

50th Anniversary of Japan's Admission to the United Nations

International Symposium on Human Security

**Human Security in Post-Conflict Peacebuilding:
Transition from Humanitarian Relief to Development**

**Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Tokyo, Japan**

6 December 2006

Table of Content

Programme.....	2
The First Session Panelists.....	3
The Second Session Panelists.....	4
Summary.....	5
Record.....	8

50th Anniversary of Japan's Admission to the United Nations International Symposium on Human Security

Human Security in Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: Transition from Humanitarian Relief to Development

December 6, 2006
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Programme

- 09:00 – 09:10** **Opening Remarks**
- H. E. Mr. Taro ASO
Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan
- 09:10 – 10:30** **The First Session** (Language: English)
- Mrs. Sadako OGATA
President, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)
 - Mr. António GUTERRES
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
 - Mr. Kemal DERVIŞ
Administrator, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Chair, United Nations Development Group (UNDG)
 - Mr. Koji TSURUOKA (Moderator)
Ambassador, Director-General for Global Issues, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- 10:30 – 10:45** **Break**
- 10:45 – 12:45** **The Second Session** (Language: Japanese)
- Mr. Hiroshi HIGASHIURA
Director-General, International Relations Department,
The Japanese Red Cross Society
 - Professor Izumi NAKAMITSU-LENNARTSSON
Professor, International Relations, Hitotsubashi University
 - Dr. Kunihiko (Chris) HIRABAYASHI
Senior Programme Officer, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Tokyo
 - Ms. Yukie OSA
Chairperson, Board of Directors, Japan Platform (JPF)
 - Mr. Koji TSURUOKA (Moderator)
Ambassador, Director-General for Global Issues, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- 12:45** **Closing**

The First Session Panelists

Mrs. Sadako OGATA

**President, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)
Former United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees**

Mrs. Ogata was appointed to President of JICA in 2003. Prior to her current career, she served as UNHCR from 1991 to 2000. Mrs. Ogata co-chaired the Commission on Human Security with Nobel Prize laureate Professor Amartya Sen and currently chairs the Advisory Board on Human Security. She also served as Prime Minister's Special Representative for Afghanistan Assistance, and the Member of the U.N. High-Level Panel on Threat, Challenges and Change. She received Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California at Berkeley.

Mr. António GUTERRES

**United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
Former Prime Minister of Portuguese Republic**

Mr. Guterres was appointed as High Commissioner in 2005. Before UNHCR, he spent more than 20 years in government and public service. He served as the Portuguese Prime Minister from 1995 to 2002. He was a member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, as well as Chairman of the Committee on Demography, Migration and Refugees. In addition, he acted as president of Socialist International. Graduated at the Institute Superior Tecnico.

Mr. Kemal DERVIŞ

**Administrator, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Chair, United Nations Development Group (UNDG)
Former Minister for Economic Affairs and the Treasury of the Republic of Turkey**

Mr. Derviş was appointed to the Administrator of UNDP in 2005. He is also the Chair of the undg. Prior to his appointment with UNDP, he was a member of the Turkish Parliament, after he had been Minister for Economic Affairs and the Treasury from 2001 to 2002. He also served as Vice-president of the World Bank for the Middle East and North Africa Region and for Poverty Reduction and Economic Management. Earned his M.A. in economics from the London School of Economics (LSE) and his Ph.D. from Princeton University

Mr. Koji TSURUOKA

Ambassador, Director-General for Global Issues, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Moderator)

Mr. Tsuruoka was appointed to Ambassador, Director-General for Global Issues in 2006. He entered Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1976. Prior to his current appointment, he served as Minister, Embassy of Japan in the Republic of Indonesia, Professor of National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies, Deputy Director-General of Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Graduated from University of Tokyo (Faculty of Law) in 1976 and received L.L.M from Harvard Law School 1978.

The Second Session Panelists

Mr. Hiroshi HIGASHIURA

Director-General, International Relations Department, The Japanese Red Cross Society

Mr. Higashiura was appointed to Director-General of International Relations Department for the Japanese Red Cross Society in 2002. Since joining the Japanese Red Cross Society in 1970, he has been active in Red Cross services for 35 years both at national and international level. Prior to his current position, he served as Deputy Director-General of Relief and Welfare Department and International Relations department for the Japanese Red Cross Society and served as Head of the Asia & Pacific Department for the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. Earned M.A. in political science from Waseda University.

Professor Izumi NAKAMITSU-LENNARTSSON

Professor, International Relations, Hitotsubashi University,

Professor Nakamitsu-Lennartsson was appointed to Professor of Hitotsubashi University in 2005. She is also a member of the advisory panel to the Japanese Foreign Minister on international exchange, and a visiting senior advisor on peace-building at JICA. Prior to her current career, she held a number of positions in the UN system, including Head of UNHCR office in Sarajevo and Mostar, Senior Humanitarian Affairs Officer to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to the former Yugoslavia, Special Assistant to the Assistant High Commissioner for Refugees (Policy and Operations), First Officer at the UN Reform Team in the Executive Office of the Secretary-General. She was Chef de Cabinet and Director of Planning and Coordination at the Stockholm-based intergovernmental organization, the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA). Graduated from Waseda University, earned M.A. in Foreign Service Program from Georgetown University.

Dr. Kunihiko (Chris) HIRABAYASHI

Senior Programme Officer, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Tokyo

Dr. Hirabayashi was appointed to Senior Programme Officer of UNICEF Tokyo in 2006. He worked as a Technical staff for Center for International Medical Cooperation, International Medical Center of Japan, Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare and extended technical assistance to many developing countries such as Bolivia, Colombia, India, Honduras and Vietnam for about 10 years since 1994. Prior to his current appointment, he served as a Senior Programme Advisor to Ministry of Public Health, Afghanistan, a Senior Project Officer, Chief of Health and Nutrition Section at UNICEF Afghanistan, and Chief of Health and Nutrition Emergency Programme at UNICEF Lebanon. Earned M.D. and Ph.D. in medicine from University of Tsukuba.

Ms. Yukie OSA

Chairperson, Board of Directors, Japan Platform (JPF)

Ms. Osa was appointed to Chairperson of JPF in 2006. Also she has been active in landmine ban campaign as a Landmine Monitor Researcher of International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) as well as a steering committee member of Japan campaign (JCBL). She served a Secretary General of the Association for Aid and Relief (AAR) till Oct. 2003. Received M.A. in political science from Waseda University in 1990. Currently enrolled in the Graduate Programme on Human Security, University of Tokyo.

