Long Walk of Peace
TOWARDS A CULTURE OF PREVENTION
Building peace is a continuous process. For more than 70 years, the pursuit of peace has been at the core of the mandate of the United Nations system and a major driving force behind all actions undertaken by its different entities. This work requires constant attention and effort, taking into account specific contexts and adapting swiftly to changing realities on the ground. Constructing “the defences of peace” in the minds of men and women needs constant investment.

Oftentimes, ensuring lasting peace appears to be an elusive goal. Decades after the nations of the world came together to form the United Nations system with a determination to build peace and security for all, conflicts continue to rage claiming countless lives, displacing millions of people, and threatening to destroy our common heritage.

This is the long walk of peace. Through a wide variety of concrete examples, this book seeks to demonstrate how the UN has pursued – and continues to pursue – the goal of preventing conflict in many different settings across the world, often with several partners. It places the evolving concept of peace in a historical perspective and highlights a number of pressing issues that will need to be addressed in order to shape a world where all can enjoy peace.

UNESCO embarked upon this research project in 2015, together with the Abat Oliba CEU University in Barcelona and thirty-two dedicated sister agencies. Developed within the context of the UN International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures (2013-2022), this book testifies to the growing recognition that peace and dialogue are fundamentally inter-dependent.

It is my profound hope and conviction that “Long Walk of Peace: Towards a Culture of Prevention” can inspire all of those who know that the walk may be long, but walking it together is vital for building stable, thriving societies.

Audrey Azoulay
Director-General of UNESCO
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"The world will live in peace, only when the individuals composing it make up their minds to do so."
(Mahatma Gandhi, 1946)

"[P]eace should never be taken for granted. It is an on-going process, a long-term goal which requires constant engineering, vigilance and active participation by all individuals. It is a choice to be made on each situation, an everyday life decision to engage in sincere dialogue with other individuals and communities, whether they live a block or a click away."
(UNESCO, 2013)

The idea of peace has long been presented as one of the most cherished goals of humanity, a vital precondition to fulfilling its potential. Peace is an overarching expression that denotes the ambitious quest of living together in harmony. As Johan Galtung (1969: 167), one of the founders of peace research remarks: ‘It provides opponents with a one-word language in which to express values of concern and togetherness because peace is on anybody’s agenda. Peace serves as a means of obtaining verbal consensus, as it is hard to be all-out against peace’. It is no wonder that the vast majority of humanity has preferred, and actively worked towards, creating institutions and structures of peace. The creation of the United Nations (UN) with the objective ‘to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war’ is a historic expression of this ongoing quest.
Peace is a continuous process and a journey of discovery. It requires constant reviewing and updating based on changing realities on the ground and the specific time and context. It is therefore not surprising that the concept of peace, despite its universal appeal, defies a common definition. Aside from the ever-changing imperatives of peace, there are numerous contestations about its underlying philosophies, preferred values and methodologies.

Most of the conventional Western discourse established a sharp distinction between war and peace and typically defined peace as the absence of war, a view that is foundational attributed to the philosophy of Hobbes. Philosophers like Spinoza, on the other hand, have employed this binary conception to interpret the autonomy and primacy of peace as a function of power. Some extreme opinions have even gone so far as to view peace as a part of the ‘system’ of war. Michel Foucault famously remarks that ‘war is the motor behind institutions and order. .... [P]eace itself is a coded war’ (2003: 50-51). There are similar debates and contentions about peace in other cultures and traditions. Notwithstanding the maze of divergent interpretations and contentions, peace is too vital a cause to be left without conceptual clarity. As Oliver Richmond (2005: 207) puts it: ‘To know peace, provides a clearer understanding of what must be done, and what must be avoided, if it is to be achieved’. This dictum is especially relevant in the case of the UN peace agenda, which has evolved and expanded its manifold horizons amid the global transformations and disruptions of recent decades.

Beginning essentially with the Eurocentric security concerns embedded in Cold War legacies, the UN peace agenda has undergone multiple transformations to include innovative methodologies and holistic visions of peace. The expanding UN peace agenda has mainstreamed a range of societal concerns in peace discourses that were previously relegated to the sidelines. Today, peace is not only about war and large-scale violence, but also about social justice, poverty alleviation, women’s empowerment, and harnessing the potential of young people and children’s welfare. It also brings to the fore environmental, health and cultural concerns, including heritage, music, theatre and sports. The emerging concept of ‘sustaining peace’ linked organically with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) offers a holistic approach towards achieving a culture of prevention.

Alongside remarkable developments signifying progress and innovations, the UN peace agenda has had to reckon with multi-layered criticisms. For instance, many scholars interrogate the foundational influence of Eurocentric visions, which confined global peace and security to Cold War legacies, disregarding decolonization conflicts and related struggles. Detractors also question the continuing hegemony of powerful countries and financial institutions in moulding liberal peacebuilding in ways that might legitimize the crafting and continuation of neo-colonial structures within emerging
national systems of governance. These and many other issues have resonated and polarized opinions in UN corridors, as well as in global scholarship.

Obviously, a range of comprehensive studies both at the conceptual and empirical level are required to arrive at a verdict – a task beyond the scope of this study. It is, however, possible to discern some of the prominent trends in the evolution of the UN peace agenda by employing the academic insights of peace and conflict studies. This is the raison d’être of this publication.

This study, jointly undertaken by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Abat Oliba CEU University in Barcelona, represents the collaborative efforts of several scholars, experts and UN staff from a wide range of backgrounds to compile an inspirational review of the UN peace agenda, its progress and challenges. It is yet another expression of UNESCO’s mandate to help accomplish the goals of the International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures (2013–2022), in consultation with over 30 UN agencies, funds and programmes (AFPs).

Several distinctive features of this volume set it apart from other comparable studies. Part I, entitled Perspectives from Peace Research, presents an overview of some of the leading academic perspectives from peace and conflict studies that have evolved in parallel with the UN system, adding to its intellectual resources. While many lessons can be extrapolated from the UN’s experience, these academic discourses have their own contribution to make. Such a scholarly purview places peace on a wide continuum and provides an instructive vantage point from which to view the dynamic evolution of the UN peace agenda.

Along with providing a conceptual delineation of peace, Part I analyses the dynamic evolution of the UN peace agenda around a range of queries: Are there any distinct patterns in the way the UN peace agenda has grown since its foundation? How have the geopolitical transformations and disruptions in the wake of the Cold War and its attenuation moulded the imperatives of peace for various UN agencies and entities? How has the UN evolved and innovated its various methodologies to meet the changing nature of conflicts? Does the UN Secretary-General’s recent focus on conflict prevention and political solutions to conflict exemplify a new surge in ‘diplomacy for peace’? Is the UN on the threshold of redefining the traditional concept of peace with the emerging philosophy of ‘sustaining peace’ in tandem with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)? Does this new approach encourage Member States and UN agencies to acknowledge that peace is ‘everyone’s business’? Might ‘sustaining peace’ be viewed as another ‘Trojan horse for outside intervention’ (Mahmoud, 2017: 1), like some other approaches? Or should the focus be on identifying context-specific factors as a starting point for sustaining peace, making it primarily a local process best undertaken through national policies and local actors?
And how does this problematic relate to critical and emancipatory discourses on peace, especially around the imperative of local ownership of building peace, or the ‘local turn’ as it is called? Part I of this volume analyses these issues and others, as the UN peace agenda moves towards a culture of prevention.

Part II of this volume, entitled Preventing Conflict and Sustaining Peace: the UN System in Action, is an equally innovative segment that brings together the experiential insights of 32 UN entities whose work contributes to peace, casting new light on a range of meaningful, if less recognized operations. Despite the political restrictions imposed by the Cold War, UN agencies continued to promote the larger imperatives of a peaceful world within their respective areas of competence. The numerous resolutions, reports and action plans of many UN entities vividly reflect such concerns and activities that contribute to peace. These multi-dimensional contributions in varied areas such as human rights protection, development, gender equality, justice and environmental preservation, while not viewed previously as peace work, now lie at the fore of emerging discourses on peace, both within and outside the UN system. This is largely due to the continued expansion and deepening understanding of areas that contribute towards peace.

Part II highlights some of the conceptual approaches of UN agencies, funds and programmes reflected in the broadening basis of UN work on achieving peace within and across the ‘pillars’ of peace and security, development and human rights. It explores the numerous ways in which UN entities have engaged in peace activities: whether in active conflict, post-conflict, fragile or latent conflict situations. The discussion brings out the multi-dimensional and multi-sectoral aspects of nurturing peace and shared responsibilities among all stakeholders of the UN system. Furthermore, it supplements current UN attempts to broaden and deepen the concept of peace through the adoption of the SDGs and efforts towards sustaining peace.

While Parts I and II raise fresh perspectives about the accomplishments and challenges facing the UN system and its AFPs, Part III, entitled Epilogue: The Way Ahead, brings together experiential insights, lessons learned and recommendations to enrich ongoing efforts to revitalize the UN peace agenda. Finally, the Annexes present well-researched reviews on landmark UN resolutions, declarations and documents that help to contextualize major shifts in the UN peace agenda over the past decades.

Overall, this unique publication is a befitting expression of the UNESCO mandate to explore the progress and challenges of the UN peace agenda, in consultation with UN entities, specifically in the context of the International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures.
The evolution of the UN peace agenda, since its inception to the present day, is linked to changing trends and debates in peace and conflict studies. The conceptual progression from negative to positive peace, and from the ‘universalism’ of liberal theories of peace to national or local ownership of peace corresponds closely to similar developments in UN parlance. The following discussion focuses in particular on Johan Galtung’s groundbreaking interpretations of ‘positive peace’ embedded in Mahatma Gandhi’s visions of active non-violence, John Paul Lederach’s ‘just peace’ and conflict transformation, Peter Wallensteen’s ‘quality of peace’, Amartya Sen’s ‘development and human security’, liberal peacebuilding and its detractors, and Oliver Richmond’s and Roger Mac Ginty’s critical take on the ‘local turn’ and ‘hybrid peace’.

The choices made and the approaches chosen here follow a twofold rationale: their transformative impact in ushering marked shifts in contemporary peace discourses, and their relevance in conceptualizing the changing dynamics of the UN peace agenda in the past decades.
PEACE: PLURAL AND DIVERSE

There is now an emerging consensus among peace researchers that terms such as ‘peace’ and ‘peacebuilding’ cannot be precisely defined because they ‘represent durable and coherent domains of concern [that] have their own set of norms and assumptions’ as well as ‘containing contradictions, which is what prevents their being expressed in universally accepted definitions’ (Buzan, 1984: 125). In a similar vein, Oliver Richmond argues that, ‘many assertions about peace are forms of orientalism in that they depend upon actors who know peace, then creating it for those that do not, either through their acts or more through the peace discourses that are employed to describe conflict and war as located in opposition to agents of peace’ (Richmond, 2006: 307-308).

Many critical perspectives interrogate the effort to assert a universally valid ontology and methodology of peace. The reductionist and universalistic approaches emerging from the West, and its influential institutions, are being questioned by a new generation of scholars from postmodern, postcolonial and feminist perspectives (Heathershaw, 2008). These writers construe peace as a diverse and relational phenomenon that must accommodate images and efforts from diverse cultures, as well as from the subaltern and marginal strata of the society (Dietrich, 2012; Mac Ginty, 2006; Samaddar, 2004; Upadhyaya, 2013). In the postmodern context, peace is in permanent flow and should be reinvented in every context, never confined within a rigid rational structure (Álvarez, 2014: 63). Such plural understandings also complement Mahatma Gandhi’s injunction to ‘be the change we want to see in the world’, which acknowledges that approaches useful for personal transformation can hold similar potential for social healing and transformation.

A very different trajectory has been pursued by scholars who underscore the associations of ‘peace’ with a wide range of expressions and meanings in different cultures and languages (Anderson, 2004; Dietrich et al., 2011). For instance, in Mandarin Chinese the word peace (hépíng) combines two characters, one signifying the harmonious (hé), the other the level or balanced (píng). In Hindi and Sanskrit, the expression for peace is Shanti (śānti), which emphasizes spiritual and inner peace and harmony with nature. In the Hebrew language, peace is translated as shalom, and in Arabic it is translated as salaam, which is also the root word for Islam (Anderson, 2004). Across the world, expressions for peace are infused with deep-rooted values and associations, a far cry from the contemporary term ‘peace’, which has been stripped to the minimalistic ‘absence of violence’.

Peace researcher Wolfgang Dietrich has explored the varied meanings of peace in different cultures. While discounting the narrow application of a singular and universal notion of peace, Dietrich and his colleagues promote the idea of world peace as a plural of ‘many peace[s]’, and maintain that peace should be perceived as a plurality
in which many versions of peace can be sought – and indeed have been sought – throughout recorded history (Dietrich et al., 2011). Christopher Mitchell notes that: “To any peace and conflict researcher brought up in a “North Atlantic” tradition of positivism, empiricism, and practice, the notion that the term peace itself can have a multitude of meanings in a wide variety of cultures and traditions – in other words, a contested concept – can initially be rather disturbing” (Mitchell, 2012: vii).

The paradigm of ‘many peaces’ challenges the universally projected conceptualization of peace as a singular and uniform idea, which negates its wide-ranging patterns in diverse cultural, social, economic and political conditions.

**TOWARDS POSITIVE PEACE**

The definition of peace as the ‘absence of war’ is probably the most popular and yet simplified definition of peace. However, numerous scholars and activists describe this narrow interpretation as ‘negative peace’ across cultures. ‘Positive peace’ has been posited as an alternative definition of peace embodying broader issues of development and social justice. Johan Galtung’s ‘positive peace’, Kenneth Boulding’s ‘stable peace’ and John Burton’s ‘human needs’ were among the earliest attempts to broaden the peace template (Boulding, 1978; Burton, 1990; Galtung, 1969, 1985). In fact, the emergence of ‘peace research’ as a discipline is allied closely to the idea of ‘positive peace’ finding war as an aberration rather than a constant or primary state of affairs. This approach construes peace as an autonomous, primary, indigenous, normal and ontologically permanent state of being (Gleditsch, 2014; Rogers and Ramsbotham, 1999).

Galtung defines ‘positive peace’ as the absence of structural violence, which concerns structure-generated rather than actor-generated harm to human beings. Structural violence refers to the social, economic and political conditions embedded in unequal, unjust and unrepresentative social structures that contribute systematically to violence, inequality and injustice, or lack of access to social services contributing to death, poor health, or the repression of individuals or groups of individuals within a society (Galtung, 1969). These conditions threaten the very survival of an individual – his or her general physical well-being, personal identity and freedom of choices.

Galtung also introduced the concept of ‘cultural violence’, which denotes cultural tools that legitimize different forms of violence as normal (Galtung, 1990). For example, one may be indifferent toward the homeless, or consider their expulsion or even extermination as a norm. According to Galtung, a precondition of ‘positive peace’ is the absence of both direct and indirect violence, where indirect violence connotes both structural and cultural violence.

While developing the concept of structural violence, Galtung was inspired by Mahatma Gandhi’s visions of non-violence. Gandhi spoke about the everyday violence
ingrained in the very structure of society and believed in the possibility of creating peace in the course of transforming unjust relationships, transcending structural conflicts through non-violent confrontation.

Gandhi, according to Galtung, was the only contemporary author or politician who ‘clearly fought against both the sudden, deliberate direct violence engaged in by actors, and the continuous, not necessarily intended, violence built into social structures’ (Galtung, 1975: 24). Gandhi offered an expanded definition of violence that included oppressive structures that erode and damage human dignity, and prevent humans from achieving their full potential. For Gandhi, deprivation and impoverishment are the visible markers of an unjust and violent social order.

Gandhi’s holistic vision of non-violent activism continues to stimulate innovative conceptual trajectories for coping with social injustice and external aggression peacefully. This has, in turn, led to the emergence of several successful non-violent movements in many parts of the world, steered by activists such as Joan Baez, Helder Camara, Cesar Chavez, Martin Luther King Jr, Gene Sharp, Desmond Tutu and many others (Upadhyaya, 2013). In 2007, the UN General Assembly declared 2 October, Mahatma Gandhi’s birthday, the International Day of Non-Violence. This has provided renewed recognition to the significance of non-violence as a universal path towards positive peace and social progress.

‘JUST PEACE’ AND CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION

The idea of ‘just peace’ is another notable contribution to the expanding horizons of peace. Defined by John Paul Lederach as a dynamic social construct, ‘just peace’ offers ‘approaches that reduce violence and destructive cycles of social interaction and at the same time increase justice in any human relationship’ (Lederach, 2005: 182). The broad project of building a ‘just peace’ in and between societies thus involves a wide range of activities and functions that both precede and follow formal peace accords. It involves the United Nations carrying out sanctions against terrorist groups in a way that promotes good governance, human rights, and economic development in the countries where the sanctions are targeted.... It involves educating the children of the next generation to transform their hatred into tolerance and even friendship.... It involves religious actors, who are all but ignored in most current thinking on peacebuilding. It involves combating inequalities that are embedded in global structures of power and wealth (Lederach and Appleby, 2010: 4).

Lederach’s pyramid of conflict describes three levels at which peace work should be carried out: ‘the grassroots, the leaders, and the middle level creating a genuine sense
of participation, responsibility, and ownership in the process across a broad spectrum of the population’ (Lederach, 1998: xvi). All actors in a dysfunctional or conflicting system interact across various social strata, from the grassroots to the middle range of regional experts, and from local leaders to heads of state. All these actors are relevant to the process of transformation, and they must all be addressed in a contextual manner, using appropriate forms of intervention.

As described by Lederach (1995: 212), the lens of conflict transformation focuses on the potential for constructive change emerging from and catalysed by conflict. To build peace, negative or destructive interaction patterns need to be transformed into positive or constructive relationships and interactions. Lederach (2005) further describes the imperative of applying moral imagination to imagine – much like an artist – creative ways to transcend the destructive patterns of day-to-day violence. Lederach’s ‘elicitive’ approach to conflict transformation paved the way for many more innovative conceptualizations of peace (Álvarez, 2014). For instance, Wolfgang Dietrich’s framework of many ‘peaces’ reintegrates spirituality into rational, modern and postmodern interpretations of peace (Dietrich, 2012).

LIBERAL DEMOCRATIC PEACE

The liberal democratic theory of peace, with its many variations, dominates the current scholarship of peace, as well as the policy discourses within international institutions. This theoretical framework assumes that democracies are unlikely to engage in mutual war and that democratic governance reinforces peace and stability within states. While numerous thinkers and scholars have substantiated the discourses on the liberal theory of peace, it essentially draws on Immanuel Kant’s essay in 1795 on ‘Perpetual Peace’. Proponents challenge the artificial dichotomy between the internal and external aspects of peacebuilding by establishing an empirical correlation between democracy and peace across borders. Scholars like Michael Doyle (2005) emphasize democratic and human rights-based governance, free trade, interdependence and involvement in international organizations as the prerequisites of peace.

The main variants of a liberal peace framework are the victor’s peace in which a negative peace is imposed by a victor in war, constitutional peace in which democracy and free trade are taken to be fundamental qualities of any peaceful state’s constitution, which in turn contributes to a positive peace, institutional peace in which international institutions, such as the United Nations, international financial institutions and state donors, act to maintain peace and order according to a mutually agreed framework of international law; and finally the civil peace tradition in which civil society organizations, NGOs, and domestic and transnational social movements seek
to uncover and rectify historical injustices that engender the risk of war (Richmond, 2014: 20).

**TOWARDS ‘THE LOCAL TURN’ AND ‘HYBRIDITY’**

Recently, there has been interest in ‘local ownership of peacebuilding’ where local actors are ‘integrated into the design and decision-making process’ of peacebuilding (Reich, 2006: 5-6). There is increasing recognition among international organizations and donor agencies of the legitimacy and sustainability advantages to be gained by cooperating with local partners. This new thinking, described as ‘the local turn’, is a consequence of increased assertiveness among local actors, paralleled by a loss of confidence among the major actors in international peace support, and the recognition that ‘peace building, state building and development should support their subjects rather than define them’ (Mac Ginty and Richmond, 2013: 769). This is reminiscent of the ‘orthodox’ dilemmas of the bottom-up approach in which actors are sensitive about local ownership and culture, but remain determined to transfer their methodologies, objectives and norms to the new governance framework (Richmond, 2006: 11). Today, contextual sensitivity is understood as a basic requirement of any peacebuilding project. Creative engagement with local actors and constituencies to ascertain local needs and expectations is not only a top priority, it is a key imperative of successful peacebuilding.

Along with the ‘local turn’ in international peacebuilding, there is renewed interest in exploring indigenous, customary and traditional institutions and approaches to conflict resolution and peacebuilding, and in considering whether they can co-exist with traditional and context-specific approaches to conflict resolution (Upadhyaya and Upadhyaya, 2017). The key issue is whether such co-existence leads to more or better conflict resolution options for the population, thereby promoting conflict settlement processes (Galvanek and Planta, 2017).

The ‘local turn’ may in certain respects contradict the universalism that lies at the heart of the liberal peace model, as well as notions of universal human rights. However, the focus on local agency highlights the multifaceted nature of peace and redefines the meaning of peace and legitimacy in different contexts, from maintaining a livelihood to striving for autonomy, aspiring for social justice or expressing an identity. One implication of the ‘local turn’ is a retreat from some of the certitudes and binaries that underpin conventional modes of thinking. This opens up the possibility of emancipation and empathy in a local to global framework. In comparison to the top-down service delivery and capacity-building approach, the ‘local turn’ is grounded in grass-root perspectives, drawing on the values, identity and needs of subjects, rather than the ‘benevolent’ assumptions of national
and global elites, whose vanguard cosmopolitanism and centralized narratives of peace and globalization seldom manifest themselves in sustainable outcomes.

Described as hybrid forms of peace, the new generation of peace theories represents a combination of norms and interests prescribed by international actors as well as local actors and their cultural imperatives. Peace in such emerging visions is no longer viewed as a state-centric activity, but rather as everyone’s business. It revolves more around everyday action in accepting, resisting and reshaping interventions, and the unique forms of peace that emerge from interactions between local and international actors (Richmond and Mitchell, 2012).

**DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVES AND HUMAN SECURITY**

Development perspectives have influenced the advancing approaches to peace, ushering in a range of new concepts and theorizations. Recent decades have seen worthy attempts to bring together the twin conceptual trajectories of peace and development, which overlap and intersect in numerous ways. Taken together they provide a useful guide to analysing conflict-inducing vectors such as poverty, resource scarcity, structural inequalities, food insecurity, gender violence and environmental degradation. Among others, Amartya Sen’s (1999) theorization of ‘development as freedom’ offers an important perspective. Sen conceives of poverty as lack of the capability to live a good life and ‘development’ as the expansion of this capability. Building on Sen’s ideas, Martha Nussbaum (2011) provided a capability theory of justice derived from the requirements of human dignity, a list of central capabilities to be incorporated into national constitutions and guaranteed up to a certain threshold. This new conceptualization reflecting human development became the cornerstone of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

Some researchers have conjectured a ‘theory of peace as freedom’ (Barnett, 2008), supplementing Galtung’s vision of structural violence. Peace from this perspective is predicated on the equitable distribution of economic opportunities, political freedoms, social opportunities, transparency guarantees, protective security and freedom from direct violence. This conceptual track highlights the imperative of pluralist institutions and agencies to provide and sustain peace as freedom.

In this context, the idea of human security stands out as the most relevant, complementing human development by paying direct attention to the security and safety of people. It suggests a paradigm shift from state-centric notions of security, which focus on the protection of state boundaries, institutions and values from external attacks. Post-Cold War intra-state violence unveiled a new phase wherein the state was frequently found wanting in its role as the protector of people, ensuring ‘freedom from
fear’ and ‘freedom from want’. Evidently, the challenges of the twenty-first century necessitate an expanded notion of security, not restricted to the well-being of the state, but taking care of the basic security needs of the citizens residing therein. Human security concerns both protection and empowerment, with the aim of empowering people to take an active role in making their lives and communities more secure (Ogata, 2015: 25). Emphasizing complementarities between the notions of ‘positive peace’ and ‘human security’, former UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali called for ‘an integrated approach to human security’ to address ‘the deepest causes of conflict: economic despair, social injustice, and political oppression’ (1992: 43-44).

As affirmed by UNDP reports since 1994, human security is defined around two aspects: freedom from fear and freedom from want, including safety from chronic threats such as hunger, disease, repression and protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions to the patterns of daily life (Hamel, 2001; Human Security Centre, 2005). This definition dovetails with the notion of the capability approach. Subsequent UNDP documents maintained that threats to human security at the societal level are root causes of protracted internal violence, thus recommending peacebuilding to support divided societies in their efforts to prevent violent conflict. Echoing this, former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan observed that the peace agenda itself should be revisited: ‘[w]e must also broaden our view of what is meant by peace and security.... it must encompass economic development, social justice, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament, and respect for human rights and the rule of law’ (Annan, 2001). The search for alternative approaches to meet new security challenges led to the establishment of the Commission on Human Security, which prepared a comprehensive report entitled Human Security Now, following two years of comprehensive discussion with various stakeholders. The report offers an innovative framework of action that addresses critical threats to human security.

The quality of peace

Liberal and emancipatory peace discourses have now begun to consider the assumed qualities of peace as a sine qua non for successful peacebuilding engagement. However, there is increasing scepticism about the type of peace being referred to, who defines it, and for what reasons. Oliver Richmond observes: ‘The way in which we think about peace, both in conceptual and ontological terms and the methods we apply to construct it, have a significant impact on the qualitative sustainability of this peace’ (2005: 394).

The notion of ‘quality peace’ has recently emerged as an innovative tool to spell out conditions and strategies that could pre-empt the recurrence of war and make peacebuilding a sustainable effort. Peter Wallensteen (2015) provides a model of ‘quality
peace’ that aims to overcome the traditional dichotomy of negative versus positive peace. Drawing on past peacebuilding experiences, he defines quality peace as the creation of post-war conditions that make the inhabitants of a society (whether an area, a country, a region, a continent or a planet) secure in life and dignity, now and for the foreseeable future. Peace is not simply a matter of living without war for a period: ‘It is a matter of maintaining conditions that don’t produce wars in the first place or – as some form of peace has failed previously – not repeating the same failure’ (Wallensteen, 2015: 6-7).

The quality of peace is composed of three critical standards: security, dignity and predictability (or durability). The consolidation of peacebuilding requires the assurance of security, equal rights and respect for the dignity of all inhabitants and stakeholders in the conflict. Wallensteen refers to the citing of human dignity in the UN Charter and amplifies its significance to argue that: ‘Violation of dignity in the form of discrimination, repression and persecution may have sparked the war that the world much later tries to prevent from recurring’ (ibid).

**Women and peace**

The widened concept of peace not only includes gender-related structural violence, but also the role of women in peacemaking and post-conflict reconciliation. Most of the recent studies and publications that link gender and peace reinforce a holistic vision of peace, defying the narrow confines of the statist notion of security and highlighting, instead, everyday insecurities. Feminist perspectives, thus, fundamentally disagree with the hitherto dominant concepts of peace and security, and offer many alternate visions. For instance, gendered power relations and identity are recognized as socially constructed rather than static or inherent. As with other social relations and identities, gender relations are inevitably reconfigured during a conflict (Haynes, Ni Aolain and Cahn, 2011; Kolás, 2017).

The promotion of women’s rights and equal political participation are among the key objectives of multilateral peacebuilding efforts today. Substantive scholarly effort has gone into the study of women’s empowerment in peacebuilding (Beckwith, 2005; Porter, 2003; Porter and Mundkur, 2012; Waylen, 2007). Much of this work has been carried out in ‘post-war’ countries such as Burundi, Liberia, Nepal and Sierra Leone, where multilateral and international organizations have played a major role in peacemaking and post-conflict interventions for women’s rights and gender equality. Such interventions are also a key topic of gender and peace studies (Black, 2009; Kuehnast, de Jonge Oudraat and Hernes, 2011; Mayanja, 2010; Mazurana, Raven-Roberts and Parpart, 2005; Tryggestad, 2009). A related strand of research focuses on the contributions of women peacebuilders to the establishment of a more
egalitarian post-conflict gender order. Beginning with the negotiations for a settlement, peacebuilding is construed as a potential site where women can both contribute to and benefit from lasting and inclusive peace (Banaszak et al., 2005).

Indeed, women have contributed to peace in many different and documented cases, highlighting unique methodologies and skills for building alliances and interacting with other conflict stakeholders (Anderlini, 2007). Women can provide a different notion of peace and tend to take a more holistic approach. They are also often more capable of reaching across to the ‘enemy’, including people of different cultures, ethnicities and so on. Yet, contrary to stereotypes of women as united and ‘natural mediators’ between conflict actors or ‘anchors of peace’, they are just as likely as men to engage in divisive political rivalry (Kolås, 2017). Hence, women’s engagement in peace processes offers no shortcuts to peace, nor should such processes be seen as providing the best windows of opportunity for women’s empowerment. This, however, does not mitigate their immense potential in peacebuilding. There is a need for more critical engagement with the women, peace and security literature and its assumptions, highlighting both local perspectives on the meaning of gender (in)equality, and experiences from conflicts where multilateral intervention is absent.

**Peace as an ecosystem**

Peace research has kept a continuous focus on the ways in which resource scarcity and unbridled development generate large-scale displacement, insidious civil strife and insurgency. Environmental degradation and excessive exploitation of natural resources, engendered by unsustainable consumption and population pressure, not only aggravate existing conflict, but also hinder its resolution (Kahl, 2007). Climate change is fraught with similar conflict-generating potential, especially in fragile states and among populations living in extreme poverty.

Recent research on environmental and resource-related conflicts has identified multiple linkages between peace and sustainable development. This has led to the recognition that a harmonious ecosystem functions as a hub of peacebuilding. In many traditional cultures, peace connotes a pathway to expanding human potential without harming others in the community or the larger ecosystem. Hindus, for instance, evoke planetary peace in their prayers, while celebrating the Earth as one family (Upadhyaya, 2013). Mahatma Gandhi’s dictum of living in harmony with the environment influenced philosopher Arne Næss, who in turn coined the term ‘deep ecology’ (Næss, 1989; Weber, 1999). Related conceptualizations such as ‘ecological peace’ provide ‘a better understanding of the inherent capacities of the environment to inform and sustain peace’ (Kyrou, 2007). More recently, numerous studies have connected hitherto compartmentalized research on
ecological integrity, socio-economic justice, democracy, non-violence and peace. Vandana Shiva, for instance, unravels the links between issues such as genetically modified food, cultural theft and natural resource privatization, and the rising tide of fundamentalism, violence against women and planetary death. She also writes about new kinds of wars being waged around ecology and the ethical limits to profit, where the enemies are coercive free trade treaties and production technologies based on violence, bioengineering and nanotechnologies (Shiva, 2005).

One remarkable initiative in this area is the Earth Charter, which has generated a composite pedagogy linking together the human community, ecology and planetary concerns in a mutually enriching manner. The Earth Charter project, which began as a UN initiative, was carried forward and launched on 29 June 2000 by the Earth Charter Commission, a global civil society initiative. The preamble of the Earth Charter serves as an expression of people’s quest for ‘a sustainable global society founded on respect for nature, human rights, economic justice, and culture of peace’. The pedagogy of the Earth Charter presents practical visions of ecosystem protection, equitable and sustainable development, the eradication of poverty, accountability, transparency and prevention of conflict. The production of such transformative knowledge may lead to a much-needed review of policies and actions intrinsic to ushering in democratic, equitable and ecologically sound communities, and provide inclusive guidelines for sustainability drawing on indigenous knowledge as well as planetary imperatives.

