

Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace:

How can the implementation of the 2025 Peacebuilding Architecture Review (PBAR) lead to more coordinated, coherent, integrated and impactful peacebuilding efforts across the United Nations system?

Roundtable Discussion with Geneva-based representatives of Member States

12 December 2025

Summary Note

This summary note captures key messages and recommendations from an expert-level roundtable held in Geneva on 12 December 2025 aimed at examining ways in which the **implementation of the 2025 Peacebuilding Architecture Review can lead to more coordinated, coherent, integrated and impactful peacebuilding efforts across the UN system.**

The [2025 PBAR](#) has recently concluded with the adoption of the 2025 dual General Assembly and Security Council Resolutions. Reaffirming the core “sustaining peace” approach of past reviews, which recognises the interlinked nature of peace, development and human rights as well as the cost-effectiveness of conflict prevention, the resolutions assert the UN system-wide responsibility to adopt a nexus-based approach that “leverages the entire UN system” in support of sustaining peace¹, enabling it to work across silos, leverage comparative advantages, and collectively address the root causes of conflict. While firmly anchoring peacebuilding in recent and ongoing global policy processes², the Resolution does not fundamentally broaden or alter the mandate of the Peacebuilding Architecture, and instead explicitly focuses on improving implementation and impact at the field level.

The 2025 Resolutions puts a strong emphasis on the Peacebuilding Commission’s (PBC) role as a system-wide platform for coherence, and decidedly aim at sharpening its bridging, advisory and convening roles, including by encouraging input to its deliberations from across the UN system³; spurring closer cooperation with the General Assembly, Security Council and ECOSOC through; and deepening engagement with International Financial Institutions (IFIs) and the private sector. The PBC is also mandated to increase the visibility of UN peacebuilding and conflict prevention efforts through an annual “peacebuilding week”; support global efforts to address peacebuilding financing gaps; and monitor the implementation of relevant action plans and strategies adopted to advance the WPS and YPS agendas. **This incentivises New York-based peacebuilding actors to take more proactive action to collect and connect information available across the UN system in support of peacebuilding and sustaining peace.**

The 2025 Resolutions draw on from recommendations generated through series of consultations held during the informal phase of the review process, including civil society dialogues and multistakeholder platforms such as the 2025 [Geneva Consultations](#) and [Greentree workshop](#), and as such provides renewed opportunity to address persistent challenges: fragmented engagement across UN hubs and the field, weak integration of peacebuilding with human rights and humanitarian action, and limited progress on financing for peacebuilding.

¹ [S/RES/2805-A/RES/80/11](#), PP9

² These include the Summit of the Future, Pact for the Future, UN80 reform initiative, and forthcoming review of peace operations.

³ [S/RES/2805-A/RES/80/11](#), OP4

Held in December 2025 on the margins of the 3rd edition of the [CSO–UN Dialogue on Peacebuilding](#) in Geneva, the roundtable discussion brought together expert peacebuilding representatives from UN Member-States and CSOs to explore how commitments enshrined in the Resolution can inform a strategic vision for their operationalisation, and drive coordinated and practical impact at the field level. Participants underscored that while the new resolutions reflects *renewed commitment* to achieving system-wide coherence for peacebuilding and sustaining peace, they also call for *renewed action*, grounded in lessons learned from previous efforts to bridge silos, alongside the establishment of a monitoring mechanism to track the implementation of the resolutions.

The following key messages emerged during the discussion:

The work of all UN intergovernmental bodies and processes needs to be peace-responsive. Reiterating commitments made in 2015 and 2020 to invest in whole-of-systems approaches, participants highlighted the need for the PBC to truly operationalize the Sustaining Peace agenda by leveraging inputs from across the three pillars of the UN – human rights, peace and security, and development –, much of which is in Geneva. The Human Rights Council, treaty bodies, OHCHR, UNHCR, WHO, ILO, IOM, ICRC/IFRC and many specialised agencies provide a wealth of thematic expertise to implement the resolutions’ commitments. Several ongoing global reform and policy processes, such as the [Inter-Agency Steering Committee humanitarian reset](#) or [Global Refugee Forum](#) offer momentum to leverage peacebuilding approaches and know-how in support of development and humanitarian goals.

