



THE PRESIDENT
OF THE
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

10 July 2020

Excellency,

I have the pleasure to transmit herewith, the attached letter from the Secretary-General and its two annexes regarding the on-going review of the United Nations Peacebuilding architecture.

The annexes consist of two letters from the group of Independent Eminent Persons selected by the Secretary-General to carry out consultations and provide their independent perspectives on the implementation of the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions (A/RES/70/262, S/RES/2282, A/RES/72/276 and S/RES/2413) on the Peacebuilding architecture.

The two letters in which the Independent Eminent Persons share their reflections and recommendations in support of the 2020 Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture are forwarded for your attention.

I avail myself of this opportunity to express my solidarity with Member States who are fighting COVID-19 and extend my sincere condolences for their loss.

Please accept Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a stylized, cursive script.

Tijjani Muhammad-Bande

All Permanent Representatives and
Permanent Observers to the United Nations
New York



THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

6 July 2020

Dear Mr. President,

I have the honour to refer to your letter of 31 October 2019, co-signed by the then President of the Security Council, concerning the terms of reference for the 2020 Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture, which has been mandated by the respective resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council (A/RES/70/262, S/RES/2282, A/RES/72/276 and S/RES/2413).

As requested in the terms of reference, and as communicated to Your Excellency 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 I have received from the group in which they share their reflections and recommendations in support of the 2020 Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture. I would be grateful if you could kindly forward the letters to the attention of the members of the General Assembly.

For my part, I will consider their views when finalizing my comprehensive report on the review as mandated by resolutions A/RES/72/276 and S/RES/2413 (2018).

Please accept, Mr. President, the assurances of my highest consideration.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'António Guterres', written over a horizontal line that extends to the right.

António Guterres

His Excellency
Mr. Tijjani Muhammad-Bande
President of the General Assembly
New York

13 April 2020

Dear Mr. Secretary-General,

We have the honour to refer to your letter dated 3 February 2020, which asked us, the undersigned, to provide our independent perspectives in support of the 2020 Review of the UN's Peacebuilding Architecture. We gladly accepted the challenge, and already had the opportunity to meet together in Geneva at the end of February with ASG Oscar Fernandez-Taranco and his team to organize our work. Since then, the cataclysmic events associated with the outbreak of COVID-19 have upended the panorama, altering everyday life world-wide, 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 March 23 for a global cease fire to help fight the pandemic and your statement to the Security Council on April 9. We also applaud the publication some days ago of the excellent analysis contained in *Shared responsibility, global solidarity: Responding to the socio-economic 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.

This 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 9 April and explored how best – and to what impact -- 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

H.E. Mr. António Guterres
Secretary-General
United Nations
New York

peacebuilding in specific country and regional contexts in the following weeks. For its part, we are advised that the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), while maintaining momentum to meet the investment objectives of the PBF Investment Strategy 2020-2024, is working to integrate this new layer of risk into its peacebuilding programming, in coordination with the CERF and SDG Fund. The recent crisis has further amplified the 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 instruments of the UN 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 where 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 75th 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.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of our highest consideration.

Respectfully,

(Signed) Roza Otunbayeva

(Signed) Nasser Judeh

(Signed) Gert Rosenthal

(Signed) Annika Soder

(Signed) Liberata Mulamula

23 June 2020

Dear Secretary-General,

With full appreciation for your commitment and actions to strengthen the effectiveness of peacebuilding and sustaining peace across the UN 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 and the Security Council 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 UN Peacebuilding Architecture, we 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 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 UN staff members, who shared their insights with us.

In our interim letter to you on 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 UN. Countries affected by conflict are particularly vulnerable, especially as responses to the pandemic and their consequences are exacerbating longstanding root causes. It has also led many states to instinctively turn inward and away from international cooperation. We believe that the UN 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 Agenda 2030 and other frameworks for international cooperation.

This 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 (PBC), promoting national and local ownership, empowering women and young people, improving leadership and peacebuilding capacity across the UN system, prioritizing “peace” in efforts to achieve system-wide coherence, further enhancing partnerships with international financial institutions (IFIs) and regional and sub-regional organizations, ensuring adequate and predictable resources for peacebuilding and notably the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), and formulating a communication and outreach strategy on peacebuilding.

