

AUGUST 2024

From Rhetoric to Practice

Concrete steps to support the implementation of
Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace at the country level



A Network of People
Building Peace



United Kingdom
Mission to the
United Nations

The forward-looking recommendations in this briefing note¹ are based on the experiences of local peacebuilders in the 2020–2024 period². Reflecting the four shifts called for by the Secretary-General in his 2018 Report on peacebuilding and sustaining peace (A/72/707–S/2018/43), these recommendations aim to inform the 2025 Peacebuilding Architecture Review (2025 PBAR). In line with the 2025 PBAR's objective³, they can support the United Nations (UN) System, development partners and the donor community in improving the implementation and impact of peacebuilding efforts at the country level.

¹ The submission is based on GPPAC (2024). From Rhetoric to Practice: Concrete steps to support the implementation of the Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace Agenda at the country level: <https://www.gppac.net/resources/rhetoric-practice-concrete-steps-support-implementation-peacebuilding-and-sustaining>. The original research was made available with the financial support from the Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations.

² Find GPPAC recommendations for the 2020 Peacebuilding Architecture Review (PBAR) at: <https://www.gppac.net/2020-peace-building-architecture-review-advancing-local-priorities-global-action>. Many of these recommendations remain relevant in the context of the 2025 PBAR.

³ Find the Terms of Reference for the 2025 Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture at: https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/sites/www.un.org.peacebuilding/files/documents/2025_review_of_the_peacebuilding_architecture_-_tors_-_approved.pdf.

UN Leadership Accountability and Capacity

Pillar

Sustaining peace requires strong and empowered UN peacebuilding leadership at the country level, a clear peacebuilding strategy and adequate capacities in peacebuilding and conflict analysis.

Despite ongoing UN reforms, the UN peacebuilding leadership at the country level remains unclear, with an often ambiguous division of roles and responsibilities related to peacebuilding amongst UN actors. This lack of clarity can lead to internal competition for funding and coordination issues among UN entities carrying out peacebuilding activities. The absence of dedicated peacebuilding strategies has undermined existing efforts and led to duplication. Further, limited capacities for conflict analysis lead to ineffective and counterproductive interventions. These issues significantly hinder the overall impact of peacebuilding actions.

To strengthen the impact of peacebuilding action at the country level, the UN should:

Clarify UN peacebuilding leadership at the country level by:

- ◆ **Identifying a single entity to coordinate UN peacebuilding efforts.** While this coordination entity can be different, depending on each country's context, it should have a long-term presence, established trust at the national level, the capacity to coordinate the UN System at the country level, and ideally, a proven track record in peacebuilding. In some settings, a mission may temporarily assume this role, but such leadership should ultimately be rooted in a permanent UN presence, such as the Resident Coordinator's Office or an entity within the UN Country Team (UNCT).
- ◆ **Providing high-level political engagement to accompany the UN peacebuilding operational mandate.** Peacebuilding leadership should be held by a permanent and high-level UN actor at the country level, such as the Resident Coordinator (RC) or head of a UN agency that has a long-standing reputation for leadership in peacebuilding. When a peace and development advisor coordinates peacebuilding from an operational standpoint, the Resident Coordinator must provide adequate political support.
- ◆ **Ensuring accountability of UN leadership in delivering impactful peacebuilding activities.** High-level political leadership should include in their ToR, and subsequently their performance evaluation, a set of indicators aimed at guiding the delivery of impactful peacebuilding activities and localisation peacebuilding action in line with the global commitments on peacebuilding and sustaining peace ([A/70/262-S/RES/2282](#), [A/72/707-S/2018/43](#), [A/RES/75/201-S/RES/2558](#), [A/RES/76/305](#)).

Develop a dedicated peacebuilding approach for the UN Country Team by:

