korea)	1 January 2009 - 31 December 2009
<b>Chair:</b> H.E. Mr. Peter Wittig (Germany) <b>Vice-Chairs:</b> H.E. Mr. Martin Palouš (Czech Republic ) H.E. Mr. Jean-Francis Zinsou (Benin)	1 January 2010 - 31 December 2010
<b>Chair:</b> H.E. Mr. Eugène-Richard Gasana (Rwanda) <b>Vice-Chairs:</b> H.E. Mr. Gert Rosenthal (Guatemala) H.E. Mr. Yuriy Sergeyevev (Ukraine)	1 January 2011 - 31 December 2011
<b>Chair:</b> H.E. Mr. Abulkalam Abdul Momen (Bangladesh) <b>Vice-Chairs:</b> H. E. Mr. Ranko Vilović (Croatia) H.E. Ms. Mwaba Patricia Kasese-Bota (Zambia)	1 January - 31 December 2012

**Annex Table 2: Number of Meetings of PBC**

Configuration/Years	2006/2007	2007/2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
<b>OC (total)</b>	19	25	15	10	13	11	<b>93</b>
Informal OC	6	17	10	7	10	8	58
Formal OC	13	8	5	3	3	3	35
<b>WGLL</b>	3	12	4	4	4	2	<b>29</b>
<b>CSCs (total)</b>	23	65	22	22	29	21	<b>182</b>
Informal CSCs	13	50	19	18	26	17	143
Formal CSCs	10	15	3	4	3	4	39
<b>Number of Countries on PBC agenda</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	
<b>Total</b>	45	102	41	36	46	34	<b>304</b>

Number of PBC formal and informal meetings per annum have declined over time both in absolute and relative terms. In relative terms, the way to confirm this is to calculate the number of meetings per PBC configuration per annum as defined on page 1 of the paper. The formula to apply is  $\frac{2+nc}{n}$ , where 2 stands for OC and WGLL and nc= number of countries on the agenda. Thus we use the gross total of meetings of OC, WGLL and CSCs meetings divided by the number of the configurations at the time. This will yield for **2006-2007**,  $\frac{45}{4}=11.2$  meeting per configuration for that year; **2007-2008**,  $\frac{102}{6}=17$ ; **2009**,  $\frac{41}{6}=6.8$ ; **2010**,  $\frac{36}{7}=5.1$ ; **2011**,  $\frac{46}{8}=5.75$ ; and **2012**,  $\frac{34}{8}=4.2$  [Note that uptick in the **2007-2008** period was because the session was for **18** not 12 months]

### Annex Table 3

#### Comparative Timeline for Completing Instruments of Engagement: Strategic Framework/Statement of Mutual Commitments

Country	Number of Months	
	Informal Adoption	Final Adoption
<b>Date of Adoption</b>		
<b>Burundi (SF)</b>	<b>8*</b>	14 (20 June 2007)
<b>Sierra Leone (PCF)</b>	(-)	14 ** (12 December 2007)
<b>Guinea Bissau (SF)</b>	6	8 (1 October 2008)
<b>Central African Republic (SF)</b>	7.75	10 (6 May 2009)
<p>*Strategic framework formally adopted without monitoring mechanism  ** The preparation of the SF was suspended during period leading to the 2007 elections  (-) There was no informal adoption</p>		
<b>Average</b>	<b>7.25 (3 countries)</b>	<b>11.5</b>
<b>Liberia (SMC)</b>	+ 21 days = (0.70month)	1.30 (15 November 2010)
+ Between dates that PBC mission report was presented to, and its informal/formal adoption by, the country configuration		
<b>Guinea (SMC)</b>	+ (Between Chair's mission and adoption)	4.5 (23 September 2011)
<b>New Average for 6 countries:</b>		<b>8.63</b>

\*Excludes Benchmarks for Monitoring Progress

SF= Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding

PCF= Peacebuilding Cooperation Framework

SMC= Statement of Mutual Commitments on Peacebuilding

## About the Global Governance Institute

The Global Governance Institute (GGI) is an independent, non-profit think tank based in Brussels. GGI brings together policy-makers, scholars and practitioners from the world's leading institutions in order to devise, strengthen and improve forward-looking approaches to global governance.

### Our core research areas are:

- Peace & Security
- Global Justice (including International Law & Human Rights)
- Environment & Sustainable Development
- Global Economy
- Forward Studies & Innovation

### Our Mission

Our mission is to promote comprehensive research, cutting-edge analysis and innovative advice on core policy issues, informed by a truly global perspective. This also includes raising awareness about major challenges of global governance among the general public.

### Our Vision

Our vision is a more equitable, peaceful and sustainable global order based on effective but accountable international organizations, the global rule of law and the empowerment of the individual across borders and cultures. GGI places particular emphasis on the improvement of the United Nations system and its mutual reinforcement with strong regional organizations.



For further information and enquiries, contact us at [info@globalgovernance.eu](mailto:info@globalgovernance.eu)  
or visit us at [www.globalgovernance.eu](http://www.globalgovernance.eu)