International Symposium on Human Security

“Human Security in Post-conflict Peacebuilding— Transition from Humanitarian Relief to Development”

(Summary)

On December 6, 2006, in celebration of the 50th anniversary of Japan’s admission to the United Nations, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan hosted the International Symposium on Human Security at the Ministry’s International Conference Hall. The theme of the Symposium was “Human Security in Post-conflict Peacebuilding —Transition from Humanitarian Relief to Development.”

In his opening remarks, Foreign Minister Taro Aso emphasized the importance of integrating people’s perspectives in international assistance and Japanese efforts. The Symposium consisted of a first session, in which speeches were delivered by Mrs. Sadako Ogata, President of JICA, Mr. António Guterres, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and Mr. Kemal Derviş, Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, followed by a second session of presentations and policy proposals made by Japanese experts. The following is a summary of the Symposium.

First Session

Panelists:

- Mrs. Sadako OGATA, President of Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)
- Mr. António GUTERRES, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
- Mr. Kemal DERVIŞ, Administrator, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Moderator:

- Ambassador Koji TSURUOKA, Director-General for Global Issues, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan

(1) Mrs. Ogata

The concept of Human Security was introduced in the 1994 UNDP Human Development Report and the 1997/98 State of the World Refugees report. The Government of Japan contributed to developing and practicing the concept by supporting the inception of the Commission on Human Security and the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security. The Final Report submitted by the Commission to the UN Secretary-General proposed a combined analytical framework of top-down and bottom-up approaches. By utilizing the Trust Fund for Human Security, cross-sector approaches to empower communities have been carried out by promoting coordination and cooperation among international organizations.

After the end of the Cold War in the 1990s, numerous civil wars broke out in the world. Yet there was no sufficient mechanism for resolving conflicts effectively in order to protect people under conflicts. While state sovereignty remained an important condition, the concept of human security emerged against the backdrop of increasing need to cope with crises that could not be managed by states alone or crises that were caused by states. Later on, human security demonstrated effectiveness not only in preventing conflicts and poverty but also in protecting people under conflicts, as well as helping smooth transition from post-conflict recovery to peace-building. Reconstruction assistance in Afghanistan is a good example which shows how a human security framework can be carried out by strengthening government institutions and communities. Although we hear recent reports on the deteriorating security situation in Afghanistan, continuous efforts to enhance security is essential for peace-keeping and peacebuilding.

By the adoption of the 2005 World Summit Outcome, the concept of human security was recognized and the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission was decided. Post-conflict states have weak governance capacity and economic and social development assistance is crucial for these states. Realizing seamless transition from humanitarian assistance to long-term development assistance, as well as coordination between development and peace and security, has gained more importance. Human security will gain a more active role to meet these needs.

(2) Mr. Guterres

Human security is a very important concept from the viewpoint of state sovereignty and the protection of individuals, and it allows for sophisticated negotiated solutions to complex situations. Since the end of the Cold War—a time when state sovereignty was emphasized and non-interference in nations' domestic affairs was the norm—a consensus had been emerging on the international community's "responsibility to protect" victims of humanitarian crises in countries where the government is unable or unwilling to take action. However, since the Iraqi intervention, we are returning to an age of non-interference. States have become very sensitive about any outside humanitarian assistance due to a fear of foreign intervention. In the face of this spreading "syndrome" in the developing world, demonstrated in such crises as Darfur, the international community is powerless. A soft approach based on a people-centered perspective may lead to a breakthrough in such situations. That is why a softer approach of human security concept probably became the only gain in time.

The concept of human security is a very effective tool for unifying international efforts in post-conflict peacebuilding. Today, we face not only the gap between humanitarian and development assistance, but also various gaps in the international system, the UN system, governments, cooperation among international organizations, funding, and so on. Human security is a coherent concept that can eliminate these gaps and serve as a unifying strategy for promoting coordination.

(3) Mr. Dervis

Japan is the main supporter of human security and has helped to bring together different aspects of the concept. It is important to ensure both national security and individual security and to bridge the two.

The transition from humanitarian relief to development assistance is a significant issue. In a humanitarian crisis, saving lives is the immediate goal, but the transition to reconstruction and development is also important. Free distribution of food is effective in the early stages, but if continued for a long time it will undermine people's incentive to cultivate land and increase national agricultural production. Another problem is coordinating activities of various players involved in reconstruction.

Secondly, there is the issue of employment creation. High unemployment can trigger an increase in crime. What is needed is not to keep people occupied with "busy work" but to give them the opportunity to engage in substantial and sustainable economic activities.

Thirdly, we must consider the role of the private sector. The public sector is often involved in humanitarian and development assistance, but the private sector can play a major role in sustainable development. An agency like UNDP has the responsibility to prevent the recurrence of conflict through creation of mechanisms that foster the involvement of private sector, thus serving as a kind of insurance that mitigates any non-commercial risks.

Lastly, to build peace, national sovereignty and the need to protect should be balanced. In order to achieve this, the UN Security Council should be reformed so that it reflects the reality and the needs of today's world.

Session 2

In the second session, panelists examined human security from a more pragmatic perspective.

Panelists:

- Mr. Hiroshi HIGASHIURA, Director General, International Relations Department, Operation Sector, Japanese Red Cross Society
- Prof. Izumi NAKAMITSU-LENNARTSSON, Hitotsubashi University
- Dr. Kunihiko HIRABAYASHI, Senior Programme Officer, UNICEF Tokyo
- Ms. Yukie OSA, Chairperson, Board of Directors, Japan Platform

Moderator:

- Ambassador Koji TSURUOKA, Director-General for Global Issues, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan

(1) Mr. Higashiura

The Red Cross works globally and locally under humanitarian law as a neutral entity that is complimentary to governments. In all complex emergencies, including humanitarian crises, we must take into consideration reconstruction, rebuilding, and development cooperation, paying particular attention to the involvement of local communities and the capacity building of local relief agencies. Recognizing that humanitarian crises do not all receive equal financial resources and media coverage, it is vital that we promote assistance where it is needed, build the capacity of local organizations and develop the human resources capacity of donors.

(2) Prof. Nakamitsu-Lennartsson

There is already an international consensus that achieving human security, namely freedom from fear and want, is a major policy agenda of the time. Japan's diplomatic efforts have significantly contributed to the promotion of this policy agenda at international fora. A paradigm shift is taking place in the international system whereby the focus of security is turning to individuals. Japan must now endeavor to establish practical approaches to support the establishment of human security by revisiting its past efforts and building up substantive gains on the ground.