- ◆ **Developing a dedicated peacebuilding strategy** or a peacebuilding component should complement the Cooperation Framework. Its purpose is to bring together all parts of the UN's in-country presence around a shared set of objectives and a clear roadmap to optimise the UN peacebuilding impact and help donors align around a strategic portfolio. Such a strategy must 1) be informed by inclusive context and conflict analysis; 2) have a concrete action plan, with medium- and long-term peacebuilding programming; 3) be accompanied by a conflict-sensitive results framework with corresponding conflict-sensitive outputs and outcomes linked to the Cooperation Framework and connected to ongoing conflict and stability risks; 4) include in every outcome indicators that are both perception-based (i.e., if a respondent feels more or less safe) and objective (i.e., incidents of violence); 5) be supported by data collection mechanisms that disaggregate data by group (i.e., women, Indigenous people, youth, among many other groups); and 6) provide for regular and inclusive processes of monitoring and evaluation, including through reflective learning, with concrete follow-up action coming from it. This strategy should also be adequately resourced, potentially with the support of the peacebuilding donor coordination group.
- ◆ **Developing a conflict-sensitive and adaptive results framework** linked to the Cooperation Framework. A clear results framework allows the UN System to learn and adapt via regular, informal, and inclusive multi-stakeholder dialogue to ultimately better support national governments and contribute to impactful peacebuilding action. Such an approach allows for continuous analysis and learning on the impact and success but also failings of initiatives, and that can be adapted along the way.
- ◆ **Ensuring accountability for impactful peacebuilding actions** by regularly reviewing the monitoring and evaluation processes via adaptive peacebuilding methodology within the UN. Further, donors should encourage UN actors to focus on measuring impact⁴. The PBSO Impact Hub could provide further tools and resources for effective monitoring and evaluation of peacebuilding activities.
- ◆ **Establishing inclusive conflict prevention, early warning, and early response mechanisms** to collect data and comprehensive indicators to measure peace, development, and humanitarian risks. These indicators must be rooted in diverse local realities and include new challenges such as climate change, supported by adequate response strategies. UN Country Teams must support national governments to ensure early warning data is linked to effective response models globally, regionally, and internationally. Where such mechanisms exist, key early warning institutions need to coordinate among themselves⁵.

Ensure adequate peacebuilding capacities across the UN in-country presence, including in the peripheries by:

- ◆ **Appointing dedicated experts in all UN entities, including Peacebuilding or Peace and Development Advisors with extensive knowledge of local conflict dynamics** within the RC Offices, funded by core contributions. This role should be part of the standard RC Office setup. Such experts should also be present in all UN entities, including offices in the periphery, involved during planning and assessment phases to facilitate reflection. If resources are limited, efforts need to be made to enhance existing staff's peacebuilding capacities and conflict analysis skills with guidance and strategic support from the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) and financial resources from the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF).
- ◆ **Strengthening conflict analysis capacities of all UN staff.** All strategies and programs should be based on robust, action-oriented conflict analysis. The PBF should collaborate with the UN System Staff College to develop and roll out conflict analysis training tailored to specific country contexts. This training should be linked to adaptive programming, with regular assessments and flexibility.
- ◆ **Ensuring that the UN leadership and staff have adequate contextual knowledge.** National staff with language skills are crucial for understanding the needs of conflict-affected people and acting effectively. Hiring national senior staff, including those from outside the capital, enhances understanding of the context and improves the impact of UN strategies. Alternatively, international peacebuilding experts should have proven expertise in the country context, including peripheral areas, and speak national languages.
- ◆ **Conducting regular peacebuilding assessments** to identify attitudes, behaviours, and conditions of vulnerability in conflict contexts. The UN-World Bank-EU Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment Methodology could be applied more regularly and in more countries. Identified areas for action could be integrated into the Cooperation Framework and peacebuilding strategy through dedicated objectives and activities.

⁴ Forthcoming: GPPAC, ICAN (2024). Grading the United Nations

⁵ GPPAC, DHF, QUNO (2023). Building on the Pathways for Peace: Towards a More Effective International Architecture for Prevention: <https://www.gppac.net/files/2023-07/Pathways%20For%20Peace%20-%20More%20Effective%20International%20Architecture%20for%20Prevention%20-Summary%20Note.pdf>.

Operational and Policy Coherence

Pillar

Sustaining peace requires strong inter-agency collaboration, advancing joint programming (where applicable) and aligning peacebuilding goals with national priorities.

Operational and policy coherence aims to reduce fragmentation and enhance coordination among the UN field presences at both strategic and operational levels. The Cooperation Framework is intended to integrate Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace across all of the UN's activities, making its effective implementation crucial for meaningful UN action. Under the oversight of the Resident Coordinator (RC), strong inter-agency coordination mechanisms and joint programming and area-based approaches (where relevant) can improve information flow across agencies and prevent siloed efforts. Additionally, the UN's ability to develop strategies aligned with national priorities and processes is key to fulfilling its role at the country level with impact.

