

the total amount included in the estimate of financial implications provided to the Security Council.”²⁴ Other ideas such as peace-keeping redeemable certificates are being floated around the UN but merely serve to mask the need for countries to be more responsible in meeting their commitments. In the short term however, the Secretariat is still tasked with mounting a mission once it has been approved even if the monies are not there yet.

Looking to other UN agencies for methods in which to resolve peace-keeping financing may not be all that useful inasmuch as they are not faced with the problems surrounding the need to assess countries for each and every mission. Also, the size of peace-keeping dwarfs others' budgets and arrangements. However, UNHCR may provide some help. Their comptroller has an emergency fund, and the High Commissioner for Refugees has total discretion on an initial tranche of \$1 million for any mission.

However, no matter how the regular peace-keeping budget process is tightened up, it will never be able to handle rapid reaction. The reality is that the Secretary-General must have sufficient funds and authority to start funding a rapid reaction mission the day it receives Security Council authorization. Alternately, various countries will have to meet all or most start up costs with the hope and expectation that they will be reimbursed.

A final issue is the funding of any contingency planning or preparatory activity. Ostensibly the Secretary-General cannot expend any resources on a mission until it is mandated by the Security Council. Presently, fiscal juggling occurs to resolve this problem. Some way must be found to allow the SG to initiate preparatory activity in the reasonable anticipation of the Security Council mandating a peace-keeping mission.

²⁴ para 52, A/48/403 (S/26450) 14 March 1994 **Improving the capacity of the United Nations for peace-keeping**, Report of the Secretary-General