

Towards a Strategy for Impact: Reflections on the First Annual Peacebuilding Week

An Informal Lunch Reflection Session for Member States

A Session of the Operationalising Sustaining Peace Roundtable Series

15 July 2026

Summary Note

The 2025 Peacebuilding Architecture Review (PBAR) resolutions (S/RES/2805-A/RES/80/11, OP12) mandated an annual “peacebuilding week [,] aimed at raising awareness of the peacebuilding and sustaining peace efforts [,] fostering inclusive dialogue on peacebuilding approaches and promoting the sharing of good practices in peacebuilding and sustaining peace.” In June 2026, the First Annual Peacebuilding Week, coordinated by Egypt and Slovenia, with substantive and organizational support from the Peacebuilding and Peace Support Office (PBPSO), brought together diverse stakeholders to exchange perspectives on advancing the Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace agenda.

As the international community moves toward implementing the 2025 resolutions, this roundtable convened Member States to informally assess the strategic contribution of the inaugural Peacebuilding Week. Specifically, the discussion aimed to identify opportunities to strengthen future iterations of Peacebuilding Week and to explore how complementary peacebuilding platforms (e.g. the United Nations–Civil Society Organization Dialogue) can collectively reinforce implementation of the PBAR.

Overall, Member States considered the first Peacebuilding Week a success. A diverse range of stakeholders came together to engage in discussions across a broad spectrum of issues, and strong support was shown for the peacebuilding and prevention agenda. As the inaugural edition, it provided a valuable foundation for future annual Peacebuilding Weeks and an opportunity to consider how they could contribute more effectively to implementing the 2025 PBAR resolutions. Member States emphasized the importance of sustaining the momentum generated in 2026, noting that the Week’s long-term impact would depend on continuity, institutional learning, and consistent improvement.

The following are the key takeaways from the discussion:

The 2026 Annual Peacebuilding Week made a positive contribution to the implementation of the peacebuilding and sustaining peace resolutions.

- *The Week helped raise awareness of peacebuilding across the United Nations system. Its numerous high-level events facilitated senior-level participation, enabled*

engagement by peacebuilding leaders from capitals at United Nations Headquarters, and helped elevate the overall profile of peacebuilding. To further strengthen participation from capitals, Member States recommended incorporating hybrid modalities into future iterations of Peacebuilding Week, including opportunities for capital-based colleagues to participate in meetings remotely.

- *The Week contributed to reducing the stigma associated with peacebuilding and prevention, and encouraged broader engagement with the Peacebuilding Commission.* The 2026 Week generated unprecedented participation by Member States, including countries not traditionally engaged in peacebuilding discussions, such as Armenia, Djibouti, Nigeria, and Syria. This broader participation could provide a foundation for strengthening their future engagement with the Commission, if the governments continue to see the value of such engagement. The Week also created a space for Member States to share national experiences and perspectives on peacebuilding without stigma.
- *The Week provided a platform for diverse stakeholders to exchange perspectives and develop strategies across a broad range of substantive areas related to peacebuilding and sustaining peace.* Discussions were concrete and action-oriented, moving beyond policy considerations to generate practical proposals for strengthening implementation. Key themes included:
 - National ownership as the cornerstone of peacebuilding and prevention, with international support most effective when it reinforces national institutions, priorities, and capacities.
 - Prevention as a universal agenda, examined from multiple perspectives across the Week's events contributed to a more substantive and forward-looking dialogue.
 - Partnerships as an essential instrument for peacebuilding and prevention, recognizing the comparative advantages of different stakeholders and the importance of mobilizing them effectively.
 - The importance of measuring the impact of peacebuilding and prevention efforts, including the development and use of appropriate indicators and methodologies, particularly for assessing prevention outcomes.
 - The Peacebuilding Commission's convening role and its capacity to facilitate the exchange of national experiences and lessons learned.
- *The Week encouraged collaboration among civil society, the United Nations, Member States and other peacebuilding stakeholders.* Partners were actively engaged in developing side events, contributing to the Week's inclusive and participatory character. For future editions, Member States recommended further strengthening the role of civil society, including through greater involvement in the planning and organization of the Week.

The strategic contribution of the Annual Peacebuilding Week to the implementation of the peacebuilding and sustaining peace resolutions requires further clarification. While the 2026 Week advanced the awareness-raising objective of the 2025 PBAR resolutions, its contribution to their broader implementation was less evident. Member

States suggested that future Peacebuilding Weeks could include a stocktaking or reflection event to explicitly assess implementation progress, identify gaps and consider further action. Some Member States also proposed using the five-year period between Peacebuilding Architecture Reviews as a structured reflection cycle. Under this approach, the Week preceding the next Review could serve as a consultative platform, drawing on the experience of the informal process conducted in 2024 in preparation for the 2025 Review.

The informal format of the 2026 Week should be applied to all upcoming Weeks.

