General Assembly
Security Council

General Assembly
Sixty-ninth session
Agenda items 13 and 115

Security Council
Sixty-ninth year

Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields

Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit

Letter dated 15 December 2014 from the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General

In General Assembly resolution 65/7 and Security Council resolution 1947 (2010), in which the Assembly and the Council, respectively, welcomed the recommendations of the first five-year review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, the Assembly and the Council called for a comprehensive review in 2015, five years after the conclusion of the 2010 review.

It is our honour to bring to your attention a proposal (see annex I) on the scope, terms of reference and modalities for the upcoming 2015 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (the 2015 review). The terms of reference reflect the outcome of an extensive consultative intergovernmental process within the framework of the Peacebuilding Commission, consolidated through further consultations undertaken by our respective Offices.

I also attach a letter dated 25 November 2014 (see annex II) from H.E. Mr. Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations and Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, containing the list of five countries that have agreed to be the subject of the case studies that the terms of reference call for to underpin the 2015 review.

In view of the above, it is our assessment that the 2015 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture should be based on the terms of reference. We request, on behalf of the General Assembly and Security Council, that you proceed as proposed therein. The Secretary-General is requested to explore all possible options for the funding arrangements of the review and revert to the General Assembly at the earliest possible time.

In terms of indicative timeline, and taking into account the need to ensure an inclusive and consultative process, the first stage as described in the terms of reference should be completed by the end of June 2015.

The second stage, consisting of nominating two co-facilitators for intergovernmental consultations which will conclude by submitting an outcome to the General Assembly and the Security Council for consideration and appropriate action, should be completed by the end of December 2015.

We would be grateful if you would circulate the present letter as a document of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

(*Signed*) Sam Kahamba **Kutesa**
President of the General Assembly

(*Signed*) Mahamat Zene **Chérif**
President of the Security Council

Annex I

Ten-year review of the peacebuilding architecture, 2015 (31 October 2014)

Proposal for suggested terms of reference

Introduction

1.   Since its establishment in 2005, the Peacebuilding Architecture — comprising the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office — has sought to find effective ways of supporting countries emerging from conflict and to establish a clear understanding of its own role in relation to diverse forms of international engagement with countries emerging from conflict. In 2010, the Co-Facilitators' report on the review of the peacebuilding architecture (A/64/868-S/2010/393) concluded that while the commitment of Member States to the Peacebuilding Commission remained strong, the Commission had yet to realize its full potential. Since 2010, the Peacebuilding Commission organized its annual work programmes in a way that would enable it to address and measure progress in taking forward relevant recommendations from the 2010 review.

2.   Following the release of the Co-Facilitators' report, the General Assembly and Security Council adopted identical resolutions on 29 October 2010 (Assembly resolution 65/7 and Council resolution 1947 (2010)) calling "for a further comprehensive review five years after the adoption of the present resolution", i.e., in 2015. The 2015 review offers an opportunity to assess the original vision and purpose behind the establishment of the Peacebuilding Architecture in 2005 with a view to strengthening it, and enable it to realize its full potential. The review should examine the continuing relevance of that vision in view of the developments in the United Nations and the international systems since 2005. Building on recommendations from the 2010 review and the progress made in its implementation, the 2015 review should generate recommendations on ways to reorient and adapt the functions and structures of the Peacebuilding Architecture to the current and emerging needs of and existing gaps in the United Nations peacebuilding practice.

Objective

3.   In recommending the establishment of the Peacebuilding Architecture in 2005, former Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, noted in his report entitled "In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all", that "there is a gaping hole in the United Nations institutional machinery: no part of the United Nations system effectively addresses the challenge of helping countries with the transition from war to lasting peace" (A/59/2005, para. 114). The gaping hole was further described by the lack of collective and coherent action to address the complex challenge of sustaining peace, reflecting the need for reinforcement from the United Nations and other parts of the international system. The Peacebuilding Architecture was established to address this systemic gap.

4. Since then, policies guiding United Nations and international peacebuilding efforts and engagement in countries emerging from conflict, as well as operational responses, have evolved. The 2015 review should examine the significance of this evolution in addressing the elements of the gaping hole defined in 2005, and their implications for the role and positioning of the Peacebuilding Architecture and the operational entities of the United Nations system.

5. Based on this analysis, the review should propose ways to strengthen the performance and impact of the Peacebuilding Architecture, with a view to realizing its full potential. To this end, the review should provide recommendations on the functioning, resources, and modes of engagement of the Peacebuilding Architecture and on its links with the United Nations system entities that engage with it.

Key elements of the analysis

6. In order to meet this objective, the analysis underpinning the review should be based on the following elements:

(a) The general developments in the policy frameworks and operational responses of the United Nations and international actors since 2005 in support of peacebuilding efforts and engagement in countries emerging from conflict;

(b) The original vision behind the establishment of the Peacebuilding Architecture in 2005 and the expectations for its functioning and impact. The analysis should address whether and how the mandate, resources, structures and authority given to the Peacebuilding Commission have responded to the vision and matched these expectations;

(c) The extent to which the diverse membership structure of the Peacebuilding Commission, including the role of regional actors, was effectively leveraged in support of broader peacebuilding objectives. The analysis should explore ways to improve the Peacebuilding Commission working methods and decision-making in order to allow for greater involvement of its members and to facilitate inputs from various peacebuilding actors;

(d) The areas of potential complementarity between the Peacebuilding Commission and relevant United Nations operational entities, considering the former's role, orientation and positioning vis-à-vis the latter. The analysis in this regard should also address the situations and settings that are most suitable for the Peacebuilding Commission's engagement and where it can most effectively support national, regional and international efforts; and the areas of its existing and potential strengths and limitations.

