On December 14, 2016, NYU’s Center on International Cooperation (CIC), the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation (DHF) and the International Peace Institute (IPI) organized the first in a series of workshops to support efforts underway to better understand and implement sustaining peace.

At this first workshop, participants discussed practical ways to improve the peacebuilding implications of peace operation mandates, drawing on the upcoming Liberia transition as a prime case, under the Chatham House rule.

Participants included member states active in the Security Council and/or the Peacebuilding Commission, experts from different parts of the UN system including the Peacebuilding Support Office, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Department of Political Affairs, the UN Development Program, and representatives from CIC, IPI, DHF, the Institute for Security Studies, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

The discussion took place against the backdrop of the transition from the UNMIL mandate, voted at the Security Council on December 21, 2016.

The Report of the Advisory Group of Experts (AGE) on the 2015 Review of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture called for a change in the way the United Nations does business, by considering the implications for sustaining peace in all its actions across the conflict cycle, from humanitarian action and peacemaking, to peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development. The member states of the UN committed to this vision, through two parallel General Assembly and Security Council resolutions adopted by consensus on April 27, 2016. Since then, member states, different parts of the UN system, and various civil society groups have come together to discuss practical ways to move the sustaining peace agenda forward.

*Sustaining peace and peace operations: 2015 Peacebuilding Review recommendations*

The AGE Report underscores that UN peacebuilding cannot be limited to the New York based Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), and the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO). Rather, the challenges for building and sustaining peace are systemic in nature, partially stemming from the UN’s machinery operating in intergovernmental and operational silos, both in Headquarters and in the field. One systemic challenge is the deficiencies in attention, coordination and resourcing to peacebuilding efforts on the ground, during the formation, implementation, and drawdown of peace operation mandates.

Recognizing this challenge, the AGE Report recommended:

- Accepting that peacebuilding is an essentially political task, and ensuring peace operation mandates are more strategic and context-specific;
- Bringing together political, security, human rights and development perspectives to the Security Council including through the PBC, in the formation and drawdown of peace operation mandates;
- Better communication, coordination, and linked action between peace operations and UN Country Teams;
- Avoiding mismatch between complex and multi-dimensional mission mandates and human and financial
resources to implement them;
- Avoiding unrealistic timelines and undue haste in transitions, to avoid relapse;
- Maintaining political and financial investment in strategic UN peacebuilding activities implicated by mission mandates, including after drawdown;
- Partnering better with other key stakeholders on the ground, including regional organizations and international financial institutions.

Security Council Resolution 2282 (2016) and General Assembly Resolution 70/262 broadly endorsed this vision, including the need to adequately resource the peacebuilding components of peace operation mandates, including during transitions and drawdowns.

The Liberia transition, sustaining peace, and the role of the PBC:

Participants were briefed on recent developments in Liberia relating to the transition, including the successes and shortcomings of the UNMIL mandate from a peacebuilding angle, the state of the discussions at the Security Council, the current peacebuilding priorities and challenges, and the recent activities of the PBC to advise the Council during transition efforts. Challenges, good practices, and ways forward for the UN system to effectively sustain peace during peace operation contexts were discussed. Key issues stemming from the discussion were:

1) The practical implications of DPKO assessment missions: The DPKO-led assessment guiding mandate formation and transitions was thorough, analytical, and well researched. However, especially in terms of recommended future action, the assessment focused more on the security implications of the mandate, rather than addressing the root causes of conflict. More effort can be spent to ensure assessments have a stronger long-term focus, with the help of PBSO and PBC, as relevant.

2) The view from the ground: Structural issues such as youth employment, horizontal inequalities, lack of institutional capacity, economic recovery, reconciliation and justice and problems with decentralization can be identified as the main challenges in Liberia, in addition to security issues. Local dependency on UNMIL, post-Ebola challenges and the upcoming elections create additional issues to address. Joint-up analysis and better coordination between various national and local capacities and international, regional and bilateral efforts would be needed to address these challenges. Ways forward to better sustain peace in Liberia could include:

- **Stakeholder mapping:** To identify the comparative advantages of various actors, utilize them towards a strategic vision, and address response gaps.
- **Ensuring national ownership:** Building local and national capacities to lead and coordinate peacebuilding activities is key to peacebuilding. When capacity gaps prevail, traditional systems and local practices could help establish ownership.
- **Coordination and joint action** between different bilateral donors and international and regional organizations is key for joint strategic vision for sustaining peace. The UN should make particular effort to coordinate with regional and sub-regional
organizations working in Liberia. Their perspectives must be brought to deliberations at the Council on mission mandates.

3) **The potential of the PBC:** The PBC Liberia Configuration, led by Sweden, organized a multi-stakeholder forum in Monrovia to discuss the repercussions of UNMIL transition on sustaining peace, followed by a configuration meeting in New York. The inputs from both meetings were communicated to the Security Council. This example can lead to a “new way of working” between the PBC and the Security Council:

- *Transforming inputs into meaningful analysis:* PBC could provide concise and practical analysis to the Council, drawing on the inputs from multi-stakeholder meetings and discussions. For this, the PBC will need to find ways to communicate results to the Council in a meaningful, timely and efficient manner.
- *Strengthening inclusive national ownership:* Peacebuilding must be a nationally owned and led process. The PBC could bring multiple voices from the field to New York, to inform Council deliberations.
- *Broader actor mapping:* Peacebuilding is a political process, which involves a broad range of actors. Various international, regional and sub-regional institutions, as well as bilateral actors from Africa and beyond are all active in Liberia, sometimes with a stronger role and visibility than the UN. The PBC could help conduct a stakeholder mapping, to identify resource and attention gaps for future peacebuilding activities, to guide New York-level activity.

