



Peacebuilding Commission

Distr.: Restricted
24 July 2007

Original: English

Organizational Committee

First session

Summary record of the 7th meeting (closed)

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 16 May 2007, at 10 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr. Gaspar Martins (Angola)

Contents

- Adoption of the agenda
- Outline of the report of the Peacebuilding Commission to the General Assembly
- Procedure for selection of the Chair and Vice-Chairs of the Commission
- Update on the progress made by the Ad Hoc Working Group on Pending Issues
- Other matters

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the record of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.



The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda (PBC/1/OC/9)

1. *The agenda was adopted.*

Outline of the report of the Peacebuilding Commission to the General Assembly

2. **The Chairperson** invited the Organizational Committee to consider the outline of the first annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission, to be presented to the General Assembly pursuant to paragraph 15 of its resolution 60/180 and to paragraph 15 of Security Council resolution 1645 (2005). It was proposed that the Organizational Committee should adopt the report at its meeting on 27 June 2007 for consideration by the General Assembly at the main part of its sixty-second session, under the agenda item "Report of the Peacebuilding Commission".

3. The proposed outline provided for a report divided into five main sections, the first three being primarily factual, and the final two analytical and forward-looking. In his own view, the report should acknowledge the efforts devoted to making the Peacebuilding Commission operational, while also remaining clear and candid about its past and present challenges and acknowledging that, as a new intergovernmental body, it must further define its role, functions and methods.

4. **Mr. Oshima** (Japan) said that the introduction should emphasize that, in its first year, the Peacebuilding Commission had established a good basis for its future work. While everyone had high expectations of the Peacebuilding Commission, and some contended that it could and should have achieved more, it was a new body with no precedent or existing rules to rely on. The report should mention the success of the country-specific meetings on Burundi and Sierra Leone in bringing together all relevant stakeholders, working on drafting an integrated peacebuilding strategy and promoting the host countries' ownership of the peacebuilding process. It should acknowledge the efforts of the working group on lessons learned.

5. However, the report should also reflect the many remaining challenges. The country-specific discussions should be streamlined, benefiting from past experience. The report's recommendations should mention the need to strengthen relations with the principal organs of the Organization, including the General Assembly, the

Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, establishing a mechanism for regular consultation between the bureaux of those bodies and the bureau of the Peacebuilding Commission, in order to reinforce its advisory role. That would lead to a more coherent peacebuilding strategy for all relevant United Nations agencies.

6. **Mr. Hoscheit** (Luxembourg) said that the Peacebuilding Commission had been a significant innovation of the 2005 World Summit and was therefore the focus of great public interest and expectation. Accordingly, the forthcoming report to the General Assembly must be more than an activity report, and must provide guidance on the reasoning behind, and future activities of, that body. It should focus as much as possible on substantive issues, rather than on institutional or organizational issues.

7. His delegation suggested that the Ad Hoc Working Group on Pending Issues should not be given prominence. It would be better to substitute a section on "Other issues", perhaps covering consultation with the principal organs of the Organization and with civil society, non-governmental organizations and major donors. It also suggested that the order of items in the outline should be altered to place the chapter on challenges of peacebuilding immediately after the introductory chapter, and thus illustrate clearly why the body had been established. Perhaps the title of that chapter should also be expanded to include a reference to developing an integrated peacebuilding strategy, a central building block of the Peacebuilding Commission. Lastly, it would be useful to add a chapter on the relationship between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund.

8. **Mr. Ustinov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation broadly agreed with the outline but had doubts concerning the inclusion of a chapter on the activities of the Peacebuilding Support Office in support of the Peacebuilding Commission in the factual portion. If the issue was included at all, it should be viewed more from an analytical point of view and placed in the chapter on the challenges of peacebuilding, or in the conclusions and recommendations.

9. Furthermore, it would like further explanation of the chapter on the challenges of peacebuilding, and wondered whether the report should focus on the general challenges of peacebuilding, or the specific

challenges which had confronted the Peacebuilding Commission during the previous year. If the chapter was to be general, it should not be forgotten that the Peacebuilding Commission was not the only entity in the United Nations system involved in peacebuilding: the Economic and Social Council, through its Ad Hoc Advisory Groups on Guinea-Bissau and Haiti, also played a role.