PEACE EDUCATION AND MULTICULTURAL LITERACY

Peace education has long been recognized as a transformative vector for sustainable peace. It is defined as the ‘process of promoting the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values needed to bring about behavioural changes that will enable children, youth and adults to prevent conflict and violence, both overt and structural; to resolve conflict peacefully; and to create the conditions conducive to peace, whether at an intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup, national or international level’ (Fountain, 1999: i). Imbued with the values of non-violence, human rights and social justice, peace education can create peaceful constituencies that can help prevent conflict, resolve conflict peacefully when it arises, and create social conditions conducive to peace. Non-violent social movements associated with Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr. inspired an ethos of a ‘culture of peace’ – an idea furthered nurtured by Felipe Mac Gregor and academics such as Michael True and David Adams within the UN context (Adams and True, 1997).

Alongside peace education, scholars have highlighted the imperatives of multicultural literacy in today’s diverse and troubled world. They argue that global
problems are not a result of lack of basic reading and writing skills, but can instead be traced to the inability of people from different cultures, races, religions and nations to co-exist peacefully and work together to solve intractable problems such as global warming, the HIV/AIDS epidemic, poverty, racism, sexism and war (Banks, 2003; Kriesberg, Northrup and Thorson, 1989; Shmueli, Elliott and Kaufman, 2006). Multicultural literacy prepares citizens to explore diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives to create a more humane and just world. It entails an awareness and appreciation of different beliefs, appearances and lifestyles and ‘of the poly-cultural origins of a global intellectual heritage and understanding that bespeak a multipolar worldview even if it manifests in an apparently fragmented form’ (Taylor and Hoechsmann, 2012).

Certainly, ignorance of the customs and lifestyles of other cultures and the resultant suspicion and mistrust are a common cause of conflict and violence. Sectarian violence often occurs when both sides maintain an illusion of what constitutes the ‘other’ (Sen, 2006). The deep fissures in social justice and surges of radicalization and violent extremism in recent years clearly indicate that the values of pluralism and tolerance embedded in a culture of peace have yet to be assimilated in our societies. The respect for diversity in everyday life is a *sine qua non* for positive peace, denoting the optimum realization of human potential. This can only be achieved through structures and processes that nurture constant dialogue through the active participation of individuals and communities.

Lately, there has been a notable upsurge in arts-based contributions to conflict transformation and peacebuilding. Peace campaigns often receive the support of the visual and literary arts, films, theatre, music and dance with a view to facilitating intercultural understanding and promoting a non-violent culture of peace. Efforts are also being made to utilize the press and the media to promote peacebuilding, rather than encourage intolerance.

**RESURGENT PERSPECTIVES**

The gradual broadening and deepening of the conceptual understanding of peace reflects changing imperatives during the post-Second World War period. First-generation approaches, steeped in Cold War legacies, has focused on the management of inter-state conflicts as the core concern of peacebuilding. The absence or cessation of physical violence was the *sine qua non* in such conceptions of peace. The next generation focused more on the positive dimensions of peace, and highlighted conflict transformation as an approach to addressing basic human needs, as well as issues of economic inequality, social oppression and justice. New and upcoming approaches to peace promise greater inclusion of emancipatory
discourse and the recognition of a range of actors, from the grass roots to elite levels and transnational peace agencies, as well as participatory forms of democracy ranging from the local to the global.

Indeed, the scholarship on peace, as well as institutional practice, is still mired in tensions between the proponents of a universal, objective and singular approach to peace, and those who view it as plural, diverse, subjective and culturally contextual. The schism between the two approaches is not only theoretical, it also has a critical bearing on the institutional practices of peacebuilding. While Universalists insist on universal norms and principals, and centralized coordination, integration and ‘delivering as one’, their opponents argue for the local ownership of peace, indigenous knowledge and skills, and local participation in the peace process.

However, serious efforts are now underway to reconcile these contrary positions by adopting positive elements from both. Gëzim Visoka (2016), for instance, highlights the importance of bringing about ‘peace between peace theories’. He suggests that ‘reality congruent’ research can help find a path drawing on the strengths of both liberal interventionism and critical emancipatory approaches. Visoka draws on Norbert Elias’s ideas of ‘figurational sociology’ to explore structured configurations, unexpected outcomes and agency in a locally rooted approach that goes beyond critical thinking to explore ways to advance more ethical and more useful research findings. In practice, though, the emerging trend in several conflict zones favours hybrid forms of peace, blending international norms of liberal peace and interests with local forms of agency and identity. Scholars such as Richmond (2014: 125) describe such phenomena as ‘the emergence of a post-liberal peace in hybrid form (i.e. a positive hybrid form of peace), representing the next step in peace theory and practice’.

THE UN PEACE AGENDA: FOUNDATIONS AND EVOLUTION

The origins of the United Nations lie in the upheavals of the Second World War, and are thus deeply embedded in the quest for peace. Beginning with its foundational commitment to ‘save succeeding generations from the scourge of war’, the United Nations Charter established three founding pillars: peace and security, human rights and development. The coupling of peace and security with human rights and development gave a broader meaning to the concept of ‘peace’ within the UN system.

The conceptual progression of peace in the UN system from its three foundational pillars has recently been linked to the 5 Ps of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) – people, planet, prosperity, partnership and peace. The resulting perspectives on peace pay particular attention to contemporary concerns including: women and
peace, peace as an ecosystem, peace education and multicultural literacy, all of which have transformed the scope of the UN peace agenda in myriad ways.

Notwithstanding the immediate challenge of creating an international security structure and instruments to avoid the carnage caused by the Second World War, the founders of the United Nations were conscious of the multiple ways in which peace must be nurtured over the long term. The preamble of the Constitution of UNESCO, which highlights the need to construct the defences of peace in the minds of men, is a quintessential example of such a holistic understanding.

In its formative decades, however, the UN peace agenda was constrained by the standoff between the Cold War adversaries, and hopes that the wartime allies would continue their cooperation into the post-war era proved short-lived. Extensive use of veto powers restrained the UN Security Council (UNSC) from carrying out its primary responsibility of maintaining peace and security. For its part, the UN General Assembly (UNGA) sought a greater role in matters of peace and security, as its reach broadened and its membership grew. Ironically, in spite of initiating a historic ‘Uniting for Peace’ resolution, the Assembly was unable to substitute for the peacemaking role of the Security Council. The unceasing constraints imposed by the Cold War left little scope for UN agencies and entities to affirm their peace-inducing role in alleviating the scale and severity of indirect violence and related humanitarian crisis.

During this era, peace was generally conceptualized as the absence of large-scale interstate war. This narrow or minimalistic view posits war as an essential and constant feature of the interstate system, wherein peace is an exception – a contingent situation that typically occurs after the signing of a peace accord. Thus, despite the UN Charter’s holistic vision that ties peace and security to human rights and development, it was a narrow definition of peace that dominated the centre stage. Humanitarian, cultural and developmental aspects of peacebuilding largely subjugated to state-centric security (or peace as security) discourses.

Still, the formative years saw some remarkable developments including the 1948 adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and the creation of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in 1950. These and many other similar initiatives were to provide a larger context for building peace over the long term.

The unblocking of the Security Council in the early 1990s paved the way for a renewal of the UN’s prime commitment to preserving and maintaining peace. Starting with the ambitious launch of ‘An Agenda for Peace’ (AFP) (Boutros-Ghali, 1992) and continuing with the 2005 founding of the Peacebuilding Architecture (PBA), the UN ethos of peace
has progressed, engendering the concept of ‘sustaining peace’ and developing synergies with Agenda 2030 and the SDGs.

**Evolving trajectories: preventive diplomacy and peacemaking**

Perhaps the most significant indicator of the dynamic UN peace agenda has been the constant evolution of its methodologies to achieve peace. In the course of over seven decades, the UN has conceptualized, developed and fine-tuned a range of trajectories to ‘make’ peace in various conflict situations. Beginning with the challenges of post-war insecurities, the UN has constantly tried to modify its approach through the Cold War threats of large-scale interstate wars to the unprecedented spurt of civilian violence in a post-bipolar world. While preventive diplomacy and conflict prevention have elicited a stronger focus in recent times, methodologies such as peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding have taken on new dimensions in past decades to meet emerging forms of conflict and threats.

The term ‘preventive diplomacy’ was first coined in 1960 by the former UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld to describe efforts to pre-empt the escalation of superpower proxy wars in Third World countries into global confrontations. However, the UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali at that time, faced with an unprecedented spate of intra-state conflicts in the post-Cold War era, extended the scope of Hammarskjöld’s term to preventing regional conflicts from starting in the first place. Boutros-Ghali also extended conflict prevention to actions designed to keep violent conflicts from spreading geographically (Lund, 2009: 288).

The methodology of preventive diplomacy has been constantly enriched to meet new challenges. A significant step towards redefining the UN preventive approach was taken in 1992 with the launch of the report *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping* by then UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. Boutros-Ghali wanted the UN to adopt an integrated agenda with conflict prevention at its core, the aim of which would be: ‘to seek to identify at the earliest possible stage situations that could produce conflict, and to try through diplomacy to remove the sources of danger before violence resulted’ (Boutros-Ghali, 1992).

While *An Agenda for Peace* highlighted the importance of early warning, mediation, confidence-building measures, fact-finding, preventive deployment and peace zones, subsequent UN policy papers such as the *Agenda for Development* (1994) significantly expanded preventive measures to include such diverse vectors as humanitarian aid, arms control, social welfare, military deployment and the media. The preventive diplomacy track is now the centrepiece of the emerging concept of sustaining peace.
The concept of UN peacemaking has also evolved to embrace new meanings in different settings. It is generally viewed as an extension of parties’ own efforts to settle their conflict. However, when unable to reach an accommodation, the parties in question or the UN Security Council or the UN General Assembly may call upon the UN Secretary-General to use his/her ‘good offices’ to resolve the conflict in a peaceful manner. The Secretary-General may also undertake a peacemaking initiative on his/her own under the provisions of Article 99. Article 33 of the UN Charter mentions various methods of peacemaking by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies, or arrangements or other peaceful means preferred by the disputing parties. Articles 41 and 42 of the UN Charter also allow for sanctions, blockading and violent intervention in order to restore peace between warring states.

The inventory of peacemaking methods listed in the UN Charter have been substantiated by many subsequent documents including the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes (1982), and the Declaration on the Prevention and Removal of Disputes and Situations Which May Threaten International Peace and Security and on the Role of the United Nations in this Field (1988). An Agenda for Peace conceptualized peacemaking as part of a spectrum of activities comprising preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping and post-conflict peacebuilding. It defined peacemaking as ‘action to bring hostile parties to agreement, essentially through such peaceful means as those foreseen in chapter VI of the charter of the United Nations: Pacific Settlement of Disputes’. While the usage of force has not been traditionally a part of peacemaking efforts, the 1992 Agenda opened up the possibility of intervention in civil wars under certain circumstances, overriding Articles 2.4 and 2.7 of the UN Charter, which impose constraints on violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of states.

Similarly, the role of the UN Secretary-General in peacemaking has evolved over recent decades, largely through precedents. A greater focus on preventive diplomacy during the post-Cold War era by successive Secretary-Generals has led to a remarkable rise in the deployment of personal envoys or special rapporteur to facilitate peace agreements in protracted conflicts. To this end, intensive training programmes have been introduced for mid and senior-level officials within the UN, regional organizations, Member States and the representatives of indigenous peoples. The UNITAR-led Peacemaking and Conflict Prevention Programme, initiated in 1993, is one instructive example of UN efforts in conflict prevention and resolution. However, notwithstanding the recent ‘surge in diplomacy for peace’, peacemaking is unlikely to succeed in addressing contemporary conflicts alone, due to the changing nature of conflicts, which are mostly fought within state borders rather than between states. Accordingly, peacemaking is increasingly being contextualized as an organic part of a larger continuum alongside preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping and peacebuilding.
While the UN Charter does not refer to ‘peacekeeping’ *per se*, the concept was developed based on its general principles and, in subsequent years, became a core activity of the UN peace agenda. After the launch of the first UN peacekeeping mission in the Middle East in 1948, by the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), peacekeeping gradually developed into one of the main UN peace and security tools to defuse complex threats to international peace and security. The ‘Blue Helmets’ of peacekeepers are perhaps the most recognizable emblem of UN peace work around the world.

The UN markedly redefined its approach to peace and security in the wake of the 1956 Suez crisis. With the UNSC paralysed, the UN General Assembly passed a landmark resolution (GA Res. 998) on 4 November 1956, authorizing then Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjöld, to raise and deploy a UN Emergency Force (UNEF), in order to erect a physical barrier between Egypt and Israel. While the UNEF was not intended to resolve conflicts, it responded in an exemplary manner to ease a tense situation during its decade-long operation. The impartial and neutral role of the UNEF thus became the prototype of UN peacekeeping missions during the Cold War era.

In 1960, the UN launched a large-scale peacekeeping effort in the Congo, involving as many as 20,000 military personnel. The ‘peace enforcement’ mission known as the United Nations Operation in the Congo (Opération des Nations Unies au Congo, or ONUC) faced physical limitations and constant attacks from local groups. A total of 250 UN personnel died while serving on the ONUC mission, including UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld, whose plane crashed 1961 *en route* to ceasefire negotiations.¹

Regardless, the UN continued to mandate peacekeeping missions during the Cold War. During this time, the UN undertook 18 missions including the Mission of the Representative of the Secretary-General in the Dominican Republic (DOMREP), the UN Security Force in West New Guinea (UNSF), the UN Yemen Observation Mission (UNYOM), the UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), and several missions in the Middle East including UN Emergency Force II, UN Disengagement Observer Force and the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). Notwithstanding the limitations of the Cold War, peacekeepers contributed significantly to the cause of peace by defusing violent conflicts and creating situations conducive for negotiations between warring parties. In 1988, the UN peacekeeping forces were awarded the Nobel

---

¹ Dag Hammarskjöld was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize posthumously shortly after his death.
Peace Prize. According to the Nobel Peace Prize Committee, the forces represented ‘the manifest will of the community of nations’ and were granted the Peace Prize for their ‘decisive contribution’ to the resolution of conflicts across the world.

Indeed, the purpose and scope of UN peacekeeping operations expanded in manifold ways during the post-Cold War era with the emergence of post-conflict peacebuilding. This was a result of the post-bipolar consensus to provide a greater role for the UN to address the unprecedented rise in intrastate conflicts. The number of blue-helmeted soldiers soared from about 15,000 in 1991 to more than 76,000 in 1994, with new responsibilities and tasks entrusted to their role.

While the early peacekeeping operations served as a physical barrier between two warring parties, peacekeepers were now dealing with a number of civil war situations and supervising the post-conflict implementation of complex, multidimensional peace agreements. In many situations, the peacekeepers carried out various police and civilian functions to help cope with underlying conflict. Beyond the traditional role of monitoring ceasefires, today’s peacekeepers are employed to facilitate national dialogue and reconciliation; implement disarmament, demobilization and reintegation of combatants; restore the rule of law and the protection of human rights; and conduct free and fair elections. As of today, 16 peacekeeping operations are ongoing on four continents under the aegis of the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), with a staff of more than 118,000 military, police and civilian personnel. Led by the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), UN peacekeeping is an instructive example of a UN entity transcending the provisions of the UN Charter to meet today’s complex challenges.

An Agenda for Peace affirmed peacebuilding as a key concern for the UN, and defined it as ‘the construction of a new environment’ to avoid the breakdown of peaceful conditions and prevent a recurrence of crisis, recognizing that ‘only sustained, cooperative work to deal with underlying economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems can place an achieved peace on a durable foundation’ (UN, 1992). This marked a turning point in the UN approach to peace, together with a reorientation and broadening of UN efforts to expand peacekeeping.

The idea of post-conflict peacebuilding was initially conceived as the final stage of a consecutive transition following preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacekeeping. However, this sequential approach to peacebuilding proved less helpful in resolving intrastate conflicts. A series of tragic conflicts in Bosnia, Rwanda and Somalia exposed the fault lines in post-Cold War peacekeeping, and despite partial successes in East Timor, El Salvador, Kosovo and Mozambique, confidence in the UN’s role as a global peacekeeper began to recede in the mid-1990s.
In their analyses of the waning role of UN peacebuilding the Brahimi Report (UN, 2000) and the Report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change (UN, 2004) identified deep-rooted challenges, suggesting the need for a more robust and realistic basis for a UN peacebuilding mandate. Aside from lacking a mandate and resources, peacebuilding efforts were fragmented (or ‘siloed’) and poorly coordinated between UN peacekeeping operations, political missions and the UN development system (Rosenthal et al., 2015: 11). The two reports also highlighted the need for closer cooperation between peacekeepers and peacebuilders to forge sustainable peace.

The growing realization that peacekeeping could not be sustained without building firm foundations for peace, was reflected in A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility, the 2004 report of the Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. This paved the way for setting up a Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in 2006 to ‘bring together the UN’s broad capacities and experience in conflict prevention, mediation, peacekeeping, respect for human rights, the rule of law, humanitarian assistance, reconstruction and long-term development’. The establishment of the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund supplemented the Commission, which combined came to be known as the UN Peacebuilding Architecture (PBA). The PBA was intended to serve as a dedicated institutional mechanism to assist countries in laying the foundations for sustainable peace and development. In 2010, however, a review of the PBA commissioned by the UN General Assembly acknowledged that the ‘threshold of success’ was yet to be achieved and that an ‘overall vision’ was lacking.

UN peacebuilding: critical perspectives

After the 1992 publication of An Agenda for Peace, peace researchers turned their critical attention to the concept of peacebuilding. Many felt that the emerging UN mandate for peacebuilding was grounded in the resurgence of liberal internationalism and the idea of a democratic transition to peace (Bertram, 1995; Heathershaw, 2008). This idea was supported by development research promoting good governance to remedy fragile states, coupled with peace research asserting that democracies are unlikely to go to war against each other (Gleditsch and Hegre, 1997). Together, research on ‘liberal peace’ provided arguments in favour of economic development and democratization as the pathway to a prosperous, peaceful world.

As the ‘liberal peace’ agenda took hold, researchers started to raise questions focusing on the underpinnings of contemporary ideas about peacebuilding in liberal ideology, as well as the organization of multilateral peacebuilding institutions, mechanisms and frameworks. These critiques centred on the peacebuilding potential of
the twin tenets of the 'liberal peace' project: democratization and economic liberalization (Boyce, 1996, 2002; Luckham, 2005; Luckham, Goetz and Kaldor, 2003; Mansfield and Snyder, 2005; Paris, 2002, 2004). As described by Neclâ Tschirgi (2004: 4–5), the liberal peacebuilding ‘template’ was based on the premise that fundamental social ‘engineering’ of conflict-prone societies is essential to prevent their relapse into conflict. This view was typically applied to the aftermath of civil war, starting with the signing of a mediated peace agreement and involving financial aid from the international donor community and assistance from multilateral agencies.

Peacebuilding assistance was developed as a package of standard remedies to be applied in different contexts across the world (Tschirgi, 2004), involving the creation of an interim or transitional government; the drafting of a constitution; the development of new or revised election systems; judiciary and security sector reform (SSR); the demobilization, disarmament and reintegration of ex-combatants (DDR); post-conflict reconstruction schemes; gender equality measures; repatriation programmes for refugees; truth commissions and war crimes tribunals.

The conceptual framework of ‘integrated’ post-conflict reconstruction has been critiqued from a range of perspectives. Most prominent is the contention that the new model of peacebuilding represented a hegemonic application of Western ideas and practices, applied rather condescendingly and without exploring other suitable modes of peacebuilding (Mac Ginty, 2006: 144). In the words of Oliver Richmond (2004: 91): ‘The question of what peace might be expected to look like from the inside is given less credence than the way the international community and its organizers and actors desire to see it from the outside’. According to Roger Mac Ginty and Oliver Richmond (2013: 764) this ‘tension is also visible in contradictions between local and international perspectives of what peace is and how it may be achieved. These contradictions lie in the international structure, its historical evolution, in power, understandings of rights, representation, norms, law and society’.

Writing on market liberalism and peacebuilding, researchers such as James Boyce (1996, 2002) and Roland Paris (2002, 2004) challenged the donor-driven preference for marketization, arguing that economic liberalization is ill-suited and counterproductive to post-conflict peacebuilding due to the potentially destabilizing effects of economic and political competition in fragile societies. Regarding the notion of democratic peace, scholars such as Robin Luckham (2005: 36) warned that ‘democracy is not the infallible solution to a conflict that it is often supposed to be’, cautioning that democracies have their own unique set of problems when determining responses to internal conflict. Despite the long-term effects of conflict, political violence may be a tempting option within the short time span of an election. As Luckham (ibid) points out, ‘it cannot be taken for granted that democracy will be sustainable, that it will support rather than get in the way of reconstruction, or that it will foster conflict resolution’.
Researchers also describe numerous cases of civil war and devastating internal conflict in democracies, further challenging the equation of peace and democratization (Collier and Hoeffler, 2000; Collier et al., 2003). Bidisha Biswas (2006: 46) refers to the case of Sri Lanka, arguing that in countries where ‘war coexists with stable, democratic institutions, conflict management becomes a complex process of balancing competing demands within the government’. For other democracies to avoid the same pitfalls, new and innovative approaches to peacebuilding should be encouraged, replacing narrow military solutions with non-coercive interventions designed to more comprehensively address complex environments.

Critiques of the ‘interventionist’ approach to peacebuilding are reflected in a range of debates, covering ethical and legal questions about the use of armed forces in peacebuilding missions, dilemmas associated with top-down ‘social engineering’ in peacebuilding, challenges of enforcing gender equality through women’s participation in peacebuilding and peace processes, and the ‘culture critique’ of the indiscriminate application of Western assumptions about conflict resolution to societies around the world.

The scholarly debate on ‘new wars’ questions international peacebuilding practices and theoretical approaches in important ways. David Keen (2008) highlights the problems faced by many peacebuilding organizations working in conflict zones, including the self-fulfilling nature of aid, organizational agenda-setting that ensures ‘success’, and the tendency to overlook abuses by those in power to bolster allegiances and access. Writing on the links between protracted conflicts and the structure and practice of development aid, Olympio Barbanti (2006) argues that development practitioners tend to overlook conflict scenarios that are present prior to interventions, and disregard the potential of development intervention to aggravate conflict. When aid programmes also fail to address underlying social triggers of conflict, aid delivery must be recognized as an important contributor to conflict.

In response to repeated failures to produce peace through military operations, serious questions have been raised about the ethical and legal consequences of military intervention on humanitarian grounds, and difficulties in differentiating between a humanitarian intervention and an operation to achieve regime change. Writing on the securitization of the peace agenda, Tschirgi (2004: 17–18) argues that the term ‘peacebuilding’ has been conflated with a new post-9/11 discourse of ‘nation-building’, ‘regime change’ and ‘stabilization’, driven by the national security interests of dominant external actors, with the United States as the ‘critical player’. Robin Luckham (2005: 17–18) argues that this new interventionism is marked by a ‘developmentalization of
security’, as security and military experts find themselves called to implement development-based peacebuilding missions.

There is a wealth of well-researched evidence to show how measures to introduce market liberalization and democratization have, at times, fanned the flames of conflict, presenting a serious challenge to the ‘liberal peace’ agenda. The regional quarterly reviews carried out under UN Secretary-General’s ‘Human Rights Up Front Policy’ in countries with conflict-preventive dimensions are tempered by the critique of liberal peacebuilding, ranging from the questioning of ‘emancipatory’ humanitarian intervention and the ‘Responsibility to Protect’ (R2P), to calls for local ownership and participation in peace processes.

A corresponding trend in the applied peacebuilding literature was dominated by case studies of ‘post-conflict’ scenarios where the international community and multilateral agencies were involved in ‘state-building’ as a part of post-conflict reconstruction, especially after the limited success of such exercises in conflicts ranging from Afghanistan to the Balkans, East Timor, Iraq, Liberia, Nepal and Sierra Leone. Generally projected as a discourse of ‘universal norms’ of democracy, the free market economy, human rights, the rule of law and development, the ‘liberal peace’ framework tends to conflate different trajectories to peace, including the victor’s peace involving a hegemonic power, constitutional or democratic peace, institutional peace supported by the UN, and civil peace based on the collaboration of local civil societies in preventing war and conflict. This results in greater confusion, rather than clarity, around the concept of peace.

Of late, the top-down model of peacebuilding has come under increasing criticism. A burgeoning post-millennial body of research raised doubts about the contemporary liberal peacebuilding recipe, generating numerous ‘lessons learned’ and ‘best practices’. According to Lederach, modern peacebuilding needs to go beyond top-down statist diplomacy and focus on reconciliation and the rebuilding of relationships (Graf, Kramer and Nicolescu, 2007). Peacebuilding in its expanded version is defined as a ‘comprehensive concept that encompasses, generates, and sustains the full array of processes, approaches, and stages needed to transform conflict toward more sustainable, peaceful relationships’ (Lederach, 1997: 20). Peacebuilding activities may, therefore, contribute either to ending or avoiding armed conflict, and ‘may be carried out during armed conflict, in its wake, or as an attempt to prevent an anticipated armed conflict from starting’ (Smith, 2004: 20). Thus, peacebuilding may involve ‘working around conflict’, ‘working in conflict’ and ‘working on conflict’, where it is feasible (Kievelitz, Kruk and Frieters, 2003: 8).
Notwithstanding the expanding horizons of peacebuilding, some researchers still prefer ‘conflict transformation’ as a more comprehensive strategy of transforming a society towards peace (Lederach, 1997; Graf et al., 2007). As Hugh Miall (2004) points out, transformation towards peace requires more than the identification of win-win outcomes that benefit conflicting parties. Conflict transformation requires a process of engagement, transforming the relationships, interests, discourses and, if necessary, the very constitution of a society that supports the continuation of violent conflict. This suggests ‘a comprehensive and wide-ranging approach, emphasizing support for groups within the society in conflict rather than for the mediation of outsiders’ (Miall, 2004: 14).

There is thus an increasing consensus that peacebuilding works best as a transformative process involving stakeholders from ‘below’ within local institutions and civil society. Top-down approaches relying on exogenous methodology do not engender sustainable peace, as they tend to erode the peacebuilding capacities of local institutions and civil society. The discontent with the liberal peacebuilding discourse has led researchers, as well as practitioners, to turn to alternative peacebuilding concepts, including multi-track peacebuilding, to produce more inclusive and sustainable political transitions (Galvanek and Planta, 2017: 18). Some have highlighted the importance of blending the top-down implementation of peace accords with bottom-up processes to heal societal divisions and engender societal ownership of the agreement (Prendergast and Plumb, 2002). Cautioning against a ‘one-size-fits-all version of peacebuilding’, the Utstein study emphasizes the importance of tailoring each intervention to the requirements of the situation, while simultaneously improving overall strategic collaboration by standardizing peacebuilding planning mechanisms (Smith, 2004). These recommendations were echoed in the report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change (UN, 2004).

FROM A ‘CULTURE FOR PEACE’ TO A ‘RAPPROCHEMENT OF CULTURES’

The UN and its associated agencies have examined peace in diverse ways, drawing on their respective specializations and competencies. Amid this medley, UNESCO stands out with its foundational commitment to nurture the defences of peace in human consciousness through transformative education, culture and scientific knowledge. Evidently, the founders of UNESCO envisioned a holistic and integrated approach to peace, and a notion of peace primarily as a non-violent or anti-war mindset, subsuming a humanistic rather than state-centric perspective.

From the viewpoint of a broader definition of peace, nothing is as significant as the notion of a ‘culture of peace’ – which has gained grounds within and outside the UN
and sits at the heart of the recent discourse on the Rapprochement of Cultures. Based on inner unity amid outer diversity, it promises a transformation of global consciousness in favour of reason as opposed to force, encouraging dialogue and peace rather than conflict and violence. Although UNESCO conceptualized a ‘culture of peace’ in 1989, its ethos is grounded in its preamble: ‘a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world ... peace must, therefore, be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind’.

With a new focus on a ‘culture of peace’, UNESCO reiterated its broader and more inclusive approach to peace, and its linkages with human rights, development and cultural diversity. According to the UNESCO declaration, ‘A key role in the promotion of a culture of peace belongs to parents, teachers, politicians, journalists, religious bodies and groups, intellectuals, those engaged in scientific, philosophical, creative and artistic activities, health and humanitarian workers, social workers, managers at various levels as well as to non-governmental organizations’ (UNESCO, 1999).

Although the ‘culture of peace’ began as a UNESCO programme, it was soon adopted by the UN General Assembly, which in 1997 characterized it as ‘respect for human rights, democracy and tolerance, the promotion of development, education for peace, the free flow of information and the wider participation of women’. On 20 November 1997, the UN General Assembly gave a much wider definition to the ‘culture of peace’, stating that:

\[
\text{the task of the United Nations to save future generations from the scourge of war requires transformation towards a culture of peace, which consists of values, attitudes and behaviours that reflect and inspire social interaction and sharing based on the principles of freedom, justice and democracy, all human rights, tolerance and solidarity, that reject violence and endeavour to prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation and that guarantee the full exercise of all rights and the means to participate fully in the development process of their society (UN, 1997).}
\]

The above points, along with an additional point relating to disarmament, subsequently became the basis of the Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace (UNESCO, 1999). UNESCO was mandated to implement the Programme of Action, establishing both the International Year for the Culture of Peace (2000) and the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence (2001–2010). In 2000, UNESCO circulated ‘Manifesto 2000’, which listed six forms of behaviour and action that contribute to building a culture of peace, in an unprecedented effort to involve
people at the local level. Drafted by Nobel Peace Laureates, ‘Manifesto 2000’ was signed during the International Year for the Culture of Peace by 75 million people, all pledging to work for the culture of peace ‘in my daily life, in my family, my work, my community, my country and my region’.

Recognizing an emerging need for new articulations in support of cultural diversity and universal values, the UN General Assembly proclaimed 2013–2022 the International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures. In a 2012 resolution on the ‘Promotion of Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue, Understanding and Cooperation for Peace’, the UN General Assembly acknowledged and reaffirmed the pioneering role and long-term work of UNESCO ‘to promote dialogue among civilizations, cultures and peoples, as well as activities related to a culture of peace’ (UN, 2012a).

The International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures (IDRC) represents an important culture and education-based supplement to the emerging notion of ‘sustaining peace’. Achieving a true rapprochement of cultures entails nurturing a culture of peace and achieving peace through non-violence and peaceful dialogue. Interestingly, the International Decade has preferred the French word ‘rapprochement’ to the earlier term ‘dialogue’, which in a sense implies a greater emphasis on a mutually enriching synergy between cultures. The Draft Action Plan for the International Decade defines the term ‘rapprochement’ as an extension of similar terms such as ‘unity-in-diversity’, ‘routes of dialogue’, ‘tolerance’, ‘culture of peace’, ‘dialogue among civilizations’ and ‘intercultural and interreligious dialogue’.

The IDRC document reiterates that ‘international security and social inclusion cannot be attained sustainably without a commitment to such principles as compassion, conviviality, hospitality, solidarity and brotherhood which are the cornerstones of human coexistence inherent in all faiths and secular ideologies’ (UNESCO, 2014). This highlights the imperative of intercultural and interreligious dialogue to develop a better understanding of otherness. Rising above prejudice can encourage greater interest in different histories, heritage, and religious and cultural beliefs.

