

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

*Statement by H.E. Mr. Madhu Raman Acharya, Permanent Representative of Nepal to the United Nations*

At the outset, let me express my delegation's sincere appreciation to you, Madam President, for having organized this important debate and prepared a comprehensive concept paper (S/2011/16, annex). Nepal has emerged from conflict and is making efforts to consolidate the gains made in the areas of peace, stability and development. We are therefore aware of the importance of deliberations such as these.

Peacebuilding is an important new dimension of our work, which calls for targeted but coherent and coordinated efforts on the political, security, humanitarian and development fronts. These efforts cannot be made in the absence of effective networks for institution-building. In the aftermath of conflict, many State institutions either collapse or become dysfunctional. Even short-term goals such as delivering humanitarian assistance and basic services become extremely difficult, let alone the provision of functional, effective governance, which is the foundation of economic revitalization and sustainable development. It is therefore important to give due priority to the institution-building aspect in planning and setting mandates for United Nations field missions, whether they come under the political, peacekeeping or peacebuilding category.

Here it is also important to stress the critical role of institution-building in the context of a civilian capacity-building review process. We cannot overemphasize the importance of capable State institutions in restoring people's hope for a better future. The credibility and legitimacy of a Government emerging from conflict is critical, and very much depends upon ensuring basic services for people. Institutions are important bridges for restoring trust between the State and citizens. It is critical for there to be a minimum level of political willingness to take the country from conflict to peace, stability and economic development via concrete programmes.

Institution-building cannot be done in a political vacuum. Gender mainstreaming and the participation of civil society must be factored in during the peacebuilding process. North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation should be fully utilized in building institutions in a post-conflict situation.

National leadership and ownership are key ingredients of sustainable peacebuilding. They can be strengthened only by capacity-building and institution-building. National leadership will take into account local sensitivities and the political context in a coherent manner. We should encourage all national stakeholders to engage in dialogue, identify the best possible solutions to their problems and play a leading role in the implementation process. The country must be engaged in a meaningful way so as to ensure that it remains in the driver's seat, confident in a sustained and durable peacebuilding process.

The international community should lend all the support needed to achieve such a transition. The process following a devastating conflict is a gradual one, but there is no alternative to it. And institution-building plays a very important role in that.

It has already been established that sustained attention, long-term predictable and flexible financing and strong technical cooperation are important for preventing countries from relapsing into conflict. If these conditions can be achieved, it will be possible to consolidate peace and distribute its dividends more widely among the general population.

The Peacebuilding Fund has proven its usefulness in terms of flexible financing. But that is not enough. The World Bank and the other development partners must come up with sufficient financing and technical cooperation to invest in nationally owned development agendas. Institution-building should be an integral part of that. United Nations coordination will ensure the coherence of these efforts.

It is pertinent to recall that one of the aims in creating the Peacebuilding Commission was to focus attention on the institution-building efforts needed to recover from conflict. In that regard, country-specific configurations have a specific responsibility to encourage all stakeholders to work coherently on the basis of an agreed peacebuilding strategy. Some institutions may need to be revived, while others may need to be created. But in doing that, we must ensure that there is strong buy-in to the process among all national

stakeholders.

It is evident that a strong sense of partnership among United Nations missions and agencies, Member States, regional organizations, international financial institutions and national stakeholders must be developed. In doing so, restoring and creating necessary State institutions and developing capacities should be made top priorities so as to ensure that peacebuilding functions are carried forward in a sustainable manner. Specific benchmarks and a coordinated strategy are critical. The ultimate goal of international support measures is to create an effective State that can deliver peace and prosperity to its people on its own. That will only be possible by strengthening institutions in the countries themselves.