(3) Mr. Hirabayashi

Regarding peacebuilding, there have been some successes, and Japan has made significant contributions. However, peace in post-conflict situations is fragile, and a coherent approach is necessary to build sustainable peace. In addition, we must assure that the dividends of peace can be felt in all areas of affected countries, especially by women and children. Women and children are often the main victims of conflict, and they are the ones that can build sustainable peace.

(4) Ms. Osa

The concept of human security has not gained the same recognition in the NGO community (or civil society) as it has in the UN and among governments. NGOs have not planned and carried out their activities with human security in mind. On the other hand, since NGOs have until now tended to work individually according to their expertise, and since more states are beginning to fear political intervention, human security can be an effective tool for promoting dialogue and coordination.

International Symposium on Human Security
“Human Security in Post-conflict Peacebuilding—
Transition from Humanitarian Relief to Development”
(Record)

Date & Time : Wednesday, December 6, 9:00-12:30

Venue : International Conference Hall, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan

Hosted by: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan

Participants :

Session One

Panelist: Mrs. Sadako OGATA, President of Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)
Mr. António GUTERRES, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
Mr. Kemal DERVIŞ, Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Moderator: Ambassador Koji TSURUOKA, Director-General for Global Issues, MoFA

Session Two

Panelist: Mr. Hiroshi HIGASHIURA, Director General, International Relations Department Operation Sector, Japanese Red Cross Society
Professor Izumi NAKAMITSU-LENNARTSSON, Hitotsubashi University
Dr. Kunihiko HIRABAYASHI, Senior Programme Officer, UNICEF Tokyo
Ms. Yukie OSA, Chairperson Board of Directors, Japan Platform

Moderator: Ambassador Koji TSURUOKA, Director-General for Global Issues, MoFA

. Opening Remark

Mr. Taro Aso, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan

Mr. Guterres, Mr. Derviş, Mrs. Ogata, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my great pleasure to welcome you to the International Symposium on Human Security. I would like to thank all of you for taking time to join us here today, and I would also like to say a few words on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which organized this event.

This year marks fifty years since Japan became a member of the United Nations. At today's symposium we celebrate this important milestone and take up the issue of human security in post-conflict peacebuilding as a theme under which to consider the future of Japan's relationship with the United Nations.

I have talked about the idea of creating *terakoya* to foster human resource development for peacebuilding in previous speeches. Today, I would like to focus on the idea of human security, an idea which we hope that everyone involved in peacebuilding will bear in mind.

In most post-conflict cases, countries are devastated and cannot fully guarantee the security of their citizens. Human security, which empowers people and protects people from threats at the individual and community levels, is therefore essential.

The challenges associated with peacebuilding are varied and complex. First of all, it is necessary to consolidate peace and prevent a recurrence of conflict through such activities as promoting peace, providing humanitarian assistance to refugees and internally displaced persons, and maintaining public order. Next, nation-building must be conducted in a democratic and independent manner through the development of political, legal, and administrative systems and economic infrastructure and the improvement of healthcare and education. During this transitional phase, human security, a human-centered approach, needs to be translated into practical action at the field level.

Human security is not limited to peacebuilding. The Commission on Human Security co-chaired by Mrs. Ogata defines human security as "to protect the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfillment." This is a comprehensive concept that should be brought into the heart of the efforts to respond to various challenges faced by the world in the twenty-first century.

I imagine that Mr. Guterres, Mr. Derviş and Mrs. Ogata fully understand the difficulty of translating "human security" into practical action. Because it is difficult, the international community, including governments, international organizations and civil society, needs to work as one.

During her tenure as United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Mrs. Ogata made every effort to develop projects that promoted reconciliation and peaceful coexistence in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, which had been ravaged by ethnic conflict. Her treatment of peacebuilding as a people's issue and her emphasis on human-centered assistance can serve as a guidelines to governments and international organizations currently engaged in peacebuilding.

In conclusion, as we look back on fifty years of Japan's participation in the United Nations, I would like reaffirm that the Government of Japan is determined to continue to put human security into practice in its efforts towards peacebuilding and other challenges facing the international community.

. Session One

(1) Mrs. Ogata

I would like to start by thanking both Mr. Guterres and Mr. Derviş for their respective agencies, UNHCR and UNDP, because they are really the major forerunners and supporters of advancing human security as a concept and also as a principle of practice. It was UNDP Human Development Report of 1994 that brought the aspect of human-beings in the development process and in UNHCR State of the World Refugees of 1997-1998 Humanitarian Agenda which the whole agenda was safeguarding human security. Since then, both agencies have been major supporters and practitioners of human security.

The Commission on Human Security, established by the Secretary-General's proposal after the Millennium Summit, presented a report in 2003. This is now available in six languages. The thrust of the report was to present an analytical framework of top-down and bottom-up. The governments need to be more intent on protecting people, establishing the rule of law, and also setting up responsible and able administrative entities. On the other hand, people need to be empowered through education, social safety nets, etc., so that they would be capable of developing communities in a way where people would be a very important part of the governing entities. This approach has given measures to governance, development, prevention measures, post-conflict reconstruction, etc.

Japan responded to this initiative and helped establish the Commission, together with UN Trust Fund for Human Security. Since then, Japan has been one of the promoters of human security concept and practice. UN Trust Fund is open to all UN agencies and it is rather extraordinary to have a fund follow-up on the proposals of the Commission. Some of the main characteristics that have come of this practice fund were to emphasize cross-sectoral community building. There are now a wide range of projects that have been put to practice, and this is something that will prevail.

The idea of human security moved in two directions. One is closer interaction with the security agenda and the other is the merging of development and humanitarian operations. This has significance to post-conflict peace building. As to the security agenda, there was a lot of security cooperation or involvement during the 1990s in the process of various internal conflicts. It was through being exposed to situations of conflict, in which humanitarian assistance had to take place and development measures had to follow with the overall maintenance of security, which the post-conflict peace building emerges. Merging was not easy either because we have different modes of operation, speed of operation and principals underlying them. I even called for a gap-filling process, going to the Brookings Institution as the neutral arbitrator to bring the two parts together. This has progressed greatly and the agencies are now working much more together and know how to work together.

