

**General Assembly
Security Council**Distr.: General
13 July 2020

Original: English

**General Assembly
Seventy-fourth session**
Agenda items 14 and 117**Security Council
Seventy-fifth year****Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up
to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences
and summits in the economic, social and related fields****Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit****Identical letters dated 6 July 2020 from the Secretary-General
addressed to the President of the General Assembly and the
President of the Security Council**

I have the honour to refer to your letter of 31 October 2019 ([A/74/523-S/2019/857](#)), co-signed by the then President of the Security Council, concerning the terms of reference for the 2020 review of the peacebuilding architecture, which has been mandated by the General Assembly in its resolutions [70/262](#) and [72/276](#) and by the Security Council in its resolutions [2282 \(2016\)](#) and [2413 \(2018\)](#).

As requested in the terms of reference, and as communicated to you on 3 February 2020, I have asked a small group of independent eminent persons, selected from relevant United Nations senior advisory boards and groups, to carry out consultations and provide their independent perspectives on the implementation of the resolutions on the peacebuilding architecture.

I am transmitting herewith the two letters that I have received from the group (see annexes I and II), in which the members of the group share their reflections and recommendations in support of the 2020 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. I should be grateful if you would kindly forward the letters to the attention of the members of the General Assembly and the members of the Security Council.

For my part, I will consider their views when finalizing my comprehensive report on the review, as mandated in General Assembly resolution [72/276](#) and Security Council resolution [2413 \(2018\)](#).

(Signed) António Guterres

* Reissued for technical reasons on 28 July 2020.



Annex I

Letter dated 13 April 2020 from the group of independent eminent persons addressed to the Secretary-General

We have the honour to refer to your letter dated 3 February 2020, in which you asked us, the undersigned, to provide our independent perspectives in support of the 2020 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. We gladly accepted the challenge, and have already had the opportunity to meet together in Geneva at the end of February with the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support, Oscar Fernandez-Taranco, and his team to organize our work. Since then, the cataclysmic events associated with the outbreak of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) have upended the panorama, altering everyday life worldwide, and of course imposing on humanity a drastic alteration of priorities.

We would like to commend you for the admirable proactive stance you have taken in addressing the emergency and its subsequent ramifications, as reflected, for example, in your call of 23 March 2020 for a global ceasefire to help fight the pandemic and your statement to the Security Council on 9 April 2020. We also applaud the publication in March 2020 of the excellent analysis contained in your report entitled “Shared responsibility, global solidarity: responding to the socioeconomic impacts of COVID-19”.

We are aware that the pandemic will have a powerful impact on the work of the United Nations and on every one of its activities for years to come. We stand ready to continue our participation in the 2020 review, with the adjustments in programming and especially scope and content that present circumstances warrant. It is clear that the direct and indirect negative impact of COVID-19 will be particularly profound in countries vulnerable to violent conflict and with fragile ecosystems as well as for vulnerable groups across the globe. We strongly support the gender perspective with which you are addressing the crisis.

The new crisis has reinforced the critical need for integrated and coherent responses; a response in which we believe the peacebuilding architecture can play a relevant role through its various tools. As you know, the Peacebuilding Commission met online on 8 April 2020 and explored how best – and to what extent – it can serve as a solidarity platform for conflict-affected countries in the context of the pandemic, and enhance the prevention of conflicts that could otherwise be exacerbated. The Commission will also focus on the impact of the pandemic on peacebuilding in specific country and regional contexts in the following weeks. For its part, we are advised that the Peacebuilding Fund, while maintaining momentum to meet the investment objectives of the Fund’s investment strategy for the period 2020–2024, is working to integrate this new layer of risk into its peacebuilding programming, in coordination with the Central Emergency Response Fund and the Joint Fund for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The recent crisis has further amplified the Peacebuilding Fund’s comparative advantage as a catalytic, timely and risk-tolerant tool, with the potential to demonstrate value added and coherence between different financing instruments. As we move forward, it will be vital for the Peacebuilding Fund and other United Nations instruments to be able to respond to the short- and medium-term impact of the pandemic on the peace and development trends in several countries across the globe.

