



Dag Hammarskjöld
Foundation

development dialogue paper
no.27 | february 2020

Advancing the Nexus of Human Rights and Peacebuilding

Riva Kantowitz

In 2020, for the third time since its creation and following previous reviews in 2010 and 2015, UN Member States will take stock of the effectiveness of the UN's Peacebuilding Architecture and the UN's efforts in sustaining peace. The focus of the review will be on where progress has been made in implementation of the 2016 twin resolutions on peacebuilding and sustaining peace, and where it is still lacking. This publication is part of a series of Development Dialogue papers by the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation that aims to provide food for thought and input to that process.

Advancing the Nexus of Human Rights and Peacebuilding

Human rights, sustaining peace and sustainable development share a number of foundational concepts and values. Many within the United Nations system have highlighted this innate relationship between human rights and sustaining peace; for example, Secretary-General António Guterres said to the Security Council on April 18, 2017 that *'upholding human rights is a crucial element of [conflict] prevention'* and *'human rights are intrinsically linked to sustaining peace'*.¹

The resolutions on sustaining peace (A/RES/70/262-S/RES/2282) reaffirm the link and emphasise the importance of a comprehensive approach to sustaining peace, wherein *'respect for, and protection of, human rights and fundamental freedoms'* are an integral component. Importantly, the resolutions encourage the *'United Nations Member States participating in the Universal Periodic Review process of the Human Rights Council to consider the human rights dimensions of peacebuilding'*.²

As the International Peace Institute notes, *'Human rights can contribute to sustaining peace by providing an internationally agreed normative framework and standards that apply at all times, during peace and war, in all operational environments at the different phases of peacebuilding. They offer a valuable analytical tool that helps identify root causes of conflict, risks, discrimination and inequalities and have important contributions to make to both long-term structural prevention and more immediate preventive actions in a conflict. They are setting the parameters for real world solutions on the ground'*.³

These real-world solutions are fundamental to the advancement of the UN's goals; integrating human rights analysis into peacebuilding work will further opportunities for sustaining peace by providing greater understanding of root causes of violence. The sustaining peace resolutions and the 2020 Review of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture⁴ present a pivotal opportunity to examine ways in which human rights and peacebuilding can be better integrated, operationalised and advanced.⁵

This working paper is meant to stimulate dialogue with regards to a landscape simultaneously characterised by disconnects and progress in bridging them. This is a conversation that shifts rapidly and has many different constituencies including but not limited to: multilateral actors in New York and Geneva; governments; INGOs; and stakeholders in national contexts who live these realities and naturally take a more holistic approach to their work. The ideas presented here are a starting point for discussion; further thinking and application is required to address the concerns of and provide more nuanced recommendations to each of the relevant audiences.

Easing the tensions

The peacebuilding field is evolving away from static check lists of conflict drivers to a more dynamic and nuanced understanding of the types of risk factors that contribute to fragility in states and their inter-relationships. The 2018 UN-World Bank report, *Pathways for Peace*, suggests that conflict is caused by a constellation of dynamics, including patterns of exclusion and inequality that, in the presence of other dynamics within three core pillars (institutions, structural factors like geography, and agency), can trigger violence.⁶

One important feature of this report is that it puts the idea of 'grievances' that are often fostered by human rights abuses at the centre of this model for understanding how to prevent violent conflict. *Pathways for Peace* also notes that targeting resources toward just four countries at high risk of conflict each year could prevent US\$ 34 billion in losses. In comparison, spending on global responses to violent conflict through peacekeeping and humanitarian operations in 2016 was US\$ 8.2 billion and US\$ 22.1 billion, respectively. Investment in conflict prevention and thereby human rights is essential in order to unlock the resources necessary to realise development goals.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development offers an important opportunity to ease the tensions between human rights and peacebuilding. This agenda is undergirded by a rights-based approach across seventeen issue areas - from the right to health to gender equality to justice. A new narrative on human rights and conflict could focus on principals - non-discrimination, accountability, inclusivity/participation, transparency - that are widely agreed upon. Aspects of economic, social and cultural rights, in addition to civil and political rights, could be more substantively explored - for example, the relationship between human rights and economic development, keeping in mind sensitivities around politicising development. Both the sustaining peace resolutions and the *Pathways* report emphasise the need to address intersectionality, discrimination and exclusion. This, in turn, links directly to the discussion on *'leave no one behind'*, a central concept to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The conceptual inter-linkages and their translation into tools for analysis that uncover reinforcing forms of discrimination is an important way forward in identifying these groups and individuals and addressing human rights concerns that can lead to conflict.