Humanitarian intervention was talked about but is very difficult to put into practice. At the time of the 1990s, where there were no indications as to who would do what at what time, there was at least some attempt by the UN to bring together the concept that civilians had to be protected. This was when consciously or unconsciously, human security became a condition that all military intervention has to deal with. The question of how to formalize these situations into a systematic reasoning, or an attempt to clarify what the principle of humanitarian intervention could be, caused a great deal of complications within the United Nations.

High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, which I was part of, had to grapple with how to systemize the need for international intervention of various sorts against the principle of non-intervention of domestic matters which article 2 of the Charter has always clearly defined. There were a great deal of debate of legitimacy and the degree of intervention upon agreement of the member states. I think the problem of sovereignty remains a serious one today, yet times of absolute and exclusive sovereignty is over. There must be some ways to prevent such things as genocides and massacres to happen, and High Level Panel tried to draw up a new security consensus for the 21st century. The panel clearly moved away from the UN preoccupation exclusively with state sovereignty and recognized the

need to cope with wide range of threats that undermine human security. Further, when peaceful intervention measures fail to stop the dissent to violence and conflict, the panel endorsed the emerging norm that there is a collective international responsibility, exercisable by the Security Council, authorizing military intervention as the last resort. The last resort had to look at how to protect people in the exercise of force, and these were very new development which we have to notice as we look into post-conflict situations.

We can site a few examples. I would say that undertaking of reconstructing Afghanistan is one in which a great deal of conscious efforts was given to follow the formula of human security protection. This was to bring in good governing body, strengthening the government but also bringing in community building efforts. In these efforts, I think the human security approach in various ways has been affecting the post-conflict situations.

One of the shortcomings of today is that we are looking at some resurgence of insecurity. I always refer to the fact that after the Balkan situation and big UN Peace Keeping efforts. When the Dayton peace agreement came through, NATO brought in 60,000 peace keepers. This shows how difficult it is to maintain peace after the conflict is formally over and this is an aspect we need to be realistic and understand.

Yet now that there is much more focus on post-conflict peace building, I am very pleased that the 2005 World Summit has agreed to set up a commission on peace building. It is not going to be an easy work but there are wide-ranging international interventions underway and it has to be wide-ranging. Also, the focus should be that human security needs to be included. Intervention includes temporary administration of governments, for they are inevitably too weak after conflicts to be able to meet the challenge of good governance, international or regional military and civilian observers to keep the security situation underway, institution building, humanitarian and development assistance would be inevitable. Most probably, humanitarian assistance would proceed and development would finalize and take the process into longer term stability.

I would like to mention my recent visit to Democratic Republic of Congo. At the elections, which I am relieved that the president elections have gone relatively smoothly, there were 17,000 MONUC members trying to keep peace. In addition, EU has sent Euro-force 1,000 to Kinshasa and another more than 1,000 to Gabon in case things don't go well. I think this is an important sign where international and regional peace keepers are working together. MONUC members had been deployed in 50 different places, and in any place, that there are MONUC forces, there are clusters of UN agencies trying to work in post-conflict peace building. I thought it was fascinating that there maybe more than 50 community centers of post-conflict work underway, engaged in peace building efforts. Since then Japan –MOFA and JICA sent a mission to DRC to see how we can help. In places where JICA was working before, together with UNHCR, Japan will be starting assistance for water-supply system very quickly. In eastern-Congo, Japan would start assistance efforts through international organizations already there. I was very pleased and pleasantly surprised that peace building efforts in Congo were following the human security model of building small communities. In any case, peace building efforts will be dealing with people, and in that sense, human security will always be a central part of these focus of peace-building activities. Physical security is very important to maintain and justice, reconciliation are also important.

I will just say one word about women. Women initiative was something UNHCR took in the Balkans and Rwanda because after conflicts more women are left than men. It is through their empowerment and commitment that a lot of changes would happen. So please, when you're thinking about peace building, think about women. They are the clue to a lot of peace building efforts.

(2) Mr. Guterres

Ladies and gentlemen, dear friends, it is a great pleasure to be here. It is a great pleasure to be here with Madame Ogata, following the steps of her. I am very happy and pleased to have that possibility. I am honored to be here with my good friend, Kemal whom we have shared many illusions and now facing daily commitment of international organization.

Allow me to speak briefly to you the two major challenges that UNHCR faces today, internal displacement and sustainability of returns of refugees and internally displaced people to try to demonstrate that human security concept in both and in many situations is the only gain in time, and a very adequate instrument to unify responses of international community to problems and challenges, namely peacebuilding in post-conflict situations.

First, internal displacement. We have around 8.5 million refugees are in the world, but we have 25 million internally displaced persons. To protect internally displaced persons is a much complex and tricky thing than protecting refugees. Refugees are supposed to be protected based on international law. They live in those countries that have the responsibility to provide to them, protection and assistance. And there is an international organization, UNHCR that has a clear mandate in order to make sure that international law is applied, and that refugees are entitled to receive protection, assistance and the solutions that are required for the future.

Now, internally displaced persons live within the borders of their own country, and they are under protection of their own governments. Their governments are in many situations part of the problem, not part of solution. When we look at the situation in Darfur, it is very different to support 230,000 refugees in Chad with the help of charity organizations, even in complex local situation and many threats of insecurity, it is much better to work with them there, than to see 2 million people displaced in Darfur and being submitted to massive violations of human rights, to killings and to destruction of their villages and sometimes of their camps to dramatic situation, facing which international community is - let's be honest - is basically powerless.

Now, during the cold-war, the basic concept in international relations was non-interference in the internal affairs of each state. That was probably useful instrument to preserve peace and also an instrument of super powers to keep control over their flock. Fortunately, when the cold-war ended, there was a very instant development in new concept in international relations and international law, and a balance between the sovereignty of state and sovereignty of human being started to be created. I remember, I was a Prime Minister of Portugal at the time, of how relevant was the discussion about the right of humanitarian intervention, that was the name in the 90s, and how, important as the capacity of international community, many times with the decision of the Security Council in Kosovo, even without a decision of the Security Council, but with a large international consensus in international community to intervene in Bosnia, in Kosovo, in East Timor where I was very deeply personally committed. This was something that was gained on the ground, and that was the concept that was being accepted.