Finally, we wish to reiterate the indispensable role of multilateralism in general, and the United Nations system in particular, in a situation in which the understandable temptation of Member States to fend for their own citizens first and foremost is belied by the existential threat of the pandemic to all of humanity. Now, as never before, cooperation at all levels of Governments and civil society is crucial to address the

common threat. The Organization was created precisely to promote international cooperation and now as it enters its seventy-fifth year it may be facing the biggest challenge in its history. We trust that Member States and the Secretariat will agree on the way forward, and on the vital role that the United Nations can play.

(Signed) Nasser **Judeh**

(Signed) Liberata **Mulamula**

(Signed) Roza **Otunbayeva**

(Signed) Gert **Rosenthal**

(Signed) Annika **Söder**

Annex II

Letter dated 23 June 2020 from the group of independent eminent persons addressed to the Secretary-General

With full appreciation for your commitment and actions to strengthen the effectiveness of peacebuilding and sustaining peace across the United Nations system, in response to your letter dated 31 January 2020 (A/74/680-S/2020/91), we are pleased to submit to you our collective reflections on the implementation of the 2016 and 2018 twin resolutions of the General Assembly (resolutions 70/262 and 72/275) and of the Security Council (resolutions 2282 (2016) and 2413 (2018)) on the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. Drawing on our diverse backgrounds and experiences, and as part of the first phase of the 2020 review of the peacebuilding architecture, we have explored the perspectives of different interlocutors, engaged in regional and thematic consultations, and reviewed relevant academic and civil society documents to consider recent trends and issues affecting the Organization's peacebuilding activities, to include the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic and its consequences, the urgent challenge of climate change and other threats to the well-being of all peoples and our planet. We are grateful to our many interlocutors, including Member States and United Nations staff members, who shared their insights with us.

In our interim letter to you dated 13 April 2020, we offered our early reflections on how COVID-19 might transform the peacebuilding terrain. This crisis has already created multiple ripple effects, impacting countries and peoples in every corner of the world, as well as the role of multilateralism and the future of the United Nations. Countries affected by conflict are particularly vulnerable, especially as responses to the pandemic and their consequences are exacerbating long-standing root causes. It has also led many States to instinctively turn inward and away from international cooperation. We believe that the United Nations has a key role to play in bringing the lessons of the current crisis to bear on the design of new paradigms that place greater emphasis on the broader challenge of addressing human needs through the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and other frameworks for international cooperation.

The present letter summarizes our reflections on the progress made and the challenges that remain to fully meet the expectations of Member States when they adopted the aforementioned resolutions. The letter ends with actionable recommendations on a wide range of issues, including the importance of unlocking the full potential of the Peacebuilding Commission, promoting national and local ownership, empowering women and young people, improving leadership and peacebuilding capacity across the United Nations system, prioritizing "peace" in efforts to achieve system-wide coherence, further enhancing partnerships with international financial institutions and regional and subregional organizations, ensuring adequate and predictable resources for peacebuilding and notably the Peacebuilding Fund, and formulating a communication and outreach strategy on peacebuilding.

We would like to start by touching upon the achievements attained since 2016. Sustaining peace is the practical manifestation of the commitment of the United Nations to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". Today's conflicts are multidimensional, marked to varying degrees by persistent exclusion, inequalities and grievances, including refugee flows, internal displacement and humanitarian spillovers of conflict, weak governance and State capacity, and compounded by climate change, violent extremism and the perverse use of new technologies. We regard the embrace of the conceptual framework offered by the twin resolutions as a major achievement, given its emphasis on empowering national and local actors and

building strong partnerships within and beyond the United Nations system to develop coherent and comprehensive responses to complex and interrelated challenges.

The framework provided by the resolutions, their interlocking complementarity with the 2030 Agenda and your reforms of the peace and security, management and development pillars of the United Nations, provide ample ground to build on without resorting to new and untried initiatives. We commend the revitalization of the Peacebuilding Support Office and its integration into the Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs as a “hinge”, in your own words, and take note of the policy synergies this has already created, including the use of the climate security mechanism. We also commend the strategic coherence brought by the new joint regional structure, which the Department of Peacebuilding and Political Affairs and the Department of Peace Operations jointly oversee. We believe that the reform of the development system and the resident coordinator mechanism has also created a more strategic and coherent framework for the United Nations to deliver in an integrated manner in the field. Owing in large part to the progressive introduction of your reforms, which favour a more holistic, field-focused approach, we also perceive better links between United Nations regional and country-level activities as well as between political strategies and programmatic responses in the field. These are all important steps in the right direction. The next step should be ensuring the systematic implementation of those frameworks.