We would like to start by touching upon the achievements since 2016. Sustaining peace is the practical manifestation of the UN's commitment to “save future generations from the scourge of war.” Today's conflicts are multi-dimensional, 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 UN system to develop coherent and comprehensive responses to complex and inter-related challenges.

The framework provided by the resolutions, their interlocking complementarity with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and your reforms of the UN's peace and security, management and development pillars, provide ample ground to build on without resorting to new and untried initiatives. We commend the revitalization of the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) and its integration into the Department of Peacebuilding and Political Affairs (DPPA) 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 DPPA and the Department of Peace Operations (DPO) 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 UN to deliver in an integrated manner in the field. Due in large part to the progressive introduction of your reforms, which favor a more holistic, field-focused approach, we also perceive better links between the UN's 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 these frameworks.

We also welcome the Peacebuilding Architecture's shift from a relatively self-contained and distinct realm to an essential tool of the United Nations. The PBC's adoption 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 PBC 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 UN system, regional organizations, international financial institutions, civil society organizations and the private sector. We are glad to hear that stronger links between the PBC and the Security Council have helped ensure better prioritization of the peacebuilding components of peace operation mandates.

As with the PBC, we note that in the past five years the PBF 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 PBF 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 PBC and the PBF are working to respond quickly and creatively to the emerging peacebuilding challenges posed by COVID-19. The PBC rapidly revised its programme of work to discuss the impact of COVID-19 and the PBF 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, though much more needs to be done to meaningfully include them during local, national and regional peacebuilding efforts and peace processes. The peacebuilding architecture has fared relatively well on this front: The PBC is the only inter-governmental body that adopted and seeks to implement a Gender Strategy, while the PBF 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 UN with the World Bank on prevention, building on policy frameworks such as *Pathways for Peace* and the World Bank's *Fragility, Conflict and Violence Strategy*. We believe that intensified cooperation between the UN and the World Bank would ensure the consideration of economic factors 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 UN 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 UN and the multilateral system. As nations and their peoples confront the inter-connected 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 UN commemorates its 75th anniversary, the UN system, its Member States and its partners need to more resolutely come together to deliver coherent responses to these pressing and multi-dimensional challenges, particularly in conflict-affected contexts. While we strongly believe that the UN, 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 more attention is needed to ensure the architecture is living up to its full potential.

First, although the UN's interactions 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 UN should do more to empower them and protect and promote civic space. The women and youth, peace and security agendas 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 UN**. This 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 UN capabilities and field tools towards sustaining peace, results remain mixed on the ground. Resident Coordinators, now empowered to bring the system together toward SDG attainment, as well as UN 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 UN 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 UN 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 inter-governmental organs into 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 UN's work, including within the peacebuilding architecture. Additionally, 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 UN and various international financial institutions and regional organizations**, this is clearly still a work in progress. The UN and its partners – such as the World Bank, the African Union, the European Union, IGAD, ICGLR, ECOWAS and OSCE – should now turn their attention to ensure the practical and systematic implementation of these frameworks in prevention and peacebuilding contexts. This is especially critical in 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**. Today’s increasingly complex nature of conflicts require the UN to deliver more strategic, focused and unified responses and the Peacebuilding Architecture can play a crucial role toward that end. The PBC, 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 PBC. In complement, the PBF can catalyze support to long term peace efforts especially in cross-border and transition settings. But for this to happen, both the PBC and the PBF need to streamline their procedures to be easily accessible and utilized much more strategically by the UN system and Member States, as well as other stakeholders such as the 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 this 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 UN 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, though contributions to the PBF 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, under-prioritized and under-resourced.

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

1) Unlock the full potential of the PBC and strengthen its advisory and advocacy role: We encourage Member States to explore ways to ensure dedicated PBC support to the increasing number of countries and regions that engage with the Commission. The PBC 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 PBC needs to enhance its engagement with donor countries and international financial institutions, maintain synergies with the PBF and advocate for strategic accompaniment to and predictable financing of peacebuilding activities.