As Madame Ogata said, Canadian government asked the Commission headed by Mohammad Sahnoun and Gareth Evans, and they presented the report on responsibility to protect and responsibility to prevent, responsibility to react, responsibility to rebuild, and in some circumstances, genocide and massive ethnic cleansing, legitimatizing the use of force of the international community, but not limiting the responsibility to protect to use force, to a wide range of instruments that were extremely important to guarantee that the sovereignty of human beings could be respected in some very specific situations.

Now, this was moving in the right direction, and to be honest, all of sudden, things started to move backwards. In my opinion, I would say that the world is today suffering what I would call as "Iraqi syndrome". There has been a massive reaction, especially in the developing world, against anything that might lead to foreign intervention -more and more, the re-establishment of the old-concept of the primacy of national sovereignty and of non-interference in the internal affairs of states. That is what we are facing

in Darfur today.

Let's be honest. Where is the responsibility to protect in Darfur? Some very other development, namely the International Criminal Court and the creation of certain idea of legal global frameworks have been established, but when we look into Darfur, we are basically powerless and we are back to situation which Government of Sudan says no-intervention of the UN. The Security Council is apparently unable to take decision against the will of the Government of Sudan, and the humanitarian agencies and the development agencies are helping as much as they can, but with very limited capacity. Violations of human rights are there, and sovereignty of human rights has been forgotten, because sovereignty of State has again gained the paramount importance.

Now, if this is the case and it is very unfortunate, because I was very strong supporter of responsibility to protect, as Kemal would remember, I was working in different forums, different organizations and pushing for it. Now it's no longer a very solid possibility. That's why I believe, excuse me this characterization, softer approach of Human Security concept probably became the only gain in time. Probably, we have to work based on that, and try to create based on that instruments that will probably not have the legal support for forcing intervention, but will allow in a more sophisticated way and in a more negotiated way will allow to bring together different partnerships, to allow for protection of human beings to be granted in those very tricky and difficult circumstances. It is not a perfect instrument, but it's better than nothing, and just try to go against the world is probably not the best way to try to face these things.

The second example of our concrete activities is the sustainability of returns. From October 2005 to October 2006, 1.1 million refugees went back home. They went back home voluntarily with a lot of courage and a lot of hope to Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Burundi, Southern Sudan, Liberia and to several other countries around the world. Problem we face when they want to go back home and when they went back home is what happens to them afterwards?

I usually take the example of Liberia, because sometimes one can argue that in many countries, there is no good governance, there is corruption, there are problems, they are not only difficulties for the international community, but the basic conditions are not there, because of the lack of capacity of the local elites. But Liberia is a country that was elected in a perfectly democratic way. President Johnson is doing an excellent job, I believe we can trust her, but the challenge is almost impossible. Her last budget before the one that was recently approved was about 80 million dollars for the Liberia state. UN mission in Liberia is costing 800 million per year. I mean the peacekeeping mission and not the agencies, we are much more poor as you can imagine, but the peacekeeping mission is 800 million dollars, 10 times the state budget. A teacher's salary is 20 dollars. In the country of semi-inhabitation, there are less than 40 doctors.

When I went to Monrovia few months ago, now there is a little bit of electricity available, there was no light, no running water, no sewage, and no garbage collection. Now when 500, 000 people go back home in Liberia and they went back home from internal displaced camps, from Guinea, from Sierra Leone, from Ivory Coast. My question is what are they going to do? How can the government like the government of Ms. Johnson give answer their needs and give the hopes of people? Now people expect many problems to be solved, but how can they do it? How can they deliver?

Here, we face a major problem, because here, we have the gap - gap between emergency relief and development. But here, I say that it is a gap that is made of several gaps - gaps in the capacity of the UN system to address in a coherent way these linkages between relief and development. Now I think we moved forward and the High Level Panel on Consistency is very clear on the way we should work together. There must be a leadership. UNDP should be the leader agency. We all agree on that. You can count on UNHCR to follow your steps on this. It's necessary to combine cultures, combine resources and combine the wills.

But there is again gap between UN system and the Breton Woods System - let's be honest. It's not

working. We can pretend that it's working, but if you want an honest appraisal, coming from my experience as a Prime Minister and my present experiences at the UN it's not working - two different entities, two different groups with two different strategies, not always effectively coordinating things. Then we have gaps between donors and sometimes within each donor governments.

I can tell you a very brief story. I'm not going to quote the country, but I once addressed some friends I had in the development area of a government, saying to them that there are a lot of support from the humanitarian department of your government, we'd like to see that for the projects of recovery, rehabilitation, integration of the refugees if we could have support from the development side of your government, but let me ask a very friendly question, do I have a ceiling? If I tap a resource from you, am I going to lose resources from the humanitarian side? The answer, very candid, friendly answer was that "Don't worry, we don't speak to each other, so you can get as much money from us as you want, and others won't even know about it." This is true.

It's a problem within the UN. It's a problem within UN and the rest of the international community. It's a problem between donors and problem within each government. Not all the governments have these problems, but some have these problems, because different departments have different views. One of the challenges and possibilities of moving forward with the conclusions of the High Level Panel on Consistency is that I'm already witnessing that in some organizations, in our governance bodies that rely each one of them in different Ministries coming with positions that would probably be different to the ones expressed in the General Assembly by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. We know that these things happen. So there are several gaps that we need to address.

Importance of the concept of human security is that it is a unifying concept. It's a concept that can bring together different initiatives, different approaches into a unifying strategy to address the gap and fill the gap and to allow for the international community to be able to effectively deliver the protection that is required, assistance that is required, connection that is required between relief and development, creating the conditions for not only for the sustainability of the returns, but for the sustainability of peace, sustainability of democracy and for the success post-conflict situations in the world.

(3) Mr. Dervis

It is my pleasure to be here with such distinguished friends and guests. Japan has been the champion of the concept of human security as an organizing framework for many years and it does help us integrate various aspects of security, which is very important. All countries value and stress national security and it is a legitimate concern. Yet national security has to guarantee the individual security of citizens which is the ultimate aim for the national security. It is important to link the concept of national security with individual security of human beings.

Madame Ogata mentioned the 1994 Human Development Report which was launching the very concept in the UN system. This year's HDR on water shows us a statistic on why thinking of security in wider context is so important. Almost two million children die annually for the lack of clean water. The international community and national community cannot provide them, and this is just one example. We have a framework to deal with various dimensions such as health-related, economic and social dimensions.