**QUALITY EDUCATION AND GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP**

become world citizens without losing their roots and while continuing to play an active part in the life of their nation and their local community’. The report further emphasizes the role of education in providing children and adults with the cultural background necessary to enable them, as far as possible, to make sense of the changes taking place. More recently, the International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures emphasized the need for quality education, grounded primarily in respect for human rights and cultural diversity. ‘Global citizenship education’ is defined as education that includes the teaching of peace education, human rights education, education for global citizenship and intercultural dialogue, as well as sustainable development education. UNESCO has scaled up its research activities, launching and promoting knowledge networks and research pools to encourage intercultural dialogue, enabling research expertise from diverse regions to share experiential knowledge on cutting-edge issues.

The UNESCO Forum for Global Citizenship Education, another UNESCO-supported initiative, draws on the organization’s long-standing experience in human rights and peace education with the aim of empowering participants to assume an active role in efforts to resolve global challenges, and become proactive contributors to a more peaceful, tolerant, inclusive and secure world. According to UNESCO, education for human rights and the promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence enhances the quality of education. UNESCO has thus collaborated widely to promote research, knowledge-sharing and policy formulation in education for peace, sustainability and global citizenship. To encourage human rights, dignity, diversity and inclusion, UNESCO envisages ‘new forms of education that promote understanding between cultures that strengthen the resilience of societies and provides the relevant skills to navigate the future’ (Bokova, 2017).

Since the adoption of Agenda 2030, the focus has shifted to converting these pledges into deeds, with the expectation that UNESCO and the larger UN system will scale up their activities to achieve the globally agreed outcomes by 2030. Sustainable Development Goal 4 and its corresponding targets aim to ensure ‘inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all’. These nascent visions are reflected in the Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action, launched at the 2015 World Education Forum. The declaration, proposed in concert by UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF and UN Women, sets out a roadmap for education for the next fifteen years.
The term ‘human rights’ is mentioned seven times in the United Nations Charter, making the promotion and protection of human rights a key purpose and guiding norm of the UN’s approach to peace. Likewise, the progression of the UN peace agenda has seen a corresponding evolution in human rights discourses and institutions.

UN activities and institutional structures have expanded significantly since the creation of the Organization, beginning with the establishment of the UN Commission on Human Rights (UNCHR) in 1946 and the Centre for Human Rights (CHR) in the 1980s by the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), followed by the creation of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) by the General Assembly in 1993, and the establishment of the Human Rights Council (HRC) in 2006.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) drafted by the UNCHR in 1948 spells out the basic civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights that all human beings should enjoy. It links human rights with international peace and security, maintaining that respect for human rights ‘was the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in our world’. Undeterred by Cold War constraints, the UNCHR prepared numerous human rights treaties on a range of issues that form the core of peacebuilding and human security. These include an agreement on two groundbreaking treaties in 1966: the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Entering into force in 1976, both covenants address key rights in civil, political, economic and social fields. These two treaties, together with the 1948 Declaration, constitute what is known as the International Bill of Human Rights. Other significant accomplishments include the successful adoption of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women in 1979 and the United Nations Convention against Torture in 1984.

The UNCHR-led human rights treaties have engendered international legal norms on a range of issues which form the core of the UN peace agenda including: preventing racial discrimination; promoting economic, social and cultural rights; civil and political rights; women’s rights; the prohibition of torture; children’s rights; and migrant workers’ rights among others. Similarly, the OHCHR has provided an overarching institutional machinery to promote human rights in various areas, which converge and intersect with the UN actions for peace.

Significant progress in the institutional growth of human rights was accomplished with the creation of the Human Rights Council in 2006, which replaced the sixty-year old UNCHR. Endowed with a new mandate, the HRC was made directly responsible to
the UN General Assembly with the proviso to ensure ‘universality, objectivity and
non-selectivity... and the elimination of double standards and politicization’ (UN, 2006).
For many observers, the creation of the HRC demonstrated the UN’s willingness to
credit due importance to the protection of human rights – the third pillar of its
foundational commitment. Its inaugural two-week session in June 2006 attracted a
significant response from several thousand participants and state representatives from
across the world (Steiner, Alston and Goodman, 2008: 791).

The HRC launched many new initiatives to uphold and monitor civil, political,
economic, social and cultural rights globally, through independent human rights
experts designated as Special Rapporteurs, Special Representatives, Working Groups
and Independent Experts. In 2007, it established a new complaints procedure to
address gross violations of human rights reported by individuals, groups or
non-governmental organizations claiming to be the victims of violations or who had
direct, reliable knowledge of such human-rights violations (UNHRC, 2007). By the end
of 2016, there were 80 active Special Procedures mandate holders covering 57 mandates,
comprising 43 thematic mandates, including water and sanitation, arbitrary detention,
the rights of migrants, violence against women, torture and human trafficking, and 14
country-specific mandates (OHCHR, 2017).

During the past decade, the HRC has remained overworked in the wake of rising
civil violence, and has often been faulted for not doing enough to address large-scale
human rights violations in Iraq, South Sudan, Sudan, Sri Lanka, Syria and Yemen,
among others. A review process mandated by UN General Assembly Resolution 60/251
in 2011 has underlined the limitations of the council, especially its inability to respond
swiftly to urgent human-rights situations (UN, 2011a). However, the HRC has recently
seen a shift from questioning whether UN human rights bodies will address an issue, to
assuming an issue will be addressed and posing the question: ‘What are you going to do
about it?’ (Gallen, 2016)

INTERNATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
AND R2P

In recent times, the international community has come under increasing pressure to
play a proactive role during protracted episodes of human catastrophes, when major
harm to civilians is occurring or thought to be imminent, and the state in question
is incapable or unwilling to protect its own citizens. In this context, human rights are
increasingly viewed as rights possessed by the individual for which they could seek
redressal from the international community (Upadhyaya, 2005: 86). Such human rights
assertions became more pronounced in the wake of an increasing surge in internal
violence, where the state has either acquiesced or collaborated with violent groups.
Indeed, the genocide in Rwanda and the civil wars in Somalia and the former Yugoslavia deeply moved the consciousness of the international community. However, there was little legal or logistical preparedness at the time to meet these new challenges. While the war in the former Yugoslavia drew attention to this issue, the Rwandan genocide made the international community’s failure to prevent, or effectively react to mass killing, painfully clear. This led to a rethinking of the UN peace agenda with increased support for humanitarian intervention.

Conscious of the inadequacy of existing provisions to deal with such human emergencies, the UN community has galvanized itself in recent years to meet such situations of internal violence, often defining these as a threat to international peace and security to justify enforcement action under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. These developments have fuelled critical debate on the limits of sovereignty and on many state-centric provisions of the UN Charter itself. New concepts of human security, humanitarian intervention and ‘sovereignty as responsibility’ have surfaced to protect threatened or victimized populations, either from local actors whom the government is unable or unwilling to control, or from the government itself.

Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is a notable human rights discourse within the current UN peace agenda. First articulated in the Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (2001), R2P defined the legitimacy and scope of international action vis-à-vis a wide range of human rights violation (ICISS, 2001). In 2004, the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change set up by former Secretary-General Kofi Annan, endorsed the emerging norm of a responsibility to protect as a collective international responsibility, ‘exercisable by the Security Council authorizing military intervention as a last resort, in the event of genocide and other large-scale killing, ethnic cleansing and serious violations of humanitarian law which sovereign governments have proved powerless or unwilling to prevent’ (UN, 2012b).

The United Nations World Summit (2005) again endorsed the responsibility of each state to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. In the event of the failure of the concerned state to do so, the international community should act collectively in a ‘timely and decisive manner’ in accordance with Chapters VI and VIII of the UN Charter. Based on the outcome document of the 2005 World Summit, a 2009 report by the Secretary-General outlined a strategy around three pillars of the responsibility to protect: (i) the state carries the primary responsibility for protecting populations from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing, and their incitement; (ii) the international community has a responsibility to encourage and assist states in fulfilling this responsibility; (iii) the international community has a responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other means to protect populations
from these crimes (UN, 2012c). The Secretary-General’s report on early warning, assessment and the responsibility to protect (2010) identified gaps and proposed ways to improve the UN’s ability to use early warnings more effectively, where there is a risk of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes or ethnic cleansing (UN, 2010). Similarly, the Secretary-General’s report in 2011 emphasized the need for effective global-regional collaboration to help implement the responsibility to protect (UN, 2011b).

In practice, the Security Council made the first official reference to the responsibility to protect in April 2006 when it authorized the deployment of UN peacekeeping troops to Darfur. Subsequently, R2P featured prominently in Security Council resolutions on Libya (2011), Côte d’Ivoire (2011) Yemen (2011), South Sudan (2011) and Syria (2012).

One of the effective steps taken in the wake of R2P has been the creation of the UN Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect. Its task is to raise awareness of the causes and dynamics of genocide, to alert relevant actors where there is a risk of genocide, and to advocate and mobilize for appropriate action. The office also develops key tools to be used by international, regional and national actors to assess the risk of atrocity crimes, as well to strengthen atrocity prevention capacities and strategies (UN, 2014a).

The other notable human rights approach to peace relates to the nurturing of National Human Rights Institutions (NHRI) designated by ECOSOC in 1946 as ‘local human rights committees within their respective countries’. Furthermore, in 1991, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted the Principles Relating to the Status of National Human Rights Institutions, popularly known as the ‘Paris Principles’. In 1993, these were followed by the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, adopted at the Vienna World Conference on Human Rights. This created the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions (ICC) to determine the level of implementation of the Paris Principles for individual NHRI. It also iterated the commitment to develop national institutions as instruments for promoting human rights, disseminating human rights information and providing human rights education. Since then, the UN General Assembly has adopted numerous resolutions calling for the strengthening of NHRI, which function as the first port of call for reporting human rights violations across the world.

Growing recognition of human rights as a prerequisite for nurturing peace, reflected in strong human rights mandates for peace missions, has led to active partnerships between OHCHR and the Departments of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), Political Affairs (DPA) and Field Support (DFS). These partnerships safeguard and integrate the sustenance of human rights in UN Peace Operations and Political Missions.
The OHCHR also strives to empower the population to assert and claim their human rights, and enables state and other national institutions to implement their human rights obligations and uphold the rule of law. Human rights teams on the ground work in close cooperation and coordination with other civilian and uniformed components of peace operations in relation to the protection of civilians, especially with regard to addressing conflict-related sexual violence and violations against children; and strengthening respect for human rights and the rule of law through legal and judicial reform, security sector reform and prison system reform (UN, 2012d).

RIGHT TO PEACE

The recent validation of the Right to Peace represents another prominent development in the emerging salience of human rights in the UN peace agenda. Just as SDG 16 and the resolutions on ‘sustaining peace’ have bonded peace with sustainable development, the endorsement of the Right to Peace has a tremendous potential to link the twin aims of development and peace to the third pillar of the UN agenda – human rights.

Monica Zulficar, Chair of the Advisory Committee that prepared the initial draft of the Right to Peace, submits that human security is an important positive element of the right to peace, addressing structural violence and including freedom from fear and from want. She also draws attention to the gender perspective of the right to peace, stating that women are the primary victims of violence and ‘should be equal partners in the struggle for the right to peace’ (OHCHR, 2013). The Declaration, argues Zulficar, offers ‘a golden chance to address not only the prevention of wars and various forms of violence and armed conflict but also structural violence’ (ibid).

The UN General Assembly resolution on the Right to Peace (UN, 2016b) consists of five articles. Among others, these articles outline the need to respect, implement and promote equality, non-discrimination and justice (Article 2). They also stipulate that states, as well as the UN and its specialized entities, should take measures to implement the declaration on the Right to Peace, with special emphasis placed upon UNESCO’s role in this area (Article 3). Moreover, international and national institutions should promote education for peace, with a view to strengthening and fostering the spirit of tolerance, dialogue, co-operation and solidarity (Article 4).

The passage of the Right to Peace in the UN General Assembly is based on the recognition of international law principles and human rights as the foundation of international peace. As early as 1949, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 290 (IV) on Essentials of Peace, which acknowledged the Universal
Declaration of Human Rights as the basis of enduring peace and recognized the inherent dignity and equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family as the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world. In accordance with the foundational UN ethos, which positions peace as a pivot of human rights, there has been longstanding demand in the UN system to recognize and declare the Right to Peace. However, such demands made little headway during Cold War imbroglios between rival power blocs, and the efforts only gained impetus after its conclusion. Even then, nearly a quarter of a century elapsed before the Right to Peace was finally passed in the UN General Assembly.

The process involved several challenges, some of which were quite recent. Notably, there was a lack of consensus among Member States concerning the Right to Peace as a human right. The debate highlighted the division among Member States, especially regarding the codification process of the new right. European states affirmed their rejection of a legal basis to the right to peace, but reiterated their willingness to discuss linkages between peace and human rights. Together with non-aligned Member States from Latin America, Member States of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) defended the legal basis of the right to peace and the need for its elaboration in a declaration. On the other hand, civil society organizations found the existing codification of the Right to Peace insufficient as a measure to advance the status of international human rights law, since the draft neither defined the emerging right nor adequately developed its elements.

The lack of consensus continued well into 2015, resulting in criticism from civil society and NGOs. For instance, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom found that, even at this late stage, ‘achieving consensus proved to be a very difficult goal for States as some are just not ready to recognize a Human Right to Peace or even a Right to Peace’ (WILPF, 2015). Moreover, the draft was criticized as weak in its measures for compliance, failing to acknowledge the Right to Peace as a human right, and instead creating the notion of an entitlement to ‘enjoy peace’. Clearly, the need to implement the Right to Peace will bring new challenges. However, the achievement of forging a consensus among Member States, civil society and NGOs deserves appreciation.

Indeed, much work remains to be done to realize the full potential of the right to enjoy peace, human rights and development. Ratification of the declaration represents a process involving international commitment that can serve to strengthen this work. Forging an international consensus is a much-needed vital first step on the long road ahead, towards realizing the Right to Peace.
TOWARDS ‘SUSTAINING PEACE’

A decade after its creation, the peacebuilding architecture was comprehensively reviewed by three independent panels. Recognizing the narrow interpretation of ‘peacebuilding’ simply as post-conflict intervention, the Advisory Group of Experts for the 2015 Review of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture introduced a much wider concept of ‘sustaining peace’ to supplant peacebuilding. The other two panels – the High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO) and the High-Level Advisory Group for the Global Study on the Implementation of Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000) – also highlighted the need to widen the scope of peacebuilding. All three reviews cross-referenced each other’s work in their recommendations, while presenting a blueprint for the emerging notion of ‘sustaining peace’ as a counterpoint to peacebuilding.

The UN Security Council and General Assembly thus adopted landmark identical resolutions on sustaining peace in April 2016, thereby multiplying the scope of peacebuilding (UN, 2016a; UNSC, 2016). The preamble of the dual resolution introduces a brand new conceptual trajectory of ‘sustaining peace’, comprising ‘activities aimed at preventing the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict, addressing root causes, assisting parties in conflict to end hostilities, ensuring national reconciliation, and moving towards recovery, reconstruction and development’.

The holistic vision of ‘sustaining peace’ is one of the key trajectories of the new UN plan to foster peaceful, just and inclusive societies, free from fear and all forms of violence. Predicated on the concept of ‘sustaining peace’, the UN General Assembly and the UN Security Council have reached a well-formulated consensus to prevent all forms of violence, recognizing the symbiotic relationship between peace, sustainable development and human rights across a wide humanitarian expanse.

The concept of ‘sustaining peace’ has indeed reframed the scope and methodology of UN peacebuilding. While the term ‘sustaining peace’ is not distinguished explicitly from peacebuilding, it sets out a new ambitious agenda and approach for UN efforts to build peace. Hitherto, the mandate of the Peacebuilding Commission was confined to post-conflict situations and treated prevention solely as a form of post-conflict mitigation, rather than a means of averting the outbreak of conflict in the first place. ‘Peacebuilding’, instead of denoting a comprehensive process, was narrowly construed in terms of time-bound, exogenous interventions that take place ‘after the guns fall silent’ in fragile or conflict-affected states (UN, 2015b).

Sustaining peace, on the other hand, does not define peace as the binary opposite of conflict, and as such, can ‘reclaim peace in its own right and detach it from
the subservient affiliation with conflict that has defined it over the past four decades’ (Mahmoud, 2017). The term ‘peacebuilding’ thus no longer remains confined to the post-conflict scenario. Detaching peacebuilding from the margins of post-conflict situations increases its relevance to all phases of conflict – before, during and after hostilities, implying that peacebuilding should be undertaken simultaneously with peacekeeping, development and humanitarian activities. Conflict prevention has been assigned a central role in ‘sustaining peace’. Making eight separate references to conflict prevention, the preamble of the joint resolution highlighted the centrality of prevention in the ‘sustaining peace’ schema (UN, 2016a).

The new methodology of peacebuilding which embodies ‘sustaining peace’ addresses the fact that violent conflicts are seldom linear, sequential processes, and that there is rarely an ordered transition from ‘state fragility’ to armed violence and humanitarian assistance, or from peacemaking to peacekeeping and peacebuilding. It represents an acknowledgement that circular or vicious cycles are more typical, with conflicts escalating to various forms of social tension, political strife and violence, particularly in light of the changing nature of violent conflicts in recent years (PBSO, 2017).

Members of the UN General Assembly have hailed the conceptual shift as transformative and forward-looking, recognizing peace as a long-term process of social change that requires collaborative work at various levels. As described in the 2016 resolution, ‘effective peacebuilding must involve the entire United Nations system’ (UN, 2016a). Tools like joint analysis and effective strategic planning for long-term engagement are meant to move cooperation forward. Being a cross-cutting issue, ‘sustaining peace’ enhances opportunities to implement the recommendations of the High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO, 2015), particularly relating to the primacy of political settlements, financing of the peacebuilding component of peace operations, and the peacebuilding roles of peacekeepers.

The UN Secretary-General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism, for instance, is an important instrument in this integrated framework of ‘sustaining peace’. It stresses the role of the United Nations system in mobilizing comprehensive responses to threats of violent extremism, by giving priority to prevention, dialogue, confidence-building and positive engagement.

According to the new resolution (UN, 2016a), ‘sustaining peace’ is ‘a goal and a process to build a common vision of society’. While this process is hard to define and harder still to break into concrete, operational steps, the resolution offers several building blocks to that end. These include enhancing the links between
peace, development and human rights; creating inclusive national ownership in which local actors have a consistent voice and women and youth play a critical role; and promoting more strategic and close partnerships with diverse stakeholders. Conceptually speaking, the idea of sustaining peace seems to be well grounded in endogenous processes and context-specific capacities embedded in national policies. Conceived as a shared public good and a collective endeavour engaging all stakeholders, it lacks the features of a donor-driven outside intervention, as apprehended by some sceptics.

With new resolutions, ‘sustaining peace’ now sits at the heart of the UN peace and security pillar. Although it remains a work in progress, the nascent conceptualization of sustaining peace promises a transformative and comprehensive roadmap to meeting today’s complex challenges to peace, human rights and development – the three pillars of the United Nations. More significantly, the new approach recognizes that sustaining peace is everyone’s business, and should be accorded the highest priority in the agenda of each UN agency and mission. It represents a shared task and responsibility to be fulfilled by the respective government together with all other national stakeholders, and should ‘flow through all three pillars of the UN’s engagement at all stages of conflict’ (UN, 2016a). All these measures require sustained support and attention on the part of the international community.

**AGENDA 2030: A HOLISTIC APPROACH**

Development has been a vital pillar of the UN’s approach to peace and security. This is exemplified in both the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the two landmarks of cooperation of the international community. While the MDGs provided a global language to redress issues of structural violence such as extreme poverty, hunger, gender inequality and child mortality, the adoption of 17 SDGs in 2015 expanded the UN agenda to around five pillars, namely: people, planet, prosperity, peace and partnerships.

Articulated on the eve of the UN’s seventieth anniversary, *Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* (Agenda 2030) strongly emphasizes the interconnection between peace and development, linking peace even closer to inclusive governance, participation, rights and security. It asserts categorically that ‘there can be no sustainable development without peace and no peace without sustainable development’. While acknowledging violence as the greatest challenge to development, Agenda 2030 spells out the various trajectories to cope with this threat. This is perhaps the most remarkable recent development associated with the emerging UN approach to peace.
Sustainable Development Goal 16 concerns peace most directly, and aims ‘to foster peaceful, just and inclusive societies which are free from fear and violence’. It sets targets for reducing all forms of violence in all countries, ensuring access to justice for all, and building effective, accountable and inclusive institutions. It underpins the need to address the root causes of conflict by synergising the imperatives of peace, sustainable development and human rights, ‘from conception to execution’, in the words of Secretary-General António Guterres.

Goal 16 is linked intrinsically with some of the SDGs and lies at the heart of ‘sustaining peace’. In all, 36 targets from seven other SDGs directly measure an aspect of peace, inclusion or access to justice, only a third of which are found in SDG 16. Described as SDG 16+, these additional targets propose to strengthen the case for universality; identify factors that entrench inequality between and within countries; place a gender and human rights perspective at the heart of efforts to achieve peace, justice and inclusion; underline the need for international cooperation to deliver the 40 per cent of SDG 16+ targets that have a global or regional dimension; and inspire partnerships that bring together those working on governance, justice, human rights, security, public health, education, jobs, social welfare and other challenges (Steven, 2017: 7).

Agenda 2030 and the reframing of peacebuilding as ‘sustaining peace’ are complementary and mutually reinforcing, with Goal 16 providing a live connection between the two trajectories. Both are people-centred and focus on various drivers of violent conflict that relate directly to the socio-economic and environmental aspects of sustainable development, including economic, social and environmental inequalities, lack of jobs, poor natural resource management and climate change. Investing in ‘sustaining peace’ means investing in basic services, bringing humanitarian and development agencies together, building more effective and accountable institutions, protecting human rights, promoting social cohesion and diversity, ensuring the meaningful participation of women and girls in all areas of society, and moving towards sustainable energy. Strengthening the rule of law and promoting human rights are pathways to this process, as are reducing the flow of illicit arms, and strengthening the participation of developing countries in institutions of global governance. Within this matrix, ‘sustaining peace’ is construed as both an enabler and an outcome of sustainable development (UN, 2016a, 2017a).

With the unprecedented emphasis on sustaining peace, the UN system has accorded a high priority to reinstating a holistic conception to peace, development and human rights. While development and human rights are being defined in a more comprehensive manner, the concept of peace has been expanded through various resolutions, reports and goals. This emerging awareness is reflected sharply
in the recent recognition of the complementarity between sustaining peace and the goals of Agenda 2030. Recognizing the organic links between the two amid intertwined global challenges such as rising inequality and climate change, UN Secretary-General Guterres has called for ‘a global response that addresses the root causes of conflict, and integrates peace, sustainable development and human rights in a holistic way, from conception to execution’.

**EMERGING AGENDAS FOR PEACE**

The evolution of the UN peace agenda over the past seven decades and the corresponding academic discourse suggest an emerging trend in favour of an inclusive approach to peace and peacebuilding. It is no longer possible to conflate peace with the narrow state-centric visions that dominated the Cold War era, notwithstanding resistance from those who suspect that such a broadening of the peace agenda might dilute its focus from the core issue of war and nuclear disarmament (Jeong, 2000). There is a realization that the confinement of peace to a narrower template has not done justice to this empowering and emancipatory idea. The rising scale of violence in today’s hyper-connected world clearly signals the inadequacy of the existing international peace agenda.

The changing spectre of threats, both traditional and non-traditional, have provided greater justification for a holistic approach to peace that could transcend Cold War legacies and include a range of humanitarian concerns along with regional and local concerns of peace. Many recent initiatives both within and outside the UN system are symptomatic of this broadening and deepening of the global agenda of peace. For instance, following the adoption of UN General Assembly Resolution 290 (2012), the human security approach has enjoyed a broad consensus among governments and practitioners on the wider connotation of peace and security, and visions of intercultural dialogues and transformative education are now considered pivotal within the global peace agenda. Another meaningful initiative in this regard was implemented by the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, which has actively promoted the increased engagement of indigenous peoples in conflict prevention, conflict resolution and post-conflict peacebuilding. The implementation of Local Agenda 21 represents yet another effort to bring the international agenda of the UN sustainable development plan to the local level. Another instructive example is the UNITAR Training Programme developed in 2000 at the request of indigenous peoples’ representative to enhance their conflict prevention and peacemaking capacities. To date, this ongoing programme has deepened and strengthened the knowledge and skills of 500 indigenous representatives worldwide to analyse the root causes of conflict, promote indigenous rights, and engage in dialogue and negotiation to contribute to conflict resolution and enhanced well-being.
Similarly, the report, *The Challenge of Sustaining Peace*, argues for the importance of ‘inclusive national ownership’ in peacebuilding, whereby national responsibility for driving and directing efforts is broadly shared by the national government across all key social strata and divides, and across a spectrum of political opinions and domestic actors, including minorities (Rosenthal et al., 2015). This implies participation by community groups, women’s organizations and activist groups, youth and labour organizations, political parties, the private sector and domestic civil society, including under-represented groups.

In the wake of the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995 in Beijing, scholars and peace activists acknowledged the immense importance of women’s participation for the success of peace processes. In 2000, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 1325 on ‘Women, Peace and Security’ specifically to promote women’s participation in peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction. This groundbreaking resolution firmly established the pivotal role of women in conflict resolution and peacebuilding, creating greater scope for addressing gender inequality, women’s equal rights and political participation.

In recent years, the UN Security Council has passed many resolutions reaffirming its commitment to the protection and empowerment of women in conflict. The creation of an architecture for Women, Peace and Security and the establishment of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) has further enhanced the UN’s commitment to women’s empowerment. The prescriptions of the Women, Peace and Security agenda have been accompanied by an emphasis on ‘peacebuilding from below’, which provides an alternative or a supplement to ‘top-down’ peacebuilding practices. Former UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon adopted a Gender Marker under his 7-Point Action Plan on Gender-Responsive Peacebuilding (2010) with the intention to increase funding for peacebuilding that promotes gender equality. The goal is to ensure that at least 15 per cent of UN peacebuilding expenditure goes towards activities that ‘address women’s specific needs, advance gender equality or empower women’ as their principal objectives.

The UN has also responded to the recent growth in terrorism. Various UN agencies and entities are contributing their experience and expertise to advance the UN Secretary-General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism, through education, youth participation and empowerment, and by promoting freedom of expression, and safeguarding and celebrating cultural diversity. The UN places particular emphasis on preventing young people from being indoctrinated into radical ideologies that inspire acts of terrorism.
In order to address this issue, the UNSC unanimously adopted Resolution 2250 on Youth, Peace and Security (YPS) in December 2015, recognizing the positive roles played by young women and men in promoting international peace. The Resolution urges Member States to consider ways to increase the representation of youth in decision-making in local, national, regional and international institutions and mechanisms for the prevention and resolution of conflict, including institutions and mechanisms to counter violent extremism, which can be conducive to terrorism. It also urges states to consider establishing integrated mechanisms for the meaningful participation of youth in peace processes and dispute-resolution, as appropriate (UN, 2015c). The resolution further requests that the Secretary-General 'carry out a Progress Study on youth’s positive contribution to peace processes and conflict resolution, in order to recommend effective responses at local, national, regional and international levels’, and to present the results of the study to Member States of the United Nations. This ongoing study is due to be released in 2018 after due consultations, and would provide a practical roadmap to exploring ways in which young people can contribute to the prevention of violence and to building a sustainable peace, drawing on their innovation and resilience.

The UN’s ‘soft power’ diplomacy is based on cooperation across the system in support of a culture of peace, dialogue and alliances, notably focused on youth, women and the media and, more broadly, on civil society as a multiplier of the UN’s work. Media literacy is thus important for efforts to build peaceful societies and expand civil society participation in strengthening democratic institutions. The impact of the UN Chronicle can be considered an example of best practice in this respect. The UN’s action on ‘Information at the service of the humanity’ contributes to ‘sustaining peace’ at the global level. This work also involves close cooperation with civil society and academic communities, both of which are important allies in mobilizing grassroots capacities, as well as with scientists to promote the global peace agenda. Messages of peace are more powerful when they come from victims of violence and wars. The UN Messengers of Peace and the Goodwill Ambassadors programme also deserve mention here.

Another recent development is the high priority paid by UN agencies to investigating the role of social media in violent radicalization processes. A recent study commissioned by UNESCO, entitled Social Media and the Radicalization of Youth Leading to Violent Extremism, confirms the need for further research into the impact of social media on the radicalization of vulnerable individuals. However, the study notes that actual violent radicalization is not reducible simply to internet exposure, and instead generally entails the mediation of complex social-psychological processes and person-to-person communication in conjunction with other offline factors, such as feelings of injustice, alienation, anomie and deprivation (Alava, Frau-Meigs and Hassan, 2017).
Indeed, the violent radicalization of youth needs to be understood and researched as a complex process—one in which social media are not separated from other communication platforms, and from various offline factors. A related concern that has engaged many UN agencies, and especially UNESCO, is how to pre-empt electronic media and the international press from playing into the hands of terrorists (Marthoz, 2017). At present, well-orchestrated acts of terrorism seeking global attention often receive extensive coverage from media incentivized to highlight acts of violence and terrorism to attract greater viewership.

Also of note are the ongoing efforts of UN agencies to mobilize international opinion and resources against the growing surge in hate speech online and to counter the production, dissemination and impact of hateful messages through international, regional and national normative frameworks. One UNESCO-sponsored study, while highlighting good practices at local and global levels, recognized that the notion of hate speech, however it is defined, is not about disagreement over political ideologies, faiths or beliefs, but rather about antagonism towards people (UNESCO, 2015).

Here, it is important to mention UNESCO’s increasing efforts to foster free, independent and pluralistic media in print, broadcast and online, with a special focus on promoting mutual understanding and avoiding situations where control of the media tends to enable the indoctrination of populations towards aggression, war and genocide. Indeed, the majority of people would prefer to resolve their differences amicably, given a choice of information and ideas, including information about options that represent dialogue, rather than a closed or censored information environment. UNESCO’s extensive work in Media and Information Literacy and Intercultural Dialogue (MILID), and its publications, reflect this emerging trend. As well as promoting media and information literacy competencies in social media, UNESCO is promoting conflict-sensitive journalism among reporters (Howard, 2009). The Organization also remains committed to building community media and fostering gender equity in the media.

Another key emerging trend is the composite vision of ecosystem sustainability, first brought to the fore by the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, and which has since been incorporated as an intrinsic core of all peace and development agendas. A significant initiative in this regard is the Earth Charter, which evolved as a global civil society initiative and was launched at UNESCO Headquarters in 2000. A key aim of the SDGs, while bringing peace and sustainable development together, is also to protect the planet from environmental degradation through sustainable consumption and production, sustainable management of natural resources and urgent action on climate change. The global consensus on SDGs also ushered in the Paris Agreement (December 2015), which intends to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change.
At the UN General Assembly High-Level action event following the Paris Agreement, UN Secretary-General António Guterres observed that ‘Climate change is an unprecedented and growing threat – to peace and prosperity and the same in relation to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)’ (UN, 2015a; UN DESA, 2017).