We also welcome the shift in the peacebuilding architecture from a relatively self-contained and distinct realm to an essential tool of the United Nations. The adoption by the Peacebuilding Commission of more flexible working methods has enabled it to expand the number of countries, regions and thematic issues under its consideration and discuss issues of strategic importance. Countries across the conflict continuum are willing to come to the Peacebuilding Commission to build consensus on their peacebuilding plans and galvanize support for the challenges they face. In return, they are finding an animated audience composed of a diverse range of stakeholders from the United Nations system, regional organizations, international financial institutions, civil society organizations and the private sector. We are glad to hear that stronger links between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council have helped ensure better prioritization of the peacebuilding components of peace operation mandates.

As with the Peacebuilding Commission, we note that in the past five years the Peacebuilding Fund has consolidated its progress. It has doubled the countries and regions it engages with to support work in cross-border settings, invest during key transitions and systematically facilitate the empowerment of local communities, women, youth and civil society actors. We were particularly pleased to hear that the Peacebuilding Fund now has the modalities to provide direct funding to civil society actors. Both tools are increasingly able to consider and respond to pressing multi-dimensional global challenges in their work. As an example, we observed how both the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund are working to respond quickly and creatively to the emerging peacebuilding challenges posed by COVID-19. The Peacebuilding Commission rapidly revised its programme of work to discuss the impact of COVID-19, and the Peacebuilding Fund adapted its programming to help Governments build crisis management capacity and address trust deficits as they implemented restrictions for public health reasons.

We further welcome that the normative framework calling for the participation and empowerment of women and youth in peacebuilding processes has continued to take shape, although much more needs to be done to meaningfully include them in local, national and regional peacebuilding efforts and peace processes. The peacebuilding architecture has fared relatively well on this front: the Peacebuilding Commission is the only intergovernmental body that has adopted and seeks to

implement a gender strategy, while the Peacebuilding Fund has played a pioneering role for the inclusion, agency and leadership of women and youth in peacebuilding processes through its Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative.

We also note the burgeoning partnerships of the United Nations with the World Bank on conflict prevention, building on policy frameworks such as the study *Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict* and the World Bank Group Strategy for Fragility, Conflict and Violence 2020–2025. We believe that intensified cooperation between the United Nations and the World Bank would ensure that economic factors are considered in peace and security responses and vice versa, as well as to ensure predictable funding to address the needs of conflict-affected countries in the longer run. We also greatly value the partnership between the United Nations and the African Union on peacebuilding, which has provided a solid framework for the two organizations to continue to build on, but where deeper joint implementation is needed.

Despite these successes, challenges and risks remain. The sustaining peace framework has demonstrated its value and potential, especially since the twin resolutions were adopted. The house has now been built on a solid base. However, it must be continuously refurbished, factoring in the constantly evolving international environment and the new challenges and risks faced by the United Nations and the multilateral system. As nations and their peoples confront the interconnected risks posed by rising inequality, exclusion and discrimination, exacerbated by the challenges of climate change and the consequences of COVID-19, there is growing urgency to build durable peace and prevent new conflicts from flaring up. In that respect, as the United Nations commemorates its seventy-fifth anniversary, the United Nations system, its Member States and its partners need to more resolutely come together to deliver coherent responses to these pressing and multidimensional challenges, particularly in conflict-affected contexts. While we strongly believe that the United Nations and its peacebuilding architecture must play a lead and robust role in responding to the needs of this ever-changing world, we have identified issues that continue to hamper progress in the implementation of the twin resolutions. We would like to highlight six specific areas where we feel that more attention is needed to ensure that the architecture is living up to its full potential.

First, although the interactions of the United Nations with national and local stakeholders have improved, more needs to be done to meaningfully increase the role of national and local actors in identifying needs and setting peacebuilding priorities as well as implementing them. Peacebuilding resources that exist within societies themselves need to be better utilized by placing greater value on local expertise and knowledge and advancing investments in national capacities. International and national civil society organizations, women's groups, youth organizations, the private sector and academia need to participate in peacebuilding, political and economic processes in a meaningful and sustainable way. This would help generate positive change, carrying forward community voices and holding Governments accountable. We believe the United Nations should do more to empower them and protect and promote civic space. The women and peace and security agenda and the youth and peace and security agenda remain highly relevant frameworks for inclusive peacemaking and peacebuilding. Yet, we see that these agendas are still treated as “add-ons”, instead of being integral parts of peace processes. More needs to be done to ensure the systematic implementation of these critical peacebuilding agendas.