Let me talk about the transition management, which both Madame Ogata and Mr. Guterres touched upon. One big problem we face is the transition from humanitarian action to recovery and development. At the time of immediate crisis, immediate priority is to save people's lives but very soon we need to move to development phase. In many countries, bringing in free foods and distributing them with the objective of saving their lives can actually take away incentive from domestic agricultural producers. We should provide purchasing power to people and maybe inputs such as fertilizers and transport means to encourage the domestic production. We had an example of this in recent Lebanon. Coordination among different actors is important in this transition.

Second issue is employment. The unemployment rate of young males in Liberia is as high as 70%

and is also high in places which are not in post crisis situation. Productive employment is absolutely a key challenge for recovery and for human security. One threatening aspect of employment phenomenon is crime, which can relapse into armed activities but simply crimes pose threats to human security. We need to create not artificial employments but generate sustainable economic activities and participations integrated in the whole development efforts.

Which brings me to the third point, the role of the private humanitarian action and early recovery action is led by public sector. However, it is the private sector activities that are able to pull countries out of crisis into sustainable recovery and back on development track. We must think carefully how we can help the private sector act in such situations. One principle worth thinking about is the insurance. I do not think that it is a good idea to subsidize private sector due to concerns about transparency and sustainability. Yet, in such a risky environment, it is very difficult for private sector to come in, invest and create new avenues of employment unless risks are reduced. I think what we have to do -and we want to work on this with our development partners- is to find insurance schemes where we take some of the risks of the private sector. Private sector should take the commercial risks, but the international community should take risks such as in times of relapse into conflict. If we are able to develop such mechanism, we can attract private sector activity in post-conflict situations.

Before I end, let me say a few words on the big picture and react to some of the points made by Madame Ogata and Mr.Guterres. I fully agree with Mr.Guterres about the balance of national sovereignty and the need to protect citizens. Despite setbacks, the principle of the need to protect and to intervene to protect will and should remain a part of the twenty-first century humanity.

On the other hand, we do live in time of great disappointment in some interventions such as Iraq which created so much destructions and deaths. There is a great reluctance to follow anything along those lines, which is a major reason for the difficulty in other interventions such as Darfur.

I think that underlying the problem, which is a subject dear to Japan's heart and I have to be careful as an official of the United Nations but I have a little academic side of myself which makes me less careful. At the heart of the problem is really the reform of the Security Council. This was something Madame Ogata's panel looked into. As long as the Security Council does not reflect today's world and the needs of today's world, as long as the rules for VETO and participation are antiquated, I don't think we will have an instrument that will make intervention and the right to protect more operationally efficient and more legitimate. The right to intervene needs to be legitimized by the international community through basis and legitimacy of the UN and the Security Council. Unfortunately, the way Security Council is structured today, we do have this problem and because of this problem, we are stuck. When I came to the United Nations, some friends told me not to mind about the Security Council for they have been trying for twenty years but have not yet succeeded. Yet it is so important to what we are discussing today and in general, to international cooperation and to peace in the world and we cannot forget about it and we have to keep trying.

Finally, let me end by saying that it is such an honor to be with Madame Ogata and Mr.Guterres and I want to say to Antonio that we have shared many illusions and listening to his speech, I know we continue to share them. Thank you.

Amb. Tsuruoka

Thank you very much Mr. Derviş.

Since time is running out and it almost seems the case that good things don't last forever, we may have little less than another half an hour where we can take advantage of the presence of the three principals being with us. Originally, I was planning to open a panel discussion among the three, but since we have many distinguished visitors with us today in the audience, I would like to first invite from the audience some comments or questions on the basis of which I will invite each of the three principals to respond and speak including both responding to what other principle has spoken. We don't have much

time, so I would hope that there will be very good sense of self-restraint in making comments or questions. Perhaps two to three minutes. I don't think I'll be able to allow more than three to four persons to raise hands, but please feel free to seek them and I will appoint those that I can see. Thank you.

Q&A

Q1.

Thank you very much Ambassador Tsuruoka. I'll just make three questions to each one of you.

The first one is for Madame Ogata. I am very pleased that you have been also embarking upon the reform of JICA, and you mentioned that in Congo that you are indeed going to have a collaboration with the UN. I would like to know how specifically you are going to do? Because in East Timor I had found JICA people being a bit shy in directly involving with the UN system in carrying out the tasks jointly. Of course this means not just water supply project, but also in the area of governance.

Second question is directed to the Administrator, Mr. Derviş. You mentioned rightly that the reform of Security Council is something perhaps beyond the immediate norms or tasks of UNDP or yourself. But I think, in the context of what Japan can do to UN system as a whole, it is imperative that I think UNDP should think more closely as a bigger paradigm. Japan I understand now has to pay 1.2 billion dollars almost, more than 1 billion dollars this year to DPKO funded assessed contributions that I think is more than all the contributions combined to UN agencies, and they have no choice. Yet I also understand that DPKO engage or employ some 20 Japanese out of several 1000 that they have. Rightly UN is not concerned about immediate national interest in carrying out its work, but I think both UNDP and UNHCR you are more sympathetic to the cause of, let's say country like Japan contributing. So my direct question is that can you see yourself more as a part of bigger, in particularly in a post-conflict country, part of the bigger framework? In Timor-Leste, we have now development coordinators funded by the assessed contribution. We have now made an arrangement in engaging 400 national staff and so forth. These are all paid, among others by Japan. So can you think of that particular possibility of working closer together with DPKO as you have already started? What would be perhaps your plan or intention?

Third question to your excellency Prime Minister Guterres and on that matter perhaps other two can comment on this. This is rather a difficult question that I would like to ask, because UNHCR has done excellent job in Timor-Leste bringing in tents and providing shelter and protection, but as three of you stated, it is a nexus of national security interest, development imperatives and humanitarian concerns. How we can balance the requirements of each? Now what is happening, it is of a concern to me in Timor-Leste. It happened in Rwanda when I was there, when Ms. Ogata visited. We had IDPs staying in camps and they were fed and protected by UN agencies they found it comfortable, and they don't want to go home. Now the national government leaders want them to go home. In Rwanda it took 4 months. In the end, it was accomplished with 3000 people dead. Question is that how would you balance your humanitarian imperative with security concerns? Would you allow the SRSG to go add on with the government to almost compel the IDPs to go home? Would that be a compromise or is that a new way?

Let me just finish by quoting what Einstein said. Einstein said that new significant problems cannot be solved at the same level of thinking when the problem was created. So I think you all are embarking upon the new era of dealing with it. I hope that you can give us some thoughts. Sorry for taking time.