10. In the chapter of the outline which dealt with the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, his delegation would particularly like to see an indication of the Peacebuilding Commission's working relationship with the principal organs of the Organization, including the Security Council, the General Assembly and, in addition, the Economic and Social Council. Although the Economic and Social Council itself dealt with peacebuilding, there appeared to be no arrangements yet for collaboration with the Peacebuilding Commission. Perhaps that matter could be discussed in the working group on lessons learned. Alternatively, it might be taken up in the operational activities and humanitarian affairs segments of the Council session in the context of the transition from relief to development.

11. His delegation wondered whether the report's conclusions and recommendations were intended for the benefit of the Peacebuilding Commission itself or for that of the General Assembly, with the intention of requesting the latter to take action.

12. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt), agreeing with the Chairperson that the Peacebuilding Commission's report to the General Assembly must be factual, forward-looking and positive, said that it must not be purely descriptive, a criticism often levelled at reports within the Organization. Rather, it should contain an analytical explanation of the rationale and approach behind Peacebuilding Commission decisions. That would encourage the General Assembly and Security Council to interact more closely with it.

13. With regard to the structure of the outline, cross-cutting issues should be clearly distinguished from country-specific issues. The cross-cutting issues covered in the chapter on the work of the Peacebuilding Commission should include the sections already suggested in the outline, namely lessons learned, relations with the intergovernmental bodies in the Organization and other activities. However, the section on the country-specific meetings on Burundi

and Sierra Leone should be separate, and care should be taken to include in it the matter of terms of reference for the joint Government-United Nations steering committees for Burundi and Sierra Leone and the reasoning behind the structure of the country-specific configurations, with reference to the relevant paragraphs of General Assembly resolution 60/180 and Security Council resolution 1645 (2005).

14. Rather than covering the challenges of peacebuilding only in a dedicated chapter, the report should also describe such challenges in each individual section, as appropriate. In other words, while the challenges of peacebuilding as a whole should be covered in the portion of the report devoted to cross-cutting issues, the challenges of peacebuilding in Burundi should be covered in the part of the report devoted to the country-specific meetings on Burundi.

15. However, his delegation did not favour removing the section on Ad Hoc Working Group on Pending Issues, given that the Ad Hoc Working Group was an existing structure with much still left to discuss, including as yet undecided matters, such as the expansion of the Peacebuilding Commission's membership to other Member States and to organizations such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the European Union, though the Peacebuilding Commission should endeavour to settle as many issues as possible before reporting to the General Assembly.

16. In the section on other activities included in the chapter on the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, the report should be as precise as possible about the Peacebuilding Commission's role in conducting seminars, and the subjects to be covered. As an example of existing difficulties, his delegation pointed out that the members of the Peacebuilding Commission had received information on a recent seminar on transitional justice organized by the Secretariat and the Peacebuilding Support Office only indirectly, from the *Journal of the United Nations*.

17. **Mr. Tarragô** (Brazil) said that his delegation would offer further reactions to the Peacebuilding Commission's report to the General Assembly once the outline had been expanded into a fuller text, but wished to make a few suggestions. It agreed with the representative of Luxembourg that the relationship between the Peacebuilding Commission and the

Peacebuilding Fund should be described. The report should indicate the resources mobilized in the past for the Peacebuilding Commission and the amount assigned to each project, while also providing an estimate of the donor commitments which would be required to cover future needs.

18. The description of the Peacebuilding Commission's dialogue with other United Nations entities should not be confined to the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, but should provide a wider view, also encompassing multilateral financial institutions and other donors, as one of the purposes of the Peacebuilding Commission was to encourage the relevant actors to engage in joint efforts in particular countries. In the light of that role, and the immediate and urgent needs which the field visits to Burundi and Sierra Leone had illustrated, the integrated peacebuilding strategies for those countries should specify the action to be taken by each actor in the international community.

19. The Peacebuilding Commission's numerous informal meetings in various configurations had provided opportunities to discuss important matters, resulting in wide agreement on such issues as the need to record which programmes were being implemented, the need to promote regional cooperation and the need to harmonize the practices of donors. However, the Peacebuilding Commission must move from conceptual discussions to concrete strategies as rapidly as possible. Although the reinforcement of human rights and exploration of gender issues were essential considerations in consolidating peace, peacebuilding also encompassed development issues. There would be no sustainable development if adequate infrastructure and basic public services were lacking, making the foundations for lasting peace fragile.

20. Recalling that the Peacebuilding Commission had discussed benchmarks, his delegation believed that it would be unwise to impose monitoring tasks, and therefore additional burdens, on recipient Governments. The Peacebuilding Commission, as another actor in an already overcrowded aid field, must ensure that it facilitated international cooperation, rather than making it more cumbersome. It should seek to help recipients secure a predictable and stable inflow of resources. In that connection, the Peacebuilding Commission should examine the quality of contributions to the countries concerned in order to

ensure that they genuinely contributed to peacebuilding.