The process of addressing fragmentation within the UN System, however, is lengthy. The UN's efforts to ensure internal coordination on prevention began with then Secretary-General Kofi Annan's initiative when, in 2001, he encouraged NGOs to host an international conference on conflict prevention ([A/55/985](#)), establishing the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC). This effort was followed by a 2003 report from the Secretary-General ([A/58/365](#)), which inspired a General Assembly resolution on preventing armed conflict ([A/RES/57/337](#)) and three follow-up comprehensive reports ([A/55/985-S/2001/574](#); [A/58/365-S/2003/888](#); [A/60/891](#)), both raising the problem of the fragmentation of the UN System on prevention. However, comprehensive reporting on conflict prevention has been sparse since 2006. In 2015, with the '[A Collective Recommitment](#)' report, the UN Secretary-General addressed the Security Council asking for the Council's support in addressing the fragmentation of the UN System on prevention. Reforms continued in 2018 with [reforms to the peace and security pillar](#)⁶, but comprehensive action to ensure coherence remains pending.

To strengthen the impact of peacebuilding action at the country level, the UN should:

Advancing inter-agency coordination on peacebuilding by:

- ◆ **Establishing and enhancing an overarching peacebuilding coordination mechanism/collaboration teams under the RC Office** to build mutual trust among UN Agencies, Funds, and Programmes (AFPs), clarify roles, and improve information management. Such mechanisms could facilitate joint peacebuilding assessments, the development of a coherent Coordination Framework, and the temporary co-location of staff from different entities. The Development Cooperation Office (DCO) could support the RC Offices in establishing and enhancing such mechanisms.

⁶ Kumskova, M. & Hilbert, J. (2024). The UN's capacity for supporting member states' national prevention strategies: Assessing practical capabilities: <https://www.gppac.net/news/uns-capacity-supporting-member-states-national-prevention-strategies-assessing-practical>.

Prioritising joint programming and joint planning by:

- ◆ **Clarifying responsibilities of the UN presence in joint programming** by using Memorandums of Understanding that detail each agency's roles within a joint project and ensure a shared understanding of the joint plan's terms. The design of joint programs should be based on the Cooperation Framework cycle, annual reviews, and evaluations, allowing for revisions as needed. The Cooperation Framework could further specify how alignment between joint programs is achieved. Joint Working Plans (JWPs) can convert the Cooperation Framework's outcomes into concrete, measurable, and time-bound outputs.
- ◆ **Avoiding rushing into joint programming.** It should be reserved for long-term initiatives rather than short-term or low-budget projects to ensure resources are focused on activities and local impact rather than coordination. For short-term actions, joint planning and area-based approaches can be an effective alternative, promoting informed and impactful programming. Area-based approaches can enhance cross-sectoral coordination initially and facilitate longer-term programming at state and local levels.

Strengthen constructive relationships with the government by:

- ◆ **Ensuring a constructive dialogue between the national government and the UN on peacebuilding** by highlighting government strengths and offering support to address deficiencies (i.e., corruption and weak national responses). The UN can support integrating global agendas into national contexts, provide training, and share resources. Enhanced engagement of national governments in global and regional policy forums, like the Peacebuilding Commission and UNSC open debates, can foster reflective internal dialogues, joint reflections, and strategy development. In situations where there is no stable national partner or legitimate government, the UN may struggle to sustain peace. More guidance on how to operate in such settings is required from the UN Headquarters.
- ◆ **Developing adequate peacebuilding infrastructure at the national level** by supporting the creation and implementation of national peacebuilding and prevention approaches and their regular review⁷.
- ◆ **Ensuring the role of the implementer is filled primarily by national and local actors, with required capacities supported by UN actors.** The UN should not implement peacebuilding programming at the country level but rather provide space for convening various actors, facilitating the exchange and supporting required capacities⁸. The UN should enhance engagement with local governments and community actors, providing conflict-sensitive guidance, tools, and capacity-building opportunities. This includes creating spaces for and encouraging the meaningful participation of diverse women and youth in peacebuilding activities, such as negotiations and transitional justice mechanisms, and prioritising joint programmes where the government is an equal partner.

⁷ See the example of Kenya's National Peacebuilding Architecture Review: <https://www.ipinst.org/2024/03/kenyas-national-peacebuilding-and-prevention-strategy>.

⁸ Forthcoming: GPPAC & ICAN (2024) Grading the UN System.