Past experiences of conflict prevention and peacebuilding have made it incumbent on the UN to draw on existing human rights resources. All recent reviews of UN peace operations along with the SDGs, especially Goal 16, clearly indicate that human rights, peace and development are indivisible and interrelated; one cannot be achieved without the others. However, despite greater recognition of the interrelated nature of human rights and peacebuilding, synergy between human rights and peacebuilding entities is still limited. Many creative suggestions are being considered to develop a dynamic connection between the PBC and the HRC to share information and analytical research in order to strengthen peacebuilding and prevention approaches (QUNO-FES, 2016). Along with increasing attention to economic, social and cultural rights in conflict zones, it is important to build mutual capacities and encourage joint Special Procedures activities in the assessment and prevention of human rights violations. It is also crucial to involve the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) in conflict mitigation and peacebuilding process.

One key development is the recent passage of the Declaration on the Right to Peace, which paves the way for other vital rights such as the right to health (Perry, Fernández and Puyana, 2015; UN, 2016b). Although it may not have an equally strong footing compared to other human rights, the Declaration is nonetheless a significant step towards ensuring human dignity, the cornerstone of all human rights. Article 2 of the Declaration aptly exhorts the Member States to ‘respect, implement and promote’ key principles grounded in the notion of human dignity, including equality, non-discrimination, freedom from fear and want, as well as justice and the rule of law.

Lastly, while the cause of a nuclear weapon-free world has remained in limbo, notwithstanding the advisory opinion issued by the International Court of Justice in 1996 censuring the legality of using nuclear weapons, the 122 non-nuclear weapon states have recently succeeded in passing a Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, a move that supporters hope will lead to the eventual elimination of all nuclear arms. In 2017, the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) ‘for its work to draw attention to the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons and for its groundbreaking efforts to achieve a treaty-based prohibition of such weapons’ (Nobel Prize, 2017). This is once again a transformative initiative, in this case working to exert moral pressure on nuclear weapons states and, as such, deserves the greater attention of the international community.
The dynamic evolution of peace, both conceptually and in UN praxis, provides evidence for its ever-changing imperatives. It also points to the continued faith of the vast majority of humanity in the UN’s credentials to define the global imperatives of peace. The coming together of 153 member states under the UN banner to endorse a holistic framework of ‘sustaining peace’, and the SDGs as its corollary, has been a reassuring development amid the changing spectre of traditional and non-traditional threats to peace and security. The increasingly expanding horizons of peace exemplified in the resurgent emphasis on a culture of prevention and preventive diplomacy provide an inspiring roadmap for UN agencies and entities to synergize their efforts towards a ‘culture of prevention’, so urgently needed in today’s turbulent world.
PART II
PREVENTING CONFLICT AND SUSTAINING PEACE: THE UN SYSTEM IN ACTION

INTRODUCTION
One of the core concerns of this publication on the UN peace agenda is to highlight the varied ways in which UN agencies and entities carry out peace work within and across their respective areas of competency. Many peace-supplementing activities, especially those concerning humanitarian action, are often omitted in contemporary peace discourses. The prolonged duration of the Cold War ensured unwavering attention on military security and investment, leaving little scope for humanitarian or socio-economic aspects of peace. Unsurprisingly, the transformative quest of UN entities in areas such as human rights, development, education and culture, gender equality, justice, environmental protection and other equally significant vectors of building peace were not typically considered as peace work during this period.

However, the widening scope of the UN peace agenda in the post-Cold War era, as detailed in Part I, foregrounded a range of socio-economic and humanitarian concerns. Most significant among these is the nascent conceptualization of ‘sustaining peace’, which along with the ‘Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’ (Agenda 2030) promises a transformative and comprehensive template to meet today’s complex challenges to peace, human rights and development – the three pillars of the United Nations. ‘Sustaining peace’ is now emerging as the top priority of each UN agency and every UN mission.

The reconfiguration of the UN peace agenda, with a renewed focus on an integrated and dynamic approach to peace, has shed light on the valuable peace work of UN entities. There is growing recognition that UN entities have enriched and expanded
the conceptual horizons of the UN peace agenda, at times transcending their assigned mandate. These efforts range from the deployment of ‘blue helmets’ in UN Peacekeeping missions to strengthening the peacemaking and conflict prevention capacities of diplomats, UN and regional organization staff through emergency humanitarian interventions. They also encompass long-term development projects that help societies become more resilient and better equipped to resolve conflicts peacefully. These multi-dimensional contributions have not only enriched the traditional template of peace and security, they have also enhanced the humanitarian and socio-economic vectors of nurturing and sustaining peace.

Part II provides a brief overview of the activities of 32 UN agencies and entities. It presents a synoptic view of their diverse peace activities within and beyond their area of competence. Written submissions from UN agencies and entities that joined this project, along with a range of reports and publications, provide the substance of this part of the study. It embodies the ethos of UN funds, programmes and agencies, and evaluates their performance and practical contributions to building and nurturing the expanded template of peace. It is based on the assumption that UN entities, with their incomparable expertise and experience, offer a promising route to enriching the emerging notion of ‘sustaining peace’.

Part II hinges on three interconnected sections. The first, ‘Agencies, Funds and Programmes: An Overview’, provides a synoptic view of each entity, describing its mandate, programmes and activities, its partners and collaborators, the settings in which it works and how that work is linked to the UN’s broader mandate to foster peace. The second section, ‘Entities in peace work: innovative practices and instructive examples’, reflects on major issues affecting the work of each entity, and presents a number of distinctive themes and examples. Indeed, there are many worthy narratives and instructive examples to draw upon from the vast scope of UN peace work. However, due to the limitations of space, only a few symbolic examples are presented here to show the diversity and range of UN peace work. These examples, explicates in the third section of Part II, ‘Emerging Visions and Recommendations’, underscore the remarkable trajectories of UN work, both horizontally, within and across the ‘pillars’ of peace and security, development and human rights, and vertically, in conflict or crisis settings, post-conflict settings, and fragile or latent conflict settings.
A. UNITED NATIONS ENTITIES, AGENCIES, FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES: AN OVERVIEW

United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT)

Despite a lack of agreement on a universally accepted definition of terrorism, in 2006, the UN General Assembly adopted the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (A/RES/60/288) to enhance national, regional and international responses to the spectre of terrorism. The Global Strategy has four pillars: addressing the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism; preventing and combating terrorism; building states’ capacity and strengthening the role of the UN; and ensuring respect for human rights and the rule of law in the fight against terrorism (UN, 2016c). The General Assembly biennially reviews the Global Strategy.

The United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT) was established through the adoption of UN General Assembly Resolution 71/291 on 15 June 2017, as suggested by the Secretary-General in his report on the Capability of the United Nations to Assist Member States in implementing the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (A/71/858 (UN, 2017b)). The Office of Counter-Terrorism, which is headed by an Under-Secretary-General, has five main functions:

1. Provide leadership on the General Assembly counter-terrorism mandates across the United Nations system.

2. Enhance coordination and coherence across the 38 Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF) entities to ensure the balanced implementation of the four pillars of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.


5. Ensure that due priority is given to counter-terrorism across the United Nations system and that important work on preventing violent extremism is firmly rooted in the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.

The Office of Counter-Terrorism includes the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF) Office and the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Centre (UNCCT). The Under-Secretary-General of the Office of Counter-Terrorism is concurrently the Chair of the CTITF and the Executive Director of the UNCCT.
The mandate of the CTITF is to strengthen the coordination and coherence of counter-terrorism efforts of the UN system (see GA resolutions 62/272, 64/297, 66/282, 68/276, and 70/291). CTITF has 36 UN and two non-UN Members (INTERPOL and the World Customs Organization) across the UN's peace and security, sustainable development, human rights and humanitarian pillars. Each entity makes contributions consistent with its own mandate. The primary goal of CTITF is to maximize each entity’s comparative advantage by ‘Delivering as One UN’ to help Member States implement the four pillars of the strategy in a balanced manner.

The UNCCT was originally established in 2011 to support Member States in the implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy through capacity-building assistance. UNCCT has received contributions totalling US$132 million from more than twenty contributors over the past five years. The main contributor is Saudi Arabia, which provided US$110 million through two generous contributions that facilitated the establishment of the UNCCT. The UNCCT seeks to contribute to the full implementation of all four pillars of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy through the implementation of capacity-building projects at global, regional and national levels, in line with the Secretary-General’s 2014 Vision Statement for the UNCCT and the UNCCT Five-Year Programme launched in 2016. An Advisory Board composed of 21 Member States and the European Union, as a guest member, representing all regions of the world, provides advice to the UNCCT’s Executive Director.

Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the Department of Field Support (DFS)

The UN Charter’s dictum to ‘save succeeding generations from the scourge of war’ (UN, 1945) is quintessentially manifest in the UN’s peacekeeping activities. The United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support (DPKO/DFS) work together to plan, prepare, manage and direct peacekeeping operations, of which there are currently fifteen. The DPKO provides political and policy guidance as well as strategic direction and support to all UN peacekeeping operations, while DFS delivers dedicated support to peacekeeping operations, special political missions and other field presences in terms of human resources, finance and budget, conduct and discipline, logistics, and information and communications technology.

2 MINURSO (Western Sahara), MINUSCA (Central African Republic), MINUSMA (Mali), MINUSTAH (Haiti), MONUSCO (DR Congo), UNAMID (Darfur), UNDOF (Golan), UNFICYP (Cyprus), UNIFIL (Lebanon), UNISFA (Abyei), UNMIK (Kosovo), UNMIL (Liberia), UNMISS (South Sudan), UNMOGIP (India and Pakistan) and UNTSO (Middle East).
UN peacekeeping has evolved considerably to address new challenges since the deployment of the first mission in 1948. Over the decades, ‘traditional’ operations have given way to far more comprehensive ‘multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations’, which are part of a broader international effort aimed at building sustainable peace in countries emerging from conflict. The 2008 Capstone Doctrine thus identified the core functions of such ‘multi-dimensional’ operations as: creating a secure and stable environment while strengthening the state’s ability to provide security with respect for the rule of law and human rights (in areas such as the protection of civilians, mine action, Disarmament Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR), security sector reform, support for the restoration and extension of state authority, the protection and promotion of human rights and institution building); facilitating political processes by promoting dialogue and reconciliation, and supporting the establishment of legitimate and effective institutions of governance (e.g. through electoral assistance or community engagement); and providing a framework to ensure that the UN and other international actors pursue their country-level activities in a coherent and coordinated manner.

The High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations made several recommendations to improve peace operations going forward. These focus on ensuring that political solutions always guide the design and deployment of UN peace operations, using the full spectrum of peace operations more flexibly, building stronger and more inclusive partnerships with other global and local peace and security actors, and making the UN Secretariat more field-focused and people-centred (UN, 2014b). Peacekeeping operations often entail cross-cutting tasks that have a direct bearing on peacebuilding and other specialized mandates of the UN. For example, this is well noted in the pursuance of the UN Security Council resolutions on Women, Peace and Security SCR 1325 (2000), Children and Armed Conflict SCR 1612 (2005), Conflict-related Sexual Violence SCR 1820 (2008) and Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict SCR 1674 (2006).

**Department of Political Affairs (DPA)**

The Department of Political Affairs (DPA) was established by the Secretary-General in 1992 on the request of the UN Security Council to provide advice and support to the Secretary-General and the United Nations system on questions relating to the prevention, control and resolution of conflicts, including early warning, political mediation and post-conflict peacebuilding. As the lead entity of the United Nations with responsibility for political analysis, mediation, political guidance and electoral assistance, DPA plays a central role in the efforts of the United Nations to prevent and resolve conflicts and to sustain peace.
The Department monitors and assesses political developments across the world and provides the Secretary-General with advice and support on political aspects of relations with Member States and intergovernmental organizations. It identifies potential and actual conflicts and makes recommendations to the Secretary-General on appropriate action to address them, including through the coordination and implementation of regional strategies. Moreover, it assists the Secretary-General in carrying out political activities in the areas of preventive diplomacy and sustaining peace; and serves as the lead Department for electoral assistance matters and coordinates programmes in response requests for electoral assistance from Member States. The Department manages a wide range of special political missions, ranging from large field-based political and peacebuilding offices, to special envoys and advisers to the Secretary-General, to regional offices.

Headed by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, DPA provides substantive support to the UN General Assembly and the UN Security Council and their subsidiary bodies, advises the UN Special Committee on Decolonization on the Remaining 16 Non-Self-Governing Territories on the UN List, and services the Secretariat of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. Since 1992, DPA has assisted more than 100 countries in electoral matters and has provided expert staff support in mediation initiatives around the world. DPA operationalizes sustaining peace with the UN Development Programme (UNDP) through a joint programme on Building National Capacities for Conflict Prevention.

**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)**

The mutually reinforcing relationship between peace and food security is also fostered by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), which was established as a specialized agency of the United Nations in 1945 with a mandate to reduce poverty and inequality, eradicate hunger, improve agriculture and promote sustainable development. The agency views peacebuilding as essential to its mission, recognizing that a stable, peaceful environment is the foundation of lasting food security and sustainable livelihoods and, equally, that investing in food security may strengthen efforts to prevent conflict and achieve sustainable peace. For FAO, violent conflict, hunger and malnutrition have common roots, are mutually interdependent, and must be solved together through an integrated and holistic developmental approach.

FAO works in both the humanitarian and development spheres, identifying ways to avoid, minimize or resolve conflicts in which food, agriculture or natural resources are drivers; intervening to offset the impact of conflicts on food security, nutrition, agriculture and natural resources; and advancing development in a conflict-sensitive manner.
Increasing the resilience of livelihoods is one of FAO’s core objectives, to assist countries and people to cope with and recover from conflict, as well as to prevent and mitigate violent conflict. Some 2.5 billion people depend on agriculture. The Organization protects, restores and develops the livelihoods of farmers, fishers, herders, foresters and others who depend upon agriculture and natural resources. Gender equality is also central to FAO’s mandate, which it promotes through activities that contribute to the equal participation of women and men in decision-making, their access to resources and the benefits of development, and equal opportunities in employment.

**International Labour Organization (ILO)**

The sheer scale of the working poor in agriculture, the inherently dangerous and uncertain nature of the work, the largely unrecognized role of women in farming, the shortage of skills, the exclusion of agricultural workers from national labour laws, and the high incidence of child and forced labour are all potential drivers of conflict that are being addressed by the International Labour Organization (ILO) as part of its mandate to promote decent work.

The ILO considers peace, especially in post-conflict, post-disaster and other fragile settings, as an important element of its work, as well as the training programmes and conferences it organizes to promote international labour standards, fundamental principles and rights at work; and to help create decent employment and income opportunities, social protection, tripartism and social dialogue. How decent employment can enhance peacebuilding was the theme of a joint ILO/UNDP working group in 2007 to 2009 that developed the *UN Policy for Post-Conflict Employment Creation, Income General and Reintegration* for the UN system, international financial institutions and national partners. The importance of employment and decent work for political stability is nowadays widely acknowledged and the UN Employment Policy is applied globally. The ILO’s flagship ‘Jobs for Peace and Resilience’ programme applies employment intensive investment strategies that supports job creation in fragile countries and enhances the employability of women, men and youth through vocational skills and entrepreneur-ship training.

In June 2017, the ILO adopted a revised version of the Recommendation on ‘Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience’[^3], which contains measures to be taken to generate employment and decent work for the purposes of prevention, recovery, peace and resilience in the context of crisis situations arising from conflicts and disasters. The Recommendation covers a number of interconnected themes,

[^3]: The original text was adopted in 1944 under the title ‘Transition from War to Peace’.
including 14 guiding principles to prevent and respond to crisis situations; a multi-track approach for implementing crisis response strategies; the importance of education, vocational training and guidance; and situations related to migrants affected by crises and on refugees and returnees. To reinforce ILO’s core mandate, the Recommendation also offers an exceptional platform to invigorate cooperation and joint initiatives among international and regional organizations operating on employment and decent work issues, both in the humanitarian and development nexus and in crisis prevention.

International Organization for Migration (IOM)

After decades of working in partnership with the UN, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) became a member of the UN system in 2016, further enhancing moves toward a more coherent international response to the global migration trend. Today, the Organization has offices in more than 150 countries and staff in around 400 field locations. It works closely with governments, other UN entities, civil society and others to ensure the humane and orderly movement of people throughout the world and to promote durable solutions through alternative and complementary pathways for forcibly displaced persons such as internally displaced refugees, diasporas, host communities as well as migrants that have become victims of trafficking or smuggling. IOM’s core peace documents are its Humanitarian Policy – Principles for Humanitarian Action, which was approved in April 2015, and the prevention-orientated Migration Crisis Operational Framework, which is central to IOM’s peacebuilding approach to interventions.

In the context of forced displacement and protracted crises, IOM engages significantly at the community level to ensure state and local partner capacity to support and sustain mass returns. It works with community members and local authorities to identify and address priority needs and support the provision of facilities such as schools, bridges, market places, water supplies and health services. IOM also builds and strengthens state and local partner capacity to support and sustain mass returns. The aim is to reduce instability by promoting the re-engagement of estranged communities through activities that focus on the common good. IOM also carries out activities that facilitate peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict or that contribute indirectly to peace by creating more stable, harmonious, cohesive and democratic societies. For instance, IOM supports reparations for victims of human rights violations during conflict and the restitution of land and property rights. It also works in transition settings through prevention and solutions to forced displacement, peacebuilding and community stabilization projects, where it addresses conflict dynamics as a driver of displacement to help communities recover from conflict and prevent the emergence or recurrence of violence. In this context, it has developed significant expertise in community violence reduction, intercommunity dialogue,
community policing, institution building and DDR, where it supports former combatants’ transition into civilian life through community-based reintegration projects. IOM works particularly – although not exclusively – in the area of DDR to address the dynamics of migration that can provoke individuals’ susceptibility to exploitation by armed extremist groups’ recruitment efforts.

**International Telecommunication Union (ITU)**

The International Telecommunication Union (ITU), a 152-year-old organization that became a UN specialized agency in 1947, is at the heart of the ICT sector, brokering agreement on technologies, services and the allocation of global resources, such as radio-frequency spectrum and satellite orbital frequencies, and working to enhance country collaboration on international telecommunications and their protection.

In 2005, the ITU was appointed by the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) as the facilitator of WSIS Action Line C5 on ‘Building confidence and security in the use of ICTs’. In fulfilling this task, the ITU focuses primarily on the technical aspects of cyber security through the adoption of technical standards, and on providing support to countries for the protection of the computer systems that increasingly underpin, among others, the operation of critical infrastructure, such as transport networks, energy plants and utility services.

Amid growing concern about cyber security, in 2010, the UN Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) initiated an action in this area involving all UN agencies with a related mandate. Over a four-year period, a ‘UN-wide Framework on Cyber Security and Cybercrime’ was developed by 35 entities, and coordinated by the ITU and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). The resulting ‘UN System Internal Coordination Plan on Cyber Security and Cybercrime’ was endorsed by the CEB on 20 November 2014.

**Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)**

Mandated to promote and protect all human rights – economic, civil, cultural, political and social, as well as the right to development (UN, 1993) – the programme and activities of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) contribute in various ways to preventing conflict and sustaining peace including through mainstreaming human rights across the UN system, and providing support to mechanisms of the UN General Assembly, the Human Rights Council, Treaty Bodies and Special Procedures. With its global agenda to foster respect and advance the promotion and protection of all human rights and fundamental freedoms,
OHCHR continues to strengthen existing efforts and make use of new opportunities to contribute to the peacebuilding agenda of the UN through the concerted efforts of the High Commissioner and staff at headquarters, country offices, United Nations Peace Missions, regional offices and centres, and Human Rights Advisers. Since 2009, the Human Rights Council, with the support of OHCHR, has made efforts to further elaborate the right to peace through the establishment of an Open Ended Intergovernmental Working Group, which negotiated the UN Declaration on the Right to Peace adopted by the Council in July 2016. In the wake of emerging crises, OHCHR ensures swift deployment of staff, where possible. When peace missions are established, OHCHR participates in inter-departmental technical assessments, defines human rights priorities and identifies start-up teams of human rights officers with the right expertise for early deployment. It participates in UN strategic assessments during mission reconfigurations and works with UN partners to ensure continuity during the exit of a UN peace mission and its human rights component. More broadly, OHCHR develops human rights methodology, training and guidance for human rights components and works to mainstream human rights in UN policies on the maintenance of international peace and security. From tracking civilian casualties in Afghanistan to giving advice and support on truth and reconciliation processes in Côte d’Ivoire, human rights components of United Nations peace missions constitute a vital part of the Organization’s peace efforts. Over the past decade, OHCHR has assisted with the design and implementation of transitional justice programmes in more than twenty countries around the world by ensuring that human rights and transitional justice considerations are reflected in peace agreements.

In remarks to the Human Rights Council, the UN Secretary-General recently observed that human rights abuses ‘play into the hands of extremists’ highlighting the importance of OHCHR’s work, including monitoring of the human rights situation, and pointing to early warning signs. Of five conditions identified as being conducive to the spread of violent extremism in the UN Secretary-General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism, three relate directly to the non-respect of human rights, namely ‘lack of socio-economic opportunities’, ‘marginalization and discrimination’ and ‘poor governance, violation of human rights and the rule of law’(UN, 2015e). The OHCHR also supports the UN’s independent human rights mechanisms (i.e. the Human Rights Council’s Special Procedures and the Treaty Bodies) in their work.

**Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO)**

Garnering international support for peacebuilding efforts and coordinating the UN system’s efforts in sustaining peace is the responsibility of the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO). The PBSO Policy, Planning and Application branch
collaborates with other parts of the UN system and relevant partners, supports the UN Secretary-General in fostering coherent approaches across the UN system, and supports partnerships in peacebuilding and sustaining peace. The office, which was established in 2005, assists the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), an intergovernmental advisory body of the UN General Assembly and UN Security Council. The PBC provides political accompaniment and advocacy to countries affected by violent conflict; promotes an integrated, strategic and coherent approach to peacebuilding; and serves as a platform to convene actors within and outside the UN to improve coordination, develop and share good practices and ensure predictable financing for peacebuilding. The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), launched in 2006, is the UN system’s financing tool of first resort to help sustain peace in conflict-affected countries. It enables the UN to seize political opportunities and enables partners to pool risk and obtain coherence by providing initial or bridging financing for conflict prevention and peacebuilding programmes. PBF projects have included disarming and demobilizing combatants and reintegrating them into civilian society (DDR); establishing a secure environment so that government can function again; providing peace dividends to populations, thereby making peace a fruitful alternative to conflict; and creating a basis for peaceful coexistence by promoting trust and unity. The Fund insists on national ownership of peacebuilding processes and national commitment to dealing with problems that could lead to violent conflict. It also stresses the involvement of women and youth in sustaining peace and provides guidance on well-coordinated, conflict-sensitive and politically astute programming to ensure delivery of results.

The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)

In 2011, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 1983 to galvanize urgent and coordinated action to curb the impact of the AIDS epidemic in conflict and post-conflict situations. This was the first in a series of resolutions that brought to the fore the links between conflict, sexual and gender-based violence, and increased risk of HIV infection. Since then, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) have worked together in a landmark partnership, exemplifying effective UN inter-agency cooperation, to provide HIV-related training and services to UN peacekeeping personnel. Over the years, many UNAIDS/DPKO HIV/AIDS units have forged strong partnerships with other peacekeeping missions in areas such as gender, DDR and security sector reform, leveraging the expertise of UN partners including UNFPA, UN Women, UNHCR, UNDP, UNICEF and WHO to reach out to local communities.

4 The Organizational Committee (OC) of the PBC consists of 31 Member States drawn from the UN Security Council (7), the General Assembly (7), the Economic and Social Council (7), the five-top financial and troop contributors, and the European Union, the World Bank, the IMF and the Organization of the Islamic Conference.
UNAIDS has also addressed Sexual Gender-Based Violence (SGBV) and HIV by supporting governments with the implementation of gender assessments tools in Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Mali, South Sudan and Zimbabwe. Among other outcomes, the assessments have helped establish critical points for service and care in border and transit areas and other hot spots, as well as ensuring that HIV and SGBV are included in national disaster and risk management policies. Through partnership with key global and regional human rights institutions such as the UN Human Rights Council and the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, UNAIDS is also drawing attention to health and human rights issues in humanitarian settings including advocacy on preventing discrimination against migrants, refugees and internally displaced persons in accessing health care.

The United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)

The UN Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) is at the forefront of efforts to change mindsets and approaches to urbanization, supporting national and local governments in the implementation of the New Urban Agenda agreed at ‘Habitat III’, the Third UN Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development held in Quito in October 2016. Measures include policy-making to create positive links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas; legal frameworks and mechanisms for the acquisition of public space, the provision of equity, financial stability and good governance; integrated urban and territorial planning and design that improves connectedness, inclusivity and resilience; strong financing frameworks that can address tenure conflicts which persistently cause instability and violence; and the empowerment of local governments and communities to address key justice and equity issues.

UN-Habitat contributes to land readjustment, improving access to basic services and slum upgrading with initiatives such as the Global Land Tool Network and the Participatory Slum Upgrading Programme. Its activities in fragile states are often articulated within inter-agency responses to human security and peacebuilding.

UN-Habitat also contributes to inter-agency responses in conflict and post-conflict settings and in cities, hosting large numbers of refugees and displaced people. Activities focus on reconstruction, decent housing, access to basic urban services, and restoration of the rule of law including through mediation mechanisms on property tenure. UN Habitat also carries out city profiling in conflict and post-conflict situations to maintain and deliver basic services. It is currently working in Afghanistan, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Haiti, Iraq, Jordan, Kosovo, Lebanon, Myanmar, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Syria. At the global level, UN-Habitat co-chairs the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Task Force on Meeting Humanitarian Challenges in Urban Areas. It launched the 65-member Global Alliance for Urban Crises,
which held its first all-member meeting in Brussels in March 2017, and operates a Secretariat jointly with the International Rescue Committee.

**United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA)**

The UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA) represents the development pillar of the UN Secretariat. The Department is specifically tasked with supporting the deliberations of the UN General Assembly and the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) (please refer to the section *Connecting Peace and Development* on ECOSOC’s peace work from an inter-governmental perspective). UN DESA’s nine divisions and capacity-development office provide a broad range of analytical products, policy advice and technical assistance that help to translate global commitments in the economic, social and environmental spheres into national policies and actions, as well as playing a key role in monitoring progress towards the SDGs. It also collaborates with partners at regional and country levels to help countries formulate and implement national sustainable development strategies. Whether by supporting policy-making bodies, facilitating major UN conferences, projecting trends in demography, publishing economic analysis or helping countries develop their national capacity, UN DESA works to promote and support international cooperation in the pursuit of sustainable development for all. It addresses a range of cross-cutting issues that affect peoples’ lives and livelihoods, especially the most vulnerable.

UN DESA’s facilitation of major global conferences and summits, as mandated by UN Member States, assists countries in finding common ground. UN DESA also organizes and supports consultations with a range of stakeholders, including the private sector and civil society, to promote progress and strengthen accountability in achieving the SDGs. It also generates, analyses and compiles a wide range of official economic, social and environmental data and information on which Member States can draw to review common problems and take stock of policy options. One of the Department’s primary contributions is providing policy research and analysis for governments. It also produces a host of flagship publications and major intergovernmental reports that are essential to UN negotiations and global policy decision-making. Helping to capacity-build, UN DESA also advises Member States and governments on implementing the policies and programmes developed at UN conferences.

**United Nations Department of Public Information (DPI)**

As part of its role to bring the United Nations story to the world, the UN Department of Public Information (DPI) aims to disseminate the Organization’s message of peace to audiences everywhere. In its efforts to generate public understanding and support for
the UN agenda, the Department engages with a global array of partners, from Member States and media organizations to civil society, students and the creative community.

DPI’s News and Media Division manages the website of the UN, facilitates multilingual and multimedia coverage of UN-related topics, provides live and on-demand webcasts, and coordinates press coverage of UN meetings and events. The Outreach Division engages and educates a diverse array of constituencies worldwide, encouraging support for the ideals and activities of the UN. The Strategic Communications Division disseminates information about substantive issues, including peace and security issues, and coordinates the work of the global network of nearly 60 UN Information Centres (UNICs) in the field.

Every year on 21 September, DPI leads the UN-wide observance of the International Day of Peace. With the help of students, peacekeeping operations and celebrity advocates, the Department promotes various themes related to peace.

The Department’s work in general plays a critical role in conveying positive narratives that can advance the UN’s universal values of peace, tolerance and human dignity. In order to implement Resolution 55/23 on the UN Year of Dialogue among Civilizations, DPI has collaborated with UNESCO on the promotion of culture and in the fields of education and communication to bridge the gap between developed and developing countries. More broadly, the UN’s multilingual news platforms, both digital and traditional, are used to report on all areas related to peace and security, including disarmament, peacekeeping, political negotiations and the important roles played by women, youth and other groups in peace processes. The UN General Assembly has recognized the communications efforts led by DPI in promoting the review conferences of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. DPI also communicates on peacekeeping operations, special political missions and related issues, including the development and implementation of a communications strategy to explain the UN’s zero tolerance policy for sexual exploitation and abuse, and to inform the public of the outcome of cases involving UN staff and related personnel.

The contributions of UN Messengers of Peace, Goodwill Ambassadors and other advocates further the Organization’s outreach in promoting peace, using their celebrity and influence to draw attention among audiences that would otherwise not be aware of the UN’s work. The UN Academic Impact (UNAI) initiative facilitates exchanges between the UN and institutions of higher education and research and scientific communities in all regions to foster a sense of global citizenship. The Dag Hammarskjöld Library’s knowledge-sharing and networking activities provide access to the vast store of UN knowledge, including on peace and security issues, for delegates, permanent missions of Member States, the UN Secretariat, researchers and depository
libraries worldwide. This reach supplements the extraordinary access offered by the global network of UNICs, which adapt the Organization’s outreach to local audiences and languages, while remaining faithful to the broader global message.

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

Strengthening institutions for more effective and accountable governance is also key to sustaining peace. The UN Development Programme’s (UNDP) work in conflict prevention and peacebuilding aims to foster social cohesion and empower nations and communities to become inclusive and resilient to external and internal shocks. With a presence in nearly 170 countries, UNDP national and international staff work with societies and governments on a range of developmental issues, supporting resilient and inclusive state-society and intra-society relationships. The Organization supports and strengthens key governance institutions that protect countries from potential conflict and help them make lasting progress. It also deepens gains made at the political and diplomatic level by providing strategic analysis, policy and programme support to the UN system and government partners. Supporting cohesive societies in the aftermath of a natural disaster or conflict is at the heart of UNDP recovery interventions at the national and local level. UNDP supports platforms for dialogue, mediation and conflict resolution, as part of the social reintegration and recovery of affected communities, with a view to building more inclusive environments. Particular emphasis is placed on the engagement of women and youth to participate in and lead social cohesion activities.

UNDP supports conflict sensitive programming and has developed and supported the implementation of conflict analysis and the Conflict and Development Analysis (CDA) assessment tools in a number of countries. The CDA has now been adopted as a United Nations Development Group tool.

UNDP also supports building national capacities for conflict prevention, often referred to as ‘insider mediators’. Over the course of the past decade, UNDP has supported insider mediators, including women, who have played critical roles in laying the groundwork for formal peace negotiations, leading democratic dialogues, mediating recurring conflicts over land and natural resources, facilitating reconciliation processes, building consensus around reforms in the context of political transitions and facilitating violence-free elections.