(e) The continuing and/or emerging gaps and constraints that limit the effectiveness and ability of the United Nations to prevent the recurrence of conflict. The analysis should also address the continuing and/or emerging challenges in the mobilization and coordination of necessary political, technical and financial support from other international organizations or Member States in support of post-conflict peacebuilding;

(f) The potential utility and limitations of mutual accountability and commitments frameworks (including in the context of the Peacebuilding Commission's country-specific engagement). The analysis should also address the

implications of these frameworks for the nature of United Nations support to countries emerging from conflict;

(g)   The implications of the developments and continuing gaps in the aforementioned areas for the Peacebuilding Commission's advisory role to its mandating bodies, the General Assembly and the Security Council, in support of broader peacebuilding objectives in the countries concerned.

Suggested methodology

7.   The analysis underpinning the 2015 review should be anchored in three to five country case studies (a combination of Peacebuilding Commission and non-Peacebuilding Commission agenda countries), from which broader lessons on progress, effectiveness and failures can be extrapolated. The analysis should also be undertaken in conjunction and synergy with the upcoming Secretary-General's review of peace operations. The case studies will be combined with a broader policy and institutional review. The analysis should shed light on:

(a)   The factors that led to notable progress or relapse of the countries in question;

(b)   The evolution in regional, international and United Nations responses in post-conflict situations since 2005;

(c)   The nature and impact of the Peacebuilding Architecture's contribution to these responses, where it was involved.

Suggested modality

Main principles

8.   The selected modality for conducting the review should meet all of the following main principles:

(a)   Adherence to the condition set out in paragraphs 5 of General Assembly resolution 65/7 and Security Council resolution 1947 (2010), and para. 27 of Assembly resolution 60/180 and Council resolution 1645 (2005) by ensuring that the outcome of the process is ultimately the product of an inclusive intergovernmental process in the General Assembly and the Security Council;

(b)   Adherence to and compatibility with the predetermined overall objectives, terms of reference and methodology;

(c)   Integration of views of existing and former government officials, as appropriate, as well as other national and local stakeholders, in the countries subject to the case studies; as well as the countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission, as the basis for the analysis and recommendations;

(d)   Integration of the views and perspectives of the African Union, and other relevant regional and subregional organizations, United Nations and non-United Nations stakeholders (e.g., international financial institutions);

(e)   Engagement of relevant expertise and experiences from within and outside the United Nations, including the expertise of former government officials, in informing the institutional and policy review developed on the basis of country studies.

Structure and process

9.   Based on these principles, a two-staged process is proposed whereby:

(a)   The country studies and the corresponding analysis undertaken in accordance with the terms of reference will be carried out by experts/advisers. On the basis of the information and analyses drawn from the country studies, as well as inputs from within and outside the United Nations that would inform the institutional and policy review, the experts will prepare a synthesis report of key findings and actionable recommendations;

(b)   The experts/advisers will submit the synthesis report to the General Assembly and the Security Council. The Presidents of the two principal organs will jointly initiate an intergovernmental process that will consider the recommendations submitted by the experts/advisers and generate agreed recommendations for consideration and final decision by the Assembly and the Council.

10.   The General Assembly and the Security Council are requested to set a timeline for the completion of the two-staged process, in accordance with their respective calendars in 2015.

11.   Accordingly, the following process is recommended to the General Assembly and the Security Council for consideration:

(a)   The General Assembly and the Security Council will request the Secretary-General to nominate no more than seven experts/advisers that will form an advisory group. The experts will be of relevant and professional backgrounds and expertise, following established practice and regulations for hiring external experts. They will represent a diverse geographic balance, drawing in particular on relevant expertise from Africa. During the process of identifying the members of the advisory group, the Secretary-General will be expected to consult with Member States, including with the relevant membership caucuses and groupings in New York, and with the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, with a view to ensuring full transparency of the process;

(b)   The advisory group will oversee the process of undertaking case studies and generating findings and recommendations on the basis of the terms of reference and methodology established by the General Assembly and the Security Council. The advisory group will be supported by a small secretariat appointed by the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General will inform the General Assembly and the Security Council of the financial arrangement to support the work of the group. In addition to the integration of views and perspectives of actors and stakeholders, as set out in the "main principles", the advisory group is expected to consult with Member States, including with the relevant membership caucuses and groupings in New York, during the process of developing the synthesis report outlining key findings and recommendations;

(c)   The advisory group will submit its findings and recommendations to the General Assembly and the Security Council;

(d)   Upon receipt of the findings and recommendations from the advisory group, the General Assembly and the Security Council will jointly appoint no more than two permanent representatives to co-facilitate an inclusive intergovernmental process that will review the findings and consider the recommendations. The co-facilitators will subsequently summarize and submit the outcome of the intergovernmental process for consideration and decision by the General Assembly and Security Council.

Annex II

Letter dated 25 November 2014 from the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission addressed to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council

I am writing in my capacity as the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and as a follow-up to my letter dated 3 November 2014 transmitting the proposed terms of reference for the 2015 review of the "peacebuilding architecture".

In that letter, I placed before the General Assembly and the Security Council an indicative list of countries that may provide an appropriate basis for case studies that would enable the review to extrapolate broader lessons, analysis and recommendation for the attention and subsequent consideration of both organs.

After consultations with the representatives of the countries concerned, and with the Presidencies of the General Assembly and the Security Council, I am pleased to communicate that the following countries have agreed to be the subject of the case studies: Burundi, the Central African Republic, Sierra Leone, South Sudan and Timor-Leste.

(*Signed*) Antonio de **Aguiar Patriota**
Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission

———————————