Progress in furthering connections

In practice, there has been important progress in furthering connections between the fields of peacebuilding and human rights. Within the UN system, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) have developed a relationship which provides key avenues

for communication and institutional entry points for coordination, enhancing the utilisation of human rights mechanisms within the peacebuilding architecture. These include leveraging special procedures, treaty bodies and the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process. Human Rights Council (HRC) resolution 38/18 passed in July 2018 tasked three rapporteurs appointed by the President of the HRC to ‘*present proposals on how the Council could effectively contribute in the future to the prevention of human rights violations*’. In Operational Paragraph 4 (b), the resolution specifically asks that the report ‘*give due consideration to how the HRC can work effectively with all pillars of the United Nations system on the prevention of human rights violations with a view to strengthening system-wide coherence and contributing to sustaining peace and the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals*’. Further, there is better general awareness that human rights are essential to peacebuilding, both conceptually and operationally, and this is reflected in OHCHR’s current strategic plan which intentionally has placed conflict prevention at its core.

The *Human Rights Upfront* initiative – one of the UN’s premier efforts to mainstream and elevate human rights issues – has furthered the UN’s ability to flag human rights concerns at the highest levels of the system, though the capacity to come to census and respond proactively remains a concern. These are all important evolutions and it is essential to note and create momentum around progress. However, there remain challenges and long-standing tensions between these fields; these are often informed by perceptions and assumptions that reinforce the two silos.⁷ It is necessary to acknowledge and unpack these narratives so they may be addressed. Today’s political landscape in which human rights are being challenged renders this a crucial moment to examine ways in which human rights and peacebuilding can be cohesively, and thus better, advanced. It also warrants taking stock of opportunities presented by key processes within the UN system and the broader international community.

Challenges to more cohesion

1. Human rights are normative and their operationalisation is sometimes perceived to be top-down; thus, they can seem to be prescriptive and overly reliant on an inflexible set of tools such as naming and shaming.⁸ In contrast, a central tenet of peacebuilding is the idea that its activities are contextually specific and determined, and they involve dynamics and processes that are fluid and centered around interactions, such as dialogue, cohesion, trust-building and reconciliation. This can make peacebuilding activities seem vague and lacking rigor or methodology. At their most oppositional, peacebuilding and human rights actors would likely define their work differently – the former empowering indigenous capacity and enabling local and national structures for

cohesion, conflict prevention and mitigation and the latter implementing normative and universal rights frameworks. For example, regarding accountability for gross human rights abuses and transitional justice processes, the maximalist human rights perspective would maintain that all perpetrators must be punished (and primarily through formal justice processes). A peacebuilding approach would likely focus more centrally on reconciliation, reintegration and processes innate to the healing of conflict-affected societies.

Of course, these are perceptions of the two paradigms perhaps at their extremes when in reality, there is nuance and fluidity within both and strong connective tissue between them. For example, the normativity and often rigorous reporting obligations for all ratified treaties (eg the Universal Periodic Review or the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women) create an accountability framework that can support peacebuilding work. Through these mechanisms, peacebuilders can advance contextually specific and locally defined and led peacebuilding. However, the connection between peacebuilding work and human rights frameworks is often not made explicit and so there can be a perception of tension.

2. There are tensions between the realities and discourse on human rights and peacebuilding at the international level versus at the country level. These discourses are expressed in different ways in different contexts. In some situations, people are better able to find entry points to promote human rights through a peacebuilding discourse and in others, a human rights discourse (for example, referring to international humanitarian law) will be the preferred option to formulate solutions to conflict. Importantly, grassroots actors including local civil society do not generally consider silos between human rights and peacebuilding – they tend not to talk about issues being strictly peacebuilding or strictly human rights and naturally take a more holistic approach to their work. Local peacebuilders and human rights actors are often very tactical and astute about utilising these paradigms.

The deep silos around human rights, peacebuilding, development and humanitarian work generally come from international policy spaces and capital cities in the Global North. As a consequence, they get translated into rigid top-down approaches to international norms. The issue of integration is really a policy issue at the international level and needs to be addressed at that level, rather than assuming that local actors need to ‘*demonstrate*’ how they are implementing the sustaining peace resolutions. Further, change or agreement at the systems/normative level doesn’t always translate to country-level contexts. There are numerous well-crafted policy documents and frameworks at international and national levels relating to violence and atrocity prevention,

human rights, responsibility to protect, etc. However, when they are applied to a country setting – for example in Yemen, Syria, South Sudan and the DRC – it is very difficult to get consensus within the UN system.