UNDP is also engaged in building ‘infrastructures for peace’ – more systematic and institutionalized ways to manage conflict that enable groups to interact with one another to address socio-economic, political, ethnic or religious differences. The Organization also supports a range of interconnected activities that reinforce peace
architectures, such as enhancing the coordination of local, national and regional mechanisms including Local Peace committees and *mesas de dialogo* (dialogue tables) in Latin American countries, advising government departments and institutions for national peacebuilding, dialogue and mediation, and assisting governments to design policies and regulations that support peace infrastructures. UNDP helps to ensure standing capacity to deal with potential conflicts by enhancing the capacity of stakeholders to resolve issues in a systematic manner.

In Ghana, UNDP has supported the National Peace Council for over a decade. In Malawi, it supports the capacities of the Public Affairs Committee regarding its role in the national architecture for peace. In Togo, it provides support to the government to build the national I4P Peace Portal, including the establishment of 37 local peace committees in 2017.

The complexities of conflict prevention require a strategic approach, institutionalized processes, and the building of dialogue and mediation capacity at local and national levels over the long term. In this context, UNDP also articulates the humanitarian-development-peace nexus, helping its national and international partners to apply a developmental lens to humanitarian action and peacebuilding, thus reducing needs and the potential for violent conflict. It also works to build strong partnerships including within the UN, as well as with the African Union, the European Union and the World Bank on developing national capacities and infrastructures for peace and joint analysis and assessments, such as Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments (RPBA). Examples include partnerships between the EU and UN (UNDP and DPA) on land, natural resources and conflict prevention, and to build national capacities for conflict prevention, as well as support for building infrastructures for peace in Africa, including support for signing the Accra and Maseru Declarations on I4P in 2013.

**United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)**

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) plays a unique role in strengthening the foundations of peace and sustainable development through its work to promote cooperation in education, culture, the social, human and natural sciences, and communication and information. The Organization’s commitment to peace is enshrined in the preamble to its constitution, which states that ‘since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed’. UNESCO is explicitly mandated to advance human dignity, mutual understanding, and the intellectual and moral solidarity of humanity.
Over the decades, UNESCO has served as a laboratory of ideas to foster more peaceful behaviours and mindsets. Its intellectual mandate is combined with concrete and often pioneering operational activities that have shaped thinking and policy and had a lasting impact. For example, in 1946, UNESCO launched its groundbreaking Fundamental Education Programme. Ahead of its day and resonant with the UN’s renewed emphasis on conflict prevention, the Programme was about much more than literacy, suggesting that education should relate to the life situation as a whole, combining literacy skills with, for example, better hygiene practices and employment opportunities as well as ‘understanding for different points of view’ and other ‘qualities to fit men to live in the modern world’. There were concerns that this all-encompassing approach infringed on other UN agencies’ mandates. However, the Programme would be decisive in convincing the United Nations to consider education as an essential tool for development.

UNESCO’s long-held holistic vision of peace was defined as a ‘culture of peace’ in 1989. The concept was subsequently adopted by the whole of the United Nations when the UN General Assembly proclaimed the year 2000 as the International Year for the Culture of Peace (Resolution 52/15) and 2001–2010 as the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence (Resolution 53/25). These were followed by the UNESCO-led International Year for the Rapprochement of Cultures in 2011 and the subsequent and ongoing International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures, 2012–2022. UNESCO’s inclusive, development and human rights-based understanding of peace was reiterated and contextualized once again in 2010 in then Director-General Irina Bokova’s call for ‘A New Humanism for the Twenty-first Century’.

Today, UNESCO remains at the forefront of efforts to share knowledge across cultures – to overcome prejudice and enhance mutual understanding between peoples through programmes and projects ranging from the protection and safeguarding of cultural heritage and the promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions through the implementation of its six Culture Conventions, to scientific cooperation in areas such as climate change, and the promotion of ‘the free flow of ideas by word and image’ or freedom of expression in all its forms.

In addition to functioning as an overarching dimension of all UNESCO’s programmes and activities, the Organization’s dedicated focus to peacebuilding provides an important contribution to the UN Secretary-General’s new approach to sustaining peace and preventing conflict – a priority of the UN system. Building peaceful, just and inclusive societies based on respect for human rights, the rule of law, and effective, accountable and inclusive institutions, as reflected in SDG 16, is a core component of UNESCO’s work to support countries in achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. To this end, UNESCO contributed by including an indicator
(SDG 16.10.1) on the ‘number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates’. The UN Statistical Commission designated UNESCO as contributing agency to monitor indicator 16.10.1 and the custodian agency for indicator 16.10.2 on access to information. In a landmark decision in March 2017, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 2347 on the Protection of Cultural Heritage in Armed Conflict, the first Resolution to focus exclusively on cultural heritage. The Resolution reinforces UNESCO’s efforts to protect cultural heritage as a contribution to international security and peacebuilding. Other key areas of focus include education for peace and international understanding, human rights education and Global Citizenship Education. UNESCO makes a substantial contribution to the UN’s counter-terrorism efforts as the lead UN agency for Education for the Prevention of Violent Extremism (PVE-E). It is also a co-facilitator, along with UNDP, UNODC and UNHCR, of the multi-stakeholder Global Alliance for Reporting Progress on Promoting Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies, which provides UN Member States with the assistance they need to report meaningfully on progress towards peaceful, just and inclusive societies – and its links to the entire 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment)

The UN Environment Programme (UN Environment) is at the forefront of efforts to bring international attention to the links between environment, peace and security, contributing to a paradigm shift in understanding their complexity. An important component of UN Environment’s work is its implementation of environmental assessments and the delivery of country programmes, which typically run for five to ten years and are conducted by mostly national staff. To date, UN Environment has delivered over 35 assessments in post-conflict countries and fragile states, dating back to an assessment of the Iraq-Kuwait conflict on terrestrial ecosystems in 1991. More recently, it has reported on topics such as climate change, migration and conflict in the Sahel (2011); livestock, livelihoods and disaster response in Sudan (2013); natural resource management and peacebuilding in Afghanistan (2013); and the illegal trade in natural resources in the Democratic Republic of Congo (2015). UN Environment also designs and delivers programmes to build institutional capacities to address priority environmental risks and needs. The largest of these have been delivered in Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of Congo, Haiti, Serbia, South Sudan and Sudan.

Through its Environmental Cooperation for Peacebuilding Programme (ECP), UN Environment works with UN organizations, Member States and other partners to better understand and respond to the conflict risks and peacebuilding opportunities presented by natural resources and environmental change. The programme entails
working in partnership with key international entities involved in peace and security including the UN Security Council, DPKO, the PBC, the DPA's mediation unit, the World Bank, the International Law Commission and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). UN Environment addresses environmental risks and opportunities in peacebuilding at three levels: through knowledge generation and training, joint policy analysis, and the demonstration of projects in the field.

Through its collaboration with the Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and Environment and in other areas of its work, UN Environment also highlights the link between peace and the right to live in a healthy environment. It raises awareness and undertakes action on the impact of climate change on ecosystems that indigenous people rely on for their livelihoods and cultural identity, and that is their right, as stated in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, ‘not to be subjected to forced assimilation or destruction of their culture’. The contribution of biological diversity to ‘peace for humankind’ is mentioned in the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity.

**United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)**

The UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) is mandated to lead and coordinate international action for the worldwide protection of refugees and the resolution of refugee problems. It also seeks to reduce forced displacement by encouraging states and other institutions to create conditions that are conducive to the protection of human rights and the peaceful resolution of disputes. It pays special attention to children’s needs and the promotion of equal rights for women and girls, and is committed to participation in the belief that refugees and others should have a say in decisions that affect their lives.

UNHCR also concerns itself with those displaced in the context of disasters and adverse effects of climate change, a growing phenomenon that has major implications for peace and security. It has assisted with the development of several major policy documents and standard-setting instruments including the Nansen Initiative for the Protection of Cross-border Displaced Persons in the Context of Disasters and Climate Change, which was endorsed by 109 states in October 2015. The Nansen Initiative process and the subsequent German-led Platform on Disaster Displacement address the legal protection gap for cross-border displacement in the context of disasters.

**United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR)**

Although the term ‘peace’ is not mentioned explicitly in its statutes, the work of the UN Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) is grounded in the UN’s
commitment to peace. UNIDIR offers advisory services on security interests to UN Member States and to the entire disarmament community, including civil society. It also supports UN agencies and multilateral disarmament processes through policy-relevant research, facilitating stakeholder dialogue and tool development. Unlike many organizations producing disarmament-related analysis, UNIDIR is not an advocacy organization, nor is it limited to a specific region or issue. It provides expert consultants to UN Groups of Governmental Experts on matters ranging from peace education to missile proliferation, arms and ammunition, and cyber security, and similarly supports negotiations on new treaties and standards on topics such as artificial intelligence, weapons stockpile management, cluster munitions, explosive remnants of war and nuclear disarmament.

**United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)**

‘Developing capacities to enhance global decision-making and support country-level action for shaping a better future’ is the guiding mission of the UN Institute for Training and Research. UNITAR, a dedicated training arm of the UN, serves some 40,000 beneficiaries annually through close to 500 capacity-development and research activities around the world. The Institute provides training for individuals, organizations and institutions at multiple levels; it facilitates knowledge and experience-sharing; researches and pilots learning strategies, approaches and methodologies; and advises and supports governments, UN agencies and other partners. It has a long track record of strengthening conflict prevention and peacemaking capacities among senior and mid-level officials in the UN, regional organizations and Member States, as well as among indigenous peoples’ representatives. In post-conflict settings, UNITAR’s training and capacity-building mitigates the often-high risks of relapse. Some of UNITAR’s key programmes include its flagship UNITAR-IPI Fellowship Programme in Peacemaking and Preventive Diplomacy, which has trained 900 senior and mid-level officials from UN substantive departments and peace missions, regional organizations and Member States; the UNITAR Regional Training Programme to Enhance Conflict Prevention and Peacemaking in Africa, which has trained more than 600 officials to date on the continent; and the UNITAR Training Programme to Enhance the Conflict Prevention and Peacemaking Capacities of Indigenous Peoples’ Representatives, which has trained 500 people.

Other areas of UNITAR’s work include tailored regional peacemaking and prevention training for Central Asia, Asia and the Pacific, and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Region; training in mapping natural disasters and conflicts and conducting damage impact assessment through the use of satellite images; enhancing the capacity of African peacekeeping training institutions to increase and institutionalize exchanges; and capacity-building and training in areas such as youth
and peacebuilding, preventing the recruitment of child soldiers and sexual violence in conflict, and the protection of civilians.

Furthermore, UNITAR is making meaningful contributions to sustaining peace in Africa through its support for the African Contingency Operation Training and Assistance Programme (ACOTA), which undertakes pre-deployment training for UN peacekeepers. To date, UNITAR has trained more than 30,000 peacekeepers. National ownership and sustainability are central principles in project delivery. UNITAR also implements a ‘train-the-trainers’ methodology, and offers expertise on how best to deliver training. This ensures a progressive enhancement of knowledge and skills among training institutions that can be replicated with little or no external involvement. Through this approach, the Institute has enhanced the capacity of regional and national African training institutions to set common peacekeeping standards, establish modalities for cooperation and transition, and conduct joint training exercises.

**United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (ODA)**

Operationally, the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs assists Member States in promoting multilateral principles and norms for disarmament and non-proliferation, as well as for conventional arms regulation and combating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. The topics under ODA’s purview are politically complex and sensitive, impacting upon national and regional security. To bolster implementation of its mandate, ODA promotes transparency and confidence-building, facilitates multilateral negotiations, and provides impartial information on disarmament and security. Eradication of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons that fuels conflict is one of the aims of the UN’s disarmament agenda.

**United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR)**

The UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) works with other members of the UN system to support Member States in developing institutional risk-reducing mechanisms, including strategies, policies and legislation to mitigate the impact of climate change by 2020. UNISDR promotes an inclusive, people-centred approach to these efforts, recognizing community members as agents for change rather than victims, and placing the most vulnerable at the centre of decision-making. It works with partners such as UNESCO, UNICEF and IFRC to provide equitable access to education on disaster risk reduction and safe learning environments for all children, and to empower children and youth to help shape more resilient societies for the future. UNISDR worked closely with UNESCO’s International Oceanographic Commission (IOC) and other stakeholders in setting up early warning systems in countries that were affected by the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004.
UNISDR received nearly 350 reports of disasters from around the world in 2015. These caused over 22,000 deaths, affecting 98.6 million people and resulting in US$66.5 billion in economic damage (WHO, 2017a).

Early and reliable warnings of severe weather, fluctuations in air quality or climate variability and change allow decision-makers, communities and individuals to be better prepared for weather and climate events, forming a vital part of a prevention-oriented approach to disaster risk management.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

Another intractable threat to global peace and security comes from the interaction between terrorism and transnational crime. In a report to the UN Security Council in May 2015, the UN Secretary-General described the undermining of state legitimacy by interactions between terrorism and organized crime as a ‘critical strategic challenge’. This is one of an array of security concerns being addressed by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). In 2011, a year after it published the report, The Globalization of Crime: A Transnational Organized Crime Threat Assessment, UNODC signed a joint plan of action with DPKO to strengthen their cooperation against organized crime in conflict and post-conflict zones.

UNODC also supports the promotion of peace, development and human rights through its work in criminal justice and crime prevention, as well as in combating corruption, illicit financial flows, the illicit drugs and firearms trades, human trafficking, migrant smuggling and money-laundering.

UNODC advances women's and girls' rights in partnership with UNICEF through a joint Global Programme on Violence against Children, and through its work to combat trafficking in persons (70 per cent of whom are women and children), the use of child soldiers and other forms of forced labour. UNODC’s work to reduce illicit financial flows helps reduce inequality and limits the assets available to fuel conflicts. UNODC efforts to combat violence against migrants are particularly pertinent in today’s global context. The Organization prepared a technical report to address case studies and lessons learned in this area in cooperation with the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). UNODC also supports UN system-wide efforts to assist Member States with urban crime prevention, security and criminal justice. It published a comprehensive study on firearms in 2015 and will continue to gather information on firearms trafficking and to monitor homicide rates.
United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)

The UN Population Fund (UNFPA) is the UN reproductive health and rights agency. Its mission is to deliver a world where every pregnancy is wanted, every childbirth is safe and every young person’s potential is fulfilled. UNFPA works for the rights of young people to help them become empowered citizens, able to realize their full potential and contribute to economic and social transformation. The Organization supports the role of adolescents and young people in sustainable development, humanitarian action, and the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security (as recognized by UN Security Council Resolution 2250 on Youth, Peace and Security). In cooperation with the Peacebuilding Support Office, UNFPA is leading the development of the Progress Study on Youth, Peace and Security, mandated by SCR 2250. This independent report will provide evidence of young people’s involvement in activities for peace and propose a forward-looking agenda for the international community to involve youth at local national, regional and international levels. UNFPA is also co-leading the Compact for Young People in Humanitarian Action, an unprecedented effort comprising over fifty humanitarian actors that aims to ensure that young people’s needs, rights, and their capabilities and capacities are addressed in humanitarian action. Through its network of country offices, UNFPA is also supporting young people’s direct involvement in sustainable development, humanitarian action, and peace and security efforts.

United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women)

The provision of mediation and other skills training is vital for the successful implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women Peace and Security (WPS) and successive resolutions calling for women’s engagement in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, and their protection from sexual and other human rights violations. Because of the deepening focus on women in conflict, peace and security, this has been an area of rapid development for UN Women with growing demands for capacity-building, technical expertise and programming to implement the WPS agenda.

UN Women raises awareness among mediators and parties to conflict of the strategic importance of including women in peace negotiations. Through a partnership with the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peace Building Support Office (PBSO), UN Women also works to ensure that an agreed minimum of 15 per cent of funds for post-conflict recovery is spent on projects that enhance gender equality. UN Women also supports gender-sensitive security sector reform and demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants, as well as efforts to increase the numbers of women
in post-conflict governance institutions. In its normative work with Member States, UN Women has provided technical support to approximately half of the WPS National Action Plans (NAPs) drafted thus far, ensuring that they have concrete targets, resources for implementation and monitoring plans. More than two-dozen countries are currently drafting and negotiating NAPs. UN Women is also coordinating a new network of national WPS focal points that were established in response to the findings of the high-level review on the implementation of Resolution 1325.

In February 2016, the UN launched a pooled funding mechanism called the Women’s Peace and Humanitarian Fund (WPHF) that aims to stimulate a significant increase in the financing of women’s participation, leadership and empowerment in humanitarian response and peace and security settings. UN Women serves as its secretariat. UN Women is also responsible for the Annual Report of the Secretary-General on Women, Peace and Security to the UN Security Council and chairs the Inter-Agency Standing Committee on Women, Peace and Security. It also acts as the secretariat for the Security Council’s Informal Expert Group (IEG) on Women, Peace and Security, which was established in response to Resolution 2242 (2015). In the first half of 2016, the IEG briefed the Council about the situation of women in Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Iraq and Mali. The Executive Director of UN Women also regularly briefs the UN Security Council, while the Peace and Security section provides technical briefings to new Security Council members. Today, UN Women supports governments and civil society in over fifty countries to help implement the women, peace and security agenda through country programming and partnerships with a broad range of stakeholders.

**World Tourism Organization (UNWTO)**

Tourism and peace are at the heart of the statutory mission of the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) whose Article 3 states that the aim of the Organization is the ‘promotion and development of tourism with a view to contributing to economic development, international understanding, peace, prosperity and universal respect for, and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.’ UNWTO mainstreams tourism in the global development agenda, assists Member States with tourism policy and governance, develops indicators and standards, shares knowledge and provides technical assistance. A senior advisor to the Secretary-General on Tourism and Peace was appointed in 2014 to underpin efforts in this area.

The Manila Declaration on World Tourism at the World Tourism Conference in 1980 stated that modern tourism had become a contributing factor to social stability and mutual understanding between individuals and peoples. Participants at the conference agreed that the tourism industry depended entirely on lasting peace, and that peace
could be fostered through the integration of tourism into youth education and training. Tourism’s potential as a force for peace is also a pivotal axis of the Global Code of Ethics for Tourism (GCET), the frame of reference for responsible and sustainable tourism. According to Article 1, ‘Tourism’s contribution to mutual understanding between peoples and societies is of particular relevance for the tourism and peace discussion’.

UNWTO’s current undertakings to promote peace include advocacy and the creation and dissemination of knowledge, with a focus on the sharing of successful initiatives and practices. These are currently being developed into a flagship publication entitled *Tourism for Sustainable Development*. In 2014, UNWTO and the Government of Austria launched an International Handbook on Tourism and Peace featuring topics ranging from sustainable development and conflict resolution to eco-tourism and heritage preservation. In May 2015, at the 3rd World Forum on Intercultural Dialogue, organized around the theme of ‘Sharing Culture for Shared Security’, a session was devoted to tourism’s contribution to peacebuilding and the attainment of the SDGs. Exploring the theme further, UNWTO and the Government of China organized the 1st World Conference on Tourism for Development in May 2016 under the theme ‘Tourism for Peace and Development’. This resulted in the Beijing Declaration on Sustainable Tourism as a Driver of Development and Peace. The 2017 UN International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development had identified ‘Mutual Understanding, Peace and Security’ as one of its five themes.

**United Nations Alliance of Civilizations (UNAOC)**

As globalization, migration, urbanization, and information and communications technology make the world more connected and bring people of different cultures and religions into closer contact, fostering mutual understanding is becoming ever more vital for peace, stability and development. The United Nations Alliance of Civilizations (UNAOC), which was created in 2005 on the initiative of former Secretary-General Kofi Annan, works to reduce cross-cultural tensions, build bridges between peoples and communities, and counter the fear, suspicion, and ignorance of other cultures and religions that have taken hold of the hearts and minds of populations in many parts of the globe. UNAOC works to address this phenomenon by demonstrating that cultural and religious differences should not be a reason for conflict, but should rather be recognized as assets that contribute to social progress and sustainable development.

Through its four pillars – education, youth, migration and media – UNAOC’s political actions assist projects and activities, and also help to alleviate tension and promote peaceful and inclusive societies. UNAOC programming has been shaped in response to the rise in polarization and acts of terrorism. Youth is a critical target audience, while civil society plays an essential role in establishing connections between
the international community and national, regional and local levels. UNAOC has also focused its attention on promoting the role of religious leaders as peacemakers, as part of its effort to support interreligious and intercultural dialogue. Most recently, in July 2017, the High Representative of UNAOC, along with the participation of the UN Secretary-General and the Foreign Minister of Spain, hosted a group of religious leaders from the Middle East to discuss their role in promoting peace.

In 2016 UNAOC organized its 7th Global Forum in Baku, Azerbaijan, co-sponsored by the Government of Azerbaijan, to address major themes affecting intercultural and interreligious understanding. The declarations from these Global Forums represent important outcomes from UNAOC’s actions for peace. The High Representative for the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations also receives input, advice and political support from the Group of Friends, a community of countries and international organizations that promotes the Alliance’s objectives and assists with its strategic planning and implementation at local, national and regional levels.

**United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)**

Since its founding, the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) has worked to help children live in peace and protect them from conflict, in accordance with the UN Convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC). Children are among the victims most affected in conflict settings. However, it is also important to recognize their roles as actors of peace. Working together with governments, United Nations partners, the private sector, civil society and children themselves, UNICEF remains steadfast in its commitment to realize the rights of all children everywhere.

Today, the agency works in 190 countries and territories to promote children’s rights and well-being, with a focus on the most vulnerable, including those living in fragile contexts. UNICEF’s past experience in protecting children’s rights has demonstrated the fundamental importance of strengthening partnerships in accordance with global engagements, the UN Secretary-General’s statements and the UNICEF strategic framework.

The UN Security Council has adopted eight resolutions on children and armed conflict since 1999. Six grave violations against children (UN, 2005) are monitored in 15 conflict-affected countries by a monitoring and reporting mechanism (MRM) task force co-chaired by the UNICEF Country Representative. UNICEF plays a lead role in this mechanism at headquarters, as well as in the field, by engaging with parties to conflict to stop, prevent and respond to grave violations against children.
UNICEF’s broader dual humanitarian and development mandate, as well as its operational presence before, during and after conflict, and its programmes centred on social services can deliver tangible peace dividends and address conflict factors that put children at risk. For UNICEF, peacebuilding represents a concrete way to improve the quality and impact of its work. Its peacebuilding work takes many forms ranging from collaborative community management of service delivery to curriculum reform. Empowering children, youth and their communities as agents of change is one of the key strategies promoted by the organization.

United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP)\(^5\)

Sport can also be harnessed to promote peace, tolerance and understanding. Universal values intrinsic to sport such as teamwork, respect and fair play are understood all over the world and can inspire solidarity, social cohesion and peaceful coexistence. From 2008 to 2017, the United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP) provided the entry point to the UN system for this agenda. It assisted the Special Advisor to the United Nations Secretary-General on Sport for Development and Peace in his worldwide activities as an advocate, facilitator and representative of sport’s positive impact. The Office also used sport to unite people and support peace initiatives, from major sporting events to those at grassroots level.

Sport’s ability to bring people together regardless of their differences makes it a flexible medium for post-conflict relief work, peacebuilding and conflict prevention. Sport-based programmes are used as ‘door openers’ to rebuild trust between former enemies and to re-integrate child soldiers and ex-combatants into communities. For those living in the aftermath of conflict and in war-torn areas, sport provides welcome relief from hardship and brings a sense of normality to daily life. Conflict resolution was one of five priorities of the Special Adviser and his Office, along with African development, gender equality, persons with disability and youth development. Some of UNOSDP’s areas of action in terms of these priorities included: encouraging dialogue and mutual understanding in conflict areas, promoting peaceful interaction in sports settings, and supporting policy and programmes that target peace objectives. UNOSDP also supported the Group of Friends of Sport for Development and Peace, an informal intergovernmental platform, and facilitated the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group, which encouraged the adoption of SDP policies and programmes by governments from 2009 to 2015.

---

\(^5\) As of 30 April 2017, the UN Office on Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP) was closed and the substantive portfolio of the Office on Sport for Development and Peace is being handled by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA).
United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD)

The United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) was established in 1963 to carry out interdisciplinary research and policy analysis on the social dimensions of contemporary development issues in social policy, gender and sustainable development. UNRISD research and analysis contributes to the evidence base underlying the UN system’s work and, as such, contributes to the imperative of nurturing and sustaining peace. Indeed, development, and peaceful and democratic societies are grounded in common normative values and share the same structural foundations. UNRISD research has contributed to strengthening the normative and analytical work of the United Nations and helped shape its social development agenda and policies. Its strategic location and relations within the system allow it to inform the analytical work and the policy recommendations produced by a variety of UN entities, from UN DESA to the Commission for Social Development and the UN General Assembly, as well as specialized agencies, regional commissions and other UN partners.

UNRISD engages with a wide range of stakeholders – bridging the gaps between policy and decision-makers, academia, practitioners and advocates – to ensure that its work informs processes of social and political change. Some of UNRISD’s research also has an explicit focus on conflict resolution and peacebuilding. UNRISD’s recent policy document ‘Transformations to Equity and Sustainability’ identifies inequalities, conflict and unsustainable practices as three overarching challenges of our time, and presents a research agenda that intends to inform policy and practice to address these challenges.

World Food Programme (WFP)

While it does not have an explicit peacebuilding mandate, as the largest humanitarian organization fighting hunger worldwide the World Food Programme (WFP) plays a key role in supporting transitions to peace. The overwhelming majority of its work in recent years has been based in conflict and post-conflict settings, where its programmes are oriented to ensure they do not inadvertently exacerbate tensions and, where possible, make a meaningful contribution to wider efforts to help countries transition towards peace.

WFP’s work in complex emergencies, or ‘transition’ settings, is governed by eight main principles: understand the context – WFP’s assistance is informed by a careful risk analysis to ensure that it does not inadvertently exacerbate conflict and that opportunities to support peace are identified; maintain a hunger focus in line with WFP’s mandate; avoid doing harm; support national priorities where possible, but follow humanitarian principles where conflict continues; support UN coherence; be
responsive to a dynamic environment; ensure inclusivity and equity; and last, be realistic – addressing hunger and supporting reconciliation and normalcy are not panaceas on their own.

**World Health Organization (WHO)**

Established in 1948, the World Health Organization (WHO) aims to build a better, healthier future for people all over the world. Working through offices in more than 150 countries, over 7,000 WHO staff work side-by-side with governments and other partners to ensure the highest attainable level of health for all people. As the pivotal UN organization to combat diseases, lately seen as the gravest threat to non-traditional security, its contribution to peacebuilding is manifold. In conflict and post-conflict settings, WHO plays a role in promoting peace by: acting as a facilitator or catalyst to bring health professionals from all sides together on technical issues of common concerns; by setting standards or ‘best practice’ in public health aimed at reducing conflict and promoting reconciliation; by networking with partners to support peace-building and violence reduction initiatives; and by coordinating with other UN agencies, international organizations and NGOs.

In conflict-affected countries, war is often not the only major cause of mortality and morbidity, as parties to a conflict may also deliberately attack aid convoys and health facilities (WHO, 2001). According to reports consolidated by WHO, more than 300 attacks on health care facilities occurred in 2016 in twenty countries, with the majority documented in the Syrian Arab Republic. Other factors can also compound the human toll of war, in particular, drought and armed conflict have recently proved to be a deadly combination, bringing famine to parts of Africa and the Middle East on a scale not experienced since the United Nations was founded in 1945 (Chan, 2017).

WHO also contributes explicitly to peacebuilding through its Health as a Bridge for Peace (HBP) policy and planning framework, which supports health workers in delivering health programmes in conflict and post-conflict situations, and integrates peace-building concerns, concepts, principles, strategies and practices into health relief and health sector development.

The HBP concept was first put into practice in Central America in the 1980s, when warring sides were persuaded to observe truces to allow mass vaccination campaigns to be carried out safely. HBP is rooted in values derived from human rights and humanitarian principles, as well as medical ethics, and is supported by the conviction that it is imperative to adopt peace-building strategies to ensure lasting health gains in the context of social instability and complex emergencies.
WHO has put into place several initiatives based upon the tenants of Health as a Bridge for Peace. For instance, to facilitate the reintegration of the health sector of Eastern Slavonia into Croatia in the 1990s, it brought together Croat and Serb health workers for confidence building, joint technical analysis, planning and implementation of health services. HBP was also applied in Angola where the WHO assisted as a neutral broker in the disarmament, quartering and demobilization of soldiers from both sides of the conflict. HBP-type projects are currently being mainstreamed within Consolidated Appeal Processes under the aegis of the Health Cluster led by WHO as part of the humanitarian response coordinated by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC).

Displacement caused by war and disasters also poses special challenges to the health sector. Health problems faced by displaced people, refugees and migrants can include accidental injuries, hypothermia, burns, cardiovascular events, pregnancy and delivery-related complications. Children are prone to infections and diarrhoea because of poor living conditions and deprivation. WHO has been asked to advise countries on the health of refugees and migrants and to gather evidence that will contribute to a draft global action to be considered at the 72nd World Health Assembly in 2019.

In a big shift of emphasis and expansion of its role, WHO is now also working with countries and partners to prepare for, prevent, respond to and recover from all hazards that create health emergencies, including disasters and conflicts, as well as its traditional locus on disease outbreaks, such as the Ebola epidemic, through its All Hazards Health Emergencies Programme. The building blocks of its approach include an Early Warning and Response Network, a Health Resources Availability Monitoring System and an Emergency Medical Teams initiative. It has also adopted an increasing leadership role in the Inter Agency Standing Committee, particularly for infectious hazards. In addition, in 1995, the Member States of the World Health Organization (WHO) agreed on the need for better disease surveillance and response tools on a global scale. A decade later, in the wake of the international SARS epidemic and the spread of a deadly ‘bird flu’, WHO’s governing body accepted the dramatically revised International Health Regulations (IHR) (2005). The regulations focus on containing public health threats where and when they occur, rather than solely at ports and borders. Countries must develop the legal and regulatory mechanisms, physical infrastructure, human resources, and tools and processes necessary to ensure that all IHR obligations can be met, all the way down to the community level. The IHR framework offers the global health community a template for cooperative capacity-building efforts that build local capabilities for evidence-based

---

6 WHO is the lead agency for the humanitarian response Global Health Cluster, which brings together more than 49 humanitarian partners at global level and 300 partners in countries. The Cluster system was first applied following the 2005 earthquake in Pakistan, when nine clusters were established in 24 hours to coordinate the assistance delivered by humanitarian organizations. There are clusters in 23 countries, working to meet the needs of 60.5 million people worldwide.

7 The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) is the primary mechanism for inter-agency coordination of humanitarian assistance. It is a unique forum involving the key UN and non-UN humanitarian partners. IASC was established in June 1992 in response to United Nations General Assembly Resolution 46/182 on the strengthening of humanitarian assistance.
health policies and reinforce measures to prevent naturally, accidental or deliberate released infections from spreading internationally.

Health should be at the centre of collective humanitarian action, and the distinctive nature of health action during emergencies should be upheld in accordance with established humanitarian principles, medical ethics and international humanitarian law. The universal moral dimension to health can help build the confidence and trust necessary for peacebuilding.

**World Meteorological Organization (WMO)**

Helping countries acquire adequate meteorological and hydrological services, which are the backbone of early warning systems, and building their capacity to use them is a key task carried out by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) as part of its mandate to promote international cooperation on the state of the Earth’s atmosphere, weather, climate and the distribution of water resources.