Second, we note that, despite your reforms, the main obstacles to peacebuilding remain systemic in nature, stemming from the persistent fragmentation among Member States and across the United Nations. That fragmentation occurs along the pillars of peace and security, development and human rights, as well as humanitarian action. While your reforms nurtured a strategic vision that directs all United Nations

capabilities and field tools towards sustaining peace, results remain mixed on the ground. Resident coordinators, now empowered to bring the system together towards attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals, as well as United Nations special representatives and envoys, continue to face capacity and resource gaps that impede their ability to respond to significant prevention challenges on the ground. Moreover, the practice of maintaining distinct and duplicative United Nations plans on the ground persists; however, this is slowly diminishing.

Third, and as a corollary of the aforementioned paragraph, while recognizing that the linkages across the three pillars of the United Nations and humanitarian action are crucial, they are often misunderstood. For example, the promotion of human rights and the maintenance of peace and security, as well as ensuring that humanitarian action and development efforts take conflict sensitivity into full account, are entirely compatible and complementary goals that do not compromise the integrity of sovereign States. Yet, we see that concerns over the “securitization of development” or fears on the part of some Member States of the encroachment of any of the principal intergovernmental organs onto the purview of the others’ remits continue to persist, hampering the implementation of holistic approaches to sustainable peace and development. We are particularly concerned about the resistance to integrating a human rights approach across the work of the United Nations, including within the peacebuilding architecture. In addition, while there has been significant progress in bridging humanitarian and development gaps since the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016, we are concerned that the “peace piece” remains an afterthought.

Fourth, while successful cooperation frameworks have been put into place to advance partnerships between the United Nations and various international financial institutions and regional organizations, this is clearly still a work in progress. The United Nations and its partners – such as the World Bank, the African Union, the European Union, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region, the Economic Community of West African States and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe – should now turn their attention to ensuring the practical and systematic implementation of those frameworks in conflict prevention and peacebuilding contexts. That is especially critical in the light of the need for a conflict-sensitive response to the impact of COVID-19.

Fifth, it is clear to us that the unique value of the Peacebuilding Architecture lies in its singular potential to play a “hinge” role. The increasingly complex nature of today’s conflicts requires the United Nations to deliver more strategic, focused and unified responses, and the Peacebuilding Architecture can play a crucial role towards that end. The Peacebuilding Commission, strengthened by its ability to work in a more flexible manner, has the potential to consider a greater number of countries that could benefit from the support and accompaniment of member State peers on the Peacebuilding Commission. As a complement, the Peacebuilding Fund can catalyse support for long-term peace efforts, especially in cross-border and transition settings. But for this to happen, both the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund need to streamline their procedures to be easily accessible and utilized much more strategically by the United Nations system and Member States, as well as other stakeholders such as civil society.

Finally, as noted in your 2018 report, we are concerned that financing for peacebuilding remains inadequate and unpredictable from year to year, a situation likely to be aggravated by additional demands on the donor community to address the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic and potentially scarcer resources to meet them. In that light, we regret that Member States have not responded to the multiple financing options you proposed in your 2018 and 2019 reports on peacebuilding and sustaining peace. Furthermore, fragmentation among Member States and across the

United Nations continues to be reinforced by divergences in donor approaches to funding. The good news is that some Member States are increasingly supporting peacebuilding activities from their international development budgets, in addition to the traditional peacebuilding support from their peace and security budgets, and they are increasingly committed to multi-year financing. But much more needs to be done, particularly to forestall the “financial cliff” that has all too often marred mission transitions. For instance, although contributions to the Peacebuilding Fund have grown significantly since 2016, they have fallen far short of your call for a “quantum leap” in funding and have not kept pace with increasing demand, now compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result, we are concerned that after five years of relatively successful efforts to prioritize peacebuilding, the scope and intensity of the challenges posed by the pandemic might again leave peacebuilding as an afterthought, underprioritized and underresourced.