It is crucial to have a dialogue that includes both an integrated human rights and peacebuilding approach at the international systems level, as well as focus on the specific country contexts that are truly *‘where the rubber hits the road’*.⁹ This dialogue can also ensure that human rights and peacebuilding approaches are in line with state sovereignty norms.

3. Each field faces unique challenges that create difficulties in bringing them closer together. The peacebuilding field often operates in a silo, separate from human rights, development and humanitarian actors, and has historically shied away from taking credit for outcomes in complex environments. This can reinforce the inability of peacebuilders to articulate what exactly they do and the impact of, or *return on investment* in, peacebuilding interventions.

Peacebuilding efforts are process-related undertakings that are not easily measured in the program outputs and objectives that the international development complex has come to value, which contributes to peacebuilding’s at-times intangible impact. Additionally, within bi-lateral foreign assistance architectures these activities can often be dispersed across various lines of effort such as *rule of law* or *stabilisation*, making it hard to aggregate impact.

The human rights field struggles with its own challenges; reporting on human rights can be perceived or experienced by other actors as impenetrable, perhaps because it is so legalistic. The push to implement human rights principles as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights¹⁰ are at times perceived as judgmental by governments (though not necessarily citizens) and rife with criticism as opposed to identifying a constructive process for change. Further, countries that lead the call for accountability for human rights abuses can at times be considered hypocritical and lacking moral credibility on these issues, particularly when they may not hold themselves to the global standards they are admonishing others for failing to meet.

4. There is currently a lack of unified global leadership on the promotion of human rights and prevention of armed conflict. Amidst deep concerns about maintaining the global system built over the last century – which provided certain safeguards to the promotion of human rights and peace – this leadership is desperately needed. Sceptics might argue that there have always been powerful actors whose commitment to human rights norms has been hypocritical in practice. In the past, however, at least there was more consensus about what the universal norms and framing values should be, though their

implementation and degree to which the global community complied with them has always been a legitimate concern.

Now, there are important actors in the global system who are actively articulating an alternate framework for bilateral engagement that lacks commitments to or interprets human rights selectively – and acting on this ideology through use of development assistance and other tools to promote this worldview. Members of the international community are weighing strategic interests and aligning themselves accordingly. At the same time, legitimacy within the international community, and being seen as a responsible global citizen, is still a powerful motivating factor for many actors. It’s possible that some who challenge international human rights may still have approaches and concepts that are useful to sustaining peace.

If we are to break the polarisation around these issues, we need to utilise diplomacy to engage actors across a spectrum, invoke agreed-upon frameworks like the 2030 Agenda and seek a more nuanced understanding of where there may be synergies around preventing violence. Peacebuilding’s contribution can be in understanding and designing processes that better capture this nuance and facilitate engagement across actors versus unilateral approaches that focus on, for example, naming and shaming.

5. In practice, the work of international actors at a country level on sustaining peace sometimes lacks coordination and can happen within different frameworks.

The work of the human rights architecture and the human rights field are perceived as being largely focused on the technical work of monitoring human rights violations, cataloguing abuses, report-writing and conducting related advocacy. This is undertaken with the goal of identifying human rights gaps and supporting the state in addressing those gaps as well as meeting mandatory reporting requirements.¹¹

On the peacebuilding side, efforts include supporting countries going through transitions and preventing violence and atrocities often through programming on elections, transitional justice, reconciliation, security sector reform (SSR), disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR), rule of law, promoting national dialogue and peace processes, and in some instances, psychosocial assistance and trauma healing. The two processes clearly reinforce each other and these linkages are at times made intentionally, particularly at the community level. At the state and multilateral level, however, the assumptions we hold and jargon we use tend to reinforce the differences between these frameworks and their connections could be made more explicitly and frequently.

6. There has been a historical and predominant focus on civil and political rights versus economic, social and cultural rights. Human rights tend to be reduced to the civil and political, with economic, social and cultural rights seen as somewhat optional or secondary (notably in peacebuilding agreements and processes). This potentially obscures the inherent connections between peace and security, sustainable development and a rights-based agenda. Indeed, many point to the successful advancement of the Sustainable Development Goals – which focus on a broad range of rights – as a good example of a rights-based approach that could also apply to the peace and security pillar.