Amb. Tsuruoka

Thank you very much. Can I invite anyone from the audience for some questions maybe one or two? I am always looking forward to hearing from the younger generations. Younger generations are always silent. I wonder why. Perhaps, because there are too many old people in the room, but please don't shy away, because there are old people in the room and you are young, and you can speak your mind.

Please raise your hand and ask question.

Q2.

Thank you for giving me the floor too. I'm slightly younger than the principals, but I'm not that young, but I have a question to any one of you who has good answer this question. This is a very pragmatic question. I just came back from working in DRC. I was working for MONUC. On the ground, I faced a very realistic challenge to actually get money from the Trust Fund on Human Security. I also shared this pragmatic question from other colleagues from other agencies, and our common question is what is the appealing point to get money from the Fund, because we tried quite a few things to reface this as a human security threat on the ground. We tried to translate problems into documents, but we seemed to be failing appeal effectively to those people sitting in New York, so would you give us some tips? Thank you.

Amb. Tsuruoka

Thank you very much for the question. This was a question concerning obtaining funding from a fund that Japan is the only sponsor, although managed by the United Nations called Human Security Trust Fund. UN agencies are eligible to ask for funding from this Fund, but there is a of course, screening mechanism as we ought to be accountable to the taxpayers and that of course results in some rejections of some of the good ones. I would try to respond to that, because these three people sitting here are not responsible for that, but perhaps Madame Ogata may have a word on that too. Since there is a little time left, I would now like to ask panelists to have a five minutes or so, each of them to think through what have been said by the others, as well as to some of the questions that have been raised. If I may, I would like to reverse the order this time by asking Mr. Derviş to take the floor first, then Mr. Guterres and to Madame Ogata. I hope Madame Ogata will also try to conclude the very useful discussion this morning. So with that process, I believe agreed, may I now ask Mr. Derviş to speak. Thank you.

Mr. Derviş

Thank you very much. I will respond to our dear colleague and friend, Mr. Hasegawa's comments.

Absolutely, we must look at the whole United Nations as a strategic whole. As you probably know, there was a second High Level Panel that was appointed by the Secretary-General last February on coherence in development, humanitarian and environment areas. I think the Panel has come forward with some strong recommendations complementing recommendations from of the previous Panel and I hope we will be able to follow up on those. One of the key recommendations is that structural mergers of UN agencies are not a good idea. It is not politically, certainly not feasible, much more coordinated actions between various branches is needed between the various members of the UN family. So hopefully we will be able to do that.

In terms of the coordination with DPKO, of course that is a special very important issue for the post-conflict states. DPKO in the places where it's active is large compared to the development agencies and we are looking for ways to work together. I should add however that sometimes, a little bit of distance between the peacekeepers and the development or humanitarian is also needed, because particularly for the humanitarians they need space, non-political space to work. If they get too close into quasi political structures, it can generate humanitarian action problems and constraints so one can work in a very delicate way.

In terms of the Japanese participation it must increase. In terms of Japanese staff, Japanese specialists and UNDP, we were able to multiply it by five roughly in the last 10 years, which is quite a lot, but we need to do even more. We want to have many more Japanese working in all kinds of positions. I think it's very very important that we are truly global, and have representatives and have colleagues from all over the world. We have made some real progress. Let me also say we really do need Japanese

support also. I know that there are very serious budget problems in Japan, but at the end of the day, development side of UN, the kind of support we get is not that huge, numbers are not huge compared to other parts, and we very much value that support.

If true development and preventative measures can avoid conflict, of course everybody gains. As we know, once there is conflict, costs of dealing with it are ten, twenty, thirty times larger than the costs of development activities. We've seen that in Bosnia, ex-Yugoslavia, and Afghanistan. We've seen it in many many other places. So preventative action is actually cheap and economical. As an ex-finance minister of my country, I'm saying that. It is cheaper to prevent than then to have to deal with actual conflicts. Many thanks.

Amb. Tsuruoka

Thank you very much Mr. Derviş. Just as factual sharing of information, during the last nine years, Japanese ODA has been reduced by 35%. In terms of amount, this goes beyond 400 billion Yen. So it is a very significant reduction of Japanese engagement with the international community. Because Mr. Derviş and Mr. Guterres are both diplomat as well, they have been soft spoken, but the message is very clear. Those of you who have taken the time to come and join us today, we hope that you'll go out now back to your own community and advocate for more positive engagement of Japan. This is a request from me.

Now, Mr. Guterres.

Mr. Guterres

I would like to say that there is a difference, whether we like it or not, between refugees return and internally displaced persons return. For refugee return, we have international law, and return can only occur if it is voluntary and well-informed. We robust to provide these two conditions with all our best and working with governments to make sure that so-called "refoulement" don't take place and so people are not forced to go back to where they risk persecution, what unfortunately can still happen not only because of states, more and more non-state agents of persecution. When we look at different countries in Africa, number of armed groups, rebel groups, political rebel groups but also armed groups within different ethnic groups, gangs, and things of sort is creating insecurity and environment absolutely unbearable when they really want to go back home.

But even with all these circumstances, I have to say that I am surprised at the will to go back that we witness massively in refugee communities. I say that in one single year, more than 1 million, more than 10 % of global number of refugees went back home. They went back home to where there are no-jobs, nothing works and insecurity is still prevailing and they want to go back. Of course the situation is different depending on the conditions where they actually stayed.

For instance, in Uganda refugees are entitled to farm the land, they live in villages, not in camps. They have access to the Ugandan regime of education and health care, even with limitations that exist, so of course to go back to Southern Sudan and to lose everything and it's a complex decision, even so they are going back. Those that are in Central African Republic, they live in a country where nothing can be provided, they are more willing to move back quicker as possible because even when they go to areas with nothing they come from areas where there is nothing.

These different situations can occur. What we can never do, for us is a matter of our principals is to decrease the level of satisfying rights in order to make people move quicker. That, I think we can never do. In terms of internal displaced persons, situation is as not as clear as that. There, we do not have a mandate. There are some norms that have been defined and guidelines on human rights and internally displaced persons, but there are not of legally binding value, and of course the authority and responsibility of the state are paramount, and in some circumstances some nasty things happen and we all know them. We have capacity of advocacy, we have capacity of denouncing the situations and creating uproar around

them, trying to bring international pressure to make sure that those things don't happen, but yet it's extremely difficult.