To address these challenges, we offer the following recommendations to you and Member States:

1. Unlock the full potential of the Peacebuilding Commission and strengthen its advisory and advocacy role

We encourage Member States to explore ways to ensure dedicated Peacebuilding Commission support for the increasing number of countries and regions that engage with the Commission. The Peacebuilding Commission should continue to serve as a platform to discuss ways to mitigate the mid- and longer-term impact of COVID-19 in conflict-affected settings and to help develop good practices for all stakeholders. The Peacebuilding Commission needs to enhance its engagement with donor countries and international financial institutions, maintain synergies with the Peacebuilding Fund and advocate for strategic accompaniment to and predictable financing of peacebuilding activities.

We encourage Member States to strengthen the advisory capacity of the Peacebuilding Commission to the General Assembly and Security Council to work across intergovernmental and institutional mandates to build consensus around peacebuilding priorities, while still honouring the separate and respective mandates of each body. Regarding the Assembly, the Peacebuilding Commission’s advisory role would be particularly relevant in the Fifth Committee in critical peacebuilding contexts. We also believe that there is space and scope to generate exchanges between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Human Rights Council. Recommendations of human rights bodies and mechanisms can guide Peacebuilding Commission efforts to formulate peacebuilding responses, and the peacebuilding architecture can in return support national Governments in their efforts to protect and advance human rights. We further believe that both the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council would benefit from enhanced interaction, particularly concerning peace operation mandates. Finally, through you, we encourage United Nations leaders in the field to engage more systematically and consistently with both the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund, to make full use of their potential to build consensus around peacebuilding priorities and invest in critical issues and processes linked to peace.

2. Empower national and local actors

Preventing conflict, building peace and ensuring inclusive and sustainable development is the primary responsibility of national Governments. But the United Nations has a key role to play in empowering and supporting Governments to fulfil their responsibilities. Towards that end, we urge United Nations leadership in the field to consistently and continuously engage with national and local actors and include their perspectives in situational and conflict analysis and in the design,

implementation and monitoring of responses and remedies. We recommend that donors lend support to nationally owned peacebuilding frameworks and processes that can be implemented and monitored more sustainably by national stakeholders and avoid reinforcing dependency on international actors. Similarly, United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks should facilitate the participation of women, youth and members of local communities, to enable them to become more effective leaders in supporting national efforts. We encourage Member States to give space to and elevate the voices of civil society and women's and youth groups, as well as local private sector actors during their deliberations at intergovernmental bodies, including the Peacebuilding Commission, and in mediation processes and peacebuilding efforts. We also recommend that national stakeholders remain engaged with the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund – which we see as sovereignty-enhancing tools – and call upon United Nations leaders in the field to support them towards that end. Finally, we encourage the Peacebuilding Fund to ensure that local peacebuilding organizations enjoy direct access to the Fund, to facilitate the delivery of solutions in their localities.

3. Strengthen the implementation of the women and peace and security agenda

Building on the framework put in place by Security Council resolution [1325 \(2000\)](#) and subsequent resolutions to ensure women's participation in peacebuilding, political and economic processes in meaningful and sustainable ways, progress in four areas can help deliver meaningful results. First, we recommend that the United Nations, its Member States and all those responsible for peacebuilding treat women and peace and security as an integral part of peace processes and peacebuilding efforts – throughout the analysis, planning and decision-making phases. Second, we see the ardent need for you and Member States to support the women and peace and security agenda with a comprehensive operational strategy, sufficient technical expertise, adequate resources and committed leadership at all levels, and to ensure that the agenda receives appropriate support to that end. Third, Member States and United Nations leadership – including in the field – should consider fully utilizing the Peacebuilding Commission to elevate the voices of women peacebuilders in addressing the structural barriers to women's participation. Finally, we are convinced that consistent political support at the international and national levels for the women and peace and security agenda is the most important safeguard to protect the gains of the past 20 years towards achieving women's empowerment and gender equality.

4. Accelerate the implementation of the youth and peace and security agenda

Building on the framework put in place by Security Council resolutions [2250 \(2015\)](#) and [2419 \(2018\)](#), we encourage you and Member States to strengthen and sustain efforts that recognize the potential of young people as key drivers of positive change and give them space to exercise it in peace processes and peacebuilding efforts, at both decision-making and implementation levels. In the meantime, we recommend focusing attention on broadening political, socioeconomic and education opportunities for young people as a pathway to prevent potential susceptibility to radicalization and narratives that promote violent extremism.