How can a nation engage in peacebuilding without promoting human rights? These are intrinsically connected processes, however, there are some tensions in the way these processes have been approached and have developed in practice over time. Human rights actors may shy away from peacebuilding because they don't perceive it to be effective, while peacebuilding actors can be hesitant to explicitly take up human rights issues for fear that their work may become politicised and be perceived as pedantic. While these are concerns, there are opportunities to further this integration, taking advantage of UN reform processes that explicitly task the system with advancing and promoting coherence between these paradigms. There is a need for better understanding of the human rights instruments in Geneva which are not well understood in New York; increased knowledge of how human rights analyses and frameworks further opportunities for sustaining peace in practice; and more mechanisms for structured, regular interaction between these communities.

There is also a need to more clearly articulate and operationalise the way in which respect for human rights is an essential part of creating peaceful relationships among groups and between citizens and the state, and *'thus lays the foundation for sustaining peace, which in turn strengthens the sovereign legitimacy of the state and its institutions'*.¹² This requires finding issues that both the human rights and peacebuilding communities prioritise and skills that both can agree their respective fields lack or which would enhance their respective work. These include: transitional justice; psychosocial support and trauma (individual and collective) healing; accountability for corruption and human rights abuses; work related to social and protest movements and the need to start framing these movements preventatively to build resilient societies; focus on victims, their courage and resilience; documentation of human rights abuses; and, an emphasis on transformational or systems change. Other examples include an analysis of how human rights and peacebuilding efforts are effective at prevention and augmenting human rights documentation work with more sociological and historical narrative – an approach that peacebuilding can bring. This can produce an analysis that plays better

to a broader audience of political analysts who sit outside of traditional and technically focused human rights organisations.

Opportunities to advance the nexus of human rights and peacebuilding

1. Utilise widely agreed upon frameworks like the 2030 Agenda to reframe a contentious narrative to one that embraces human rights. For example, what opportunities does the sustaining peace agenda provide for addressing human rights concerns like maintaining civic space, particularly for human rights defenders? Landmark reports such as Pathways for Peace could be better employed to elevate human rights. The Danish Institute for Human Rights has created a useful tool which links human rights monitoring information to the goals and targets of the SDGs¹³; these and other resources could be amplified. Countries can also use the voluntary national review (VNR) process of progress towards the SDGs and the High-level Political Forum as opportunities to highlight the importance of human rights in the context of sustaining peace. This could demonstrate leadership and provide key examples from specific country contexts of how human rights and peacebuilding are intrinsically connected in practice.¹⁴

2. Support the development of a body of knowledge or research, including examples, of human rights-based peacebuilding programming and an analysis of the preventive value of investing in such initiatives, led by national actors. The distinctions between human rights and peacebuilding may often be irrelevant to local actors working on the ground. Looking to them to design and lead work to better understand how human rights and peacebuilding actors can bolster each other's efforts in practice would provide needed wisdom to an often-siloed international discourse, as well as a useful facilitative role for northern-based actors. Examples could also be collected of how human rights language can be translated into other policy and programming tools, for instance, how regional and national contexts and institutions have adopted human rights language and what difference it has made in respect for human rights and the prevention of conflict.

3. Systemically explore the ideological challenges to human rights and link this to conflict and development. There is concern around faltering human rights norms with good reasons, yet, the concrete, empirical and systematic understanding of what the trajectory of this collective erosion looks like is focused on civil and political rights.¹⁵ How does the erosion of these norms link to sustainable development and violence reduction goals? A data-informed discussion would allow for more rigour and less hyperbole and potentially politicisation in addressing these issues. This exploration could also include a more nuanced understanding of a range of

global actors' approach to sustaining peace and how that relates to upholding rights. The human rights field can contribute an understanding of human rights frameworks and how they are applied in practice. The peacebuilding field's history of dialogue and scholarship on local norms and realities and *bottom up* approaches to peace could provoke some useful discussions and consideration in the human rights community.

4. The Peacebuilding Architecture within the UN could be better used as a tool for promoting human rights.

This is particularly true given that these issues are often too contentious to be constructively dealt with in the Security Council and receive tremendous pushback in the Human Rights Council. The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has an explicit mandate to break silos and promote coherence between the human rights, development and peace and security pillars. There could be better strategising on how to use this body to further human rights issues.

