



CIPS
University of Ottawa

NUI

2020 Vision

Visioning the Future of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture

Carolyn McAskie



Working Paper

The Future of the Peacebuilding Architecture Project

2020 Vision

Visioning the Future of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture

Carolyn McAskie

Publisher: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs
Centre for International Policy Studies, University of Ottawa
Copyright: © Norwegian Institute of International Affairs 2010
© Centre for International Policy Studies, University of Ottawa 2010
ISBN: 978-82-7002-264-9

Any views expressed in this publication are those of the author. They should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs or Centre for International Policy Studies, University of Ottawa. The text may not be printed in part or in full without the permission of the author.

Internet: www.nupi.no
www.cepi-cips.uottawa.ca

Preface – From the Project Director

At the 2005 World Summit in New York City, member states of the United Nations agreed to create “a dedicated institutional mechanism to address the special needs of countries emerging from conflict towards recovery, reintegration and reconstruction and to assist them in laying the foundation for sustainable development”. That new mechanism was the UN Peacebuilding Commission and two associated bodies: a Peacebuilding Support Office and a Peacebuilding Fund. Together, these new entities have been characterized as the UN’s new peacebuilding architecture, or PBA.

This Working Paper is one of nine essays that examine the possible future role of the UN’s peacebuilding architecture. They were written as part of a project co-organized by the Centre for International Policy Studies at the University of Ottawa and the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs. All of the contributors to the project were asked to identify realistic but ambitious “stretch targets” for the Peacebuilding Commission and its associated bodies over the next five to ten years. The resulting Working Papers, including this one, seek to stimulate fresh thinking about the UN’s role in peacebuilding.

The moment is ripe for such rethinking: During 2010, the UN will review the performance of the PBA to date, including the question of whether it has achieved its mandated objectives. Most of the contributors to this project believe that the PBA should pursue a more ambitious agenda over the next five years. While the PBC and its associated bodies have succeeded in carving out a niche for themselves, that niche remains a small one. Yet the need for more focused international attention, expertise, and coordinated and sustained assistance towards war-torn countries is undiminished. It remains to be seen whether UN officials and the organization’s member states will rise to the challenge of delivering on the PBA’s initial promise over the next five years and beyond, but doing so will at least require a vision of what the PBA can potentially accomplish in this period. The Working Papers produced in this project are intended to provide grist for this visioning effort.

Roland Paris
Ottawa, January 2010

Summary

Despite the overwhelming impact of major global crises, the actual number of conflicts has been reduced significantly since the end of the cold war. At the same time too many post-conflict countries either fall back into violence or fail to get on the path to sustainable peace. More is now understood about the link between global security and the lack of economic and social investment. This combination of analyses has provided the impetus behind the development of peacebuilding as a field in its own right and the creation of new international architecture.

The Peacebuilding Architecture was launched following the UN World Summit, 2005. Its main goal is to bring increased strategy, resources and coherence to political, peacekeeping, development, humanitarian and human rights activities designed to keep countries on a sustainable road to peace.

To move forward the PBA must develop a more aggressive approach as follows:

- be more proactive in its relations with the Security Council, particularly in building understanding of the fundamental link between security and development;
- implement its mandate to mobilize predictable resources for peacebuilding;
- take a longer view of peacebuilding which encompasses all aspects of the spectrum of peace activities, including peacemaking and preventive development investment in fragile states;
- seek to become the focal point in a global system defining and supporting peacebuilding policy, research and applied techniques;
- support the creation of UN mandated integrated peacebuilding missions, raising resources and bringing all the operational actors to the table in a supportive and coherent manner.

Introduction

For some time now, there has been convincing evidence that despite the overwhelming impact of major crises, whether Iraq, Afghanistan or the Middle East, the actual number of conflicts has been reduced

significantly since the end of the cold war¹. At the same time, however, research shows us that too many post-conflict countries either fall back into violence or fail to get on the path to sustainable peace.² More is now understood about the link between global security and the lack of economic and social investment. This combination of events is probably the single most important impetus behind the new preoccupation with peacebuilding as a field in its own right and the creation of new international architecture to deal with it, the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission. The Peacebuilding Architecture will be the subject of a General Assembly review in 2010.

Part One: What is Peacebuilding?

Any discussion of the Peacebuilding Architecture and its future must begin with a discussion of what we mean by peacebuilding. There are as many definitions of peacebuilding as there are peacebuilders, but for this writer, peacebuilding is not so much an activity in itself, neither is it a point on the spectrum following peacekeeping, but a methodology, a way of approaching a range of activities designed to maintain nations and their people on track for a just and sustainable peace. Under this approach, peacebuilding can be the lens through which we look at all peace related activities, whether peacemaking, peacekeeping, early post conflict recovery and nation building on into a longer term process of sustainable development for peace. For many, peacebuilding has become synonymous with state-building or nation-building, or more particularly the period sometimes referred to as early recovery or activities in the immediate aftermath of conflict. While this is undoubtedly peacebuilding, it is by no means the whole story and narrows the field with potentially disastrous or at least wasteful consequences.

For peacebuilding to succeed, what is needed is a shared understanding among the actors, internal and external, of what the crisis itself is really all about. Each actor brings their own analysis to the problem and bases their own intervention on that analysis. The conflict that launched in 2001 in Cote d'Ivoire is an excellent example. Whether you were President Laurent Gbagbo, neighbouring Burkina Faso President Blaise Compaore, rebel leader Guillaume Soro, Charles Taylor of Liberia, the French Government, the United Nations (whether

¹ Human Security Centre, University of British Columbia, Human Security Report, 2005, War and Peace in the 21st Century

² World Bank Policy Research Report, *Breaking the Conflict Trap, Civil War and Development Policy*, 2003

the Security Council or the Humanitarian Agencies), or a myriad of other actors, you saw the situation as something totally different and you responded accordingly. It is unrealistic to expect that each of these disparate actors would have sat down together; after all, for many of the actors, power and influence were at stake. But at a much earlier point, those actors who claimed that they were dedicated to supporting a solution, could have pooled their intellectual resources and pulled together in a more efficient way, starting with a definition of an end-game based on a shared understanding of what was really at stake. **This I believe should be the first rule of peacebuilding that it will not succeed unless all the players are at the table and willing to share their understanding of the issues.**