21. **Mr. Palous** (Czech Republic) remarked that the first report of the Commission to the General Assembly would set the standard for future reports and was, therefore, important for countries, donors, stakeholders, civil society and Governments. The report should reflect clearly the way in which the Commission's founding resolutions had been implemented and should indicate its achievements and outstanding tasks. The chapters on the challenges of peacebuilding and the conclusions and recommendations should identify the added value provided by the Commission's activities, as reflected in the results of interactions in the field among all stakeholders and donors initiated and stimulated by the Commission.

22. He expressed concern that resources allocated by the Peacebuilding Fund to Sierra Leone and Burundi for the projects outlined were still not available. His country wished to see resources used in a timely manner to help post-conflict countries to move forward promptly and hoped that the first report would include the first projects in those countries.

23. The relationship between the Commission and the Fund should be made more explicit under the heading "Other issues". His delegation agreed with the delegation of Luxembourg with regard to the need to refer to consultations with major donors. He expressed the hope that the Commission's report would be concise, readable, practical and oriented towards its future activities.

24. **Mr. Muñoz** (Chile) agreed that the report should be readable and proposed that an executive summary of each section could be provided to highlight salient points. The purpose of the report was to raise the profile of the Commission with other entities, within and outside the United Nations, including donors and the private sector. Winning their confidence would serve the purpose of mobilizing resources for the creation of employment and stability in post-conflict countries. The structure of the report should therefore target possible potential partners of the Commission beyond the United Nations.

25. He agreed that, while the three descriptive chapters of the draft outline were necessary, emphasis should be placed on the two analytical chapters, which should refer to lessons learned and make brief

recommendations. Relations with other intergovernmental bodies could also be described and a subsection added specifically on links with the Bretton Woods institutions, which were crucial partners in the Commission's work, as well as the regional banks.

26. His country seconded the Luxembourg proposal for the inclusion, in the interests of transparency, of a section on relations between the Commission and the Fund with regard to resources and their use.

27. **Mr. Hayee** (Pakistan) said that his delegation agreed that the report should be analytical and contain a section on the Commission's relationship with the Fund, in view of the primary objectives of the Commission and its direct operational relationship with the Fund. The activities of the bureau might also be included, to reflect its weekly meetings, in the organizational section. Matters related to support could be worked into the body of the report rather than dealt with separately as envisaged in the chapter on the activities of the Peacebuilding Support Office of the draft outline.

28. **Mr. Deruffe** (France) emphasized that the Commission's first report to the General Assembly should be drafted with care and agreed that it should not be simply a factual progress report. The founding resolutions had attached special importance to lessons learned and best practice. He agreed with previous speakers that the two analytical chapters should form the core of the report. The founding resolutions had been drafted with a view to innovation and that should be reflected in the modern working methods of the Commission in its reports to the custodian bodies. A focus on lessons learned would permit the report of the Commission to be more conceptual, with respect to both its methods of work, peacebuilding and the consolidation of peace.

29. His delegation was satisfied with the general structure of the draft outline but reserved the right to reconsider its position. It supported the idea that a specific section distinguishing between the Commission and the Fund should be included in the report.

30. **Ms. McAskie** (Assistant Secretary-General, Peacebuilding Support Office) thanked representatives for their valuable comments, of which her Office had taken note, and assured members of the Committee that a draft report would be forthcoming shortly. In response to the question by the representative of the

Russian Federation on the target audience of the recommendations, members should bear in mind that recommendations contributed to future General Assembly resolutions which could facilitate the future work of the Commission. The Support Office welcomed the inclusion of the link between the Commission and the Fund in the report. The Secretary-General was required to report annually to the General Assembly on all details of the Fund and so the amount of information to be included in the Commission's report could be discussed.

31. With regard to the question of available funding raised by the representative of the Czech Republic, up to four projects had been approved in each of Sierra Leone and Burundi. The joint process of discussions between donors, partners and Governments was sometimes complicated but was now moving forward.

32. The seminar to which the representative of Egypt had referred was presumably the recent conference organized by the International Center for Transitional Justice independently of the Secretariat or of her Office. The Center had been anxious to involve the Peacebuilding Commission and had sent invitations to members; perhaps the invitations had failed to arrive.

