

Speakers emphasized that the adoption in 1997 of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction indicated significant progress and reaffirmed the international community's commitment to the elimination of all mines. The representative of France maintained that the Convention could be used as a mobilization tool for mine action at all levels, including financing.⁸² The representatives of France and Mexico urged those States that had not yet signed or ratified the instrument to do so.⁸³ The representative of Mexico welcomed the fact that Kenya would host in 2004 the first review conference of the Convention, as African countries had been severely affected by the scourge of landmines.⁸⁴

**Decision of 19 November 2003
(4864th meeting): statement by the President**

At the 4864th meeting, on 19 November 2003,

⁸² Ibid., pp. 8-9.

⁸³ Ibid., pp. 14-15.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

the President (Angola) made a statement on behalf of the Council,⁸⁵ by which the Council, inter alia:

Expressed its grave concern at the harmful and widespread impact of landmines and unexploded ordnance on civilian populations, especially children, and on humanitarian workers and United Nations staff;

Urged all Member States to respect relevant international law that addressed landmines and unexploded ordnance;

Urged all parties to armed conflicts to abide by their mine-related commitments and to cooperate with mine-risk education and mine-clearing activities;

Called upon the Secretary-General to provide information on the scope and humanitarian impact of the mine and unexploded ordnance problem;

Urged Member States to provide adequate and sustained financial assistance to support mine action, and to increase their contributions to the Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Action.

⁸⁵ S/PRST/2003/22.

48. Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach

Initial proceedings

**Decision of 20 February 2001 (4278th meeting):
statement by the President**

By a letter dated 25 January 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General,¹ the representative of Tunisia informed the Secretary-General that, during its presidency of the Security Council in February 2001, Tunisia intended to organize on 5 February 2001 a debate, open to States which were not members of the Council, on the topic "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach". Annexed to the letter was a note with suggestions on specific subjects for the debate, including disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants; refugees and displaced persons; poverty eradication and promotion of sustainable development; strengthening the rule of law and democratic institutions; a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy; and the role of the Council.

¹ S/2001/82.

At its 4272nd meeting, on 5 February 2001, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Peacebuilding: towards a comprehensive approach", and included also the above-mentioned letter. At the meeting, the Council heard a statement by the Secretary-General, following which statements were made by all members of the Council, and the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Croatia, Egypt, Guatemala, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Romania, the Republic of Korea, Senegal and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union²).

The Secretary-General stated that the overarching challenge of peacebuilding was to move societies towards sustainable peace, and was the sum of many initiatives, projects, activities and sensitivities.

² Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.

Peacebuilding was the process of building the pillars of peace from the ground up. He stated that, to ensure the coherence of those efforts, the United Nations was also trying to improve its internal arrangements, so that peacebuilding was not only comprehensive, but also done in an integrated way. He noted that the goals were to consolidate peace, reinforce an often hard-won and fragile stability and to prevent a slide back into conflict. However, he also saw peacebuilding as a preventive instrument, which could address the underlying root causes of conflict, and which could also be used before the actual outbreak of war. He emphasized that the problem was that the international community did not practise prevention as often as it could or should. He also emphasized that peacebuilding needed to be seen as a long-term exercise, while there was also a need to achieve tangible progress on a number of fronts in a short period of time. He mentioned that both the General Assembly and the Security Council had recognized the importance of peacebuilding and the need to work with a range of partners, including non-governmental organizations and the private sector. He noted that the Council had recognized that peacebuilding could be a vital component of peacekeeping missions, and that it needed to include such preventive tools as early warning, diplomacy, preventive deployment and disarmament. He stressed that the Council had a prime role to play, and that among the major challenges of peacebuilding was the mobilization of political will and resources on the part of the international community. He called on the members to do more politically to give peacebuilding a higher priority and a higher profile by bringing it closer to the forefront of their awareness.³

In their statements, representatives touched on a wide variety of issues and concurred, *inter alia*, on the need to develop a common approach between the United Nations and all participating actors in order to develop a practical, comprehensive and integrated strategy to promote peace, taking into account the primary responsibility of the State concerned; to support the capabilities of the Secretary-General; to take into account the necessity of focusing efficiently on the deep roots of conflicts, especially the economic and social roots, owing to the close links between security, stability and development; to eliminate poverty as a collective international responsibility and

³ S/PV.4272, pp. 2-4.

develop an innovative approach and mechanism to address poverty and economic backwardness; and to focus on governance, democracy and the building of State institutions as essential ingredients for promoting peace. They also stressed the importance of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, while paying special attention to children, refugees, internally displaced persons and the promotion of the role of women in peacebuilding; coordination among all active parties and apportionment of responsibilities in the area of peacebuilding, especially in respect of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council;⁴ in particular the importance of the Security Council in mobilizing international political will, given its special responsibility in the area of international peace and security and the close relationship between the maintenance of peace and security, conflict prevention and peacebuilding; the initiation of consultations among all active parties at an early stage, before establishing any peacekeeping mission, for better preparation and coordination towards that goal; and the promotion of sustainable and continuous international partnership in all phases of conflict prevention and peacebuilding.