Member States noted that the informality of the Week fostered open, candid, and action-oriented discussions that might be more difficult to achieve within a formal and rigid setting.

The leadership arrangements for future Annual Peacebuilding Weeks remain to be clarified.

The twin resolutions do not designate an entity or Member State to lead the organization of the Week. In 2026, Egypt and Slovenia volunteered to serve as co-coordinators given their roles as co-facilitators of the 2025 PBAR; however, the process for identifying and transitioning leadership for subsequent iterations has yet to be established. Member States therefore emphasized the need to start discussions on the next Week's leadership early to ensure adequate preparation time and to have the responsibility shared between Member States and PBPSO.

Some logistical aspects reduced the full potential of the Annual Peacebuilding Week.

- *Overlapping events* limited participants' ability to engage fully in each discussion, transition effectively between sessions, and pursue bilateral exchanges. Member States recommended:
 - Continuing efforts to consolidate events, which helped reduce scheduling conflicts, fostered more inclusive discussions, and facilitated networking among stakeholders working on related issues.
 - Allowing sufficient time between sessions for participants to move between venues or locating events in close proximity to minimize transit time.
 - Maintaining the Week's current duration; extending it would place significant capacity demands on participants.
 - Considering an overarching theme for each Annual Peacebuilding Week and organizing individual days explicitly around specific topics, such as an "Impact Day" or a "Prevention Day," to promote more focused and coherent discussions.
- While *the consolidation of events* offered important benefits, it led to sessions having many speakers and thus reduced the time available for interactive exchange in many sessions. Participants had limited opportunities to engage with speakers, ask questions, and share national experiences. Member States recommended:
 - Using more interactive formats, including round-table discussions, moderated dialogues, breakout sessions, workshops, and question-and-answer sessions.

- Maintaining a balance between formal and informal events, which were considered complementary and together supported both substantive deliberations and open exchanges.
- *Civil society* was actively involved in coordinating side events, but its role in the overall organization of the 2026 Week was limited. Earlier and more systematic engagement with civil society during the preparatory process could have helped identify and maximize opportunities for inclusive participation.
 - Member States recommended closer coordination among Member States, PBPSO, and civil society to broaden participation while ensuring a coherent and well-coordinated programme. This could include dedicated networking opportunities and the establishment of a coordination mechanism during the preparatory phase. At the same time, Member States emphasized that the Annual Peacebuilding Week should remain Member State-led.
- Some important *peacebuilding stakeholders* were not sufficiently represented in the discussions.
 - Member States recommended broadening participation, particularly by meaningfully including young people and issuing strategic invitations to relevant actors beyond the United Nations system, including private sector, IFIs, and civil society.
- *The high number of high-level events* during the 2026 Week resulted in some repetition and may have diluted their individual value in advancing peacebuilding policy and implementation. Member States further observed that, while several issues received substantive and strategic consideration, other key dimensions of peacebuilding—including financing for peacebuilding—were insufficiently addressed.
 - Member States recommended considering one principal high-level event during the Annual Peacebuilding Week. This would facilitate focused engagement by senior leadership, while allowing other high-level events to sustain political attention to peacebuilding throughout the year.
- The absence of a consolidated mechanism for accessing *summaries of the Week's discussions*. Given the compressed schedule and overlapping events, this limited participants' ability to remain informed about sessions they could not attend. Member States recommended:
 - Making summary notes from all events available on the Annual Peacebuilding Week website.
 - Considering the inclusion of a dedicated section on the Annual Peacebuilding Week in the Peacebuilding Commission's annual report.
 - A minority of Member States suggested preparing a PBC Chair's Summary or another form of outcome document. However, this proposal received limited support, given the time and sensitivities associated with negotiating or agreeing upon such documents.

The Annual Peacebuilding Week could be more closely linked to other peacebuilding discussions and forums held throughout the year, including the Stockholm Forum on

Peace and Development, Geneva Peace Week and the United Nations–Civil Society Organization Dialogue. Such linkages could include presenting key messages, lessons learned and summaries from these forums, reflecting the perspectives of diverse stakeholders.

Continuing efforts are needed to broaden stakeholder engagement in future Annual Peacebuilding Weeks. Member States welcomed the organization of events in 24 countries in support of the 2026 Week, which helped extend participation and dialogue beyond United Nations Headquarters and reinforced the Week’s global reach.

Strengthening the impact of the Annual Peacebuilding Week may require consideration of resource needs beyond those currently available. As the Week is mandated to be organized without a dedicated additional funding allocation, the United Nations does not have a specific budget for meeting space. The resources available for analysis, planning, and strategic coordination depend on the respective capacities of Member States, PBPSO, and other stakeholders. Against the backdrop of declining financial support for peacebuilding, resource and capacity constraints should be taken into account when considering options to enhance the impact of future Peacebuilding Weeks. At the same time, Member States emphasized that greater impact does not necessarily require additional resources, as it can also be achieved through clearer priorities, stronger coordination, and a more strategic use of existing capacities.