5. Prioritize “peace” in efforts to ensure system-wide coherence, including by improving leadership and peacebuilding capacity across the United Nations system

We laud your efforts to prioritize prevention and achieve strategic integration across the peace and security, development, humanitarian and human rights work of the United Nations and urge you to take all necessary steps to ensure that appropriate attention to peacebuilding is maintained. We encourage that peace and conflict perspectives be adequately taken into consideration in the organization's efforts to

foster linkages across the “nexus”. We also recommend integration of the needs and priorities of people affected by conflict, low human development, climate change, refugee flows, internal displacement and humanitarian spillovers of conflict into peace processes and peacebuilding efforts, to ensure moving towards durable solutions for all.

6. Improve leadership and peacebuilding capacity across the United Nations system

Good leadership – both from headquarters to the field and from United Nations leaders in the field – is critical to ensuring peacebuilding results in the field. We believe that resident coordinators have a particularly important role to play, both by bringing together the complementary peacebuilding work carried out by the country teams under strategic objectives, and by ensuring complementarity with the work of peace operations when relevant. But they need to be capacitated and empowered to that end. We recommend that you and Member States ensure that the configuration of the authorities, capacities and resources of resident coordinators and United Nations country teams matches identified needs and gaps, especially during transitions. We believe that the identification of candidates with appropriate competencies and experience for senior leadership and other key posts in conflict-affected settings and during transitions is essential, supported by adequate preparation and training, and underpinned by solid accountability processes. Building on the positive examples of various United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, we encourage you to reinforce the structures and mechanisms that support resident coordinators and country teams in carrying out peacebuilding-related programming in the field. The expansion of the number of peace and development advisers and the addition of regional specialists is already helping close a critical gap.

7. Invest in better transitions

We believe that transition planning and the design of exit strategies should start from the formation of a mission mandate and continue throughout its life cycle. We recommend that transition planning at Headquarters and in the field take conflict dynamics fully into account and consider peacebuilding as an integral component of unified responses, including through the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks. We laud the Peacebuilding Fund’s commitment to provide dedicated support to mission transitions in its new investment plan and welcome the engagement of the Peacebuilding Commission in transition situations. However, in our opinion, while the Peacebuilding Fund has proven to be a vital catalytic and flexible instrument, predictable funding from other sources, including programme countries themselves, must be there to take over when initial projects end.

8. Further operationalize the partnership with international financial institutions

We would like to make four suggestions that can enhance partnerships of the United Nations with international financial institutions. First, we encourage United Nations resident coordinators, including those who are triple-hatted in mission settings, and World Bank country managers in conflict-affected settings, to routinely seek to align their country-level strategies to maximize complementarity and ensure coherent support to host Governments. Building on positive examples of shared work in food security and forced displacement, they should invest in joint risk analysis and data to build an evidence base for shared goals and complementary action. The Humanitarian-Development-Peacebuilding and Partnership Facility, housed in the Peacebuilding Support Office, should be utilized systematically to help resident coordinators build and reinforce their partnership with the Bank in that regard. Second, we believe that the existing United Nations-World Bank Partnership for Crisis-Affected Situations would benefit from establishing modalities for regular engagement with the International Monetary Fund on fragile States, including on

information-sharing and joint data and analysis, considering the importance of macroeconomics and debt issues for peace. Third, we encourage Member States – particularly those that have representatives in the World Bank Board of Executive Directors – to help support coherence between the efforts of the two organizations, both through their representatives in the countries concerned and by bridging their own positions and strategies in New York and Washington, D.C. Finally, we believe that the Peacebuilding Commission should continue to focus on the relationship of the United Nations with the World Bank and other international financial institutions. In parallel, the Peacebuilding Fund should work with the Bank’s funding instruments on strategies that would enable synergetic interventions and the sequencing of activities.

9. Enhance partnerships with regional and subregional organizations

To enhance partnerships with regional and subregional organizations, we recommend that greater attention be paid to the harmonization of United Nations peacebuilding efforts with regional and subregional frameworks, such as the African Peace and Security Architecture, with the aim of joint action in areas such as conflict prevention, political dialogue, national reconciliation, democratic governance and human rights. Partnerships should aim to strengthen cooperation between the offices that deal with peacebuilding and prevention issues and move towards joint analysis and deeper engagement between intergovernmental bodies and funding mechanisms.