33. **The Chairperson** thanked representatives for their comments and specific suggestions, which would contribute to the high standard to which he aspired for the report. A draft report would be circulated in time for fuller discussion at a future informal meeting and subsequent adoption at a formal meeting.

Procedure for selection of the Chair and Vice-Chairs of the Commission

34. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the procedure for the selection of the Chair and Vice-Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission. Although the present incumbents had been selected on 23 June 2006 for a term of one year in accordance with the provisional rules of procedure, the rules did not specify the procedure for the selection of the Chair and Vice-Chairs or the chairs of country-specific meetings and working groups. The procedure should be clarified before the expiration of the one-year term of the present incumbents and the next formal meeting.

35. **Mr. von Ungern-Sternberg** (Germany) remarked that ideas raised during discussion of the topic in 2006 remained valid, including the need for regional rotation. However, in view of the intricate links

between the Commission and the United Nations, qualifications and experience in the United Nations were more important than nationality. It was also important to identify a person who was available for the full term. Moreover it would be desirable to maintain continuity with respect to the chairs of the country-specific groups, in view of the longer time frames of their work.

36. **Mr. Muñoz** (Chile) supported the view of the representative of Germany with regard to rotation and identification of the best-qualified individuals. However, knowledge of the intricacies of the United Nations was available in the Secretariat, while the role of the Chair or Vice-Chairs was one of leadership. Their availability depended on their capitals. The Group of Latin American and Caribbean States had circulated a letter advocating continuity in the Bureau. Group members in the Commission would cooperate in seeking an individual who represented their region best. It was important for the Commission to move forward with its work with the full support of its membership.

37. **Mr. Deruffe** (France) agreed with the remarks made by the representative of Germany. Regarding the selection procedure, the existing practices and procedures of other subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly could provide guidance and it was perhaps not necessary to establish a written procedure at the present stage. The selection procedure should be in line with the work of the Commission and should be inclusive.

38. **The Chairperson** said that there would be informal consultations on the matter and that the Committee should decide on a selection procedure by 23 June 2007. The observations made by the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States would be taken into account.

Update on the progress made by the Ad Hoc Working Group on Pending Issues

39. **Mr. Antonio** (Angola), speaking as facilitator of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Pending Issues, said that the negotiations on pending issues had been intensive. He thanked his co-facilitator and the members of the Working Group for their efforts.

40. Recalling paragraph 21 of General Assembly resolution 60/180, which had established the Commission, and rule 4 of the Commission's

provisional rules of procedure concerning consultation with civil society and non-governmental organizations, he said the Commission had established the Ad Hoc Group to deal with two principal issues: the participation of civil society in the meetings of the Commission and the request by the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) and the European Community to participate in meetings of the Commission. The Group had focused its attention, thus far, on the role of civil society.

41. The draft guidelines distributed to Committee members were not final and were merely intended to inform them of the Ad Hoc Group's work on pending issues. The Group hoped to have resolved all pending issues by the next formal meeting of the Commission.

42. The most important issue that the Group had discussed was the participation of civil society in formal meetings of the Commission. It had reached a provisional consensus on a two-pronged approach. The Commission was to continue the practice of meeting with those groups informally prior to its own meetings and also invite the groups to join in the formal meetings.

43. The only issue on which the Ad Hoc Group had not reached a consensus was where the guidelines for the inclusion of civil society organizations in formal meetings should appear in the Commission's report to the General Assembly. The proposals offered thus far were to include them as a footnote, in the body of the text or as an annex. If the Group were given another two weeks, he believed that it would be able to reach agreement on that issue.

44. **The Chairperson** expressed thanks to the Ad Hoc Group for its work and stressed that civil society organizations should be associated with the Commission in a manner that was in keeping with United Nations practice. He urged the Ad Hoc Group to finalize its position with regard to the participation of civil society before the next meeting of the full Commission on 6 June 2007.

45. **Mr. Doraiswami** (India) said that, if the wording of the guidelines for the inclusion of civil society was acceptable to all, the members of the Commission should not be concerned about where those guidelines would appear in the report.

46. **Mr. Oshima** (Japan) said the Commission would be sending the wrong message if its members were

unable to agree on the guidelines for the participation of civil society and non-governmental groups after six months of work. He proposed that the mandate of the Ad Hoc Group be extended for two weeks so that it might be able to take into account the comments made regarding the matter.