If we are to have a shared understanding of peacebuilding we need a shared understanding of what bringing an end to conflict really means. It is not just an end to hostilities, critical as that is, nor is it the creation of democratic government, i.e. post-conflict electoral processes, paving the way for participatory development, worthy as this is. Rather, bringing an end to conflict must encompass a series of inter-related steps from the moment that national and international actors start to monitor a conflict up to the point where a country's development takes off in a sustainable way. While peacemaking has as its primary objective negotiating an end to hostilities, the peace agreements which have been most successful in the long run are those which also take account of what has to happen, and by whom, after the hostilities are ended. The Arusha agreements on Burundi are a case in point. The 1993 Arusha agreement, essentially an agreement to end hostilities, ended in assassination, whereas the 2000 Arusha Accord³, despite its flaws, laid out a blue print for political burden sharing, reconciliation and justice, rebuilding core institutions at the local, regional and national level, bringing the refugees home, and a range of other peacebuilding and development initiatives. In addition, peace negotiations need to ensure the inclusion of all affected parties, not just combatants. Peace is not just to be negotiated by those who made war, but must include those affected by war. In this sense, the Arusha Accord of 2000 fell short of an ideal, as while the process engaged a broad range of political actors, critical combatant groups were excluded as were groups of women, civil society and religious leaders, despite their special pleas to be included. **So the second rule of peacebuilding is that it has to start at the time of peacemaking, be inclusive of all aspects of society and lay down a blue print for building sustainable peace.**

Modern peacekeeping has learnt the lesson that peacekeeping is not just a military and security function, but encompasses a range of state-

³ The Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi, Arusha, 28 August 2000

building activities which are recognized as part of the peacebuilding spectrum, whether political support, human rights, rule of law, civilian police, integration of combatants, gender equality, children's rights and others. As a result, the Security Council, since the land-mark Brahimi report⁴, has increasingly funded functions which go further and further into the domain of peacebuilding. In the UN this is done within a clear command structure with a civilian control of the military. The current determination of the UN Security Council to "stay the course" on peacekeeping as peacebuilding means that the international community is now putting a modest part of the US \$8 billion peacekeeping budget to peacebuilding activities, via the assessed budgetary process. **This gives us the third rule of peacebuilding, that where there are peacekeeping operations, peacebuilding must go hand in hand and must be funded accordingly.**

Post conflict recovery remains the area where international and national communities have the least experience, the least well developed tools and the least amount of available funding. It is this stage which most players identify as peacebuilding; when special efforts must be made to assist post-conflict countries to stay the course; when societies are particularly vulnerable; and when the risk of relapse into conflict is high. The international community is learning the lesson that a political agreement, ceasefires, peacekeeping and elections are still not enough. Too often, after withdrawing costly political and military players, the world has expected the traditional donor community to take over in assisting newly minted governments to get on their feet. However, not enough donor organizations have developed the tools to operate in a post conflict environment. In addition many countries in this situation are not on traditional donor lists as partner countries because for too long they have been seen as "non-performing", so they have few, if any, real donor partners ready to jump in. **So the fourth (and perhaps the most important) rule of peacebuilding is that a new form of international partnership and support must emerge to help countries stay the course for peace. It is here that the new UN Peacebuilding Architecture can have the greatest impact.**

Another important lesson being learned is that the broad range of actors, whether political and security, humanitarian and human rights, development and commercial, must have a better understanding of how each of the parts work together to make a successful whole. Political and developmental actors have too often worked separately on different aspects of peacebuilding. However, political solutions are often hampered by lack of development investment, and development

⁴ United Nations, *Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations A/55/305/ - S/2000/809*, 21 August 2000

investment is often wasted if it takes place outside the framework of the political timetable. Security actors must pay attention to rule of law, human rights issues and the need for economic investment, and humanitarian intervention must not end before development has taken off. **So the fifth rule of peacebuilding must be to seek a better integration of political, security, economic, social and humanitarian approaches to ensure that these actors complement each other in a strategic way. We must better understand how lack of development creates a security risk and inversely, how development investment can improve the security environment.**

Finally, for countries and regions with a history of conflict, traditional development approaches must be adapted to ensure that investment for development continues to be oriented towards addressing areas which gave rise to conflict in the past and to building and maintaining consensus in the long term. Too often, societies are looking for approaches and methodologies to “solve” their problems, whereas what societies need are methodologies to “manage” legitimate conflicts. No society is without conflict. The most successful societies are those which learn to manage their conflicts without recourse to violence. **So the sixth and final rule of peacebuilding is that it never stops.**

Part Two: Genesis of the Peacebuilding Commission

Immediate Post-Cold War

It has become a truism now to say that the end of the Cold War changed the nature of the threats to peace and security. The breakdown of the bi-polar world changed the basis for state interaction with several long-standing conflicts such as Cambodia, Afghanistan (the earlier version), Angola, Mozambique and El Salvador coming to an end, although each for reasons of its own. This did not mean an end to conflict but a change in the nature of conflicts with internal or intra-state conflicts erupting. Somalia, Rwanda and Haiti were reminders that the end of the Cold War did not usher in an era of peace and stability.

The international community grappled with the challenges of responding to these developments; how to overcome the shortcomings of existing tools and approaches; and how to encourage more integrated efforts of the range of separate actors – whether in peacemaking, peacekeeping, humanitarian relief, human rights or development. Over

the late nineties and into the new century there was a continuous improvement in approaches in all of these sectors, but what remained elusive was how to get them to work together more effectively and to understand why that was important for success.

UN Secretary-General Boutros-Boutros Ghali's groundbreaking 1992 Agenda for Peace⁵ introduced the concept of peacebuilding within the UN, identifying preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding as key instruments in the UN's toolkit in responding to violent conflicts. The major missing element was the development agenda and the need for preventive investment in fragile states.