We encourage Member States to strengthen the advisory capacity of the PBC to the General Assembly and Security Council to work across inter-governmental and institutional mandates to build consensus around peacebuilding priorities, while still honoring the separate and respective mandates of each body. Regarding the General Assembly, the PBC’s advisory role would be particularly relevant in the 5th Committee in critical peacebuilding contexts. We also believe there is space and scope to generate exchanges between the PBC and the Human Rights Council. Recommendations of human rights bodies

and mechanisms can guide PBC 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 PBC and the Security Council would benefit from enhanced interaction, particularly concerning peace operation mandates. Finally, through you, we encourage UN leaders in the field to engage more systematically and consistently with both the PBC and the PBF, 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 UN has a key role to play in empowering and supporting governments to fulfill their responsibilities. Toward that end, we urge UN 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 donors to lend support to nationally owned peacebuilding frameworks and processes that can be more sustainably implemented and monitored by national stakeholders and avoid reinforcing dependency on international actors. Similarly, UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks should facilitate the participation of women, youth and local communities, to become more effective leaders in supporting national efforts. We encourage Member States to give space to and elevate civil society voices, women’s and youth groups, as well as local private sector actors during their deliberations at inter-governmental bodies, including the PBC, and in mediation processes and peacebuilding efforts. We also recommend that national stakeholders remain engaged with the PBC and PBF – which we see as sovereignty enhancing tools - and call upon UN leaders in the field to support them toward that end. Finally, we encourage the PBF to ensure that local peacebuilding organizations enjoy direct access to PBF funds, to facilitate the delivery of solutions in their localities.

3) Strengthen the implementation of the women, peace and security (WPS) 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 UN, its Member States and all those responsible for peacebuilding treat WPS 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 WPS agenda with a comprehensive operational strategy, sufficient technical expertise, adequate resources and committed leadership at all levels, and ensure the agenda receives appropriate support to that end. Third, Member States and UN leadership - including in the field – should consider fully utilizing the PBC 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 to WPS 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, 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, socio-economic 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 UN and urge you to take all necessary steps to ensure appropriate attention to peacebuilding is maintained. We encourage that peace and conflict perspectives are 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 toward 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 UN 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 UNCTs 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 UN agencies, funds and programmes, we encourage you to reinforce the structures and mechanisms that support RCs and UNCTs to carry 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 takes conflict dynamics fully into account and considers peacebuilding as an integral component of unified responses, including through the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks. We laud the PBF's commitment to provide dedicated support to mission transitions in its new investment plan and welcome PBC engagement in transition situations. However, in our opinion, while the PBF 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 UN with international financial institutions. First, we encourage UN Resident Coordinators, including triple hats 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 (HDPP) Facility, housed in PBSO, should be utilized systematically to help Resident Coordinators build and reinforce their partnership with the Bank in this regard. Second, we believe that the existing UN-World Bank partnership for crisis-affected states would benefit from establishing modalities for regular engagement with the IMF on fragile states including on information sharing and joint data and analysis, considering the importance of macro-economics and debt issues for peace. Third, we encourage Member States – particularly those who have representatives in the World Bank Board of Directors – to help support coherence between the two Organizations' efforts, 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 PBC should continue to focus on the UN's

relationship with the World Bank and other IFIs. In parallel, the PBF 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 sub-regional organizations: To enhance partnerships with regional and sub-regional organizations, we recommend greater attention to the harmonization of UN peacebuilding efforts with regional and sub-regional frameworks, such as the AU Peace and Security Architecture, with the aim of joint action in areas such as 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 toward joint analysis and deeper engagement between inter-governmental 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 they each contribute to. 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 this 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 UN system, its 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 PBF, but also other critical funding mechanisms such as the CERF, the SDG Fund and the new COVID-19 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 PBC members, to revisit your proposals and provide necessary funding both for the PBF to fully resource its 2020-24 Strategy and for broader peacebuilding needs. We encourage existing donors to expand their contributions to the PBF 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 PBF 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 toward 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 UN Charter's vision 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 PBC 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 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 multi-dimensional challenges the world faces today. The UN system has come a long way toward realizing the vision behind the establishment of the peacebuilding architecture in 2005, and toward 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 UN 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 socio-economic 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 this light, our final recommendation to you is to continue dedicating 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.

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

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of our highest consideration.

Respectfully,

(Signed) Roza Otunbayeva

(Signed) Nasser Judeh

(Signed) Gert Rosenthal

(Signed) Annika Soder

(Signed) Liberata Mulamula