Among Member States there is a Human Rights–Conflict Prevention Caucus (co-chaired by Switzerland and Germany) that aims to be practical in providing a space for dialogue on these issues and engages a cross-regional group of states in New York committed to placing human rights at the heart of conflict prevention and peacebuilding. The role of the Caucus is to strategically identify opportunities for integrating human rights issues and connect better to colleagues in Geneva. Members of the Caucus indicated that one of the priorities for the group has been to find ways to better frame the narrative of human rights as a building block for sustaining peace, providing an alternative to the focus on risks and violations that typically brings these issues together. This is an important forum, particularly given that many of the Caucus members are also members of the PBC and could potentially use that space more proactively to raise human rights issues, especially in the context of mission drawdown and other transitions in engagement or presence by the UN and broader international community.

5. There is a need for increased leadership on human rights in general and across the UN system, including a greater recognition of the changing role of the UN in the multilateral system, particularly its role in upholding global norms. Reflecting on how this has happened in the past, through the development of the SDGs, may be useful in understanding how the implementation of the sustaining peace resolutions presents an opportunity for the UN to assert its leadership and moral authority through furthering norms. The sustaining peace resolutions and the SDGs bear many similarities, in particular regarding their fundamental underpinnings on national ownership, accountability and participation. In addition, there are other potentially replicable models within the UN system that strive to advance peacebuilding

and human rights in an integrated way – for example, UNICEF has developed an approach to programming which essentially means that every line of effort, from Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) to child protection, becomes a way to promote peacebuilding and human rights as a *primary* or *secondary outcome*.¹⁶ Increased public understanding of and attention to the erosion of human rights norms and the relationship to sustaining peace is also important.

6. Funding streams that support peacebuilding and human rights should be reviewed. While the UN is primarily meant to be a body that upholds – and defends – global norms, there are very few resources given to OHCHR and other parts of the ecosystem charged with this task. In 2017, of the total funding for UN system-wide activities only 10 percent went to the UN's work on global norms, standards, policy and advocacy, and that was down 4 percent from the previous year.¹⁷ This lack of resources undermines the system's capacity to promote human rights and to integrate human rights with sustaining peace. Given the high costs associated with intervention in conflict-affected countries, there is a need to optimise the preventive impact of all funding. A better analysis of funding, including resources made available for human rights, could assist in this.

7. Utilise the 2020 review of the UN's Peacebuilding Architecture to examine the role and impact of human rights in promoting conflict prevention and in sustaining peace. The review could be an opportunity to explore how the PBC, PBSO and the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) can provide support to these potentially cross-cutting issues, for example, in the particular context of mission drawdown. It could also be fruitful to gather examples of how the PBC can be used as a platform to facilitate conversations and provide concrete examples of work on these issues that serves to better integrate them and answer questions such as: What does a rights-based peacebuilding intervention look like? What are best practices in creating such interventions? What is the contribution of regional and national human rights bodies to peacebuilding? What are practical examples of how to translate and frame human rights language in *culturally nuanced ways* into other policy and programming tools? How do human rights tools prevent conflict?

Addressing the disconnect collectively

The challenge of promoting human rights and peacebuilding in an integrated way should be approached as part of a medium-term sustained strategy, rather than one-off workshops and meetings, building on the progress already being made within the UN system and good examples, particularly at the community level. There is also a clear need in general for more *collective impact* thinking, more cohesion and a better strategic approach to address some of these deeply systemic and structural issues. These efforts are likely best lead from the Global South through partnership with Global North institutions.

The issue of silos obviously extends beyond the UN system to civil society and funders operating at the international level. Human rights organisations and donors often work in conflict-affected settings, yet they do not consider themselves to engage in peacebuilding. While peacebuilding actors might understand their work as promoting human rights writ large, they are more likely to identify their efforts as primarily focused on violence and conflict-related processes and not human rights. The majority of the questions raised in point seven above are relevant but not well understood in general within the two communities that work on these issues.

Professionals from the human rights and peacebuilding communities recognise that there are these disconnects, which also include those working on women's and environmental rights, yet, no one seems to know exactly how to address them. Particularly as both the human rights and peacebuilding fields have grown and professionalised over the last two decades, managing workloads and the task of coordinating and connecting within each of these distinct communities is often overwhelming. There is space for thought leadership on how these two communities bolster each other's work (or not), including what it means practically speaking to fund the same groups and how to be more strategic about creating movements. Ensuring that the gains made in the last century on human rights and the prevention of violent conflict are not lost is a shared vision, even if the way forward is not clear. The imperative to work collectively has never been more urgent.