In the 1992 definitions, *Peacemaking* would involve a hands-on approach with the use of special mediators and the development of the concept of the "good offices" of the Secretary-General. *Peacekeeping*, which was expected to take place after a peace agreement, was defined as "the deployment of a United Nations presence in the field, hitherto with the consent of all the parties concerned, normally involving United Nations military and/or police personnel and frequently civilians as well." *Peacebuilding*, appearing for the first time as an official UN concept, was defined as "post-conflict action to identify and support structures which tend to strengthen and solidify peace to avoid a relapse into conflict."

This distinction was largely based upon a sequential approach to the transition from war to peace which had characterized inter-state conflicts but which did not hold true in the complex political emergencies and violent intra-state conflicts that were confronting the international community in the immediate post-Cold War years. Very often these conflicts did not end in a decisive military victory, even when there was a formal peace agreement, but remained in an uncertain state of neither war nor peace, with a complex set of outstanding problems such as upholding a ceasefire, disarming former combatants, resettling refugees and internally displaced people, holding elections and rehabilitating a war-ravaged economy.

As a result, traditional peacekeeping operations began extending their mandates through the addition of a wide range of non-military activities, including the monitoring and organization of elections and the reform, or even the creation, of governmental institutions. The United Nations Transitional Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia (1989-1990) was the first such type of operation, with a mandate including elections, policing, and demilitarization. This was followed by complex peacekeeping (and peacebuilding) operations in El Salvador

⁵ 1992, United Nations, *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping*. Report of the Secretary-General A/47/277 – S/24111, 17 June 1992

(ONUSAL, 1991-5), Angola (UNAVEM II, 1991-5), and Cambodia (UNTAC, 1991-3). They included in their mandates human rights and elections monitoring, the demobilization and reintegration of former combatants into civilian life, and the promotion of economic liberalization (although no funding for the latter).

Despite this, the 1990s also witnessed serious setbacks as countries such as Angola, Somalia, Haiti, Zaire/DRC and Burundi relapsed into violence. Transitions from conflict were proving to be long and complex and often unsustainable. Shortcomings to peacekeeping were dramatically highlighted in the tragedies of Somalia, Rwanda and Srebrenica, giving rise to fundamental questions of how peacekeeping mandates should be designed and executed. The Security Council faltered in the late nineties as a result, but in 2000, with the Council's agreement, Secretary-General Kofi Annan commissioned a comprehensive review of peace operations designed to recommend fundamental changes to UN Peacekeeping. The Brahimi report⁶, as it came to be known after its main author, senior Algerian diplomat Lakhdar Brahimi, introduced more robust, complex and sustained missions which were to "stay the course".

The System Matures

Interventions in Kosovo (UNMIK), Timor Leste (UNTAET), and Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) with ambitious mandates of nation-building reflected this trend. These operations were soon followed by complex missions in Afghanistan (UNAMA), Burundi (ONUB), the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), Côte d'Ivoire (UNOCI), Liberia (UNMIL), Haiti (MINUSTAH), and two Sudan missions (UNMIS and UNAMID). By 2009, the UN had over 90,000 military and 20,000 civilians in peacekeeping missions.

While peacekeeping was taking on tasks traditionally the purview of the development and political sectors, the academic and development communities, recognizing the difficulties, were looking at how to assist countries stay the course for peace. Development in the 1990's had increasingly focused on rewarding performance, ignoring the question of how to bring non-performing countries into the system, giving rise to greater numbers of the poorer developing world which were either failed or failing states. Despite the gloom and doom analyses of the effectiveness of aid, policy makers believe that while other instruments are essential, including trade, aid has contributed to a more poor centred growth in the developing world – **but not for all**. In 2004, the World Bank's annual development report on Conflict and

⁶ The Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations

Development⁷ showed that many countries coming out of conflict, particularly those known as the “aid orphans”, had fallen back within five to ten years after a peace agreement. Other researchers were documenting similar trends. We only have to look at Haiti and Liberia to see that the international community had a habit of mounting complex efforts and then leaving too soon. Central Africa and Africa’s Great Lakes region experienced serious and repetitive conflicts in the immediate post-Cold War years, despite repeated interventions. And in 2006 just as the new Peacebuilding Commission was opening its doors, Timor Leste had a substantial relapse requiring the re-engagement of the Security Council.

Traditionally, there has been a reasonably clear division of labour among peacekeepers, humanitarian actors and development agencies. Humanitarian actors worked in conflict or disaster zones, guided by the humanitarian principle of impartiality. They avoided too close an association with any military activity, including peacekeepers to protect their neutral humanitarian space. Development actors generally avoided working in conflict zones, focusing their efforts on socio-economic issues in peaceful or post-conflict contexts, i.e. countries who could be counted on as reliable “performers”.

However, given the post-cold war trend of intra-state conflicts, both relief and development actors found themselves facing more complex environments. Humanitarian actors found themselves at risk in complex political emergencies and civil wars such as in Somalia and Rwanda where established humanitarian principles and international humanitarian law did not hold – at the end of the nineties more humanitarian actors than peacekeepers were dying in conflict zones. Development actors were increasingly called upon to provide assistance to countries that were at various phases of the transition from conflict even though their tool kit was not designed to deal with the challenges facing conflict or post-conflict countries.

A small but significant number of donors (e.g. the UK and the Nordics) began to develop new approaches to operating in immediate post conflict environments. At the United Nations, there was greater emphasis on coordination among the various players identifying the need for greater collaboration between civilian and military actors in conflict and post-conflict contexts. The publication of the OECD DAC guidelines on Helping Prevent Violent Conflict⁸ opened the door for development actors to design new programs and projects in such areas as security sector reform, rule of law and DDR, areas where donors do not get DAC credit for their expenditures.

⁷ WB Conflict and Development, as above

⁸ OECD, *Helping Prevent Violent Conflict*, DAC Guidelines, 2001

Greater UN efforts were being made to improve coordination on the ground, particularly through the system of humanitarian coordinators who worked with UN agencies, Red Cross and civil society and provided a vehicle for bilateral donors to address the human cost of complex emergencies. At UN headquarters various exercises were underway; Sadako Ogata's Brookings Process which brought UNHCR, the World Bank and UNDP together under the umbrella of the Brookings Institute to review the humanitarian-development interface; efforts by the development and humanitarian actors to deal with what was called the transition from relief to development, including internal guidelines developed in the UN Secretariat's Executive Committee on Humanitarian Affairs (ECHA). Some of the main problems identified were lack of tools and lack of donor funding (or interest) for the unique type of assistance required in the post conflict environment. The International Financial Institutions (particularly the World Bank) and the UN agencies (particularly UNDP) began developing instruments to deal with fragile states and conflict prone countries, with UNDP expanding its capability in the new Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction (BCPR). One of the outcomes of this process, the Post Conflict Needs Assessment is a broad based analytical tool being applied by members of the UN Development Group in cooperation with other multilateral actors particularly the World Bank.