Partnerships for Peacebuilding

Pillar



Sustainable peace requires strong and operational partnerships to ensure peacebuilding stakeholders and local peacebuilders enhance the impact of peacebuilding action at the country level.

The UN's convening power allows it to unite diverse peacebuilding stakeholders, including national governments, donors, regional organisations, international financial institutions, civil society, and other stakeholders, around impactful peacebuilding action⁹. To be effective, these partnerships require ongoing coordination, clear roles and responsibilities, and a shared understanding of concepts, policies, and tools to address overlap in strategies and programming¹⁰.

Community engagement is at the heart of impactful peacebuilding and sustaining peace efforts (A/72/707, para. 18). Although this is widely recognised, the UN's engagement with local peacebuilders is often perceived as top-down, inconsistent, and dependent on individual UN staff, with limited resources dedicated to meaningful engagement. Consultative processes with civil society actors can be repetitive, lacking representation from diverse national stakeholders, including indigenous groups, traditional leaders, and those from remote areas. This limited engagement usually involves international NGOs and their local partners, as well as civil society organisations based in capitals and major cities, leading to objectives and tools that do not align with local needs, thus reducing project effectiveness.

To strengthen the impact of peacebuilding action at the country level, the UN should:

Harness the UN's convening capacity to bring diverse peacebuilding stakeholders together at the country level by:

- ◆ **Specifying the role of non-UN partners in the Cooperation Framework** to address gaps and overlaps in relevant peacebuilding and conflict prevention activities. The Coordination Framework should build on the activities of all partners like the World Bank, civil society, and regional organisations. These partners should also contribute to developing and monitoring the Framework, sharing their experiences and data, such as development indicators and early warnings, to inform UN field presence actions and avoid duplication. Signing Memorandums of Understanding with these partners can help clarify responsibilities and reduce mistrust.
- ◆ **Establishing multi-stakeholder platforms for dialogue at the country level.** The UN should elevate its role as a convenor rather than an implementer, focusing on facilitating annual meetings for partners to coordinate joint analysis and peacebuilding strategies, build capacities, and ensure strategic collaboration. Setting up such a platform starts with mapping all relevant stakeholders nationally and regionally and identifying strategic opportunities for engagement (i.e., the development of national peacebuilding policies and prevention approaches).
- ◆ **Supporting the development of partnerships among non-UN stakeholders that benefit peacebuilding priorities.** For instance, connecting regional organisations and civil society on early warning can prevent duplication and enhance these mechanisms. The UN should provide political support and a platform for fundraising to strengthen and expand such initiatives.

⁹ Note that as stated in Our Common Agenda: "There is no other organization with its legitimacy, convening power and normative impact." For further information see UN, 'Our Common Agenda- Report of the Secretary General', September 2021, p. 82: https://www.un.org/en/content/common-agenda-report/assets/pdf/Common_Agenda_Report_English.pdf.

¹⁰ GPPAC (2022). From Rhetoric to Practice: Concrete steps to support the implementation of the Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace Agenda at the country level: [GPPAC Synthesis Report From Rhetoric to Practice.pdf](https://www.gppac.org/~/media/Files/2022/09/From_Rhetoric_to_Practice.pdf).

Develop institutionalised and systematised strategies for community engagement by:

- ◆ **Appointing dedicated UN staff responsible for civil society engagement.** The position of a civil society liaison is something that the DCO is working on establishing in all UN Country Teams. This position should be directly accountable to the RC, who should have localisation objectives embedded in their respective ToRs. Expert-level peacebuilding personnel should include civil society engagement in their ToRs to ensure continuity beyond individual staff members.
- ◆ **Developing institutionalised community engagement strategies.** This involves mapping stakeholders by the UN Country Team to understand local dynamics and identify existing community structures, such as youth champions and peace councils. This strategy should be coordinated by a civil society liaison within the RC Office. Partnerships should include discussions on joint activities like capacity building and conflict analysis, followed by identifying regular spaces for meaningful civil society contributions, such as in the CCA processes and Cooperation Framework monitoring.
- ◆ **Advancing systematic and institutionalised engagement with peacebuilding networks.** When designing inclusive processes, the UN Country Teams should reach out to local, national and regional networks, as they already are representative and accountable to their members¹¹.
- ◆ **Advocating for an environment that fosters free and open dialogue by ensuring a safe space for civil society engagement.** The UN Country Teams should advocate with the government to ensure that civil society is engaged in relevant national peacebuilding processes. The UN System at different levels should support Member States in ensuring the security of civil society representatives both at UN Headquarters and in their home countries. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) can offer valuable support through its country offices.
- ◆ **Supporting more impactful engagement by involving civil society early in strategic and programmatic development, with established feedback loops and follow-ups.** Adopting a 'learning by doing' approach can effectively build local capacities and foster collaborative partnerships, rather than relying on already-capacitated civil society actors. This approach would help simplify UN processes and create equitable partnership spaces.