Endnotes

¹ Connolly, L. & Athie, A. (September 2017). *Applying Sustaining Peace and Human Rights: The Links Between Sustaining Peace and Human Rights*. International Peace Institute. New York, NY: <https://www.ipinst.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Final-Meeting-Note-Workshop-6-Sustaining-Peace-and-Human-Rights.pdf>.

² A/RES/70/262 and S/RES/2282.

Available at: <https://www.un.org/press/en/2016/sc12340.doc.htm>

³ Ibid p. 4

⁴ The year 2020 marks the 15th anniversary of the creation of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture (PBA). The 2016 twin resolutions that resulted from the 2015 review of the PBA, referred to as the 'sustaining peace resolutions,' called for a further comprehensive review of United Nations peacebuilding and stipulated that it take place during the 74th session of the General Assembly (UNGA).

⁵ This paper evolved from numerous conversations with human rights and peacebuilding practitioners throughout 2019 and is meant to be an evolving conversation in which feedback is welcome.

⁶ See: <https://www.pathwaysforpeace.org/>

⁷ For a useful academic discussion of peacebuilding and human rights see: Journal of Human Rights Practice, Special Issue, *Breaking the Silos: Linking Human Rights and Peacebuilding*. Parlevliet, M. (Ed.) 2017. 9(3). Oxford Press: Oxford, UK: <https://academic.oup.com/jhrp/issue/9/3>

⁸ See, for example, Ignatieff, M. *The attack on human rights*. Foreign Affairs (2001): 102-116. Available at: <https://www.michaelignatieff.ca/assets/pdfs/TheAttack.pdf>

⁹ Interview, January 2019

¹⁰ <https://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html>

¹¹ Informal conversation, January 2019. This is a bit perplexing as the promotion of human rights is not new to the foreign assistance community; there are bi-lateral governments that support civil society organisations working on human rights issues all over the world.

¹² IPI p. 10

¹³ See:

<https://www.humanrights.dk/tools/sdg-human-rights-data-explorer>

¹⁴ As specified by SDGs, the VNR is to include contributions from Indigenous peoples, civil society, government ministries, the private sector and other stakeholders also related to human rights issues. See: <http://sdg.iisd.org/news/47-countries-to-date-planning-to-present-vnrs-at-hlpf-2020/>

¹⁵ See for example:

<https://freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-world>

¹⁶ Metz, Z; Nilaus-Tarp, K. & Sobhani, N. (November 2016). *Conflict Sensitivity and Peacebuilding Programming Guide*. UNICEF. New York: NY.

¹⁷ Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation and UN Multi-partner Trust Fund Office, *Financing the UN Development System: Time for Hard Choices*, September 2019. p.36.

The author



Riva Kantowitz focuses on the prevention of conflict and violence, promotion of human rights, effective financing for frontline actors, and resilience and organisational support in fragile and developing environments. Dr. Riva Kantowitz is a Senior Advisor at the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation. Prior to that, working under both Obama administrations, she founded and led a team at the U.S. Department of State that provides strategic direction and oversight to a global investment portfolio to promote human rights in conflict-affected countries. Riva earned a Ph.D. from Columbia University in Social-Organisational Psychology and International Conflict Resolution (2006).

This paper was enriched with valuable input from a number of reviewers, notably Per Nordlund, Florence Foster and Sigrid Gruener. Participants in a December 2019 roundtable on this topic in New York hosted by the Foundation also contributed important thinking.

Photos: Adobe Stock Images
Printed by XO-Graf, Uppsala 2020

In 2020, for the third time since its creation and following previous reviews in 2010 and 2015, UN member states will take stock of the effectiveness of the UN's Peacebuilding Architecture and the UN's efforts in sustaining peace. The focus of the review will be on where progress has been made in implementation of the 2016 twin resolutions on peacebuilding and sustaining peace, and where it is still lacking.

Widely recognised areas of concern will be explored such as financing, operational and policy coherence, inclusivity, and changes at international, regional and national levels from the roll-out of the Secretary General's reform efforts, notably to the UN Development System, the Peace and Security pillar and the Management System.

The review is expected to be comprehensive and forward-looking, going beyond an assessment of the functioning of the Peacebuilding Commission, Peacebuilding Fund and Peacebuilding Support Office to also look at a examples of implementation at country and regional level. It is an opportunity to review systematic shifts and to consider new perspectives and approaches to more effectively operationalise sustaining peace. This publication is part of a series of Development Dialogue papers by the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation that aims to provide food for thought and input to that process.



Dag Hammarskjöld
Foundation

www.daghammarskjold.se
secretariat@daghammarskjold.se