At the same time, with the development of more complex peacekeeping operations, there was a push to integrate UN security/political efforts on the ground with humanitarian/development efforts already on site, a move long sought by the peacekeeping community and resisted by the humanitarian community, but finally over-ruled by Secretary-General Kofi Annan who, in 2002, decided to appoint the newly assigned Head of the UN Development Team in Sierra Leone as the first Deputy SRSG in the Sierra Leone peacekeeping mission thereby achieving de facto integration. This has now evolved to be the standard for all missions.

Towards a More Comprehensive Approach

Concepts and practices of peacebuilding, therefore, were moving ahead, informing peacekeeping, humanitarian and development approaches, although still on parallel, rather than integrated tracks. It was still not universally defined as such, but gradually, particularly through missions such as Kosovo, Afghanistan, East Timor, peacebuilding came to be seen as facilitating processes and building new national capabilities, particularly in rule of law, to address the causes of conflict as a basis for longer term peace. However, its infrastructure remained spread across multiple institutions and actors spanning the

military-civilian, the bilateral-multilateral and civil society divides. Funding for anything beyond the Security Council agreed activities remained a problem.

For policy makers, peacebuilders and academics alike, it was becoming more obvious that the end of the war was not the end of the process, but the beginning of the next set of challenges, requiring continued military resources along with major financial and political commitments. The international community was beginning to understand that long term sustainable peace would require a new analysis of how economic and social factors, along with human rights and justice needed to interact with the political and security agenda. It could no longer be a question of political, security and economic actors working alone in their own spheres.

There had been a number of earlier, but tentative, institutional attempts to address this. In fact in 1998, the Security Council encouraged the Secretary-General to find ways to establish a peacebuilding capability and two years later, the Brahimi Report recommended the creation of a focal point for peacebuilding within the United Nations Secretariat to coordinate the many different activities that peace entails. However, there was no real enthusiasm on the part of member states, and no impetus from within the independent sectors of the United Nations.

Part three: The Peacebuilding Architecture

It was within this context that in 2004, the *Report of the Secretary-General's High Level Panel on Threats Challenges and Change*⁹ suggested the creation of a new intergovernmental body to provide the sustained attention that had been lacking. In his response, *In Larger Freedom*,¹⁰ prepared for the September, 2005 World Summit, the Secretary-General proposed that this body advise on and promote integrated strategies for peacebuilding, with a primary focus on country specific activities in support of effective country-level planning. In his words, “no part of the UN system effectively addresses the challenge of helping countries transition from war to lasting peace.”

⁹ United Nations, *Report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change*, 2004

¹⁰ United Nations, *In Larger Freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all*. A/59/2005, 21 March 2005

The core of the proposal was the creation of a forum, a Peacebuilding Commission, in which UN entities, major bilateral donors, troop contributors, relevant regional actors and organizations, IFIs, civil society and national governments could share information about post-conflict recovery strategies and facilitate coherent decision-making. It would rally all of the various actors, governmental and non-governmental, around common priorities, ensure predictable financing and sustained political and financial attention. The Commission would be matched with a Peacebuilding Fund and a Peacebuilding Support Office in the UN Secretariat to support the Commission and bring coherence to UN efforts.

As a result, the UN General Assembly's Outcome Document of the 2005 World Summit laid down as one of its most important reform proposals, a Peacebuilding Commission as an intergovernmental advisory committee, a subsidiary of both the Security Council and the General Assembly, to address the critical gap in the international community's ability to meet the needs of countries emerging from violent conflict¹¹.

The PBC's central purpose would be **to bring together all relevant actors to marshal resources and to advise on and propose integrated strategies** for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery. In doing so, it would:

- **Help ensure predictable financing** for early recovery activities and sustained financial investment over the medium to long-term;
- **Extend the period of attention** provided by the international community to post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery; and
- **Develop best practices** on issues that require extensive collaboration among political, security, humanitarian and development actors.

The Commission is made up of 31 member states: 7 Security Council members (including the 5 permanent members); 7 Economic and Social Council members; 5 top providers of assessed and voluntary contributions to the UN; 5 top providers of military personnel and civilian police to UN missions (a first); and 7 additional members that help to ensure adequate regional representation selected by the General Assembly.

¹¹ United Nations, *2005 World Summit Outcome*, A/Res/ 60/1, 24 October 2005

The PBA's First Years

The PBC had a difficult procedural birth, with the inevitable UN focus on process over substance. But member states showed that they wanted to make a real name for the Commission as a working, knowledge-based body with a substantive agenda. The test of relevance is already there as it brings financial and political results for Burundi and Sierra Leone – the first two countries on its agenda. The third and fourth, Guinea Bissau and the Central African Republic (CAR) present much more difficult political challenges than the first two, lacking governments with full control over their territories.

In engaging with these countries, the PBA has taken seriously its mandate “to bring together all the relevant actors”. As outlined above, if peacebuilding is going to work, it must do so on a shared understanding of the problems and a shared commitment to work together to address them effectively. It is only in this way that the concerned actors can identify the requirements and bring all the sectors, including bilateral and multilateral, official and non-governmental, national and international, together in the search for strategic and meaningful solutions. Its country committees go beyond the core 31 members of the Commission to bring in all the political, financial and development actors, including, as an essential element, the country itself. The concept of local ownership is paramount. A country must decide to engage with the PBC, and its own priorities are at the heart of the work of the commission.