10. Ensure adequate and predictable long-term peacebuilding financing

We encourage you to continue to explore ways to ensure improved peacebuilding financing with Member States. This includes encouraging donors to maintain an appropriate focus on long-term and strategic peacebuilding priorities, even in times of crisis, to prevent the risk of conflict in the longer run. First, we call upon Member States to consider spending an increased and dedicated share of their development assistance on peacebuilding priorities. Second, we call upon all peacebuilding donors to seek greater synergies across the different funding instruments to which they each contribute. Peacebuilding donors should also seek to interact more strategically with international financial institutions, to ensure that their respective support in crisis contexts is mutually reinforcing and has a long-term perspective. Third, we believe that all donors should avoid the proliferation of new funding instruments and prioritize contributions to existing pooled funding mechanisms. In that respect, we call upon donors to reduce earmarking and prioritize multi-year funding to existing funding tools and to continue to pursue initiatives on good peacebuilding donorship. We also believe that ensuring complementarity, instead of competition, among funding mechanisms that are relevant to peacebuilding is a critical aspect of ensuring strategic and integrated action. We are of the opinion that convening the United Nations system, Member States and donors to discuss ways to ensure this complementarity, under your able leadership, can help chart the way forward.

In our opinion, dependence on voluntary contributions from a limited number of donor States continues to underscore the financial precariousness of the Peacebuilding Fund and must be addressed. Predictable funding would allow the Peacebuilding Fund, but also other critical funding mechanisms such as the Central Emergency Response Fund, the Sustainable Development Goals Fund and the new COVID-19 Solidarity Response Fund, to better harness resources to address the long-term multidimensional challenges posed by the coronavirus outbreak, especially in conflict-affected settings. We urge Member States, and particularly Peacebuilding Commission members, to revisit your proposals and provide the necessary funding both for the Peacebuilding Fund to fully resource its 2020–2024 strategy and for broader peacebuilding needs. We encourage existing donors to expand their contributions to the Peacebuilding Fund and call upon new donors to contribute,

preferably through multi-year funding. We also emphasize our continued belief that it is highly advisable to earmark a yearly assessed contribution to the Peacebuilding Fund to assure its long-term financial viability, either within the regular or the peacekeeping budgets. We encourage you to consider undertaking additional consultations with Member States to identify appropriate avenues for the implementation of your previous financing recommendations and to identify innovative approaches to the same end.

11. Formulate a communication and outreach strategy to explain the peacebuilding architecture

Communicating the vision of the Charter of the United Nations for long-term peace to the broad array of peacebuilding stakeholders, to generate better understanding of the value and practical use of its peacebuilding tools, can play a critical role in bringing all relevant actors around strategic peacebuilding priorities, particularly in the field. We believe that your regular policy briefings should be utilized to that end. We also advise you and Member States, particularly Peacebuilding Commission members, to contemplate a far-reaching communication and outreach strategy to reach diverse audiences.

To conclude, it seems clear that, for the United Nations to help to build and sustain peace and make a tangible difference on the ground, it must marshal all of its capacities, resources, and tools, especially in the light of the multidimensional challenges that the world faces today. The United Nations system has come a long way towards realizing the vision behind the establishment of the peacebuilding architecture in 2005, and towards the implementation of the 2016 twin resolutions. But every challenge creates new opportunities, including new ways to approach peacebuilding. For us, the solution lies not in the creation of new mechanisms or institutional structures, but rather in a change in the mindset defining how the long-term vision of peace is understood, implemented and prioritized. Rather, change will mean forging a common vision for response and recovery, drawing on United Nations system-wide tools and capacities to support countries in their efforts to sustain peace and build resilient, safe, and prosperous societies in line with their pledge to leave no one behind. As it evolves in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic and other pressing challenges, particularly persisting trends of conflict, climate change, internal displacement and refugee flows and pressing socioeconomic issues, the entire United Nations system and its partners must also ensure that peacebuilding remains a priority and that the gains of the past years are not lost.

In that light, our final recommendation to you is to continue to dedicate particular attention to sustaining peace. As the world emerges from the pandemic, there will be new opportunities to prioritize the welfare of all humanity and its natural habitat, and to spur global recommitment to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. We should be sure not to miss this chance.

Last, we thank you for providing us the opportunity to participate in the review exercise, and kindly request that the present letter be shared with the States Members of the United Nations.

(Signed) Nasser **Judeh**

(Signed) Liberata **Mulamula**

(Signed) Roza **Otunbayeva**

(Signed) Gert **Rosenthal**

(Signed) Annika **Söder**