Internal communication within Member States permanent missions in New York and Geneva should be strengthened. Many development, humanitarian, and human rights issues discussed in Geneva would offer valuable insights for more impactful action in New York, and vice versa. Communication within ministries of foreign affairs and their offices (eg. between missions in NY, in Geneva and capitals) remains limited, particularly among countries with limited capacities. Regular briefings within and between missions in New York and Geneva would help strengthen communication and information-sharing, in support of the Resolution’s emphasis on system-wide cooperation.

Effective national prevention strategies can be strengthened expertise from Geneva-based stakeholders. Geneva has traditionally positioned itself as a prevention hub to complement peace and security processes in New York, where sustained political support for conflict prevention is faltering, and as such offers an alternative space and thematic expertise to discuss the national prevention strategies advocated by the 2025 Resolution. Agencies headquartered in Geneva already shape peace-responsive programming in sectors such as health, labour, displacement, climate and human rights, and as such can support the translation of broad PBAR language on prevention into concrete sectoral guidance and tools to be used by Resident Coordinators and national authorities. Current global funding cuts impacting the aid sector require a shift towards multi-faceted responses that mobilise diverse sources of financing by leveraging Geneva’s emerging role as a centre of Peace Finance expertise.

Effective coordination between New York and Geneva requires nimble, informal, and ad hoc mechanisms. Informal and ad hoc platforms – such as ambassadorial roundtables and civil society forums – offer practical alternatives to rigid coordination structures and can better connect expertise across geographies, strengthening support to the PBC’s advisory role. Geneva’s dense

ecosystem of UN–civil society interfaces, including the HRC, treaty bodies, UPR, humanitarian mechanisms, and women’s and youth networks, make it a natural platform for advancing inclusive participation, WPS and YPS agendas, and field-level operationalisation.

The Annual Peacebuilding Week, as proposed in the new resolutions, could be considered as a comprehensive initiative connecting regional and global discussions. Existing discussion forums such as the CSO-UN Dialogue, Geneva Peace Week, Paris Peace Forum, Stockholm Forum on Peace and Development, BLED Strategic Forum, etc. should be capitalised upon to strategically inform the convening of an annual peacebuilding week.

Civil society actors engaged in global peacebuilding processes can play a critical role in supporting the operationalisation of the 2025 peacebuilding and sustaining peace resolution at the field level. While global policy discussions are often insufficiently connected to field realities, CSOs participating in international fora can help bridge this gap by sharing practical insights with RCs and UN Country Teams. More focused and regionally grounded dialogues – conducted closer to field contexts – can enhance inclusivity and effectiveness, while enabling civil society to convey consolidated perspectives from the field to global platforms. This two-way exchange would strengthen coherence between global policy processes and field-level implementation.

A monitoring framework should be formalised to track the implementation of the 2025 dual resolutions. This could be established by civil society as an independent mechanism, or by the PBSO as a formal reporting mechanism to the UN-SG.

Key recommendations from the discussion:

1. *The PBC should systematically invite and integrate inputs from Geneva-based humanitarian, development, and human rights actors into its deliberations, thematic discussions and annual programmes of work, or use informal knowledge exchange mechanisms, including CSO-led platforms.*
2. *Member States and civil society should ensure that peacebuilding analysis informs discussions across UN intergovernmental processes, including those not traditionally framed as peace and security-related, by strengthening internal coordination, through regular joint briefings and exchanges across geographies.*
3. *Geneva-based UN actors should strengthen support to Member States in developing national prevention and peacebuilding strategies, drawing on their normative and technical expertise, and analytical inputs.*
4. *The capacities of the PBSO need to be strengthened.* This will ensure its capacity to support coordination across UN entities in New York, Geneva, the field, and regional organizations.
5. *Make systematic use of Geneva’s role as a hub for innovative financing mechanisms to inform PBC-IFI dialogue.*
6. *Stronger coordination between CSOs across Geneva and New York may enable Member States to leverage a platform to operationalize nexus-based approaches and sustain engagement in Geneva-based UN peacebuilding processes.*
7. *A monitoring framework would be very useful to track the implementation of the 2025 Resolution, either internally through the Secretary-General, with the support of the PBSO, or by independently by civil society.*
8. *An annual peacebuilding week could drive coherence and learning between country-level, regional and global peacebuilding discussions, and as such, should replicate the CSO-UN Dialogues’ engagement modalities for the meaningful participation of diverse stakeholders.*