Within the country committees, the PBC engages with the country to develop a clear strategy based on priorities and commitments from the country and its partners to address the priorities. After a devastating civil conflict, everything legitimately can be a priority. However, it is essential for all actors to agree on a short list of key priorities which need to be addressed to keep the country on track politically, enable it to meet the urgent needs of its citizens and begin the process of economic recovery. Experience has shown that the process itself of developing the shared strategy, called the Integrated Peacebuilding Strategy, or IPBS, has proven to be an important element as it forces the players to work together and negotiate priorities and justify choices. It has brought new partners to the table, whether local civil society, often previously excluded, and some new donors. The weakness remains in the longer term commitment of all parties to be guided by the priorities in their own interventions.

One worry was that the PBC would focus exclusively on financing and that the PBC would become just another donor forum. Financing for post conflict recovery is essential, particularly as many of the affected countries are ones described as “aid orphans” by the World

Bank or those which have been the “forgotten crises”. Serious financial attention, including broadening the donor base, is fundamental to recovery, as outlined persuasively in “The Bottom Billion”, Paul Collier’s landmark publication¹². However, it is recognized that the Commission would need to understand the political fragilities inherent in post conflict situations and to help newly minted governments stay on track. In the North/South atmosphere which prevails in New York, this might have proven difficult. It might also have been seen by the Security Council as mandate creep. However, in Burundi, Sierra Leone and Guinea-Bissau, the PBC has proven that it can speak frankly and seek to influence the countries. There is evidence that this has had a positive effect in a number of cases. Particularly in Burundi and Sierra Leone, both governments have sought to ensure that PBC endorsement was forthcoming for their financial and political actions.

The strategic approach is now in its fourth iteration and as a first attempt is encouraging, although it is proving to be more labour intensive than is appropriate for an inter-governmental body. This will have to be streamlined in the future. In addition to the country committees struck by the PBC, local steering committees, co-chaired on the ground by the government and the UN, and bringing together other donors, IFIs, political and regional actors and civil society, have been useful drivers of the integrated peacebuilding strategies. In fact, in some ways the local process has been more successful in being inclusive than the New York level bodies, particularly in the inclusion of local civil society. There remain real difficulties in bringing civil society into an inter-governmental body, and it is physically impossible to engage the sub-regional actors in New York. New methodologies will need to be developed to address this.

Despite the worry that it “would be all about financing”, the very real worry is that the PBA has not found a workable methodology (or political will) to enable it to implement its mandate to mobilize resources. The Security Council has access to the process of assessed budgets under which once the Peacekeeping mission’s parameters are set, they are costed and member states pay their assessed share. Development and humanitarian activities (and by extension, peacebuilding) are funded through voluntary contributions, or discretionary funding. If the PBA is going to launch its countries on a sustainable path to peace they cannot rely on the old inefficient methods of waiting to see who steps up to the plate and expect to have credibility as a new mechanism with new approaches to sustainable peace.

¹² Paul Collier, *The Bottom Billion, Why the poorest countries are failing and what can be done about it.* (Oxford University Press, 2007)

In its first years the Commission has had an awkward relationship with the Security Council, a question related to UN North/South politics, where G-77 member states believe, not without foundation, that OECD countries are by and large more concerned with addressing the security agenda than with providing urgent support to the development agenda. This has not been helped by the fact that the five permanent members of the Security Council insisted on permanent membership of the PBC, but few of them engaged with the Commission. A healthy PBC/SC relationship will be a key to the future workings of the PBC.

The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF)

The Peacebuilding Fund was set up to provide flexibility for the Secretary-General to provide catalytic funding in urgent situations and to launch peacebuilding efforts prior to the implementation of long term project funding. It is allocated in the first instance to countries on the PBC agenda, but is also available for other countries declared eligible by the UNSG. There is an external advisory group appointed by the SG.

There has been an awkward relationship between the PBC and the PBF with some PBC members believing that they had authority over the allocation of the Fund. Certainly in PBC countries, Fund allocations must follow the priorities set out in the PBC strategy, but overall decisions are under the authority of the Secretary General. Other members, particularly some donors, believe that their obligations under the founding PBC resolution to “mobilize resources” have been met by their contributions to the PBF. The PBF is a useful instrument and is being applied strategically, but funding for peacebuilding will require massive amounts well beyond the capacity of the fund. If member states are prepared to see the annual budget (from assessed budgets) for peacekeeping grow to \$8 billion a year, and if they are serious about peacebuilding, then where is the equivalent effort for ensuring that peacekeeping efforts are not wasted due to lack of support for peacebuilding? This is a key challenge for the long term success of the PBA.

The Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO)

The third pillar is the UN Secretariat office created to support the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, manage the Peacebuilding Fund and support the Secretary-General in convening the UN System for peacebuilding. As is usual practice in the UN budgetary debates, much of the funding was to come from “within existing resources”.

This did not give the PBSO the wherewithal to mount a strong effort early on. In fact, it began its work with only three professionals.

The PBSO supports the commission's agenda through the country processes, both in supporting the design and implementation of the strategic approaches to peacebuilding, while the actual implementation is done by the UN and other operational actors, particularly in the field, working closely with national governments. The PBSO aims to build itself up as a knowledge centre for lessons learned and good practices on peacebuilding. An important aspect of this has been the creation of web-based networks to bring together the growing number of civil society, academic and government efforts in peacebuilding.

A controversial role for the PBSO has been its mandate to convene the UN system to ensure a coherent approach to peacebuilding among UN actors; controversial among certain member states, who saw it as a function which would detract from the PBSO's ability to support the PBC, and controversial among UN system actors who saw it as an encroachment into operational functions. The Office, however, needs to be positioned to convene the system to undertake strategic discussions around peacebuilding, whether in the context of integrated peacebuilding strategies or during the planning of Integrated Missions. This need not mean an operational role for the PBSO, but it must mean that the integrated strategies will have operational implications for UN field actors, as it will impact on their priorities and their methodologies as well as on the way they inter-act with other players.

The PBSO has been set up as a very small office with a restricted budget reporting independently and directly to the Secretary-General. This has caused problems with UN department heads who believe that peacebuilding should come under their areas of responsibility, particularly the Department of Political Affairs. The decade long debate on peacebuilding within the UN, however, which led to the 2004 High Level Panel and the subsequent decisions are predicated on the understanding that peacebuilding is neither a purely political, security nor developmental process, but must bring together security, political, economic, social and human rights elements in a coherent and integrated way. Since December 2006, however, the senior UN team which designed the architecture have all been replaced by a team which has not been through the same learning process, so the reality and positioning of the PBSO has been under threat.