Most of the representatives highlighted the need to develop a comprehensive and integrated strategy within the United Nations system to address the root causes of conflict. They also expressed appreciation for a number of recommendations and reports on the issue of the development of a comprehensive and integrated peacebuilding strategy by the United Nations, *inter alia*, the report of the Secretary-General entitled “An Agenda for Peace”⁵ and the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (the Brahimi report).⁶

In discussing the role of the Council in peacebuilding, the representative of France noted that though peacekeeping operations were authorized by the Council and included elements of peacebuilding, the Council was not competent to be the “project manager”. In relation to the Council’s role in the coordination of the many different actors involved in peacebuilding, he suggested that the division of roles and financing could be clearly defined at the time the

⁴ For more information on the discussion relating to the Economic and Social Council, see chap. VI, part II, case 11.

⁵ S/24111.

⁶ S/2000/809.

Council established an operation, and could even appear in an annex to the resolution. From the outset the Council would establish a double partnership with the troop-contributing countries and financial institutions entrusted with carrying out the Council's decisions.⁷ The representative of Ukraine noted that once peace efforts in a zone of conflict reached the stage of long-term preventive peacebuilding, the Council needed to pass the responsibility on to other entities of the United Nations system, such as the United Nations Development Programme, to coordinate further international efforts.⁸ The representative of Egypt expressed the belief that sustainable development and poverty eradication needed to be dealt with through other bodies of the United Nations, although the Council should take those dimensions into consideration when intervening in conflicts. He stressed that his delegation did not want the Council to be transformed into the Economic and Social Council or a private, miniature General Assembly, particularly since there was a high degree of politicization in the work of the Security Council.⁹ Similarly, the representative of India stated that, while the Council had a role to play in setting up the peacekeeping operations that were part of the process of building peace, it did not follow that those operations must take on the work of economic and social reconstruction, or that the Council should ask them to do so. He argued that the majority of peacekeeping missions were still groups of observers or formed contingents observing a truce, and that in recent years the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone, the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) were the three exceptions to that rule. Trying to draw general conclusions from those very exceptional cases was dangerous and one of the more serious shortcomings of the Brahimi report. In the cases of UNMIK and UNTAET, the United Nations had stepped into a political vacuum and set up transitional administrations. However, where a Government was in place, no matter how weak, the United Nations should do nothing to give the impression that the Government was not in control and that authority resided in the

peacekeeping operation, which would undermine peace.¹⁰

The representative of the United States stressed that, while conflicts had underlying structural causes, the international community must not forget that their immediate causes were often individual ambition and greed. He also stated that his country did not believe that a Security Council mandate should focus on reconstruction and development as that was not the responsibility of the Council. However, he mentioned that all elements of the United Nations system needed to work together, and regional organizations, international financial institutions, donor Governments and non-governmental organizations all had roles, although better coordination was needed. He noted that the Council should be clear and should encourage clarity on this issue.¹¹

At its 4278th meeting, on 20 February 2001, the Council again included the letter dated 25 January 2001 from the representative of Tunisia in its agenda.¹²

At the same meeting, the President (Tunisia) made a statement on behalf of the Council,¹³ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Recognized that peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding were often closely interrelated;

Stressed that, to be successful, such a peacebuilding strategy should meet, *inter alia*, the following basic criteria: relevance, coherence and consistency of programmes and actions; the consent and cooperation of the authorities of the State concerned, where they existed; continuity in and conclusion of the process; cooperation and coordination among organizations and other actors involved; and cost-effectiveness of the overall peacebuilding operation;

Strongly encouraged the United Nations system and regional and subregional organizations, donor countries and the international financial institutions to consider undertaking initiatives such as: utilizing of the mechanism of consolidated appeals and holding joint pledging conferences to mobilize expeditiously international political support and essential resource requirements; ensuring prompt financing of quick start-up peacebuilding projects; and strengthening mechanisms that promoted development and self-reliance by improving capacity-building activities.

⁷ S/PV.4272, pp. 4-7.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁹ S/PV.4272 (Resumption 1), p. 11.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹¹ S/PV.4272, pp. 9-10.

¹² S/2001/82.

¹³ S/PRST/2001/5.