

Peacebuilding Commission
Informal meeting of the Organizational Committee
30 March 2011

Chairperson's Summary of the Discussion

On 30 March 2011, the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) convened an [informal] meeting. The Vice Chair of the PBC presided over the meeting. The agenda for the meeting included the following items: (1) Briefing on the Peacebuilding Commission's Work Plan for 2011-2013.

The Chair of the Peacebuilding Fund Advisory Group, Mr. Dan Smith, opened his remarks by stating that the Advisory Group strongly believes in the key role the PBF has to play in supporting peacebuilding processes, and the specific niche it occupies. Progress made by the PBF to date is encouraging. The Advisory Group noted the stable and committed leadership of PBSO and its positive influence. The Advisory Group noted the positive rating of PBF by DFID's rigorous Multi-lateral Aid Review process, as well as areas for continued attention (results focus, reporting and transparency).

However, without strong action to ensure a solid financial basis, the Fund will face a funding deficit in 2013. The Advisory Group therefore hopes that future funding can be made available for the PBF, so that it can be sustainable in its efforts, build a body of experience and take forward lessons learnt. The Chair urged that action to implement the Peacebuilding Fund (PMP) and the intention to focus its efforts on a maximum of 20 countries. The Advisory Group received a presentation on the Peacebuilding Fund. The Peacebuilding Fund is different from a regular development Fund – largely because of its willingness to support risk taking and because of the political nature of peacebuilding – it needs to

be judged differently. The PMP is therefore a good start, but also an experiment.

The Chair observed that the Fund “now operates in an evaluation rich mode”. The Advisory Group commends the willingness of the Fund to be transparent, by conducting independent evaluations on both country level and cross cutting

thematic reviews. The Advisory Group received a presentation of the independent evaluation of the PBF projects in Sierra Leone, which found that the overall impact of the PBF in Sierra Leone was positive and identifiable. Considering the fact that

target called for by the Secretary General in his Report on Women's Participation in
Peacebuilding V n A Pn n M ú

Concerning Norway's interventions, the Chair noted that although actual financial commitments often come annually, there are ways to signal politically multi year commitments.¹

The Chair concluded by noting that whilst the UN has indeed a certain comparative advantage when it concerns supporting national peacebuilding efforts, it also has some disadvantages. Whilst the UN is present almost everywhere, it might not always be so with the right capacities and skill sets at its disposal. The PBF can address this comparative disadvantage. As the Fund is not operational, it needs partners. Because of this reliance on partners, care should be taken when analyzing flaws that deficiencies of the system are not laid at the Fund's door. The Fund hence works jointly with the UN in shaping the quality and efficiency of its peacebuilding work. The PBF should hence be seen as an opportunity to improve the system's peacebuilding work as a whole.

There were no other matters raised by the Chairperson or other members of the Committee.

¹ The PBF benefits from several formal multi year commitments, including Australia, Canada, China, Japan (their contribution was "for at least two years") and the UK. Other countries have indicated informally or through practice annual commitments, including Finland, Luxembourg, Spain, Sweden and Turkey.