Other Peacebuilding Actors

There is no monopoly over peacebuilding activities within the UN system. Many organizations and bodies have peacebuilding mandates

and components. As has been made clear in this text, the 20 UN peacekeeping operations rightly include mandates covering an array of peace building activities. 10 special political missions and peacebuilding support offices in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia fielded by the Department of Political Affairs are active on peacemaking and peacebuilding. UNDP's Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Recovery and other Funds and Programmes are active in peacebuilding where everyone is quickly learning lessons. The World Bank is a leader in the field both in policy and financial terms, and Regional Development Banks, particularly the African Development Bank are becoming more active.

Beyond the UN, more and more peacebuilding actors are appearing on the scene, including regional actors such as the AU and the EU. Bilateral donors, NGOs, research centres and institutions, and policy organizations such as the OECD contribute to the rich peacebuilding field. The challenge for the Peacebuilding Architecture in this regard remains to bring together this expertise to build a cohesive approach and put forward a coherent effort with all actors focused on agreed priorities.

Part Four: Immediate Challenges – What Next?

Peacebuilding through the new architecture has made a modest but encouraging start. In the first two or three years it has been possible to identify a number of challenges, some of them related to ensuring an effective process for the Commission itself, but others related to a broader strategic vision for Commission members and the UN more broadly.

On the workings of the Commission:

- It is important to keep the PBA focused, at least initially, on those crises that would otherwise be the forgotten countries. If the PBA is drawn into the major crises which are already the subject of massive international effort it will risk having little value added at this stage. It is in Haiti and Liberia, Burundi and Sierra Leone, that the PBA can make a difference, not in Afghanistan or Iraq which already have access to sustained attention.

- In coordinating the efforts of all the players, the Commission must involve active and operational participation of the IFIs and the donors, not just UN actors. This can happen through a mechanism whereby the donors and IFIs as well as the UN participate with the Commission in designing strategic approaches and then commit to applying them to their own operations. If there are no operational implications for these major field players of the work of the PBA, the PBA efforts will have no meaning. Donors, in particular, must avoid “going it alone” and commit to a collective effort.
- Countries under consideration must engage with the PBC to find ways to stay on track. Sovereignty and ownership does not preclude the fact that they have come to the Commission for help and advice.
- The recommendations contained in the IPBS for each country must lead to practical programmes which are fully funded and implemented. This means that member states of the PBC must take seriously their mandate to mobilize real resources.
- Each member of the PBC will need to determine what contribution it can make individually to the PBC’s success on the ground. The PBC success will be the sum of its parts and members must avoid the tendency to hide behind the collective nature of an inter-governmental body.
- The working methodology of the Commission must be reviewed. It is not feasible for 31 + member states to engage in detailed planning with more and more countries. This work must be delegated to technical teams who can report to the PBC, in the same way that DPKO submits mission plans and regular reports to the Security Council.
- The PBSO must be funded and staffed at a level suitable to manage the peacebuilding agenda, interact with the PBC, manage the fund, mobilize peacebuilding funding, liaise with the field missions and work with all the operational actors.
- Field missions must be mounted in PBC countries to engage with local actors, provide support to external actors and channel funding. This can be financed either through Security Council mandates or through the regular budget of the UN Secretariat.

On the broader agenda:

- The Commission will not be able to address all the world’s post conflict situations. The PBA must use the process to learn lessons which can be applied more broadly to ensure the widest possible multiplier effect. The Commission can

direct this effort without actually running a peacebuilding process in each affected country.

- The PB Architecture will need to enhance the study of root causes to help assess how we can make a real difference in understanding why countries fall back into conflict as a basis for keeping them on track. How can we ensure that our actions and investments are as effective as possible and aimed at the right targets? This will require engaging the research community at a more sophisticated level and developing the capability to take a stronger leadership role.
- Research is also required to better understand the history of neglect. This should be coordinated with the OECD/DAC to devise means to ensure that donor decision-making on the allocation of aid funds doesn't leave some countries out in the cold and create more forgotten crises.
- Can we use the PBC to overcome the ongoing tension in the UN on the North-South divide? Can success in peacebuilding help to bring the Peace and Security agenda closer to the Development agenda and promote greater cooperation among member states in working together on these issues which we now realize are often two sides of the same coin?

Part Five: The Longer Term Vision for the PBC – from 2010 to 2020

The 2010 review of the resolutions founding the Peacebuilding Architecture offer an opportunity to address the challenge for the Peacebuilding Commission: which is whether it can become the place in the international structure where we can address state failure and the strategic, global security and human implications of neglect. Can decision makers be convinced that we cannot afford to see a large segment of the world's population slip further and further back from the growth pattern which increasingly characterizes the rest of the world?

The current age is characterized by a growing commitment to solve some of the world's intractable problems along with a growing consensus on the priorities, although we are far from consensus on the methodologies or on the need for appropriate resources. How do we bring certain countries, war torn and painfully poor, into the world community? If not for reasons of justice alone, then for reasons of global security, we must address that class of countries which are sliding back. As noted above, Paul Collier, one of the main authors of the

World Bank's report on Conflict and Development of 2004 (one of the documents behind the creation of the Peacebuilding Architecture) has addressed the question of what he calls "*The Bottom Billion*"¹³. Mr. Collier's thesis is that, rather than continue to see the world in terms of the billion "haves" and the five billion "have-nots", we need to recognize that of the five billion in the developing world, about 80% now live in countries where there is discernible progress. It is the last 20%, or one billion, who live in countries (many but not all in Africa) that are stagnant or sliding back, which represent the great challenge. Some of these countries are the ones where the international community is now committed to making massive security investments, whether DRC, Haiti or Liberia, expenditures which could have been avoided if these countries had not been left alone to fail in the first place.