47. **Mr. Hoscheit** (Luxembourg) said that the Ad Hoc Group should meet with the other members of the Commission and exchange views in order to reach a consensus. His delegation was impressed by the contribution of non-governmental organizations to the Commission's work. The Commission should solicit the opinion of those organizations, even if that opinion was critical, because of the substantive added value that it represented.

48. **Mr. Hayee** (Pakistan) said that the placement in the report of the guidelines for the inclusion of civil society should be decided in the next two weeks. It was his delegation's view that the guidelines should be included in the body of the report, but he agreed that the most important thing was to reach a consensus on the matter.

49. With respect to the provision in the guidelines for raising an objection to the participation of a given organization or representative in the meetings of the Commission, his delegation believed that circulation of the names of those organizations or representatives would not provide a sufficient basis on which an objection could be raised. The guidelines should also require circulation of the relevant background information of the organizations and representatives that wished to participate. If the provision was amended thus, perhaps the overall question of the placement of the guidelines in the report would be resolved more easily.

50. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt) said that the guidelines could be in an annex so long as it was clearly linked to the body of the report and so long as that would not create a separate category of text within the report.

51. **The Chairperson** said that it was his understanding that the requests submitted by the European Community and OIC to participate in the Commission's meetings had yet to be addressed by the Ad Hoc Working Group. The response to those requests required a collective political decision. However, the Committee could not delay a decision on the participation of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

52. **Mr. Hoscheit** (Luxembourg) said that he welcomed the proposal to issue standing invitations to the World Bank and IMF to participate in all meetings of the Commission. However, the European Community, represented by the European Commission, was just as central to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, as had been proven by work in the field. It was important for the European Community to participate in the meetings of the Commission and he called for a swift and positive decision on that matter.

53. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt) said that he agreed with the representative of Luxembourg and supported issuing standing invitations to the World Bank, IMF, the European Community and OIC. However, it was not acceptable to draw distinctions between the Bretton Woods institutions and others because the language of paragraph 9 of resolution 60/180 was not restricted to those institutional donors. Therefore, the Commission should immediately issue invitations to those four institutional donors.

54. Informal consultations should be held prior to each meeting of the Commission in order to decide whether institutional donors should be invited to attend and so as to avoid a situation in which representatives of those institutions were turned away from a meeting. It was important for the Committee to take an immediate decision with regard to all four of the institutional donors that had been discussed.

55. **The Chairperson** said the question of which meetings institutional donors should be allowed to attend was an important one. Such a decision was to be made either by the Chairperson or by means of consultations with relevant institutions in advance of meetings, and it was for the Commission to decide whether the participation of an institution was relevant or not. The Commission's aim was to galvanize all those who could make a positive contribution to peacebuilding rather than to alienate them.

56. **Mr. von Ungern-Sternberg** (Germany) said that he supported the position of the representative of Egypt and called for an immediate decision in the matter. However, it was not necessary to approve all four institutions at once. The World Bank and IMF were expressly mentioned in General Assembly resolution 60/180 and there should have been no delay with regard to those institutions.

57. The case for approving the European Community was clear because European Union funding of global

peacebuilding activities was well documented. The Union was also active in a variety of areas including disarmament, demobilization and integration, security sector reform and good governance. While his delegation would like to see the Bretton Woods institutions, the European Community and OIC approved immediately, it was not necessary to link the approval of any one institution with the approval of another.

58. **The Chairperson** said that the proposal before the Committee was to approve all four institutional donors. While the question of which meetings they should be invited to attend could be discussed further, it should be possible to take a decision on the question of principle immediately.

59. **Mr. Wolfe** (Jamaica) said that he was in favour of inviting all four institutional donors currently under discussion to participate in meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission. However, some meetings of the Organizational Committee might not be relevant to them, and he therefore agreed with the representative of Egypt that a mechanism should be established to determine the meetings to which institutional donors should be invited.

60. **Mr. Wolff** (United States of America) pointed out that, since paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 60/180 stipulated that institutional donors should be invited to participate in all meetings of the Commission, any decision to depart from that practice would require the approval of the General Assembly. However, he agreed that it would not be appropriate for institutional donors to participate in the consideration of certain organizational matters. They should therefore be invited to attend all country-specific meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission, during which the most substantive aspects of its work were discussed.

61. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt) recalled that, in accordance with paragraph 9 of the resolution, institutional donors should be invited to participate in all meetings of the Commission in a manner suitable to their governing arrangements. To his mind, it therefore fell to the Commission to decide whether the governing arrangements of institutional donors allowed them to participate in its meetings.