WMO takes an integrated and multidisciplinary approach to the management of water resources, which are vital for life, the production of virtually all goods and services, and are the most widely used source of renewable energy, producing 16 per cent of the world’s electricity. The World Hydrological Cycle Observing System (WHYCOS) assists national hydrological services in acquiring and sharing information needed for water resource management strategies. For instance, the WMO encourages the integration of flood risks into the management of water resources, rather than a single focus on flood control, to protect people and infrastructure more effectively. Because of their long-term wide-ranging socio-economic and environmental impacts, droughts are by far the most damaging of all natural disasters and their economic cost is estimated to be around US$80 billion a year. The WMO is also behind efforts to promote the resilience of countries, communities and ecosystems to drought through the Integrated Drought Management Programme, which was launched in partnership with the Global Water Partnership in 2013. In another initiative that builds community resilience, the Agricultural Meteorology Programme (AgMP) helps national meteorological and hydrological services to meet the needs of farmers, herders and fishermen to improve production and quality, reduce losses and risks, decrease costs, increase water use efficiency, conserve natural resources and decrease pollution.
B. ENTITIES IN PEACE WORK: INNOVATIVE PRACTICES AND INSTRUCTIVE EXAMPLES

At the sharp end of peacekeeping

UN peacekeeping, a pivotal peace and security tool, has evolved over time in line with the mandates provided by the UN Security Council in response to evolving peace and security challenges across the world. During past decades, peacekeepers popularly known as ‘Blue Helmets’ have experienced successful outcomes as well as disappointments. Currently, 15 UN peacekeeping missions are deployed in different parts of the world, overseen and supported by the DPKO-DFS. The following examples, drawn from five current peacekeeping operations, illustrate some of their expanding activities and challenges.

The UN Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) has disarmed more than 100,000 combatants and provided support for two presidential elections, with presidential and legislative elections that took place in October 2017. UNMIL is now helping to build national security institutions, having handed over responsibility for security to Liberian national forces in June 2016. In light of the largely successful implementation of its mandate, the mission has begun to draw down in preparation for a full exit in 2018.

The UN Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA) halted a potential genocide amid severe challenges and created space for peaceful and credible elections. Under its multidimensional mandate, the UN Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) has been engaged proactively in providing support for the political process, protecting civilians, and neutralizing armed groups in support of the national armed forces, as well as undertaking stabilization tasks. The UN Mission in the Republic of South Sudan (UNMISS) has stepped up measures to protect civilians through engagement, deterrence and the facilitation of humanitarian assistance for some 2 million civilians displaced by widespread and systematic violence since 2013. Notably, the mission is providing physical protection to over 200,000 civilians sheltered in its six Protection of Civilians sites (PoC). The United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) has played a key role in supporting the implementation of the peace agreement, including through support for the establishment of interim authorities in the five northern regions and support for the launch of the first mixed patrols in Gao.

Over the years, UN peacekeeping has made efforts to improve and adapt its approaches and practices to current challenges and contexts. For example, considerable efforts have been invested in improving approaches for the protection of civilians,
community engagement, support for the extension of state authority, human rights monitoring and so forth. Initiatives are also underway to enhance the performance of uniformed components in partnership with troop-contributing countries. Meanwhile, the management of missions has provided opportunities to foster sustainable environmental practices by limiting the negative environmental impact of missions. In Darfur, for example, UNAMID and humanitarian organizations switched from building compounds with kiln-fired bricks, whose construction was contributing to the loss of 52,000 trees a year, to less environmentally damaging soil blocks. In a project in South Sudan, ex-combatants were employed to construct UN buildings with soil blocks, which created employment and reduced environmental impacts.

**Early warning: identifying the root causes of conflict**

With growing competition over natural and other resources essential to an adequate standard of living, denial of economic and social rights is increasingly becoming a cause and predictor of violence, social unrest and conflict. In keeping with the UN's renewed focus on conflict prevention, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights explored this issue in a thematic report on early warning and economic, social and cultural rights for the 2016 session of the Economic and Social Council. The report pointed out that violations stemmed from factors such as unequal power distribution, discrimination and inequality (OHCHR, 2016).

Future opportunities for OHCHR to promote peace lie in continued and strengthened efforts to implement and support the effective implementation of all human rights. The Declaration on the Right to Development addresses the root causes of poverty, inequality and conflict, systemic issues and structural challenges, in its quest to build a world order in which all rights and freedoms can be realized for all people everywhere, as envisioned in the Universal Declaration (UN, 1986). It calls for an enabling environment for realizing peace, human rights and development, as well as disarmament and the use of released resources for comprehensive development. Grounded in the human rights framework, the 2030 Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) provide new momentum to promote peace through human rights and development, with the aim of leaving no one behind. SDG 16, which aims to ‘Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels’, alongside the other SDGs, offers renewed potential to achieve the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, through a human rights framework, environmental protection and strengthened international cooperation.
Human rights must be integral both to ‘sustaining peace’ and sustainable development. They play a pivotal role in preventing conflict and violent extremism and are included in the UN Secretary-General’s ‘integrated way of thinking and acting’ to consolidate the UN’s capacities to meet the ‘prevention challenge’. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights will build on the Human Rights Up Front Initiative to reinforce the accountability and effectiveness of the UN. This initiative aims ‘to strengthen the UN system’s ability to effectively prevent and respond to serious human rights violations and complex crises’ and inter alia involves human rights education, including mandatory courses for all UN staff. Human rights-based implementation of the SDGs with the right to development at the core will enhance efforts to sustain peace. Effective, integrated and coordinated implementation of the economic, social, human rights and environmental components of sustainable development alongside the pursuit of progress, peace and security will serve to nurture lasting peace for all humanity.

**Increased women’s participation as uniformed personnel in peacekeeping**

Despite the ambitions of the WPS agenda, women still only account for around 3 per cent of UN military peacekeepers deployed around the world. However, their participation has been recognized as a critical component of mission success, leading to greater credibility for peacekeeping forces and a lower incidence of sexual exploitation and abuse in those settings. Women and children are often the main victims of violence in conflicts, particularly sexual violence, and it is often difficult for male soldiers to cross social and cultural boundaries and build their trust. Evidence has shown that women peacekeepers are more likely to provide victims with a sense of security, obtain their trust, and in the process gather the information needed to obtain justice. Women are also distinguishing themselves in leadership roles in UN peacekeeping. Sgt. Felicite Mujawamariya, a Rwandan peacekeeper serving with UNAMID, was awarded a UN medal of excellence in 2015 for her exceptional performance in implementing reform and restructuring as a UN Team Site Commander.

To incentivize troop-contributing countries to deploy more women, UN Women runs training courses for female military officers and supports the DPKO in training military peacekeepers to prevent and respond to conflict-related sexual violence. UNITAR, the training arm of the UN, also delivers pre-deployment training to female and male peacekeepers. For example, several hundred Rwandan women have received training from UNITAR in collaboration with the African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance (ACOTA) Programme at the Rwanda Military Academy in Gako. In May 2016, Platoon Commander Marie Gorrette Ingabire became the first female staff officer to participate in pre-deployment training before leading her platoon.
in the UNAMID AU/UN Hybrid Mission in Darfur, Sudan. UNAMID is the UN mission with the largest number of women peacekeepers, while Rwanda contributes the largest number of female peacekeepers. With more than 5,136 uniformed peacekeepers and 520 police currently serving, Rwanda is Africa’s second largest contributor to UN and African Union peace operations, and the fifth largest contributor globally.

**Reframing the youth and conflict question**

The more common approaches to ‘Youth, Peace and Security’ have been dominated by theories that focus on young people – especially young men – as potential perpetrators of violence. At a time when humanitarian crises and disasters are becoming increasingly salient in the contemporary health and development landscape, and in the context of rapid demographic transitions brought about by the largest ever generation of young people in history, the UN Population Fund (UNFPA) and the Peacebuilding Support Office are coordinating a Progress Study on Youth Peace and Security, mandated by UN Security Council Resolution 2250, that will recommend ways to end the marginalization and political exclusion of youth and foster their participation in sustaining peace. Many other UN entities such as UNDP, UNESCO and UN Volunteers (UNV) have been collaborating with UNPF A in this pursuit.

**Facilitating political crisis resolution**

The Department of Public Affairs (DPA) mediation work is conducted out of public view, but often plays a decisive part in the peaceful resolution of political crises. For example, in late 2013, Burkina Faso’s ruling party tried to abolish constitutional term limits to enable President Blaise Compaoré to run for another term of office, a move that stirred tensions within the country. Early in 2014, the DPA’s regional office in West Africa and the Sahel (UNOWAS) deployed a joint UN-ECOWAS early-warning mission and worked at leadership level to try to persuade President Compaoré to abandon his efforts to change the constitution. By the end of October 2014, mass demonstrations had triggered Compaoré’s precipitous departure from office. When Compaoré fled the country, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mohammed Ibn Chambas, the head of UNOWAS, led a joint UNOWA-ECOWAS-African Union mission to engage with national and international stakeholders and facilitate a peaceful solution. Intensive consultations led to a new Constitutional Charter and the appointment of transitional authorities in the capital Ouagadougou until fresh elections could be held. However, a year later, in September 2015, a month before the country was due to go to the polls, the former presidential guard mounted a coup d’état. In the wake of the coup attempt, ECOWAS and SRSG Chambas strove to secure the release of the transitional president and ministers,
restore the transitional authorities and obtain the coup leaders’ surrender. Mission officials repeatedly condemned the coup, worked with other partners for the transitional government’s return, and called for an end to the violence and the protection of the civilian population. This was achieved within a few days by working together with regional leaders and intervening with the coup leaders. The coup leaders surrendered power and on 29 November, Burkina Faso held post-transition elections and voted in a new democratically elected administration.

Factors that contributed to the success of the UN’s preventive engagement in Burkina Faso include the presence of a dedicated regional political office with a highly respected and connected leadership, timely and extended deployment, unrelenting effort from the UNOWA leadership and its staff, engagement with all actors and the perceptible neutrality of the UN’s involvement, and highly effective partnership with key regional organizations and the broader diplomatic community.

**Eradicating illicit small arms and light weapons**

Put simply, where weapons are available, violent conflict is more likely to occur. The Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (PoA) and its International Tracing Instrument (ITI), adopted by consensus by the UN General Assembly, are central to international efforts to combat illicit weapons, one of the explicitly peace-related targets of Sustainable Development Goal 16 on ‘peaceful and inclusive societies’. The Office for Disarmament Affairs (ODA) has assisted the PoA/ITI process through the provision of substantive support to global meetings, capacity-building for governments, awareness-raising and advocacy. Constant monitoring of data on SDG indicators will be critical to ensure the SDGs are met. The ODA will be centrally involved in efforts to gather data, in particular for SDG Target 16.4, most notably through the work of its regional centres in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean. To the same end, the ODA has provided legal, policy and technical assistance to Member States of the Central African sub-region on drafting the ‘Kinshasa Convention’, the Central African Convention for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons, their Ammunition and all Parts and Components that can be used for their Manufacture, Repair and Assembly, which entered into force in March 2017. The Convention was signed by 11 Central African states and aims to prevent and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and reduce the human suffering they cause in the sub-region and Africa as a whole. The Kinshasa Convention and other sub-regional small-arms instruments such as the Nairobi Protocol and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Conventions create a mutually reinforcing African disarmament and arms control network that provides
a framework for achieving the African Union’s ‘Silencing the Guns by 2020’ objective, as well as the SDGs. The United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa (UNOCA) of the Department of Political Affairs (DPA) acts as the Secretariat of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee for Security Questions in Central Africa (UNSAC), which negotiated the terms of the Convention.

The UN Institute of Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) has actively worked on the topic of illicit small arms and light weapons for over 25 years, supporting negotiations, producing policy-relevant studies and developing tools. UNIDIR’s current small arms and light weapons work focuses on weapons and ammunition management in fragile settings, addressing the illicit global arms trade, and providing support for the implementation of global instruments and guidelines on small arms and light weapons. These activities are carried out through the development of targeted tools (e.g. an arms and ammunition management software tool to assist practitioners in conducting storage assessments at the field level), capacity-building and the design of improved processes and better methods of stakeholder cooperation and collaboration (e.g. supporting the Government of Somalia to establish systems for import, storage, marking and recordkeeping, and the distribution of small arms in line with the relevant UN Security Council resolutions).

**Coordinating counter-terrorism efforts**

To draw the different strands of the UN together to tackle terrorism in a coherent manner, the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF) has developed an ‘All-of-UN’ coordination framework, which functions through twelve CTITF Inter-Agency Working Groups on priority areas of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (GCTS). These include foreign terrorist fighters (FTF), preventing violent extremism (PVE), human rights, gender and strategic communications. CTITF is also strengthening the delivery of UN capacity-building support to Member States and regional organizations tailored to the needs and priorities of each country. This is achieved through a strategic ‘All-of-UN’ Integrated Assistance for Counter-Terrorism (I-ACT) tool, currently being implemented in Burkina Faso, Nigeria, Mali and the G5-Sahel countries. At the request of the UN Security Council, comprehensive UN system-wide capacity-building efforts involving more than 200 tools are being implemented by 17 UN entities, with over 140 PVE projects implemented by 13 UN entities around the world.

The UN Counter-Terrorism Centre (UNCCT) also delivers capacity-building support through an ‘All-of-UN’ approach at national, regional and global levels across all four pillars of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. In response to the growing need for impact-driven capacity-building for Member States, the Centre developed a
five-year programme, which was endorsed by its Advisory Board in 2015, that ensures strategic guidance for the Centre’s work in 2016–2020. The programme outlines four key outcomes in line with the four pillars of the Global Strategy covering areas such as border security and management, countering the financing of terrorism, strategic PVE communications, addressing the foreign terrorist fighter threat, and ensuring respect for human rights when countering terrorism.

Preventing violent extremism through Education (PVE-E)

Violent extremism knows no boundaries and affects every society. However, young people are most at risk as the victims of extremist violence and the main targets of recruitment strategies. The United Nations Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism (A/70/674) expands on the first Pillar of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (A/RES/60/288), which addresses conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism. The PVE Plan of Action provides over seventy strategic recommendations to Member States and the UN to address the drivers of violent extremism. In Resolution 70/291, adopted on 1 July 2016, the UN General Assembly recommends that ‘Member States consider the implementation of relevant recommendations of the Plan of Action, as applicable to the national context’, and invited ‘Member States and regional and sub-regional organizations to consider developing national and regional plans of action to prevent violent extremism as and when conducive to terrorism, in accordance with their priorities and taking into account, as appropriate, the Secretary-General’s Plan of Action.’ A growing number of Member States and regional and sub-regional organizations are now developing national and regional PVE plans to address the drivers of violent extremism, drawing on the United Nations PVE Plan of Action, and are requesting the United Nations to support them in their efforts. A High Level PVE Action Group, chaired by the UN Secretary-General and consisting of the Heads of 21 UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes is spearheading UN efforts to support Member States in implementing the PVE Plan of Action, at their request.

The Office of Counter-Terrorism acts as Secretariat to the UN Secretary-General’s High Level PVE Action Group. It works through a dedicated CTITF Inter-Agency Working Group on Preventing Violent Extremism to coordinate the ‘All-of-UN’ approach to preventing violent extremism across the seven priority areas of the PVE Plan of Action. These UN efforts already encompass 223 projects and initiatives by 14 United Nations entities around the world.

UNESCO is at the forefront of UN system-wide efforts to prevent violent extremism through education, as stated in the UN Secretary-General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism and Security Council Resolution 2354 (UN, 2017) on Countering
Terrorist Narratives. This work is conducted through UNESCO’s Global Citizenship Education (GCED) programme, which aims to empower learners to face and resolve global challenges and contribute to a more peaceful, tolerant, inclusive and secure world. It also complements other key UNESCO actions to promote intercultural understanding, such as the protection and transmission of cultural heritage and inclusive education on information and communication technologies (ICTs), with a specific focus on young people. To this end, UNESCO co-organized the conference ‘Internet and the Radicalization of Youth: Preventing, Acting and Living Together’ with the Government of Quebec in 2016. The result of this conference was the Call of Quebec, which encourages all governments to elaborate national policies or action plans dedicated to preventing radicalization leading to violence. UNESCO also published A Teacher’s Guide on the Prevention of Violent Extremism in 2016 and Terrorism and the Media – A Handbook for Journalists in 2017, which take a holistic approach to fighting violent extremism.

UNESCO’s activities to prevent violent extremism through education (PVE-E) focus on awareness-raising and advocacy, the development of guidance, capacity-building for educators and policy-makers, and partnerships and projects. Senior policy-makers were among 200 participants who met to discuss educational interventions and approaches to PVE-E at the first International Conference on the Prevention of Violent Extremism through Education: ‘Taking Action’, co-organized by UNESCO and the UNESCO Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Education for Peace and Sustainable Development (MGIEP), and held in New Delhi in September 2016. In cooperation with the Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding (APCEIU), UNESCO has been expanding its Clearing House on GCED with the addition of resources on PVE-E. It has also developed two key normative tools to assist Member States – a guide on managing classroom discussions on PVE and radicalization for the upper primary/lower secondary level, and a guide to help policy-makers prioritize, plan and implement PVE-E actions.

In 2016, UNESCO conducted capacity-building for educators in Albania, Central Asia and West Africa. A seminar also took place in February 2017 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, organized by the UNESCO International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa (UNESCO-IICBA), UNESCO Headquarters and the UNESCO Asia-Pacific Centre for International Understanding (APCEIU), which brought together 40 representatives from Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, Uganda and Tanzania.

National capacity-building workshops on PVE-E for West and East Africa are under discussion as a follow-up to sub-regional workshops. UNESCO Field Offices and Institutes are also involved in PVE-E. The Office in Dakar is supporting the UNCCT-led Integrated Assistance for Counter Terrorism (I-ACT) capacity-building initiative for the G5 Sahel Region. The UNESCO Office in Venice is supporting teacher capacity-building and curriculum review in Albania to promote intercultural
and interreligious understanding as a contribution to PVE. A second phase of capacity-building is currently ongoing in partnership with Albania’s Ministry of Education, Sports and Youth. The UNESCO Office in Almaty is cooperating with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in Tajikistan and contributed to PVE-E capacity-building in July 2017. UNESCO’s Office in Rabat is supporting a ‘Schools as actors of PVE’ programme in Morocco and Global Citizenship Education and PVE through literacy and non-formal education in Mauritania. The UNESCO Office in Beirut has developed an agreement with the Ministry of Education in Lebanon and the Lebanese University to mainstream GCED and PVE into national teacher preparation programmes. It is also collaborating with a consortium of Arab State universities to develop a Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) on intercultural dialogue competences. The UNESCO International Bureau of Education in Switzerland launched a project entitled ‘Addressing Intolerance and Extremism through Universal Values in Curricula’ to guide curricular reform. In partnership with the Center for the Prevention of Radicalization Leading to Violence (CPRLV) in Montreal, Canada, the UNESCO Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Education for Peace and Sustainable Development (MGIEP) held a global PVE event in September 2017 with around 15 countries to test PVE training modules on critical inquiry, empathy and compassion. UNESCO is currently conducting a study on pedagogical measures and approaches in PVE.

Scientific cooperation for peace

UNESCO has done much to promote international cooperation in the field of science. During the Cold War, it was one of the few places in the world where scientists from both sides of the Iron Curtain could come together to discuss and share their knowledge. Today, UNESCO works with scientists who are tackling challenges such as climate change and natural resource management. For example, a project to improve scientific knowledge and management of Lake Chad and its ecosystems, organized in cooperation with the Lake Chad Basin Commission and other partners, is helping to promote sustainable development and build a culture of peace. Another example is the SESAME (Synchrotron-light for Experimental Science and Applications in the Middle East) Laboratory, which opened in Jordan in 2017, largely thanks to the determination of scientists to overcome the region’s political tensions and work together.

Culture and heritage for peace

The idea that cultural and natural heritage in all their diversity belong to all of humanity is a powerful message, and one that UNESCO promotes to foster mutual understanding and peace. The first large-scale campaign for cultural heritage, the Nubia campaign to safeguard the Abu Simbel temples following the construction
of the Aswan Dam, was launched in the same area where the very first UN Blue Helmets intervened, a few years earlier, following the Suez crisis. Protecting cultural heritage has become an increasingly important challenge as symbolically and historically important sites are often targeted during conflicts, including most recently in Afghanistan, Iraq, Mali and Syria. In this context, UNESCO leads the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 2347 (2017) on protecting cultural heritage for the maintenance of peace and international security, and fights against the illicit traffic of cultural property as a source of financing for terrorist groups, thereby spearheading implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 2199 (2015). Through activities such as its #Unite4Heritage campaign, UNESCO works to mobilize both governments and civil society for the protection of shared heritage. Multinational nominations to the World Heritage List and the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, as well as UNESCO's Histories series of pedagogical publications, including its General History of Africa, also aim to facilitate dialogue, overcome prejudice and enhance the idea of diverse but shared histories.

Engendering conflict sensitivity

Working in complex conflict, post-conflict or latent conflict settings poses special challenges beyond logistical and security considerations, a topic that UNICEF addressed in its ‘Conflict Sensitivity and Peacebuilding in UNICEF: A Technical Note’. A central concern is that interventions should be designed and conducted in such a way that they do not make matters worse – the ‘do no harm’ principle. The realization that development and humanitarian interventions could have a negative impact on the population they were intended to help became apparent in the 1990s when it was observed that introducing resources into environments of scarcity could exacerbate competition and inter-group tensions. If development actors poorly understand local realities and the political context, humanitarian aid deliveries can end up being diverted to combatants and inadvertently fuel conflict.

Among other factors, ‘conflict sensitivity’ incorporated into the design of an intervention seeks to ensure that it does not legitimize or support systems that promote violence and conflict or create tensions over access to services. Crucially, it is understood that any intervention becomes a part of the context and is never seen as neutral by the people in that context. While conflict sensitivity is the ‘minimum standard’ for interventions in conflict-affected contexts, peacebuilding also attempts to address the root causes of conflict and violence. It therefore intervenes in the dynamics of a conflict and involves a much greater degree of social transformation. New ways of addressing the challenges of fragile situations through peacebuilding have been the focus of much attention in recent years. Fragility has multiple underlying causes both chronic and acute, which can include low state legitimacy, insecurity and conflict,
porous borders and organized crime. When conflict and high levels of violence are present in a fragile situation, peacebuilding plays a critical role in developing resilience and supporting transition out of fragility. The notion underpins the approach to working in fragile states that was agreed by the UN, OECD members and the 17-member G+7 Group of fragile states in 2011 to improve development outcomes.

Members of the UN system are not alone in developing conflict sensitivity programmes; governments, civil society and international cooperation partners are increasingly developing conflict sensitivity and peacebuilding policies, frameworks and tools, as well as carrying out assessments to evaluate their assistance at different stages of planning or implementation. One key methodology increasingly used by development partners is the Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA).

**Peacebuilding through education**

In conflict-affected or fragile settings, education may serve both as a driver of conflict and as a platform for peacebuilding. Education is often complicit in creating the conditions for armed conflict through, for example, inequitable provision, biased curriculum, or teaching methods that reinforce existing exclusion and stereotypes. On the other hand, education can make many contributions to social cohesion and managing conflict and can also provide major peace dividends.

As children grow older, schools offer the means to learn how to think critically, resolve conflict non-violently, and provide a venue where students can develop positive relationships across conflict divides. Teaching young children the values of respect, tolerance and empathy, and equipping them with the necessary skills to resolve even daily conflict among peers in a non-violent manner, provides them with the tools they need, now and in the future, to foster peaceful relations at home, school and in their communities and beyond. Schools are also unique hubs for multi-sectoral programming that reaches into communities.

The promotion of peace through education is the objective of ‘Learning for Peace’, a new four-year peacebuilding, education and advocacy programme being implemented by UNICEF in partnership with the Government of the Netherlands, the national governments of 14 participating countries and other supporters. The programme will focus on five key outcomes: increasing the inclusion of education in peacebuilding and conflict reduction policies, analyses and implementation; increasing institutional capacity to supply conflict-sensitive education; increasing the capacity of children, parents, teachers and other duty bearers to prevent, reduce and cope with conflict and promote peace; increasing access to conflict-sensitive education that contributes to peace; and generating and using evidence and knowledge on policies and programming related to education,
conflict and peacebuilding. It will be implemented in 14 countries in East Asia and the Pacific, Eastern and Southern Africa, the Middle East and North Africa, South Asia, and West and Central Africa.

Another example of education being harnessed to foster peace is ‘Back to School’ campaigns, which have been implemented in Afghanistan, Côte d’Ivoire, Gaza, Somalia and Southern Sudan, and have been shown to provide massive peace dividends. During campaigns, UNICEF encourages community-level engagement, distributes essential school materials, and provides temporary learning spaces to keep children in school during and after a conflict or crisis. UNICEF also strengthens the capacity of education ministries by providing technical assistance on policies, guidelines, system development and programme planning. ‘Back to School’ campaigns employ intense advocacy, communication and social mobilization efforts. They are informed by the principle of risk reduction, underpinned by a human right-based approach to local ownership, and serve as platforms for communal dialogue and social cohesion.

UNICEF’s efforts to harness education for peace are not confined to the classroom. For example, the Organization’s Youth, Peacebuilding and Leadership Training, which has been implemented in Guinea and Liberia, has been shown to contribute to reconciliation and the reduction of mob violence and violence against women, as well as an increased awareness of civic rights and responsibilities. In Liberia, a leadership and peacebuilding-skills programme used interactive and participatory techniques to address self-awareness, trust-building, cooperation, information-seeking, managing emotions, leadership, discussion about human rights, the causes of conflict, and nationalism and patriotism.

Employment for refugees

Within the framework of the Regional Refugee Response and Resilience Plan (3RP), the InternationalLabour Organization (ILO) has adopted a development-focused, employment-driven strategy to support host communities and refugees. The strategy builds on the ILO’s core mandate to promote employment, social dialogue, social protection and rights at work through three key pillars: contributing to building the resilience of host communities and refugees by enhancing access to employment opportunities and livelihoods; strengthening institutional capacities and coordination to eliminate child labour; and supporting evidence-based policy development to ensure an employment-rich national response based on the principles of decent work. The strategy is anchored in the ILO’s 2016 ‘Guiding Principles on the Access of Refugees and other Forcibly Displaced Persons to the Labour Market’. The ILO has allocated US$40 million in response to the crisis, including its own resources and project
funding from partners. Under the 3RP, the ILO is seeking an additional US$37.7 million for 2017–2018 to deliver on livelihoods, jobs and skills, child labour and labour market governance. In April 2016, Jordan’s Ministry of Labour introduced a new model de-linking work permit applications from specific employers in the agricultural sector and allowing cooperatives to apply for Syrian refugee work permits. Over a nine-month period, the number of work permits issued to Syrian refugees grew practically tenfold to almost 37,000. The ILO is now collaborating with the National Employment and Training Company to provide testing and certification for Syrian and Jordanian workers in the construction sector to improve their employability. The Organization will also build on its Better Work Programme in the garment sector to provide third-party monitoring for a compliance programme for factories exporting under the trade agreement between Jordan and the European Union. In Lebanon, the ILO has been pursuing a resilience-based approach, an example of which involves demonstrating how farmers can produce different varieties of potatoes and crops in accordance with Global Good Agriculture Practices (Global GAP) standards. In Turkey, it has delivered an array of vocational and technical skills development and entrepreneurship training to Syrian refugees and Turkish citizens. It has also supported the integration of Syrian refugees and host communities into the labour market by assisting with the implementation of Turkey’s Regulation on Work Permits of Foreigners under Temporary Protection and the new International Labour Force Law that came into effect in August 2016.

**Strengthening national capacity for conflict prevention**

UNDP and DPA have been working together for more than a decade on a flagship joint programme to strengthen national capacities for conflict prevention. The programme was joined in 2016 by the Peacebuilding Support Office, which is co-funding a growing cadre of Peace and Development Advisors (PDA) deployed in the field to help Resident Coordinators (RC) and UN Country Teams (UNCT) adapt and respond to complex political situations, and develop and implement strategic conflict prevention initiatives and programmes. In 2016, the programme provided support to 45 countries, engaging in a variety of contexts. Notable results were achieved in strengthening peace architectures and mediator capacity-building in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Togo; establishing early warning systems in Cameroon and the Caribbean; and engaging with women and youth groups in Burundi, Malawi and the Maldives. In many instances the approach has opened up new entry points for conflict-prevention initiatives and facilitated the integration of conflict-sensitive perspectives into development programming.
PDAs wear two ‘hats’: while they provide strategic guidance and implement conflict-prevention initiatives with national counterparts from government and civil society, they also support RCs through political and conflict analysis and the UNCT with the design and implementation of conflict-sensitive programming. The Joint Programme’s support is intended to be catalytic, shaping the UN’s work on conflict prevention in-country and strengthening the capacity of both UNCTs and national partners to sustain efforts going forward. The average PDA deployment is two years, with an emphasis on recruiting nationals of the country to promote ownership and sustainability. A standout example of a positive contribution made by the programme concerns Malawi, which went through the most contentious and violent electoral process in its history in 2014. The PDA supported the UN’s preparedness ahead of the elections, working closely with the Resident Coordinator, the UN Country Team, UNDP and DPA Headquarters on the development of election scenarios. In the lead up to the polls, the PDA worked alongside DPA-deployed Standby Mediation Experts and UNDP specialists to boost the Public Affairs Committee’s (PAC) efforts to serve as ‘inside mediators’ before, during and after the elections. A series of planned peace initiatives and the mobilization of a critical mass of ‘peace voices’ across all sectors of Malawian society played a key role in limiting violence and ensuring calm after the results were announced. The PAC benefitted from simulation and mediation training facilitated by the mission and went on to become an effective intermediary between presidential candidates, securing their commitment for peaceful elections.

Another example concerns the deployment of two PDAs to Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan to alleviate cross-border tensions. The PDAs have led UN efforts to develop peacebuilding initiatives, designing immediate responses to the current situation to build confidence and reduce tension, as well as longer-term programmes linking peacebuilding and sustainable development. In order to respond quickly to emerging conflict dynamics, UNDP plans to enhance its conflict-monitoring capacity in cross-border areas through the implementation of a pilot MPRD (Measuring Political Risks for Development) project, which is currently being tested in Tajikistan. If successful, the MPRD will also be considered by Kyrgyzstan using the capacities of two PDAs in close collaboration with the United Nations Regional Centre for Preventive Diplomacy (UNRCCA), DPA, two UNCTs and other UN partners. Under the leadership of the respective RCs, the PBSO and PBF offices have been engaged through an additional allocation that is expected to augment peace-building activities.

‘Asset creation’ as peacebuilding

In addition to its better-known humanitarian relief role, the World Food Programme (WFP) also engages in peacebuilding activities in the field and is currently implementing elements of peacebuilding policy in countries including the Central African Republic,
Colombia, Kyrgyzstan, Mali, Somalia, South Sudan and Syria. A project in the Kyrgyz Republic, jointly implemented by UNDP, UNICEF, FAO, WFP and UN Women as part of an 18-month PBSO-funded activity, includes both ‘hard’ elements such as infrastructure and ‘soft’ elements such as trust-building, mediation, collaboration, awareness-raising, early warning and information-sharing. WFP is concentrating on asset creation under its Food for Work (FFW) and Food for Training (FFT) activities and collaborates on other ‘soft’ interventions.