The reasons for this phenomenon are complex, but part of the reason lies in the aid relationships which evolved in the 1990's. After the terrible effects of the third world debt crisis (caused as much by irresponsible first world lending institutions as by third world borrowers) and the equally terrible excesses of structural adjustment, donors began a process of entering into more equal contractual relationships of providing assistance to countries which committed to certain performance standards and targets. Donors drew up their eligibility lists not only on the basis of historical and economic partnerships but on whether their aid money would bring returns in growth and progress. While this was an improvement over the aid relationships which characterized either cold war politics or structural adjustment economics, it neglected to deal with the question of how to assist non-performing countries to reach a level of acceptable performance. A number of countries, for different reasons, whether local corruption, weak institutions, civil conflict, for example, became understandably less attractive to bilateral donors.

We are now paying the price for walking away from these countries. The countries themselves have paid an enormous price in death and disease, war and economic failure. The international community has paid the price in heightened international security risks, in humanitarian assistance and in peacekeeping missions. Now we are recognizing that humanitarian and peacekeeping assistance can get people and their communities to a certain level, but that this is not enough. Another level of investment and involvement will be required.

As improved research into the link between conflict and development recognized the risks of leaving such countries to descend into poverty and conflict, the emerging peacebuilding community gained accep-

¹³ Collier, 2007

tance for an analysis which recognized the interrelatedness of political and security concerns with economic, social and human rights concerns. Global interest in addressing the wide range of political crises has led to more consistent mediation approaches; humanitarian coordination and response tools continue to improve; peacekeeping has gone from strength to strength and now includes a broad array of civilian peacebuilding functions; and financial and development institutions are developing new tools to respond to the needs of fragile states. In addition, strengthened human rights and international justice mechanisms are building a framework to put an end to impunity and flagrant abuses. But we are not “there” yet. We have not yet brought it all together.

Kofi Annan’s report “In Larger Freedom”¹⁴ stated that “no part of the United Nations system effectively addresses the challenge of helping countries with the transition from war to lasting peace”. The Peacebuilding Architecture was created to help achieve this end. Massive investments have been and are being made to deal with the consequences of state failure. The concomitant investments in helping countries stay the course must be seen as an obligatory follow on. Similar investments in conflict countries which have not benefited from a peacekeeping mission are equally essential.

Elements of a New 2020 Vision

The Peacebuilding Commission, as it comes out of its first years of operation must decide whether it wants to become a leader on these issues. 2010 sees the mandated first five year review of the Peacebuilding Architecture and offers an opportunity to outline a new long term vision. To move forward the PBA must develop a more aggressive approach as follows:

First, the PBC must build a more confident and mature relationship with other UN bodies, particularly the Security Council. This is particularly important in developing a greater understanding of the fundamental link between security and development (or rather the lack of development). Regular consultations should take place with the Council on areas of interest, particularly on potential countries for the PBC’s agenda. Countries such as Liberia, Haiti and East Timor should move gradually onto the PBC agenda, and there could even be a transition period when both bodies follow events in the same countries. The PBC must give up the fiction that the General Assembly and ECOSOC have the same role in managing peacebuilding as does the

¹⁴ United Nations, *In Larger Freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all*. A/59/2005, 21 March 2005

Security Council, but regular briefings of these bodies, and full fledged discussions can take place regularly.

Second, member states of the PBC, including interested potential new members should have a frank debate outside the UN walls on how to get over the sterile North South debates and reach a partnership of trust among member states based on an understanding of how the political and economic agendas interact and must work together for the same end. This will require a discussion and agreement on what peacebuilding means for the PBA and how the Commission as a body (**and member states individually**) plan on implementing peacebuilding. This discussion should include recognition of the costs of peacebuilding, both in terms of the UN infrastructure required and in terms of the investment in post-conflict countries as well as awareness of the cost of not making such an investment. It should include an agreed definition of all aspects of peacebuilding, from prevention, through peace making, peacekeeping, post conflict support and long term development and commercial investment for sustainable peace.

Third, this should lead to a clearer claim for a PBA role in all aspects of UN peacebuilding including peacemaking and peace operations. This includes arguing for preventive development investment in neglected and fragile countries which have not experienced conflict. It should include outlining criteria to ensure that peace negotiations include long term peacebuilding strategies and that such negotiations include all affected sectors of society, not just combatants and political players. (The recent Secretary-General's report to the Security Council on peacemaking was a serious lost opportunity, with no mention of peacebuilding, and no reference to the Peacebuilding Commission. Once again the UN Secretariat continued to operate within its separate silos.) The PBC should be asked to advise the Security Council on peacekeeping missions to ensure that peacekeeping operations continue to be designed with fully funded civilian peacebuilding operations.¹⁵

Fourth, the PBC must seriously address its mandate of mobilizing resources for peacebuilding, either through the General Assembly adopting a process of assessed budgets for peacebuilding operations, or through a more predictable form of voluntary funding, based on negotiated estimates of requirements by country. If PBC member states cannot show a willingness to finance long term peacebuilding, it will become little more than a talk shop and will not develop the credibility to engage with the Security Council on taking on new countries as outlined above. While maintaining and expanding the

¹⁵ Report of the Secretary-General on enhancing mediation and its support activities, S/2009/189, 8 April 2009

Peacebuilding Fund can be one small element of such a strategy, financing for Peacebuilding must go well beyond the PBF. Investment in economic and social development on the ground, while helping countries to attract private investment is crucial in giving citizens an investment in peace. For conflicts which take place in resource poor environments, this is particularly important and requires the development of new strategies.

Fifth, the PBA should support the creation of UN mandated integrated peacebuilding missions on the ground, bringing together all UN entities, funded by the General Assembly. Such missions can bring in expertise and assist the local government to coordinate multilateral, bilateral and civil society players around the Integrated Peacebuilding strategies including resource mobilization for programs arising out of the strategies.

Sixth, the PBA must invest in partnerships with the research community to develop methodologies for assessing why countries fall back into conflict and what are the key elements of keeping countries on course for peace. Much of the research is underway. What is needed is a process to finance the implementation of such research in post conflict situations and bring it together in a forum where ideas can be tested on the ground.

Seventh, the PB Architecture must draw on the authority of the UN Secretary-General and insist that the UN Secretariat and related funds and programmes work together coherently to understand and address peacebuilding across the various UN sectors, political, security, development, humanitarian and human rights. The UN secretariat should be provided with the resources via an expanded PBSO to support the PBC and the UNSG to bring the system together, to develop peacebuilding strategies for all aspects of peace operations, to mobilize funding, commission research and to support field missions.

