

**Security Council Open Debate on Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: Institution Building**  
**21st January 2011, Security Council Chamber (GA-TSC-01)**

*Statement by H.E. Mr. Maged Abdelaziz, Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations*

At the outset, I would like to express my delegation's appreciation to Bosnia and Herzegovina for convening this important debate on the theme of "Post-conflict peacebuilding: institution-building", emphasizing the consistent priority that has always been stressed by Governments in post-conflict countries. I would also like to associate my remarks with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Bangladesh in his capacity as coordinator of the Non-Aligned Movement for peacebuilding activities.

Over the past six years, the United Nations has been successfully shaping its peacebuilding architecture, adjusting it to address the challenges and fill in the gaps emerging from past experience in peacebuilding in post-conflict situations, as identified in the recommendations of the review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the ongoing review of the international civilian capacity. We are confident that Member States will continue to support international efforts through the Organization's principal organs, which significantly contribute to peacebuilding in post-conflict countries, in particular those of the Peacebuilding Commission, along with the efforts by the Secretary-General.

In that context, Egypt is confident that the implementation of the recommendations of the Peacebuilding Commission review will contribute to further strengthening the role of the Commission in establishing the vital peacebuilding platform. Egypt is coordinating on this issue with the African Union and will present, at the African Summit to be held in a few days at the end of this month, a proposal to establish a regional centre in Cairo to support peacebuilding and institution-building capacities on the African continent.

The success of institution-building in post-conflict situations largely depends on a strategic vision that should be established on the fundamental pillars of national ownership, innovative approaches, comprehensiveness, and multi-pronged partnerships.

The doctrine of transferring responsibility for peacebuilding, and consequently institution-building, to the international community is a falsely premised one. National ownership is a sine qua non for a successful peacebuilding process. In no case can the international community, even at the stage of conflict, provide services that would otherwise be provided by national or transitional Governments. Accumulated international and regional expertise have proven that national ownership of all phases of any peacebuilding process, including institution and civilian capacity-building, is the essential requirement for the success of such efforts.

National and transitional Governments in post-conflict countries must have the responsibility in identifying peacebuilding priorities and should be at the core planning and implementation of peacebuilding strategies, supported by a vibrant national civil society and assisted by the international community. They should always maintain the ability to terminate any peacebuilding activity at any time, in true reflection of the principle of national ownership.

In this context, institution-building represents a vital component of peacebuilding strategies, requiring innovative methodologies beyond traditional approaches. The requirements for stabilizing a newly established peace in a post-conflict situation extend beyond the traditional goals of security sector reform, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, and the rule of law.

If the aforementioned goals are to be successfully realized, other vital priorities must be achieved in tandem, in particular the strengthening of economic, financial, social and political institutions and civilian capacity-building in all fields. Such an approach requires a thorough analysis of existing national capabilities and resources, as well as the challenges facing successful, comprehensive and gradual institution- and civilian capacity-building on a case-by-case basis.

The efforts of post-conflict countries to address institution- and civilian capacity-building and to respond to these challenges should be supported from the early stages by multi-pronged partnerships within and outside the United Nations system among the relevant United Nations bodies and the United Nations field operations. Furthermore, the United Nations should not be the only player in institution- and civilian capacity-building.

This responsibility should also be shared by the donor community, international institutions — in particular, international financial institutions — and relevant regional and subregional organizations, drawing in particular on the vast pool of regional and international expertise and resources.

Establishing the appropriate environment required for exit strategies of peacekeeping operations necessitates the active involvement of peacebuilders and development actors at the early stages of any peacekeeping operation. Providing the needed support to the efforts of national Governments and civil society in post-conflict countries requires innovative coordination and collaboration among the principal organs of the United Nations and within the United Nations system, as well as maximizing the benefits from the established peacebuilding architecture.

Finally, efforts to rehabilitate and establish national institutions and the capacities needed to support them, as well as creating the enabling structural, economic and social environments for their sustenance, will not meet with success without adequate, reliable, predictable and flexible funding, without conditionality or earmarking. In addition, we need to establish monitoring and follow-up mechanisms to ensure the fulfilment of national and international financial commitments needed to realize the nationally agreed institution- and civilian capacity- building priorities. They would also ensure the consistency of the priorities of international funding mechanisms, including the Peacebuilding Fund, with the national peacebuilding priorities of the concerned countries, and address the need to consider innovative methods to strengthen the resources of such mechanisms, particularly the Peacebuilding Fund.

In this connection, at the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly, Egypt suggested the convening of an annual donors' conference for the Peacebuilding Fund, similar to the annual pledging conference for the Central Emergency Response Fund, in order to ensure the mobilization of increased funding for future peacebuilding activities. We hope that this proposal will garner the necessary support for its full implementation.