The WFP’s Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) projects in conflict-affected areas increasingly focus on the construction of infrastructure such as bridges, dams or community centres. The WFP includes participants from all sides in FFA programmes as a means to promote dialogue. Participants in the FFA programme in the Kyrgyz Republic reported that the work they had been involved in fostered inter-ethnic cooperation and helped to break down mistrust and negative stereotypes.

In Somalia, the WFP promoted the incorporation of food security and livelihood assistance into national peacebuilding plans, including the three-year New Deal Compact for Somalia (2014–2016), the United Nations Integrated Strategic Framework (ISF), peacebuilding priority plans for PBF funding and the new three-year National Development Plan. The objectives include enhancing the resilience of communities through food assistance-for-assets interventions and strengthened partnerships, rebuilding household food and nutrition security with preventive and therapeutic nutrition interventions and school meals, and protecting livelihoods during shocks and seasonal vulnerability through blanket supplementary feeding and targeted relief assistance.

**Capacity-building through food and agriculture**

FAO has collaborated with the Peace Building Fund since 2009 to support emergency projects in conflict-affected or post-conflict countries including Burundi, the Central African Republic, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea-Bissau, Kyrgyzstan, Niger, Somalia, South Sudan, Tajikistan, Uganda and Yemen. It provides training, education and capacity-building; implements infrastructure rehabilitation projects; distributes seeds and agricultural kits; and provides veterinary care for livestock. As part of wider early action efforts, FAO has been working with 11 partners to build a technical consensus on food insecurity through the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC). The IPC includes implications for responses, thus helping decision-makers to prioritize actions. The IPC has helped to mitigate the humanitarian impact of the conflicts in the Central African Republic and South Sudan and is currently being used in more than 20 countries. In another example of capacity-building, FAO has established pastoralist field schools to help the cross-border pastoralist communities of Kenya and Uganda, which are frequently
involved in inter-tribal conflicts, to cope more effectively with drought risks. To contribute to peacebuilding efforts, FAO has also conducted exchange visits between communities on each side of the border to help mitigate negative attitudes and promote peaceful co-existence.

FAO often works in extremely sensitive contexts in post-conflict countries, where local people have unequal bargaining power and marginalized actors, such as women and ethnic groups, and are not fully aware of their territorial rights. In keeping with the notion that the settlement of disputes must be inclusive and participatory to produce lasting results, FAO has employed a Participatory Negotiated Territorial Development (PNTD) approach in order to promote equitable access to and management of natural resources in countries including Burundi, Ghana, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Senegal.

In March 2016, the Director-General of FAO addressed the UN Security Council for the first time at an Arria-formula meeting on food security, nutrition and peace, indicating that links between peace and development are strengthening within the UN. FAO has since provided quarterly technical updates to the UN Security Council on the state of food security in countries in conflict. The information will contribute to a forthcoming in-depth analysis of the relationship between peace and food security.

Environmental Cooperation for Peacebuilding

The Environmental Cooperation for Peacebuilding (ECP) programme, led by UN Environment, was established in 2008 to help countries, regional organizations, UN entities and civil society understand and respond more effectively to the conflict risks and peacebuilding opportunities presented by natural resources and the environment. The programme is divided into three pillars:

1. Building an evidence base on environmental peacebuilding, for instance through the Environmental Peacebuilding Knowledge Platform.

2. Providing strategic advocacy and joint policy analysis including through reports on the role of environment and natural resources in conflict and peacebuilding, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR), and international law.

3. Promoting the uptake of good practices and pilot projects, such as the work carried out in Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Haiti, Mali and Sudan.

---

8 Arria-formula meetings are “very informal, confidential gatherings which enable Security Council members to have a frank and private exchange of views, within a flexible procedural framework, with persons whom the inviting member or members of the Council (who also act as the facilitators or convenors) believe it would be beneficial to hear and/or to whom they may wish to convey a message.”
Together with publishers Routledge, ECP has published a six-volume collection of 150 case studies on natural resources and the environment in post-conflict peacebuilding, which are freely available online. The volumes cover 67 conflict-affected countries, and are based inputs from more than 225 researchers, practitioners and decision-makers across the globe. ECP has also produced six peace-related policy reports with other UN agencies, including *Natural Resources and Conflict: A Guide for Mediation Practitioners* (2015) with UNDPA, *Women and Natural Resources: Unlocking the Peacebuilding Potential* (2013) with UN Women, PBSO and UNDP, and *The Role of Natural Resources in Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration: Addressing Risks and Seizing Opportunities* (2013) with UNDP.

Through the ECP, UN Environment has also assisted the United Nations International Law Commission with its ongoing review of the international legal framework for protecting the environment before, during and after armed conflict. The review aims to establish guidelines that can better support environmental protection and preservation, for example, in protected areas and environmentally sensitive sites, such as drinking water aquifers, which are of critical environmental and cultural importance and can be severely affected by warfare.

In May 2016, the UN Environment Assembly adopted a resolution on ‘Protecting the Environment in Areas Affected by Armed Conflict’ with the consensus of all 193 Member States. The resolution includes a provision on collaborating with UNESCO to protect conflict-affected World Heritage Sites.

**Preventing conflicts over natural resources**

Conflict prevention and peacebuilding in connection to the environment and natural resources concerns many UN entities, with UN Environment serving as the pivotal body. For instance, UN Environment has collaborated with the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the UN Department of Field Support (DFS) to decrease the overall consumption of natural resources and the production of waste of peacekeeping operations, thereby reducing potential conflicts with local communities, protecting local environmental health, and establishing the UN as a role model for sustainable practices. In June 2009, DPKO and DFS adopted their ‘Environmental Policy for UN Field Missions’, drawing on technical support from UN Environment. The policy provides a set of minimum standards to be implemented across all UN field missions on energy, water, waste, wildlife, fauna, the management of cultural and historical resources, and environmental management and assessment. An important milestone of this partnership was the landmark policy report, *Greening the Blue Helmets: Environment, Natural Resources and UN Peacekeeping Operations* (2012).
Building on this collaboration, DFS and UN Environment established the UN Peace Operations Rapid Environment and Climate Technical Assistance Facility (REACT) partnership in 2016. REACT serves to promote the mainstreaming of environmental sustainability in the UN system, focusing in particular on peacekeeping operations, by supporting DFS in their efforts to improve their own environmental and energy performance.

The illegal exploitation of natural resources is another dimension of concern that has elicited the attention of several UN entities. Since 1990, more than 18 violent conflicts have been fuelled by the exploitation of natural resources. Civil wars such as those in Angola, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Liberia have been fought over high-value resources such as timber, diamonds, gold, minerals and oil, while others, including those in Darfur and the Middle East, have involved the control of scarce resources such as fertile land and water.

An expert report published in 2015 by UN Environment in conjunction with DPKO and other partners highlighted the extent to which transnational criminal groups are engaged in illicit natural resources exploitation. Research suggests that, globally, at least 40 per cent of internal conflicts are linked to the exploitation of natural resources. In addition, conflicts linked to natural resources are more likely to relapse in the first five years after a peace agreement has been signed (UN Environment, 2015).

UN Environment has an active partnership with INTERPOL to assess and address environmental crime, including financing provided to armed groups and criminal networks. Two recent reports, *The Rise of Environmental Crime* and *Environment, Peace and Security: A Convergence of Threats*, have been published in this context.

Armed conflict can thus inflict direct and indirect environmental damage, coupled with the collapse of institutions, and threats to people’s health, livelihoods and security.

However, transparent natural resource governance can help to maximize peace dividends, minimize the risk of social grievances and violent conflict, and serve as a vehicle for durable peace, confidence-building and poverty reduction. To address this key governance issue, which has a direct impact on peace and stability, UN Environment is currently working on a partnership with the World Bank to understand how improved information management and stakeholder engagement in the extractive sector can help contribute to SDG targets to reduce corruption and bribery, develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions, foster inclusive decision-making and ensure public access to information. The ‘MAP-X’ (Mapping and Assessing the Performance of the Extractive Industries) geospatial platform aims to
help stakeholders improve monitoring, compliance and performance of concessions across the extractive industry value chain using economic, social and financial criteria.

**Cooperating for climate change**

While the threat posed by climate change has galvanized international cooperation in recent years, there is a long history of nations coming together to better understand and cope with the weather and climate. The transformation of the International Meteorological Organization (IMO) into the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) in 1950 was a major milestone in strengthening global cooperation in this area. From its inception, the WMO built bridges between the scientific communities of different countries, including during the Cold War, with cooperation flourishing during those politically difficult years. Observational networks were extended to cover practically the entire globe. The World Weather Watch (WWW), which was established in 1963 at the initiative of the United States of America and the Soviet Union, represents an outstanding landmark in international cooperation. It combines observing systems, telecommunication facilities, and data-processing and forecasting centres operated by Member States, and provides meteorological and related environmental information needed to ensure efficient services in all countries. WMO has remained at the forefront of early warning on weather and climate-related risks that affect all nations, regardless of politics. The WMO technical document on the possible climatic consequences of a major nuclear war, published in 1986, will remain a historic reference for future generations. In 1976, WMO released its authoritative statement on the accumulation of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and the potential impacts on the Earth's climate. This helped to focus attention on global warming and climate change, which are today understood as a major threat to sustainable development and even to human survival.

**Addressing the challenges of climate change**

Addressing climate change and its effects is the foremost challenge of the present era. The Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and reports of the WMO on the global climate and greenhouse gases are unequivocal: the temperature of the atmosphere and the ocean are continuing to rise, ice caps and glaciers are receding, and sea levels are rising. Human influence on the climate is beyond any doubt: 2016 was the warmest year on record, with global average temperatures 1.1 °C above pre-industrial levels, while the global concentration of CO₂ and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere continues to rise. IPCC scenarios show that continued reliance on fossil fuels will definitively lead to a warmer planet (IPCC, 2013–14; WMO, 2016a; WMO, 2016b). Limiting global warming to less than 2 °C as mandated by the Paris Agreement can be achieved, but requires a rapid and significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.
Climate change is exacerbating extreme weather events and pressure on vital resources such as water, food and energy. If not adequately addressed, these effects will continue to exacerbate tension, conflict and displacement, and undermine peace and security, as well as efforts to transition towards a greener economy and more sustainable development. A recent report published by WMO (2014) and the Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED) of the Université Catholique de Louvain states that, between 1970 and 2012, 8,835 disasters, 1.94 million deaths and US$ 2.4 trillion of economic losses resulted from droughts, floods, wind storms, tropical cyclones, storm surges, extreme temperatures, landslides and wildfires, or climate or weather-linked health epidemics and insect infestations.

Water stress is already high, especially in developing countries, and climate change is exacerbating the situation. Poor water resource management will jeopardize progress on poverty reduction, sustainable development, and food security and nutrition targets across all economic, social and environmental dimensions, including as a result of forced displacement in situations where basic human rights are weakened or threatened.

With the increased decline of the Arctic and Greenland ice sheet mass, the possibility of a sea level rise of 1 metre or more by 2100 cannot be excluded. As a recent article in the IOM Environmental Migration Newsletter stated, Small Island Developing States (SIDS) such as Kiribati, Tuvalu or the Maldives face the prospect of submergence and complete abandonment during this century (Camus, 2014). Countries in Asia and Africa with low levels of development and rapid population growth in coastal areas are also threatened.

In 2011 and 2012, drought and famine in the Horn of Africa led to an influx of Somalis into Kenya’s Dadaab refugee camp. Occurrences of this kind highlight important challenges for the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the broader international community about how climate change affects and will continue to affect displacement, security and peace. What happened in Kenya underscores the difficulty of attributing causality, or determining the primary driver of displacement, particularly when persons are fleeing slow onset hazards such as droughts since there is no identifiable sudden trigger, but rather changes that occur over a prolonged period. There is currently a gap in international law concerning persons displaced across international borders in the context of disasters including climate change impacts. According to the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, such individuals do not usually qualify as refugees, although their status may change in circumstances where the disaster is linked to armed conflict and violence (UNHCR, 2017). Another issue relates to the question of displaced persons unable to return to their country of origin due to the effects of climate-related impacts, such as droughts.
In an example that illustrates how the issue can be mainstreamed, the High-Level Committee on Programmes (HLCP) is developing a UN strategy on climate change in the context of the 2030 Agenda, under which UNHCR is contributing to the thematic area on the nexus of climate change, displacement and security. From 2013–2016, UNHCR coordinated the Advisory Group on Climate Change and Human Mobility composed of UNHCR, IOM, UNDP, Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, Refugees International, Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED) and the University of Liege. At the 2016 Climate Change Negotiations (COP22), UNHCR also organized and was a panellist at the ‘Delivering as One’ UN side event on Climate Change and Human Mobility, anchored in SDG 10 on ‘Addressing inequalities’, which brought together diverse perspectives from across the UN family. The panel included representatives from the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), UN Women, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the Platform on Disaster Displacement (PDD), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the UK branch of the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF UK), the UN University Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS) and the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), and was moderated by the UNFCCC Secretariat. There is also a need for a shift in mentality towards prevention, rather than solely reaction to these issues, for instance through the integration of early warning systems, disaster risk reduction and preparedness measures into national policies to build communities’ resilience and prevent displacement. Such a forward-looking perspective will enable the UN family to ensure no one is left behind and to promote and foster peace.

**International cooperation on early warning systems**

The number of weather and climate-related disasters has more than doubled over the past 40 years, claiming lives, forcing people from their homes, and threatening peace and stability. From 1970 to 2012, close to 2 million deaths and US$2.4 trillion of economic losses were reported globally due to extreme weather events. Countries that have successfully built early warning systems have benefitted from a dramatic reduction in deaths related to weather extremes as well as obtaining additional economic benefits. However, over 80 per cent of the world’s 48 least developed countries and many SIDS, which are particularly affected by such hazards, have only the most basic early warning systems, while weather observation networks – the foundation of early warning systems – are inadequate in many African countries.
At the Third Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction held in Sendai, Japan, in March 2015, the UN stressed the need to ‘substantially increase the availability of and access to multi-hazard early warning systems and disaster risk information’ by 2030.

The Climate Risk and Early Warning Systems (CREWS) initiative was launched in 2015 at the Paris climate change negotiations to strengthen risk information and early warning systems in vulnerable countries and to leverage financing to protect populations exposed to extreme climate events. The CREWS coalition is led by France, with support from Australia, Canada, Germany, Japan, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, and the initiative is being implemented by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), and the World Bank’s Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR). The initiative aims to mobilize US$100 million by 2020 to fill the gaps in existing bilateral and multilateral cooperation programmes.

At the Marrakech talks in November 2016, it was announced that the Democratic Republic of Congo, which has been affected by significant coastal erosion, would be one of the countries to receive assistance in upgrading their national meteorological and hydrological service forecast capabilities, along with Burkina Faso and Mali.

**Making cities safer**

Enhancing the safety of cities makes a crucial contribution to peace and security. The application of UN-Habitat’s Safer Cities approach in more than 30 countries over the past two decades has shown that the prevention of urban crime and violence promotes more equitable, socially integrated and inclusive cities, and represents a critical contribution towards peace. The programme promotes an urban planning, management and governance model of enhancing safety in which local authorities play a decisive role, fostering closer UN engagement with local decision-makers. UN-Habitat has also launched the Global Partnership Initiative on Safer Cities, which advances knowledge management and the development of tools, training, capacity development and networking in cooperation with the associated Global Network on Safer Cities (GNSC) and the Regional Forums for Urban Safety in Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America. In partnership with the government of Canada, UN-Habitat and the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) have prepared UN system-wide *Guidelines on Safer Cities*. UN-Habitat’s Safer Cities Programme and the Geneva Peacebuilding Platform held the first biennial conference on ‘Reviewing the State of Safety in World Cities’ in Geneva in June 2017.
Building peace through communication and information

The free flow of ideas by word and image is an essential component of lasting peace. In 1957, UNESCO in cooperation with the French government enabled the creation of the first regional centre for the training of journalism teachers – the International Centre for Higher Education in Journalism, hosted at the University of Strasbourg in France. By fostering freedom of expression, promoting the expression of pluralism and cultural diversity in the media, and ensuring access to information and knowledge through ICTs, UNESCO is actively contributing to promoting fundamental rights and freedoms. UNESCO’s efforts in this area have led to continuous cooperation between tertiary educational establishments across Libya with a view to opening up access to scientific research and education resources.

In South Sudan, UNESCO organized a series of workshops through its YouthMobile Initiative, teaching young girls and boys how to design mobile applications and build a ‘PeaceApp’, which offers practical steps towards peace and reconciliation, and has allowed users to share information and make personal commitments to the peacebuilding process.

Among many other interventions, UNESCO has also launched a Massive Open Online Course on media and information literacy (MIL MOOC) for young girls and boys in English and Arabic. Over 500 young people have been trained to verify information online, to recognize how information influences their beliefs and attitude, and to use ICTs to promote equality and tolerance to tackle online misinformation, which is one of the leading causes of radicalization.

Building confidence and capacities in cyberspace

Over the past decade, the Global Cybersecurity Agenda (GCA) (2007) of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) has guided the ITU’s work in the area of building confidence and security in the information society. Achievements include the existence of a growing number of national Computer Incident Response Teams (CIRTs) to respond to cyber-attacks and protect critical infrastructure from cyber-threats. ITU aids Member States with initial assessment and design through to the establishment and enhancement of their CIRT. ITU and its partners also organize regular regional cyber-drills to improve coordination between national CIRTs.

To help improve international cooperation on cyber security, national governments also need effective national cyber security frameworks. The development of a comprehensive national cyber security strategy is the first key step. ITU has partnered with 14 entities with experience in devising models and implementing cyber security strategies to produce one single reference guide, which is currently at the finalization stage.
In 2015 and 2017, the ITU published a Global Cybersecurity Index (GCI) report, a tool aimed at providing an incentive for countries to identify areas for improvement in their cyber security measures and actions, and to harmonize their practices with those of other countries. The Index measured countries’ commitment to cyber security based on a set of legal, technical and organizational criteria including levels of capacity-building, and national and international cooperation.

Child online protection is another aspect of the ITU remit. In 2008, ITU launched the Child Online Protection (COP) initiative as a multi-stakeholder effort within the GCA framework. The initiative is designed to create a safer and more empowering online experience for children. ITU has also been providing guidance and building capacity in countries in cooperation with other stakeholders.

**ILO’s embedded approach: case study of Timor Leste**

The International Labour Organization (ILO) began carrying out assessment missions in Timor Leste in 2001 when the country was under UN transitional administration before its independence. Given the weak institutional environment in the newly founded republic, the ILO decided to implement its Skills Training for Gainful Employment (STAGE) (2004–2009) project by embedding ILO staff in national institutions where they would work side-by-side with their local counterparts, ensuring that the project would be delivered not for the government, but by the government from the onset.

A second watershed decision was taken in 2006 when the ILO chose to continue with its engagement in Timor Leste despite the outbreak of violence. A core team remained in place and operational, a decision that would influence the ILO and its counterparts in two critical dimensions: relationships and strategy. Establishing solid working relations and common objectives dramatically contributed to building trust between the government and the ILO, and by not ‘abandoning ship’ during the emergency the ILO was uniquely positioned to help the government respond to unaddressed emergency needs through responses that would later serve as springboards for future programme development. A series of conflict vulnerability analyses identified poverty, youth unemployment, youth gangs and unmet youth expectations as contributing factors to instability. Through STAGE, the Timor Leste government provided immediate employment opportunities to support stability and facilitate a transition from emergency relief to recovery. Two short-term cash-for-work projects, ‘Work for the Nation’ and ‘Work for Peace’, were implemented and a third, ‘Women in Self Employment’, was developed. ‘Work for the Nation’ was a quick-impact project that engaged community members in the relief effort through providing jobs in rice distribution and debris clearance. ‘Work for Peace’ provided
short-term jobs repairing roads through labour-based techniques to ensure that most funds went into the local economy through wages rather than into capital-intensive machinery. To this day, the ties forged and lessons learned in 2006 are vividly remembered and sincerely felt by the Timorese and international staff alike.

**Tackling unemployment and building a global health workforce**

The global demand for health workers will double by 2030, as populations grow and change. Investing in the necessary training and sector development will not only contribute to health goals, it will also provide an opportunity to tackle what the UN Secretary-General considers to be ‘probably one of the worse threats to global peace and security’ (Guterres, 2017) – youth unemployment. Under the five-year ‘Working for Health’ action plan, which resonates with the UN focus on prevention to advance peace and development, the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Labour Organization (ILO), and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) are working with governments and key stakeholders to address the global health and social workforce shortfall and to contribute to international efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.

The plan calls on countries to view the health and social workforce as an investment rather than a cost, and to take advantage of the economic benefits of growth in the health and social sector. It outlines how ILO, OECD and WHO will take intersectoral action on five fronts: galvanizing political support; strengthening data and evidence; transforming and scaling up the education, skills and decent jobs of health and social workers; increasing resources to build the health and social workforces; and maximizing the multiple benefits that can be obtained from international health worker mobility. It also focuses on maximizing women’s economic empowerment and participation, and addresses occupational health and safety, and the protection and security of the health and social workforce in all settings. In addition, the plan covers the reform of service models towards the efficient provision of care, particularly in underserved areas. The action plan supports the WHO Global Strategy on Human Resources for Health: Workforce 2030 and will facilitate implementation of the recommendations of the United Nations Secretary General’s High-Level Commission on Health Employment and Economic Growth (WHO, 2017b).

According to the Commission, ageing populations and increasing rates of non-communicable diseases are projected to generate demand for 40 million new health workers worldwide by 2030 – double the current global health workforce. Most of those jobs will be created in the wealthiest countries. Without action, there will
be a shortfall of 18 million health workers needed to achieve and sustain universal health coverage, affecting primarily low and lower-middle income countries.

**Reconciliation and peacebuilding through land and property reparations**

Land, property and reparations issues play an ever-increasing role in reconciliation, peace-building and reconstruction efforts, and represent an important rehabilitation tool for countries in transition. The contribution of such programmes to durable solutions for conflict-affected populations is substantial.

As part of its global mandate on migration, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) Land, Property and Reparations (LPR) Division, under the Department of Operations and Emergencies (DOE), assists governments to address severe human rights violations in the aftermath of natural disasters and protracted conflict situations. It gives technical support on land and property issues, including the resolution of disputes and increasing and protecting access to land and land tenure security for vulnerable populations in rural and urban settings. The IOM also sensitizes international and national actors to the importance of land issues in post-conflict and post-natural disaster environments. With respect to reparations for victims of conflict or serious human rights violations, IOM provides technical support to governments and other stakeholders on locally sensitive programme design and the transparent delivery of individual or collective reparations, such as compensation payments, the provision of in-kind benefits such as vocational training, access to health care and education, and the implementation of symbolic reparations.

IOM’s range of services in this area extends from programme design to direct implementation, and includes activities such as field surveys, consultations and technical assessments, policy advice and recommendations, institutional design, capacity-building for implementing bodies, provision of IT support, and the development of strategies, standard operating procedures or guidelines. The LPR division relies on its extensive network of field missions, as well as its strong relationships with other international agencies and academic institutions.

The division was formed in 2002 when the Remembrance, Responsibility and Future German Compensation Foundation tasked the IOM with implementing the German Forced Labour Compensation Programme (GFLCP). This was the first large-scale reparations programme of its kind and it incorporated a property restitution component as well as the Holocaust Victims Assets Programme (HVAP). Since then, it has developed and implemented several initiatives relating to land and property, reparations and transitional justice across the globe. In Africa, LPR supported the design and implementation of the still ongoing Sierra Leone Reparations Programme.
(SLRP), which has provided material and symbolic reparations to over 32,000 victims of the 1991–2002 war. In 2014, it produced a technical assessment study for the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda on possible reparation options for survivors of the 1994 genocide in Rwanda. In Asia, the division is supporting Nepal’s efforts to develop a national transition plan for implementation of a land reform and property return, as well as a comprehensive and transparent reparations policy, both of which lie at the heart of the country’s peace process. It is also providing technical support for implementation of the 2013 ‘Compensation Act’ to Victims of Human Rights Violations under the Marcos regime (1972–1982) in the Philippines. It has provided technical support to enable the comprehensive implementation of Colombia’s 2005 Justice and Peace Law and the 2011 Victim’s Law for more than 7 million victims of Colombia’s protracted conflict. It has supported the work of the Commission for the Resolution of Real Property Disputes in Iraq (CRRPD), now the Iraqi Property Claims Commission (IPCC), which collects and adjudicates Iraqi real property claims.

A cornerstone and increasingly popular feature of the division’s capacity-building work is its training programmes, which bring together practitioners and policy-makers confronted with handling land and property issues in post-conflict settings around the world.

Anti-corruption initiatives for peaceful societies

As corruption decreases, prospects for peace improve, yet in many parts of the world levels of corruption have been on the increase globally, while violence has also been increasing. There is a link between violence and corruption in the police and judicial systems, which encourages a vicious cycle of low trust, low crime reporting and increased incentives for criminals to erode the rule of law (UNODC, 2011). Globally, the cross-border flow of proceeds from criminal activities, corruption and tax evasion is estimated at between US$1 trillion and US$1.6 trillion per year. Corrupt money associated with bribes received by public officials in developing and transition countries is estimated at US$20 billion to US$40 billion a year – a figure equivalent to 20–40 per cent of official development assistance (Institute for Economics and Peace, 2015).

The United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) is the sole comprehensive international legally binding anti-corruption instrument. Together with the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC), it provides a platform to combat corruption, especially in the context of transnational crime. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) supports the implementation of UNCAC by States Parties seeking to develop and implement anti-corruption reforms. The UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism, established to provide a systematic and comprehensive peer-review process, respects the principles
of equality and sovereignty of States Parties and may not serve as an instrument for interfering in their domestic affairs. Since 2007, UNODC and the World Bank have cooperated through the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative, a joint programme that works with developing countries and financial centres to prevent the laundering of the proceeds of corruption and facilitate the return of stolen assets. A global programme was launched after the adoption of the Doha Declaration at the 13th United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice aimed at helping countries improve criminal justice, corruption prevention and the rule of law; elements inherently connected with peaceful societies.

**Strengthening indigenous peacemaking capacities**

Participating in a training programme organized by the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) was a ‘major catalyst and source of inspiration’ for prominent international constitutional and human rights lawyer Megan Davis, who then went on to become chair of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, serve as Acting Commissioner of the New South Wales Land and Environment Court and a Solicitor of the Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory. Ms. Davis, an Aboriginal of Australia’s Cobble Cobble clan, was an Indigenous Fellow of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in Geneva when she attended in 2000 UNITAR’s first intensive training programme to strengthen the capacities of indigenous peoples to negotiate, engage in dialogue and promote their rights. She later went on to share her knowledge and expertise with the next generation of UNITAR trainees. UNITAR’s programme, which responds to growing calls for capacity-building to foster more inclusive and participatory decision-making, provides indigenous representatives with the opportunity to analyse the root causes of conflict, learn about interest-based negotiation theory, and practice negotiation based on real cases. The 2016 Report of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues praises the UNITAR programme as: ‘One of the most important human rights training programmes in the UN system that examines the root causes of conflict’. The training is provided as part of UNITAR’s Peacemaking and Conflict Prevention (PMCP) Programme, which addresses the strategic need for skills in negotiation and mediation for the prevention and resolution of conflict. Intensive training sessions are organized for mid and senior-level officials from Member States, regional organizations and the UN, as well as among representatives of indigenous peoples.
Connecting peace and development

The UN’s renewed focus on the links between peace and development augurs a closer relationship between the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), one of six main organs of the UN, and the UN Security Council. Article 65 of the UN Charter states that ‘ECOSOC may furnish information to the Security Council and shall assist it upon its request’. Although such collaboration has been historically limited, the situation started to change in the 1990s when the UN Security Council, the UN General Assembly and ECOSOC saw the need for a more comprehensive approach to conflict prevention and peacebuilding. In its resolution on the ‘Prevention of Armed Conflict’, the General Assembly supported ‘the more active involvement of ECOSOC with regard to the prevention of armed conflict, taking into account the relevant recommendations of the Secretary-General and the need to promote socio-economic measures, including economic growth, in support of poverty eradication and development, as a core element of Council strategy in that regard’.

In line with the Security Council’s resolution inviting ECOSOC to contribute to a long-term programme of support for Haiti (Resolution 1212 (1998)), ECOSOC established the Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Haiti\textsuperscript{10} in 1999, which would be the forerunner of the ECOSOC Ad Hoc Advisory Groups on African countries emerging from conflict. Two pilot groups were established on Guinea-Bissau in 2002 and Burundi in 2003, to assess humanitarian and economic needs, prepare long-term programmes to integrate relief, rehabilitation, reconstruction and development, and provide advice on timely, adequate and coordinated development assistance. However, these pioneering groups had to contend with political and security issues beyond their mandate and had limited ability to mobilize resources, until the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), when the groups’ mandates were terminated. For a certain period, ECOSOC worked closely with the Security Council on Guinea-Bissau and Burundi, conducting joint missions to both countries, while the chairs of the groups and the ECOSOC President were invited to address the Security Council. In recent years, ECOSOC has followed the development situation in South Sudan under its agenda item ‘African countries emerging from conflicts’.

Over the years, the Council and ECOSOC have established a working relationship, holding joint meetings on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), peace and development in Sudan and South Sudan, and job creation for young people in countries emerging from conflict. Recent meetings include the ‘2030 Agenda for Sustainable

\textsuperscript{10} The Group, which is chaired by Canada, is composed of the Permanent Representatives of Argentina, the Bahamas, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, France, Haiti, Mexico, Peru, Spain, Trinidad and Tobago and Uruguay to the United Nations and the representative of the United States of America to the Economic and Social Council.
Development and Sustaining Peace’, which took place in June 2016, and the ‘Situation in the Sahel’, which took place in June 2017. Interaction between the Council and the Commission has developed around the institutional ties of both bodies. Seven members of the Council are on the Commission’s organizational committee and the Commission establishes its agenda based *inter alia* on requests for advice from the Council with the consent of a concerned Member State, in exceptional circumstances, on the verge of lapsing or relapsing into conflict and with which the Security Council is not seized, and the Council can act on recommendations by the PBC Commission.

The recent review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture calls for closer cooperation between ECOSOC and the PBC, and emphasizes the centrality of development to sustaining peace (UN, 2016d and 2016e). It also stresses the importance of ‘enhanced dialogue in support of promoting coherence and complementarity between the United Nations peace and security efforts and its development, human rights and humanitarian work’, and ‘encourages the Peacebuilding Commission to draw on the expertise of relevant Economic and Social Council subsidiary bodies’.

In the same vein, the recently adopted GA resolution on the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) calls upon the UN development system to enhance coordination with humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts at the national level in countries facing humanitarian emergencies, and countries in conflict and post-conflict situations, and calls upon ECOSOC ‘to provide overall coordination and guidance to the United Nations development system’ (UN, 2017g). The resolution recognizes ‘the positive role that sustainable development can play to mitigate drivers of conflicts, disaster risks, humanitarian crises, and complex emergencies, and that a comprehensive whole-of-system response, including greater cooperation and complementarity between development, disaster risk reduction, humanitarian action and sustaining peace, is fundamental to most efficiently and effectively addressing needs and attaining the SDGs’.