Eighth, OECD/DAC members continue to examine their policies vis-à-vis countries in conflict, or coming out of conflict. This can continue the work of developing policies and methodologies for working in post-conflict areas, but should also include a managed process of reviewing donor allocations of aid to recipient countries, to avoid the neglect of “aid orphans”. Within the context of the PBC, donor members should review their relationships with countries on the PBC agenda, with a view to ensuring that no post-conflict country is without a minimum number of donor partners. Other funding mechanisms, such as trust funds can be put in place to enable other donors to contribute to countries where they do not have an official bilateral relationship.

Finally, the Peacebuilding Commission must seek to become the central point in the global system which can bring together all the actors in every sense, whether around peacebuilding experiences, the implementation of a particular country strategy, or around issues, research and global solutions.

Conclusion

The PBA is at a critical moment. It has had some small success but has not yet moved on to develop as an essential player. It risks being overshadowed by events on the ground, either in cases where external actors are already engaged and are moving faster than the PBC, or in its own agenda countries where it is not bringing the resources to bear to have the desired impact. It is time for the PBC to develop a persona of its own; to develop cooperative strategies which avoid old north/south jargon; to insist on a more mature relationship with the Security Council; to address each country situation seriously with sufficient resources, appropriate interventions and political support based on a true understanding of the local dynamic.

The PBA must also engage the Secretary-General, who should be convinced of the need for this instrument, both inter-governmental and inter-departmental. Senior officials in the UN need to engage in a peacebuilding dynamic, based on the recognition that political solutions cannot be divorced from economic solutions, and vice-versa, that economic activity cannot take place unless the political framework is conducive to its success. The PBSO's ability to drive a cooperative approach within the UN depends not only on its own leadership, but on the cooperation of the leadership of UN political, peacekeeping, development, humanitarian and human rights entities.

These are modest proposals, and most are within the framework of existing structures, but may well be beyond the ability of member states to agree on in the forthcoming debate on the review of the PBA. However, the growing awareness of peacebuilding in general and the peacebuilding architecture in particular already represent concrete steps forward. The question will be whether member states will see in the PBA a symbol of both hope and perseverance: hope for the many millions of people throughout the world who are striving to keep their societies on the fragile road to peace; and perseverance, for Member States and the United Nations System, to find creative means to overcome the obstacles that impede sustained support to end suffering and ensure sustainable peace and development in a more secure world.

List of Working Papers – The Future of the Peacebuilding Architecture Project:

Kwesi Aning and **Ernest Lartey**: *Establishing the Future State of the Peacebuilding Commission: Perspectives on Africa*

Thomas Biersteker and **Oliver Jütersonke**: *The Challenges of Institution Building: Prospects for the UN Peacebuilding Commission*

Cedric de Coning: *Clarity, Coherence and Context: Three Priorities for Sustainable Peacebuilding*

Rob Jenkins: *Re-engineering the UN Peacebuilding Architecture*

Carolyn McAskie: *2020 Vision. Visioning the Future of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture*

Erin McCandless: *In Pursuit of Peacebuilding for Perpetual Peace: Where the UN's Peacebuilding Architecture Needs to Go*

Angelika Rettberg: *The Private Sector, Peacebuilding, and Economic Recovery: A Challenge for the UN Peacebuilding Architecture*

Eli Stamnes: *Values, Context and Hybridity: How Can the Insights from the Liberal Peace Critique Literature Be Brought to Bear on the Practices of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture?*

Necla Tschirgi: *Escaping Path Dependency: A Proposed Multi-Tiered Approach for the UN's Peacebuilding Commission*

Electronic versions of these Working Papers are available at:

www.nupi.no

www.cepi-cips.uottawa.ca

www.statebuilding.org

About the Contributors

Kwesi Aning, Head, Conflict Prevention Management and Resolution Department, Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre, Ghana

Thomas Biersteker, Gasteyer Professor of International Security, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva

Cedric de Coning, Research Fellow, African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) and the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)

Rob Jenkins, Professor of Political Science, Hunter College and the Graduate Center, and Associate Director, Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies, City University of New York

Oliver Jütersonke, Head of Research, Centre on Conflict, Development and Peacebuilding (CCDP), Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva and Research Fellow, Zurich University Centre for Ethics (ZUCE)

Ernest Lartey, Research Associate, Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre, Ghana

Carolyn McAskie, Senior Fellow, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Ottawa, and former Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding, United Nations

Erin McCandless, Founder and Co-Executive Editor, *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development*, and Adjunct Professor, New School for General Studies, New York and New York University, New York

Roland Paris (Project Director), Director of the Centre for International Policy Studies and Associate Professor, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Ottawa

Angelika Rettberg, Professor of Political Science and Director of the Research Program on Peacebuilding, University of the Andes, Bogotá, Colombia

Eli Starnes, Senior Research Fellow, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)

Necla Tschirgi, Research Associate, Centre for International Policy Studies, University of Ottawa, and former Senior Policy Advisor, Peacebuilding Support Office, United Nations

Acknowledgments

The project on Visioning the Future of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture is one component of the Sustainable Peacebuilding Network (SPN), an international research initiative co-directed by the University of Ottawa's Centre for International Policy Studies and the University of Denver's Center for Sustainable Development and International Peace, and funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Additional funding for this Peacebuilding Architecture project was received from the Norwegian Peacebuilding Centre and from the Global Peace and Security Fund of the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

We are grateful for comments on draft papers from the participants in the November 2009 workshop at the University of Ottawa, particularly Richard Caplan of Oxford University, Richard Ponzio of the U.S. Department of State's Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Development, and Jenna Slotin of the International Peace Institute.

We also thank Judy Meyer and Marie-Hélène L'Heureux of the Centre for International Policy Studies for administering this project, Liv Høivik and the staff at the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs for producing these Working Papers, and the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs – especially the Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force and the Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations – for helping to organize a workshop in New York City where project findings were discussed.

The views expressed by the contributors to this project are their own.



Foreign Affairs and
International Trade Canada

Affaires étrangères et
Commerce international Canada



NORWEGIAN
PEACEBUILDING CENTRE