¹¹ 'Unpacking a Network Approach: The Role of Networks, Movements and Coalitions in Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace.' Informal Learning Session for the Civil Society-UN Dialogue Initiative Summary Note, January 2024: <https://www.gppac.net/resources/unpacking-network-approach-role-networks-movements-and-coalitions-peacebuilding-and>.

Financing for Peacebuilding

Pillar

IV

Sustaining peace requires a strengthened effort from the UN system, and the donor community to support both the quality (a standard encompassing more participatory, accessible, flexible, and sustained financial resources)¹² and the quantity of financing in a coordinated manner.

In response to the significant resource gap for peacebuilding and the growing recognition of the limited quality of available resources, Member States came together for [the 2022 High-Level Meeting on Financing for Peacebuilding](#) that led to the adoption of the UN General Assembly Resolution on Peacebuilding Financing in 2022 ([A/RES/76/305](#)). Among other provisions of this resolution, Member States called for longer-term and more flexible funding for local-level peacebuilding, and increased quality investment in youth and women-led organisations. It also stressed that civil society can play an important role in advancing efforts in peacebuilding and sustaining peace (OP8). There has, however, been no direct follow-up from this resolution, except for the adoption by the Fifth Committee of a resolution agreeing to contribute \$500 million to the PBF out of assessed contributions in the next 5 years.

At the same time, more research highlights that locally-informed and locally-owned action has the most impact on the communities¹³. To support localisation, some bilateral donors made formal statements highlighting the value of localisation¹⁴. Yet, these processes did not lead to the increased quality and quantity financing for local peacebuilding, and political shifts in 2022 and 2023 have redirected many governments' priorities towards securitisation and humanitarian aid, further decreasing resourcing for peacebuilding financing.

To strengthen the impact of peacebuilding action at the country level, the UN should:

Increase the quantity of sustainable financing for peacebuilding by:

- ◆ **Increasing funding streams for peacebuilding.** One approach is to establish dedicated country-based peacebuilding pooled funds, with dedicated funding windows for local peacebuilders, women and youth. These funds can be linked to the implementation of the Cooperation Framework or a specific peacebuilding strategy. Additionally, bilateral donors and international financial institutions globally should allocate at least 30% of Official Development Assistance (ODA) to peacebuilding.
- ◆ **Adopting a peacebuilding marker** for all international aid, ensuring conflict sensitivity. Member States should clarify the concept of peacebuilding as positive and prevention-oriented, grounded in the everyday aspirations of all people in the region, as defined in the dual resolutions on peacebuilding and sustaining peace ([A/RES/70/262-S/RES/2282](#); [A/RES/75/201-S/RES/2558](#)). This will enable donor alignment and coordination for more impactful peacebuilding action.

¹² LPI, DHF, GPPAC (2022). Principles for Quality Financing for Peacebuilding and Conflict Prevention: <https://gppac.net/resources/principles-quality-financing-peacebuilding-and-conflict-prevention-practical-avenues>.

¹³ IASC (2021). Guidance Note: Strengthening Participation, Representation and Leadership of Local and National Actors in IASC Humanitarian Coordination Mechanisms. IASC Policy and Advocacy Group (OPAG).

¹⁴ For instance, the [OECD-DAC Recommendation on Enabling Civil Society in Development Co-operation and Humanitarian Assistance](#) (2021)—developed in consultation with DAC Member States—and the [Donor Statement on Supporting Locally Led Development](#) (2022) stress the need for local ownership, leadership, and meaningful engagement of local actors to address today's vast and complex development, humanitarian, and peacebuilding challenges.