62. **Ms. Moir** (United Kingdom) said that she was in favour of inviting the World Bank, IMF and other institutional donors to participate in certain

organizational meetings of the Commission. She proposed that invitations to those meetings should be issued at the discretion of the Chairperson of the Commission.

63. **Mr. Majoer** (Netherlands) said that institutional donors played a vital role in post-conflict reconstruction and should therefore be involved in all aspects of peacebuilding within the United Nations system. Accordingly, the question of the participation of institutional donors in meetings of the Commission should be resolved at the earliest opportunity. While his delegation was flexible in that regard, it felt that the Commission must act in the most transparent manner possible. However, his interpretation of paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 60/180 differed from that of the representative of Egypt: in his view, institutional donors themselves, and not the Commission, would have to decide whether their governing arrangements allowed for participation in the Commission's meetings.

64. **Mr. Doraiswami** (India) pointed out that, by its very nature, a standing invitation would entitle institutional donors to attend all meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission. If the Organizational Committee wished to exclude such donors from certain meetings, it could not issue such an invitation.

65. **Mr. Deruffe** (France) said that the General Assembly, in its resolution 60/180, had already decided that institutional donors should be invited to all meetings of the Commission. Furthermore, since that resolution also made explicit reference to two institutional donors — the World Bank and IMF — it should be possible to take a decision on their participation at the current meeting.

66. The Peacebuilding Commission should aim for maximum inclusiveness. Institutional donors could certainly shed light on a number of the issues on its agenda, even if those issues were not directly relevant to their work.

67. **Mr. Løvald** (Norway) echoed the comments made by the representative of the Netherlands, stressing that the absence of a decision on the participation of institutional donors in the work of the Peacebuilding Commission had led to uncertainty. The Organizational Committee should base its decision on the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolution 60/180 and issue an unqualified standing invitation to all institutional donors. Any exceptions to that

procedure should be at the discretion of the Chairperson.

68. **Mr. Muñoz** (Chile) said that his delegation was not opposed to inviting all four institutional donors to participate in meetings of the Commission. However, if a standing invitation was issued, it must apply to all meetings, in accordance with paragraph 9 of the relevant General Assembly resolution. If meeting agendas were prepared and circulated sufficiently in advance, institutional donors could decide which meetings were relevant to their work and which were not.

69. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt) emphasized the importance of equal treatment: if certain meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission were closed to non-members, it would be unfair to allow outside entities, such as institutional donors, to participate. Meetings should therefore be either open to all or closed: in accordance with rule 2 (c) of the provisional rules of procedure (PBC/1/OC/3), decisions on whether a meeting should be held in public or private should be taken by the Chairperson in consultation with the members of the respective configuration.

70. **Mr. Hoscheit** (Luxembourg) endorsed the remarks made by the representative of France, and stressed the need for a strict interpretation of General Assembly resolution 60/180. In particular, paragraph 9 of that resolution made it clear that institutional donors themselves would have to decide whether their participation in meetings of the Commission was compatible with their governing arrangements.

71. He was in favour of extending standing invitations to all meetings to the World Bank, IMF and the European Community at the earliest opportunity; the Organizational Committee should act expeditiously to ensure that key stakeholders in the peacebuilding process were involved in its work. Any exceptions to those invitations should be at the discretion of the Chairperson.

72. **Ms. Zarra** (Italy) stressed the importance of abiding by the provisions of General Assembly resolution 60/180. The Peacebuilding Commission's strength lay in its flexibility, and exceptions to the arrangements set out in that resolution should be at the discretion of the Chairperson.

73. **The Chairperson** said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Organizational

Committee wished, in accordance with paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 60/180, to issue a standing invitation to the World Bank, IMF, the European Community (represented by the European Commission) and OIC to participate in all meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission. A separate meeting to discuss specific arrangements would be held in due course.

74. *It was so decided.*

Other matters

75. **The Chairperson** drew the Committee's attention to the chart of pledges, commitments and deposits made by Member States to the Peacebuilding Fund. As at 15 May 2007, a total of \$221 million had been received, of which \$180 million in the form of commitments and \$137 million as deposits. Since then, two additional contributions had been received from the Governments of the United Arab Emirates and the Kingdom of Bahrain. The Fund had now reached 88 per cent of its target level.

76. He also drew attention to the updated calendar of meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission for May and June 2007. Any further updates would be communicated to members in due course.

77. **Ms. Zubčević** (Croatia) said that every effort should be made to give sufficient notice of meeting cancellations.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.