



Talking Points for H.E. Mr. Shigeki Sumi

Ambassador of Japan

At the plenary meeting of the General Assembly to consider draft resolution A/65/7 entitled, “Review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture”

29 October 2010

1. I would like to thank the President of the General Assembly for convening this important meeting to consider the outcome of the PBC review. I would also like to extend my gratitude to the co-facilitators (Ireland, Mexico and South Africa) for presenting their report entitled, “Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture (A/64/868-S/2010/393).”
2. Japan welcomes the report presented by the co-facilitators, and urges all related UN organs to take forward relevant recommendations of the co-facilitators with the aim of further improving the impact of PBC activities on the ground. In this regard, I would like to express Japan’s support for the draft resolution. In order to take forward the co-facilitators’ recommendations, I would like to raise the following three points for further consideration.

(Diversifying the PBC’s approach)

3. First, Japan would like to stress once again the need for diversifying the approach of the PBC’s engagement in post-conflict countries. As suggested by the co-facilitators, we should consider employing lighter approaches than the current full country-specific configuration. Therefore, Japan supports the idea of seeking multi-tier approach (sectoral, regional and “light footprint” engagements) (paragraph 95). The priority agenda for the PBC’s engagement in Liberia that we are now discussing on draft SMC (Statement of Mutual Commitment on peacebuilding) should be more targeted and focused.
4. Another useful approach is to look into a specific focus in a cross-country and cross-sectoral manner. As the co-facilitators pointed out in their report, youth employment has been identified as “a potential Achilles’ heel in any peacebuilding process” (paragraph 55). Japan considers that PBC has a role to play in developing strategies based on such perspective that requires special attention. In this regard, I

would like to recall the discussion in the Working Group on Lessons Learned on the issue of post-conflict employment. The PBC should follow up that discussion and apply the lessons learned to the actual activities on the ground. In addition, as Delegate from Canada proposed in the last meeting of the Liberia country-specific configuration, cooperation between the CSCs of Liberia and Sierra Leone is also useful in promoting youth employment in the post-conflict situation in relation to the Mano River Initiative.

(Strengthening PBC's advisory role)

5. Secondly, I would like to stress the importance of strengthening the PBC's advisory role to the Security Council. To that end, Japan supports the co-facilitators' recommendation to enhance the consultations between the Security Council and the PBC (paragraph 109).
6. In that connection, I am delighted to note that the newly adopted Note by the President of the Security Council on the working methods (S/2010/507) echoes the co-facilitators' recommendation. In paragraph 61 of Presidential Note 507, the Council expresses its intention "to invite the Chairs of country-specific configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission as appropriate, to participate in formal Security Council meetings at which the situation concerning the country in question is considered, or on a case-by-case basis, for an exchange of views in an informal dialogue." Japan would like to explore the possibility of having such an informal dialogue ideally on Liberia at an appropriate occasion before the end of the year.

(Improving the functioning of PBSO)

7. Thirdly, Japan generally supports the notion that the function of PBSO must be enhanced to maximize the effectiveness of PBC programmes. On the other hand, we would like to stress the need for PBSO to clarify the division of roles and its comparative advantage in relation with other related UN departments. Japan supports the co-facilitators' recommendation to invite the head of PBSO to brief the Security Council in the same manner as the heads of DPKO, DPA and OCHA (paragraph 109). However, careful examination is necessary in considering the question of "the ratio of core to non-core staff" within PBSO (paragraph 149).
8. In addition, we should further look into creating the synergy between PBC and the Peacebuilding Fund. We have no objection that PBF should retain the

decision-making autonomy on the allocation of the fund, but we believe that PBC can provide some strategic guidance as well. In this context, Japan supports strengthening of such interaction between Chairs, PBSO, and PBF Advisory Group.

(Conclusion)

9. In conclusion, I would like to reiterate our readiness to participate in the coming discussion on how we may take forward the implementation of the recommendations of the co-facilitator. Japan encourages PBC to expedite the discussion to this end. Japan stands ready to actively take active part in those efforts.

I thank you, Mr. President.