- ◆ **Supporting peacebuilding action in complex political settings.** Donors should avoid freezing resources during periods of conflict relapse. Instead, they should reallocate funds to support peacebuilding efforts through alternative strategies that sustain peace across the conflict continuum. This approach helps stabilise and prevent further escalation of conflict, recognising the dependence of national constituencies on these resources and the importance of applying peacebuilding principles throughout the conflict cycle. Donors should also refrain from withdrawing peacebuilding resources prematurely after a situation at the country level stabilises unless advised by an independent assessment. Premature withdrawal can risk a relapse into conflict and undermine peacebuilding mechanisms that depend on continued funding.
- ◆ **Enhancing the accessibility of funding to diverse national stakeholders to improve their engagement in peacebuilding.** The donor community should identify and address specific barriers that hinder national peacebuilding stakeholders from accessing funds. The PBF's commitment to expand partnerships with civil society organisations and explore new avenues to make funding available for community-based organisations should be further operationalised and mirrored by other funds. This will shorten the long chain of beneficiaries, allowing for a more impactful response. In an effort to fund more diverse and smaller local actors to complement existing funding mechanisms in the PBF, the UN Secretariat should consider setting up a separate nimble and more accessible support facility.

Prioritise quality funding of existing and new approaches for peacebuilding by:

- ◆ **Adapting financing mechanisms to changing contexts and allowing them to reflect shifting peacebuilding realities.** This includes removing earmarking from donor contributions and launching flexible funding windows. It also includes testing innovative funding models such as micro and small grants, to provide community-based organisations with flexible access to funding through their networks. These networks can then create collaborative capacity-building assessment processes, allowing the organisations they support to identify and address their own capacity needs.
- ◆ **Prioritising the principles of participatory funding approaches** that suggest donors, intermediaries, and local peacebuilders have an equal role in a strategic partnership on project development, monitoring and evaluation. This involves ensuring that the exchange of knowledge, connections, and access is mutual, rather than merely extracting information from local peacebuilders. Additionally, capacity building should be a collaborative process, rather than a one-way transfer from donors or intermediaries to local peacebuilders.
- ◆ **Encouraging proposals where local organisations are the primary implementing partners** and international non-governmental organisations/intermediaries play a supporting and administrative role.
- ◆ **Allowing partners to allocate time and resources for meaningful relationship-building.** Incentivising network collaboration and engagement by supporting specific convening and conference grants to support local peacebuilders to access a greater diversity of knowledge and experience (i.e., of varied local contexts), expertise (i.e., in human rights, gender, the environment, economic development, law), and constituencies (i.e., different ethnic and religious groups, youth, women).

- ◆ **Creating opportunities for meaningful dialogue and collaboration between donors and local peacebuilders** beyond financial transactions. Where possible, the UN and other donors should provide civil society with access to other donors by creating spaces for sharing their experiences and expertise. For example, the Multi-Partner Trust Fund for Sustaining Peace (MPTF) in Colombia exemplifies effective capacity- and partnership-building practices by organising thematic meetings for civil society to facilitate learning and exchange, thereby strengthening partnerships and enhancing collaborative efforts¹⁵.

Improve coordination among peacebuilding donors by:

- ◆ **Strengthening donor coordination efforts.** Many existing donor coordination platforms should be understood as convening platforms. Donor coordination mechanisms should have proper coordination mandates and resourced coordination capacities. Such a mandate requires donors to relinquish their authority over funding in favour of commonly determined priorities.
- ◆ **Establishing monitoring mechanisms for donor commitments to localisation.** UN Country Teams can designate a UN actor to support donors in developing jointly agreed indicators for localisation adhering to the principles of participatory funding and encouraging donors to report transparently on progress.
- ◆ **Providing a dedicated role to local peacebuilders in donor coordination mechanisms.** Donors should include diverse local peacebuilders and their networks on governance, advisory, funding and review boards and committees. This enables fund managers to better understand the experiences of civil society with the fund and adjust the requirements accordingly. Alternatively, donors should consult local actors as equal partners in the development of donors' financing strategies through the process of 'co-design' or 'co-creation', with a feedback loop.
- ◆ **Optimising existing coordination mechanisms to assess their added value and potential overlap.** Donor coordination platforms should leverage each other, possibly facilitated by the same actor (e.g., the RC). This optimisation could lead to creating dedicated spaces for regular, informal, and inclusive multi-stakeholder reflection and learning, capturing ideas, challenges, and insights to adjust peacebuilding action.

¹⁵ GPPAC (2023). Advancing local peacebuilding impact through quality financing: Learning and exchange of best practices in meaningfully supporting local organisations: https://www.gppac.net/files/2024-04/Financing%20Local%20Peacebuilding_Summary%20Note%20Colombia.pdf