

Strengthening Coherence Globally

The Role of the Peacebuilding Commission in Supporting Follow-up from Peace-Centered Discussions Outside of New York

A Discussion of the Operationalising Sustaining Peace Roundtable Series

30 October 2025 | 8:30am-10:00am

305 E47th Street, 10th Floor, New York | Dag Hammarskjold Foundation Office

Summary Note

During the 2025 Peacebuilding Architecture Review (2025 PBAR), the question of strengthening the Peacebuilding Commission (hereinafter, the Commission) is one of the central considerations. However, Member States of the Commission have yet to find alignment on how they envision the Commission's work to bring more impact at the country level.

This roundtable engaged member state peacebuilding experts in a discussion on how to strengthen operational coherence across the global peacebuilding ecosystem, recognizing that the United Nations is one node in a much larger system with many important actors and institutions at the regional and national levels. The Commission has a unique role in this architecture and an unmatched potential to connect and convene other actors within the global peacebuilding architecture, including multilateral development banks and regional organisations, among others. National prevention or peacebuilding strategies could serve as a mechanism to strengthen coordination and coherence among diverse actors within the global architecture in a specific context. The roundtable drew on the work and experience of the [African Development Bank](#) and discussions held at the recently concluded [Africa Resilience Forum](#) in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire.

Participants highlighted the following areas where the Commission specifically adds value: 1) to provide a unique political forum where diverse actors can be convened in support of nationally-determined peacebuilding priorities; 2) as a platform to share lessons learned on peacebuilding and prevention; 3) to set norms and standards for the consideration of national actors on national peacebuilding and prevention strategies; 4) to galvanise Member States political commitment; and 5) to serve as a forum to discuss risk factors and potential for sustaining peace in specific contexts. For the Commission to adequately support national peacebuilding priorities, more needs to be done to transform it into a more field-relevant, impactful body by integrating good practices and outcomes from peace-centered conversations outside of New York.

The takeaways from the discussion include the following:

The Commission is uniquely positioned to support national peacebuilding priorities by facilitating dialogue, knowledge-sharing, and collaboration among representatives of development banks, Member States, civil society, and other relevant stakeholders. The Commission could enhance how it uses its convening role to bring together diverse peacebuilding actors, including civil society, to support better alignment of tools and resources and to foster better coordination. Practically, the Commission could deepen partnerships that already exist at the field level (e.g., partnerships between Resident Coordinators and Development Banks). Globally, the Commission could standardize best practices, foster alignment between peace and development financing, and promote risk management strategies that incentivize greater investment in fragile and conflict-affected settings, thereby strengthening the coherence and impact of peace finance globally. Political support of the Commission could further be complemented by the catalytic funding from the Peacebuilding Fund (the PBF) to unlock additional funding through regional development banks (RDBs) and other donors. However, the capacity of the Commission to deliver such a platform depends on the capacity of its Secretariat to provide such support.

Regional development banks play a pivotal role in advancing peacebuilding by integrating peace and resilience into large-scale infrastructure and development projects. Over the years, RDBs have made great strides in advancing peace financing for climate-affected contexts and supporting national prevention strategies. At the same time, RDBs, including the African Development Bank (AfDB), do not have peace as an indicator. However, the AfDB has moved from conflict-sensitive programming to more explicitly prioritising fragility and peace-positive investments. The Commission provides a high-level platform to strengthen how different actors come together as a system across fragile and conflict-affected contexts, highlighting the comparative advantages of different actors and for exploring and showcasing innovative efforts.

Flexibility of regional actors allows them to adjust to the evolving nature of peacebuilding. While the Commission evolves slowly, regional actors are much more flexible and can adjust their strategies and approaches regularly. Regional institutions are a better fit to support concrete action at the country level. The same lack of flexibility might affect the effectiveness of global financial mechanisms. In the face of a shifting multilateral landscape affected by geopolitical tensions, global institutions need to evolve and can learn from regional institutions. The Commission could facilitate such learning.

National Prevention Strategies are a potentially powerful tool for enabling countries to unlock financing for peacebuilding. The initiative of Member States to focus on prevention has the potential to serve as a derisking strategy and to thus

improve the ability of donors to invest in development in fragile contexts. In the experience of the AfDB, new countries were added to its portfolio as a result of lowering risk factors. However, it is critical to ensure that following such investments, the priorities of donors and development partners do not overstep the priorities of national actors. The Commission can be a platform to support national prevention strategies in a specific context, while helping other Member States see the value of adopting such strategies and share lessons learned on what an effective strategy may look like.

Key recommendations emerging from the discussion include the following:

- *The Commission's Member States should consider ways to enhance the Commission's role as a forum for convening diverse stakeholders and include more economists and finance actors who are often not part of its meetings and conversations.* To help the Commission reach its full potential, however, the Commission's Secretariat (PBSO) capacity needs to be strengthened.
- *The Commission can add value through more focus on specific national and regional contexts,* providing lessons learned globally while enabling partnership building and coherence in specific contexts. Through increasing the partnership with ECOSOC, the Commission could channel its learning in global-level conversations.
- *The Commission could reconsider the way it designs and holds its meetings.* The Commission could invite actors to discuss concrete technical capacities, beyond generalized research findings.
- *The Commission's Member States should further discuss the role of Vice Chairs,* including in strengthening the engagement of International Financing Institutions and Regional Development Banks in the Commission's work. One of the Vice Chairs could take on such a responsibility with clearer guidelines on what that would entail and ensuring that it reinforces rather than dilutes the overall leadership by the PBC Chair.
- *The Commission and its Secretariat could engage with regional actors to explore ways to use the platform of the Commission to facilitate dissemination of regional discussions and to support follow up action on the outcomes of such meetings.* The upcoming Civil Society-UN Dialogue could be another Forum to channel clear and relevant recommendations to the Commission.
- *Member States should consider the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR)* as an important vehicle to operationalize peacebuilding and sustaining peace across the UN system. This could ensure that UN Country Teams and Resident Coordinators integrate peacebuilding priorities in national programming and the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks (UNSDCFs), while enhancing UN accountability when engaging with national prevention and peacebuilding priorities.
- *In advancing discussions on what the Commission can offer to support the development and implementation of national peacebuilding and prevention*

strategies, Member States could consider drawing lessons from the experience of g7+ countries and their engagement with [the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States](#). Several of these countries have received support from the Commission and the PBF and have important relevant knowledge to share on working with peacebuilding compacts and national development strategies with a peacebuilding and prevention focus.