*Tailoring peace operation mandates to better sustain peace:*

Building and sustaining peace after a violent conflict is a lengthy and costly challenge, which requires sustained attention, funds, and linked action among multiple stakeholders for a sustained amount of time. The workshop centered around three questions and raised the following key points and recommendations:

1) **Can the PBC and its configurations play a practical role to support the Security Council in the formation and drawdown of peace operation mandates?**

- The Council’s workload has increased and intensified over the years, to include new conflicts and disasters and a range of thematic issues. It may not always have the capacity to be the primary UN peacebuilding actor. *The PBC should find innovative ways to support the Council to prioritize sustaining peace. For instance:*
  - *The PBC could bring the perspectives of development and humanitarian agencies, civil society, and regional and sub-regional organizations to Security Council debates.* This would allow field and need driven strategies in the planning, implementation and coordination of UN peacebuilding efforts.
  - *Multi-stakeholder forums,* such as the Swedish-led exercise in Monrovia, can help the PBC prioritize local and national perspectives and structural issues during mandate drawdown deliberations. *More practical PBC working methods are needed, to communicate results from these fora to the Council.*
The PBC, with the support of DPA, could serve as a forum where member states can discuss various structural and operational prevention priorities under the principle of national ownership, without necessarily being on the Security Council’s or PBC’s formal agenda. The PBC has recently engaged with Burkina Faso and Sri Lanka in such a format; this type of interaction should be continued.

- Security Council delegates often have limited time available (3-4 weeks) to finalize mandate deliberations, creating a challenge for elaborate discussions on prevention and peacebuilding priorities. The PBC, and its country specific configurations should find ways to engage with the Council at a working level well ahead of these deliberations.
- Beyond the Council, the PBC should engage with other organs of the UN, especially the ECOSOC and General Assembly, to better communicate the concept of sustaining peace and its implications. These discussions should include all main Committees of the General Assembly, particularly the 2nd Committee that deals with development issues.

2) How can peace operations better connect with UN Country Teams and Resident Coordinators, as well as with other various peacebuilding actors on the ground? What are the options for joint and linked analysis, planning and programming?

- Sustaining peace is not about enhancing UN’s response on the ground. It is about finding appropriate ways to work with national/ local governments and boost their capacities.
- Joint strategic analysis and assessments between peace operations and UNCTs are essential. This analysis should include a political economy dimension, which involves identifying elites and elite structures, donor dependency, formal and informal revenue sources, whether these revenues trickle down to the people, and ways to generate income. A strategic unit in the Secretary-General’s office, mandated to bring the system together around strategic priorities and action, could coordinate such analysis.
- The UN should act more as a whole throughout its entire presence. Often, peacekeeping operations such as UNMIL are perceived as the “UN Brand”; transitions confuse populations on the shape and format of UN’s continued presence on the ground. Peace operations and Country Teams should act together and coordinate better from the outset to prevent such confusion. Both DPKO and DPA should have stronger relations and communication with the Resident Coordinator (RC), particularly after mission drawdown. A substantial dialogue between UNDP and DPKO ahead of mandate deliberations could prevent overly ambitious and unrealistic Council mandates.
- Although transitions particularly require linked action, this is not the norm. In Liberia, while most of the attention currently is on the upcoming elections, the broader need to plan future development processes with the participation of and coherence between the government, UN, and donors is overlooked.

---

1 In fact, in terms of integrated action, the UN has gone backwards. For instance, in Burundi, there was triple-hatting - RC/HC, the SRSG and the Head of Political Affairs –and the UNCT included the World Bank. However, the national government seemed to prefer to work with UNDP on solely a development platform.
Hasty withdrawals of missions are problematic, but peacekeeping also requires a deadline. For instance, while conflict drivers in Liberia certainly exist, they are not dissimilar from several countries with no peace operation. UN engagement should be based on a framework of mutual accountability, rather than dependency. DPKO and PBC could collaborate on ways to achieve this.

After transitions, the capacities and resources of UNCTs must be enhanced and tailored to respond to the needs for sustaining peace, following a thorough assessment.

3) What are the major funding challenges for peacebuilding activities during mission mandates? How can these challenges be overcome?

When peacekeeping operations leave, peacebuilding funding often drops dramatically. The exception is when special political missions (SPMs) are deployed, whose presence often trigger voluntary contributions. However, in cases like Liberia, there has been little or no consideration for transitioning into an SPM, following the drawdown of UNMIL. In transitions, this catalytic effect of SPMs should be utilized. There is need for better DPA – DPKO coordination to make this happen.

Many member states are not aware that UNCTs are mainly financed through voluntary funding, and great financial risks ensue in the wake of peace operation drawdowns. Better communication with member states on funding sources and streams is needed.

The military components of peacekeeping operations like UNMIL are expensive; as a result, budgetary concerns dominate transition decisions. More focused peace operation mandates could help reduce budgets, increase the appetite for accompanying countries for a longer time, and facilitate smoother transitions.