Now, I would like to say just a few words, on the question of assessed contributions versus voluntary contributions. It is indeed rather difficult for us that work in organizations that have as it is our situation 96% to 98% of our fund coming from voluntary contributions to look at those based on assessed contributions. Sometimes, I get a little bit angry, because it also makes a difference in the criteria that are used to use the funds that are available. What I would like to say is I'm a strong believer that there is now a room, and more than a room, need for more proactive Japanese foreign policy and Japanese presence in the international arena.

I am very concerned about recent developments. If you look at Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Palestine, Sudan and Somalia, there is a risk, real risk. I would like to say of crash of civilization, not to use the jargon, but serious confrontation that is to a certain extent, fed by religious considerations. Of course, we know that tolerance is always easier with monotheistic religion. Now Japan is an old civilization, has very strong identity, but always based on religious tolerance. So I believe that Japan can be a major broker in the international arena in the relation to conflict prevention and resolutions with the kinds of conflict that we are witnessing today. We are far from the Cold War and ideological confrontation, but kind of conflict is getting much bigger. I believe that Japan can have a very positive role. Now, that role is enhanced through the Japanese presence in humanitarian field and through the Japanese presence in the development field.

Of course assessed contributions are something that is lost – we don't follow the money. Money follows events, but we cannot follow the money. In development and in humanitarian action, we can follow the money, Japanese commitments to NGOs, to international organizations both UN and non-UN, etc in these fields both humanitarian and development as a visibility, and allows for synergy with active diplomacy that is of course much bigger than the billions that is spent in assessed contributions that would be put and there visibility of every other contributing country is no longer there. I'm not saying that Japan should now forget about assessed contribution and it is not an easy thing and it is not my objective to undermine UN system. What I would say is that when the budget is cut, I was in government in Portugal, and I had to cut the budget deficit from 6% of GDP to 3% of GDP between 2005 and 2007, because of the Euro. We wanted to join the Euro. I think I know what it is, to cut the budget, and there is a law in cutting the budget. We always start by cutting the easy things. It's not the priorities, we just start from cutting the easiest things, because we need to do it and of course voluntary contributions are easier to cut than other things. It is very important, in my opinion for the Japan and it's very important for the world that there is a stronger Japanese presence in international arena. It is important for Japan to have stronger presence in multilateral framework of assistance to development and humanitarian assistance to create a synergy with your diplomatic action.

Amb. Tsuruoka

Thank you very much Mr. Guterres. Before I give the floor to Madame Ogata for wrap up and to make her last concluding remark, may I just remind the audience that this is really exceptional that we have two leaders of two UN institutions at the same time. UN membership is comprised of 192 member states, so if they had spent, let's say two days in each of the 192 one year would not be enough, but they are here for two to three days. The leaders of the two major institutions taking the time in Japan to discuss issues with you, this is the expectation that Japan receives from the international community, especially from the UN system, and I think it's about time that we respond.

Now, Madame Ogata.

Mrs. Ogata

I'd like to just say one thing first. Every peacebuilding situation is different. This is a very bad way of concluding, because what you want is to wrap up. But I firmly believe that each situation of peacebuilding is different. You have to understand the causes of conflict and process of conflict in order to really find out the best peace building formula. Don't think that you have this solved and everything will be solved. At the same time, having said that, Japan is involved fully in many of them, not in all of them. Because that is again, situation of relevance of that particular peacebuilding effort to what Japanese policy is. And in this sense, this situation is something that is quite history by now, but involved very much Japanese commitments and this is the repatriation of Cambodian peace agreement. That was a major input went in from Japan, because it was a country that was new and in the area that we carried a lot, or we were also expected. What I want to say there is that the operation of peacekeeping and transition was by assessed contribution. It was my first exposure as the High Commissioner for Refugees to do the repatriation and UNHCR was the only one that had to go on voluntary contribution, and I thought that was very unfair. But then, as it turned out, we were the best funded, because at that time, somehow international community recognized that the refugee return was maybe one of the very important ones, so we got it right. Sometimes, assessed contribution and voluntary contribution work the other way around. I just wanted to make that point for you.

To the question of East Timor that was just raised, JICA, I think went in earlier than we usually do, because, JICA is a technical assistance Agency. It really doesn't go into conflict or immediate post-conflict situation, but it is again an Asian situation, and we went in rather early. I don't think we went into what you call governance, so we left that to you. We assumed that security was fairly well assured. JICA staff nowadays get E-Center training from UNHCR, trying to know work how in insecurity situations. But we usually go in when there is a fair prospect of security being assured, and I think the recent events that took place was quite a shock for us, and I think we at least went back.

You said JICA is shy dealing with international other agencies, I don't know whether shyness is the right thing to say, but we have done things much more on our own than we mixed with other international players. But I think increasingly, because we are trying to become much more field based activities organization, I think our exposure is there, and we are communicating more and more with other agencies in the field, and this is what I think with UNHCR that there is a clear interaction these days, because UNHCR is there ahead where JICA goes in. There is a lot of repatriation, building communities in order that refugees will be better-received. This was the situation in Chad. For JICA to go into Chad was rather extraordinary, but we tried to help the community there so that refugees from Darfur would be able to be received much better, so we did some water and forestry, something small scale.

So there are attempts like that, attempt to re-communicate and find partnership with various international agencies. So this is something that we'll expand much more open to relatively insecure situations when there is a real need. There were some reference other culture and civilization, we are just beginning operation in Mindanao where peacekeeping is carried out by the Malaysian General, supported by Libya and Brunei peacekeepers or observers. Invitation came in to see whether we can bring in some social economic supporting factor. It's a very new situation. But these things are happening, so I wanted to say that Japan is changing and becoming much more operationally exposed and willing to be exposed although security coverage is still a very important thing.

About the Trust Fund, I am still on the Advisory Committee on the usage of the Trust Fund and I would like to look into what you have said about MONUC and about the situation in DRC, because I came from that part of the world too.

Last thing is we are talking about the cut of ODA in the last 9 years by 35%. I am affected too. JICA is affected by the budget cut, and so I am all with all of you trying to get budget on the ODA increased, because I think it's important work of Japan, contribution of Japan through development assistance in various situations. Thank you.

Amb. Tsuruoka

Thank you very much Madame Ogata. I would like to thank the three principals for being with us this morning and enlightened us, as well as providing us about challenges that we need to take on board. I think this morning session has been both informative and provocative. I hope that this will be a starting point for us taking actions. Not just resting what we have heard, but use this as food for us going forward.

(End)