The inclusion of peaceful societies in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/RES/70/1) is a significant step towards enhancing the peace and development nexus. The ECOSOC system can contribute significantly to each dimension of sustainable development, whether economic, social or environmental, and their contribution to peace. It is working with the PBC to find ways to enhance collaboration and break down silos at the intergovernmental level for a stronger peace and development nexus.
Conflict analysis and researching for peace

The work of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) has informed and had an impact on the UN's approach to 'sustaining peace' as well as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Research on social policy and poverty reduction over more than two decades has demonstrated *inter alia* the importance of strategic state interventions to protect the vulnerable, and to promote social cohesion and nation-building. The Institute's research also contributed to the explicit inclusion of inequality, social protection and unpaid care work in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Furthermore, UNRISD's evidence-based analysis, knowledge and ideas can assist governments and other stakeholders as they work to achieve the SDGs.

One vehicle for this contribution is the UNRISD 2016 flagship report *Policy Innovations for Transformative Change*. The key message of the report is that 'transforming our world' – as the title of the 2030 Agenda states – will require attacking the root causes that generate and reproduce economic, political, environmental and social problems and inequities, not merely their symptoms. In other words, tackling the same structural causes as those underlying conflict, and integrating efforts more effectively.

There are notable examples of UNRISD research that fit a narrower, more traditional concept of peace and security. Work from the early 2000s on ethnic diversity and development looked at policies and mechanisms to prevent, contain or resolve ethnic conflicts and build pluralist public sector institutions in multi-ethnic societies. It concluded that devolution of power and power-sharing, as well as pluralist electoral systems, cultural policies and education, all help to promote a healthy system of ethnic relations, thus promoting the process of peace in cohesive societies.

One action-research project on rebuilding war-torn societies evolved into *Interpeace*, an independent, international peacebuilding organization whose methods build on and operationalize the results of this UNRISD research. The project looked at laying the foundations for sustainable development on the premise that development is a difficult enough challenge for peaceful countries, and that for war-torn societies the problems are amplified many times. To be sustainable, it suggested, rebuilding must proceed on many fronts simultaneously – political, social, judicial, moral, psychological and economic – using an integrated and inclusive approach that can help to prevent inequalities along ethnic, religious or regional lines. UNRISD has also researched gender equality and women's roles in conflict resolution and peacebuilding.
Intercultural innovation to promote peace

The Intercultural Innovation Award is a global venture between the UN Alliance of Civilizations and the BMW Group, which identifies and provides monetary and in-kind support to highly innovative grassroots initiatives working to alleviate identity-based tensions and conflicts around the world. The projects selected by the scheme promote intercultural dialogue and understanding, thereby making vital contributions to prosperity and peace.

The award is given annually to ten not-for-profit organizations active in the fields of migration and integration, intercultural awareness or education for intercultural citizenship, or to organizations addressing the needs of specific groups in promoting intercultural understanding (e.g. faith-based, youth, women, media, etc.). The selected organizations must have a track record of managing intercultural projects and show a willingness to expand their range of action.

The award has benefited more than 600,000 individuals in dozens of countries around the world since its establishment in 2011. Winners have included a Berlin-based project that brings migrants together with host country populations through volunteering to help the elderly.

Tourism for peace

Tourism is one of the most viable and sustainable economic development options and a main source of foreign currency revenue in many developing and least developed countries (LDCs). Today, international tourism accounts for as much as 6 per cent of all exports in the 49 LDCs. To capitalize on potential tourism offers with a view to improving the lives of the world’s poorest, the UN World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) launched the ST-EP (Sustainable Tourism – Eliminating Poverty) initiative at the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002, in partnership with other UN entities, governments, donor agencies, NGOs and stakeholders. Since its launch, the initiative, which predominantly targets those living on less than a dollar a day, has built up a portfolio of some 120 projects in Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe and the Middle East. In March 2016, members of UNWTO agreed to transform the ST-EP Foundation into an international organization hosted by the Government of the Republic of Korea, which was instrumental in establishing the Foundation and has contributed to many of its projects.

ST-EP projects provide business and financing services to micro, small and medium community-based tourism enterprises, establish links between local producers and tourism enterprises, train local guides and tourism workers, and facilitate
the development of tourism around natural and cultural heritage sites. They create employment for local people in tourism, ensure the supply of local goods and services to tourism enterprises and tourists, establish locally run tourism operations, levy tourism income or profits to benefit communities, encourage voluntary donations by tourism operators, and invest in infrastructure that benefits tourism and the host community.

These efforts have enhanced UNWTO’s longstanding work to encourage sustainable tourism – social, economic and environmental – with activities that specifically alleviate poverty, deliver development and jobs. The ST-EP Initiative has organized over 25 regional and national training seminars on tourism and poverty alleviation with the participation of over 2,000 officials, and has also set up 180 small libraries for communities around the world under the Thank You Small Library (TYSL) initiative.

**Fostering youth leadership through sport**

To date, some 800 young men and women have participated in the flagship ‘Youth Leadership Programme’ (YLP), launched by the UN Office of Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP) in 2012 to train young community workers, coaches and volunteers from disadvantaged backgrounds to use sport to effect positive change in their communities. UNOSDP has held 23 YLP camps in eight countries. In 2014, the YLP camp held in Gwangju in the Republic of Korea was attended by participants from both North and South Korea. Participants explored how sport can contribute to strengthening relationships between the opposing sides of a conflict. Youth and officials from both Koreas were again invited to the ‘Imagine PEACE Youth Camp’ held in Olympia, Greece. The Office will continue to play a facilitation role between the two Koreas using upcoming sporting events such as the 2018 PyeongChang Winter Olympics. In February 2016, the UNOSDP also welcomed three young refugees from Syria to its YLP camp in Hamburg. In another project to empower young people, the UNOSDP supported the building of an indoor sports hall extension in Palestine for refugee children, providing a safe sports environment for them as part of ‘Sport for Resilience’, a project implemented by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). In 2014, the Office supported the Diyar Women Sports Centre, a project implemented by the Diyar Consortium, which provides women in Palestine with skills and education to enhance their employment prospects.

**Culture for peace and reconciliation: case study of Mali**

In 2012, following the occupation of the northern region of Mali by armed groups, cultural heritage and cultural practices and expressions suffered deliberate attacks
that resulted in significant and sometimes irreversible damage. Examples include the destruction of historical monuments and ancient manuscripts, the looting of archaeological sites and museums, and the prohibition and weakening of cultural practices and traditions. In Timbuktu, 14 of the 16 mausoleums inscribed on the World Heritage List were destroyed and over 4,000 manuscripts in the Ahmed Baba Institute of Higher Learning and Islamic Research were burned or stolen. The exodus of hundreds of thousands of people who fled south and to neighbouring countries also disrupted cultural practices and expressions.

UNESCO’s involvement in the response to the crisis in Mali started immediately in 2012 with appeals by the Director-General for the protection of cultural heritage and the need for concerted action to stop its destruction in occupied areas in the north of the country. In February 2013, the Organization convened an international expert meeting for the safeguarding of Mali’s cultural heritage at UNESCO Headquarters that resulted in the adoption of an Action Plan to guide its work and raise resources from donors. These efforts were complemented with the dispatch of several expert missions to evaluate the status of Mali’s cultural heritage and the establishment of a Special Fund to support Mali in its efforts to preserve and protect the World Heritage properties affected by the armed conflict.

In January 2013, UNESCO and the Government of Mali launched an ambitious heritage rehabilitation programme for the country, which included the reconstruction of the Timbuktu mausoleums, rooted in the belief that culture is an essential source of community pride and identity and vital for peacebuilding. The rehabilitation and reconstruction process considered both professional expertise and local know-how and fostered the intergenerational transmission of practices and the inclusion of diverse social groups. The reconstruction of Timbuktu’s physical fabric, which included inclusive capacity-building workshops to sensitize communities about the significance of local heritage sites and the use of traditional masonry practices, helped to promote healing and reconciliation.

The cooperation between UNESCO and the UN Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), along with the integration of culture protection into the international community’s coordinated humanitarian and peacebuilding response to the crisis, represented an important milestone in the recognition of the role of culture as a factor in reconciliation and lasting peace. This cooperation translated into the implementation of capacity-building initiatives for civil, military and police personnel; the joint drawing up of emergency security plans; and coordinated action to rehabilitate heritage buildings and cultural expressions.
The International Criminal Court’s (ICC) conviction of Ahmed Al-Faqi Al-Mahdi for directing attacks against the historic monuments of Timbuktu marked a new step towards the full recognition of the deliberate destruction of heritage as a war crime. UNESCO’s cooperation with the ICC was instrumental to the case.

As a contribution to the process of peace and national reconciliation in Mali, UNESCO and the Malian government adopted in July 2016 the National Programme for the Culture of Peace in Mali. The objectives of this programme are: (i) to develop and promote intercultural dialogue for a culture of peace; (ii) to develop education for a culture of peace through formal and non-formal education; and (iii) to promote the societal and political involvement of women and young people and their empowerment as key actors in the promotion of a culture of peace in Mali.

**Women at the peace table**

There is growing evidence that the presence of more women at the peace table leads to longer-lasting and more effective peace deals, an outcome that was highlighted in the Global Study on the Implementation of Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000). The report concluded that far from being symbolic, the presence of female negotiators produces ‘a shift in dynamics, a broadening of the issues discussed, increasing the chances of community-buy in and addressing root causes, and greater pressure on the parties to reach an agreement or go back to the negotiating table when the talks had faltered’ (UN, 2015d). A key message of the report was that the international community tended to neglect ‘track 2’ negotiations at the local or sub-national level, where many women are already brokering peace or shoring up community resilience needed to sustain peace, while investing narrowly in ‘track 1’ negotiations with predominantly male political and military elites.

The UN has been working to change this state of affairs. UN Women has successfully championed the participation of women in negotiations on the conflicts in Colombia, Mali, Myanmar, South Sudan and Syria, where it helped to ensure that women made up a third of peace table participants, half the participants in consultations, and more than 60 per cent of the victims and experts addressing the peace table. UN Women also made gender expertise available during negotiations and strengthened women’s capacity to influence and engage in the peace process.

In another example, with support from the UN Peacebuilding Fund, over the past few years UN Women has also helped to develop a network of 534 women community peace mediators in Burundi, who tackle issues that threaten to destabilize communities during the present tense political context.
Disarmament is another area where women could play a fuller role. In *Gender, Development and Nuclear Weapons*, a report that resonates with the Women, Peace and Security agenda, the UN Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) contended that progress on achieving nuclear disarmament is being hampered by the limited participation of women in negotiation processes. In an analysis of 26 nuclear security meetings over the past 35 years, including the five-yearly review of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and meetings of the UNGA First Committee, which considers security issues, fewer than 30 per cent of the participants were women. In meetings of the Third Committee, which deals with ‘softer’ development issues, the number of women averaged 48.1 per cent over the same period. It is necessary to go back more than two decades, to 1995, to find such a small number of women on the Third Committee. More recently, at the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Disarmament in 2016, only 10 per cent of the nuclear-alliance states’ speakers were women, compared with 40 per cent of the speakers representing other states.

The UNIDIR report contends that gender imbalance in nuclear disarmament matters notably because it reduces ‘collective intelligence’ by limiting the range of perspectives on the issue. More specifically, there may also be a link between the under-representation of women and the dominant discourse on nuclear weapons as legitimate instruments of statecraft.

The report cites independent research suggesting that states are less likely to be peaceful if their family laws favour men or when, despite equality under the law, gender discrimination is prevalent in practice. Providing more food for thought, gender equality is reportedly a stronger predictor of a state’s peacefulness in comparison to its level of democracy, predominant religion or gross domestic product.
EMERGING VISIONS 
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As transpires vividly in this chapter, every day, operationally and intellectually, in the field or at headquarters, the UN and its agencies and entities continue to engage in activities that strengthen the UN’s ‘pillars’ of peace and security, human rights and development. These activities are in line with the UN Secretary-General’s Vision on Prevention, which calls on the UN system to focus on working upstream to help countries avert crises rather than intervening less effectively and at greater cost, after the event. A synergetic approach to peace involving all agencies and entities together is much needed to consolidate the UN’s capacities to meet the prevention challenge. The UN system also has to work in new areas with integrated peace trajectories to harness the recent emphasis of sustaining peace and prevention. Here, it is useful to mention some of the promising visions of UN agencies and entities in their current practices.

The Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support (DPKO-DFS), for instance, has developed insights and skills to better serve the emerging needs of the UN’s peace and security architecture. Because of its experience with tackling situations on the ground, the DPKO-DFS can provide a useful focus on preventing conflicts and operating in non-permissive environments. DPKO-DFS’s belief in more firmly underscoring the positive impacts of UN peacekeeping also deserves attention at a time when multilateralism is being called into question in some quarters.

Also instructive is the approach of the Peacebuilding Support Office which finds opportunities in conceptual synergy between Agenda 2030 and ‘sustaining peace’. These include an emphasis on country responsibility and ownership; people-centred approaches; a focus on preventing violent conflict; recognition of the interdependence of issues and the comprehensive approaches required to address them; and the importance of inclusive, transparent, effective and accountable institutions. The importance of enhancing coherence across both agendas was reflected in the recent Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR). This resolution recognizes that ‘a comprehensive, whole-of-system response, including greater cooperation and complementarity between development, disaster risk reduction, humanitarian action and sustaining peace, is fundamental’ to sustaining peace (UN, 2016a). Added to this, a recent series of reviews of UN peacekeeping and peacebuilding recommend improved joint analysis and planning, identification of collective outcomes and even joint monitoring and evaluation as concrete means to advance the links between the UN’s humanitarian, development and peace work.
For the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA), the bonding of peace and development and the inclusion of issues related to ‘peaceful societies’ in Agenda 2030 offer an opportunity to capitalize on the ECOSOC system’s extensive knowledge of each of the dimensions of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental – and its understanding of the contribution they can make to the objective of peace.

The comments of the Department of Political Affairs (DPA) regarding the MDGs and SDGs are insightful. During the pursuance of the MDGs, the DPA came to recognize that objectives such as ending hunger and providing universal education were impossible to achieve in situations of unresolved conflict. The DPA acknowledges the significance of similar goals in Agenda 2030 that aim to tackle factors that contribute to an increase in violence, such as inequality, corruption and poor governance, and in particular highlights Goal 5 on gender equality and Goal 10 on reducing inequalities in and between countries. Addressing conflict drivers across 2030 Agenda can be a potent form of structural or upstream conflict prevention, an area the DPA has continued to advance, for example, through the Peace and Development Advisors it deploys in partnership with UNDP.

For the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF), fresh impetus and new approaches to combating terrorism and preventing violent extremism across the UN system come from the new 12-point ‘Comprehensive International Framework to Counter Terrorist Narratives’, which was proposed by the Counter Terrorism Committee (CTC) and adopted by the UN Security Council in May under Resolution 2354 (2017) on Threats to International Peace and Security Caused by Terrorist Acts (UN, 2017). Noting that Member States bear the primary responsibility for countering terrorism acts and violent extremism conducive to terrorism, the resolution encourages greater coordination and coherence with donors and recipients of counter-terrorism capacity-building, and calls for counter-narrative measures to be tailored to the specific circumstances of different contexts. The Resolution requests the CTC to work ‘with UNDP, UNESCO, and other relevant UN agencies, through CTITF working groups, to promote appropriate education-based efforts to recognize and prevent radicalization to violence and recruitment to terrorist groups’.

UNESCO, the lead agency on education for preventing violent extremism, also cautions that ‘one size does not fit all’ and that educational strategies to support prevention efforts may vary significantly according to the context. However, the common denominator of prevention efforts should be that they address the drivers of violent extremism and build learners’ resilience to hateful narratives and propaganda that legitimize violence. UNESCO sees the UN’s focus on the
prevention of violent extremism, and more broadly the ‘culture of prevention’
that the UN Secretary-General has called for, as providing ample opportunities for
its peace work in coming years. The ideas of sustaining peace and a culture
of prevention are closely related to the UNESCO-initiated concept of a ‘culture
of peace’. Furthermore, through its varied fields of competence – education, culture,
science, communication and information, and the social and human sciences –
UNESCO offers holistic approaches to peace that can enrich the concept of an
integrated prevention platform.

Similarly, the emerging tracks of the UN Alliance of Civilizations (UNAOC)
to address racism and xenophobia present useful perspectives to promote a ‘culture
of prevention’ and ‘combat terrorist narratives’, as called for in UN Security Council
Resolution 2354 (2017). Also of significance is the UNAOC’s innovative approach
to promote greater tolerance and mutual understanding in accordance with
the mandate of the International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures (IDRC).

The UN Department of Public Information (DPI) has a unique role to play in
communicating universal, inclusive values and countering the narrow, destructive
ideas propagated by violent extremist organizations. This crucial peace activity is
performed in accordance with UN General Assembly resolutions, including
Resolution 68/127 on a World against Violence and Violent Extremism (UN, 2013).
UN Security Council Resolution 2354 (2017) also provides useful guidelines for media
in enhancing dialogue, broadening understanding, promoting tolerance
and co-existence, and countering terrorist narratives (UN, 2017f). Heralding further
change for the Department, the UN Secretary-General has called for ‘substantial
reform of [the UN’s] communications strategy, upgrading [its] tools and platforms
to reach people around the world’, so that the UN will not only fulfil its function
more effectively, but can be seen to be doing so. As the UN Secretary-General
António Guterres noted in his oath-of-office speech, ‘[i]t is not enough just to do
better. We must be able to communicate better about what we do, in ways that
everybody understands’.

The emphasis in the SDGs on the organic relationship between peace
and development is reflected in a range of initiatives conducted by the Office
for Disarmament Affairs (ODA). For example, the ODA’s efforts to assist states
in their efforts to control the spread of arms contributes to SDG Target 16.4,
which seeks to reduce illicit arms flows to curb the armed violence that jeopardizes
development. Constant monitoring of data on SDG indicators will be critical to
ensure that the goals are met by 2030, and ODA and its regional centres worldwide
will play a central role in efforts to collect data for this target. The peace and security
aspects of the 2030 Agenda, also to be found in SDG 11 on ‘making cities and human
settlements inclusive, safe and resilient’, open up new perspectives that the UN Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) has already begun to explore. For example, in 2016, it researched the implications of the reverberating impact of explosive weapons use in populated areas on the implementation of the SDGs (UNIDIR, 2016).

The mandate and the capacities of the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) assume greater significance in the context of the 2030 Agenda, often enabling it to contribute to the achievement of several SDGs simultaneously. For instance, its work on trafficking in persons in conflict and post-conflict zones pertains both to SDG 5 on gender equality, since 70 per cent of trafficked persons are women and girls, and to SDG 8 on decent work and economic growth. Its *Global Report on Trafficking in Persons*, based on data gathered from 155 countries, serves as an important resource for further actions in this field together with the *Catalogue of Materials* concerning the Global Programme against Trafficking in Persons (GPAT) and the Global Programme against Smuggling of Migrants (GPAS).

The 2030 Agenda’s ambitions to achieve a world of equality and inclusion, health, education and sustainability provide strengthened impetus to UNICEF’s efforts to improve the lives of children. The Fund’s broad-ranging work has relevance for no fewer than 11 of the SDGs, including those on poverty, education and health.

The UN Population Fund (UNFPA) considers Agenda 2030 as central to its mandate through its commitment to ensuring individual rights and well-being, and universal access to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights, including family planning. The SDGs recognize the critical need to empower women and young people and emphasize that providing young people, including adolescent girls, with a nurturing environment for the full realization of their rights and capabilities will help countries reap a demographic dividend of increased economic growth.

Although youth are not the focus of a separate SDG, youth employment and empowerment is a top priority of the UN Secretary-General, and the youth and peace agenda will be enhanced at the end of 2017 by the *Progress Study on Youth Peace and Security*. UNFPA, which is coordinating the study with the PBSO, firmly believes that more concerted local, national and international action is needed to better understand, engage with and support young people in the lead up to, during and after conflict. The study will propose a global agenda that may, among other recommendations, call on Member States to do more to support youth populations in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, as well as addressing youth populations’ needs and priorities.
The UN Secretary-General has also clearly signalled the need to engage more closely with the Women, Peace and Security agenda as a key tool for preventing conflict, building and sustaining peace. The sustaining peace resolutions call for women’s participation not only in peacebuilding, but throughout the whole conflict cycle (UN, 2016 and 2016). The challenge remains to put these aims into practice. UN Women cites data from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC), which shows that only 2 per cent of aid to peace and security in 2014 targeted gender equality as a principal objective. Another notable focus for UN Women will be the widespread targeting of women and girls in conflict zones and the pushback in some settings against progress on women’s rights.

In their work to promote women’s political participation and post-conflict participation in peace processes, several UN agencies have contributed to the literature on women’s post-conflict empowerment, including UN Women and its precursor, the UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), as well as UNDP, UNESCO and the UNFPA.

The successful management of large-scale human migration will continue to be one of the biggest global challenges facing the UN system. The Secretariat of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) has warned that by 2030, 135 million people will be at risk of being displaced because of desertification, with 60 million people expected to move from sub-Saharan Africa to Northern Africa and Europe. These movements will have an impact on the attainment of the SDGs.

The International Organization for Migration (IOM), the UN’s migration agency, considers it important to ensure that the UN family factors migrants and migration into all relevant activities to better serve peace in the context of the Agenda 2030. The UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) also notes the need for greater understanding of climate-change related displacement across policy silos, so that the issue is mainstreamed across peace-building, humanitarian response, development, climate change, disaster risk reduction, refugee and internationally displaced persons (IDP) protection, and migration management. A more forward-looking perspective will enable the UN system to ensure that no one is left behind.

The UN’s efforts to assist refugees and migrants and the communities they settle in or return to will be further boosted by ongoing multilateral efforts to close policy and legal gaps in the treatment of displaced people. Following the UN General Assembly’s first ever High-Level Summit on Refugees and Migrants in 2016 and the resulting New York Declaration, a global compact for migration is expected to be
adopted at a conference on international migration in 2018. Pursuant to the New York Declaration, a Global Compact on Refugees will also be finalized in 2018.

The issue of refugees and migrants’ access to HIV/AIDS and other healthcare services will be of paramount importance in the attainment of the SDGs on health. UNAIDS would like to see a global advocacy campaign dedicated to the integration of HIV and Global Business Coalition services into the emergency and humanitarian architecture, so as to ensure a minimum package of prevention, treatment and care in humanitarian contexts, which would also address the root causes of conflict over the longer term. UNAIDS can also address the objective of inclusivity and leaving no one behind through its capacity to reach constituencies such as the youth movement and faith-based communities, and through those partnerships it can also play a role in early warning systems in volatile environments.

The World Health Organization (WHO) observes rather insightfully that while health cannot be a substitute for political action, it can monitor political developments and take advantage of situations in which it operates to reinforce peacebuilding. WHO finds the present juncture rather conducive to renewing UN’s commitment to health as a peace instrument and a tangible peace dividend. The emerging synergy could be harnessed to promote such ventures as the Global Health and Foreign Policy Initiative and the ‘Health as a Bridge for Peace’ framework. WHO also feels strongly about imparting new knowledge, attitudes and practice to field health personnel in conflict-prone or affected countries, so as to help them successfully identify peacebuilding opportunities, including an understanding of humanitarian and human rights law and sensitivity to the political, legal and socio-economic environment.

In view of the increasing frequency and intensity of climate-related disasters and their conflict inducing potential, the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) is committed to promoting coherence in the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, the Paris Agreement and the 2030 Agenda as key processes in building more equitable and resilient societies. This means closer integration of development and climate change issues as part of disaster risk reduction policies and vice versa. UNISDR considers that disaster risk reduction is not the sole preserve of one single agency, community or government, it is everybody’s business. More efforts are required to adopt a people-centred approach that includes capacity-building, gender-sensitive policies and the promotion of equitable access to decision-making to empower communities. Moreover, ‘Delivering as One UN’ is essential. These efforts gain impetus from the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, held in Cancun in May 2017, which encouraged stronger integration of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation in achieving the SDGs.
Given the regional differences in vulnerability to weather-related disasters, populations in fragile settings must be the focus of efforts to tackle climate change and its impacts. The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) considers that priority must be given to supporting least developed countries (LDCs), Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and other vulnerable developing countries in strengthening their resilience to climate change and their social stability. By promoting a culture of cooperation and inclusiveness, weather, climate and hydrological services can help prevent conflicts over strategic resources, build more climate-resilient societies and economies, and empower communities and individuals to adapt to climate change on an equitable basis. The Global Framework for Climate Service (GFCS), a UN initiative adopted by the World Meteorological Congress in 2012, aims to transform knowledge into action, for instance, through investment in infrastructure projects for long-term water management. Climate Outlook Forums are being organized in sub-regions to produce seasonal climate predictions to inform decision-making. WMO also sees a growing role for its services in supporting the humanitarian activities of the UN.

UN Environment notes that the SDGs serve to mitigate fragility, corruption and environmental hazards on the one hand, and enable good governance on the other. This is implicit in the objectives of SDG 16 – ‘building effective, accountable and inclusive institutions’ and ‘access to justice for all’. Targets within SDG 16 (e.g. 16.5, 16.6, 16.7 and 16.10) can also help to strengthen transparent natural resource governance based on well informed, inclusive decision-making, thereby maximizing peace dividends and minimizing the risk of social grievances and violent conflict (UNEP, 2015).

UN Environment contributed to A New Climate for Peace, a report commissioned by the Foreign Ministers of the G7 which notes that the SDG process, with its broad peace and development scope, ‘could be a key entry point’ for helping countries discover ‘opportunities to align their climate adaptation and national development or post-conflict recovery plans’ (Rüttinger, 2015). Building on the recommendations of the G7 report, UN Environment and the European Union have established a partnership that aims to strengthen the resilience of crisis-affected countries by integrating climate change into peacebuilding efforts and reducing conflict risks in climate change programming.

In addition, SDG 5a regarding gender equality and access to resources relates strongly to UN Environment’s collaboration with PBSO, UN Women and UNDP on Gender-Responsive Approaches to Natural Resources Management for Peacebuilding. Climate change adaptation strategies and peacebuilding programming informed by disaggregated data can be an opportunity to support
women as agents of change in their communities, and provide pathways to empowerment through equitable and effective resource governance.

The rapid growth of cities is also a major global trend that requires a forward-looking approach. UN-Habitat has an opportunity to contribute to promoting peace in the world through its work toward SDG 11, to ‘Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable’, and to implement the New Urban Agenda (NUA) adopted at Habitat III, which refers to cities’ role in addressing the root causes of violence and conflict. UN-Habitat will also help cities contribute to an array of development goals, such as helping to end poverty and hunger, reducing inequality, and promoting inclusive and sustainable economic growth through its action framework to support national and local government.

Both the SDGs and the UN Secretary-General’s vision on prevention, with its call for a ‘surge in preventive diplomacy’ for peace, will create more demand for UNITAR’s capacity and knowledge-sharing initiatives in these and allied areas. The Institute aims to reflect the complexity of the peace and security agenda by broadening its regional training programmes and target audience to enhance the numbers of young people, women, minorities, people with disabilities and indigenous peoples it reaches. It also intends to tackle new thematic areas such as youth and radicalization, youth as contributors to peace and sustainable development, conflict-related sexual violence, addressing trauma and building institutional capacities for peace.

The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) will build on the Human Rights Up Front Initiative to strengthen the accountability and effectiveness of the UN. This initiative aims to strengthen the UN system’s ability to effectively prevent and respond to serious human rights violations and complex crises, and involves human rights education including mandatory courses for all UN staff. OHCHR will also strengthen efforts to effectively implement the entire human rights framework. Human rights-based implementation of the SDGs with the right to development at the core will enhance efforts to sustain peace. Effective, integrated and coordinated implementation of the economic, social, human rights and environmental components of sustainable development, alongside the pursuit of progress, peace and security, will serve to nurture lasting peace for all humanity.

In keeping with the prevention-led agenda, the World Food Programme (WFP) recognizes the need for attitudinal change within the UN and a more deliberate focus on peacebuilding activities, with guiding principles to create more efficient and systemic cooperation between humanitarian, development, peacebuilding, human

---

rights and other actors. Partnerships to tackle the complex, interrelated and growing challenges posed by armed conflicts and situations of violence are key to more dynamic and potent UN peace efforts. In working for a more coherent UN peace action, there is also an evident need for better, joined-up harmonized risk analysis, planning and reporting on outcomes, especially at country level.

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) has launched the ‘FAO-Nobel Peace Laureates Alliance for Food Security and Peace’, which will focus on innovative ways to bring peace to conflict-prone areas and eradicate poverty and hunger. Following the recent peace accord in Colombia, FAO with other partners has committed to supporting the country through making rural development a priority and a peacekeeping tool. FAO notes that the Commitment to Action made by relief organizations at the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul in May 2016 provides further impetus towards delivering on the promise of ‘leaving no one behind’ and to working together across institutional boundaries in a more efficient, transparent and harmonious way.

With growing awareness of the link between peace and employment, the International Labour Organization (ILO) will contribute over the coming years to addressing SDG 16, on ‘peaceful and inclusive societies’ and SDG 8, on work, through its flagship programme ‘Jobs for Peace and Resilience’. It will also support the G7+ countries in their implementation of the 2030 Agenda based on a Memorandum of Understanding signed with the Organization. Its work with the G7+ includes implementation of the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States, and the promotion of Fragile-to-fragile, South-South and triangular cooperation on the SDGs.

In response to the UN Secretary-General’s call for evidence-based research to more clearly inform targeted programmes and activities, the UN Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) has described its holistic way of working that aims to incorporate all three pillars of development: social, economic and environmental. UNRISD’s three research programmes – Social Policy, Gender and Sustainable Development – include activities of close relevance to the peace agenda. Ongoing work on social and solidarity economy, for example, acquires increased relevance as an innovative pathway to sustainable development, with an alternative economic, social and political approach that integrates the principles and practices of equity, justice and democratic decision-making.

In urban or rural environments, information and communications technology brings communities closer together, and plays an enabling role in all aspects of socio-economic development. The International Telecommunications Union focus
on the security of ICTs will therefore have a cross-cutting effect on the entire SDG implementation process. In 2015, UN facilitators of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) Action Lines carried out a mapping exercise that highlighted the impact of ICTs on sustainable development. The resulting WSIS-SDG Matrix highlighted areas in which ICTs and improved ICT security could foster and accelerate implementation of the SDGs and their individual targets, such as access to electronic financial services, online information for education, the empowerment of women, the development of resilient infrastructure and sustainable economic growth, the transition to ‘smart cities’, and the end of child violence and exploitation online (ITU, 2018).

The World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) plans to pursue the tourism and peace agenda by further exploring tourism as an instrument for peacebuilding in post-conflict settings. Its approaches include engaging local communities, providing a source of livelihood, strengthening cultural identity and supporting entrepreneurial activities. Through its technical assistance and capacity-building, UNWTO will also work towards the attainment of the 2030 Agenda, in particular the three goals that mention tourism. Its efforts to achieve SDG 8 on sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth will focus on promoting sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products; its efforts towards SDG 12 on sustainable consumption and production patterns will concentrate on developing tools to monitor the development impact of tourism; and its efforts towards attaining SDG 14 on the conservation and sustainability of marine resources will focus on increasing the economic benefits to SIDS and LDCs from sustainable tourism. UNWTO also intends to foster cross-cultural interfaith dialogue through projects such as a network of religious tourism, which is currently being developed in the Middle East. However, UNWTO points out that the sector requires further guidance to become more peace-sensitive regarding policies, business practices and consumer behaviour. The research agenda needs to be pursued while advocating for tourism both as an agent for peace globally and in post-conflict settings.

The preceding overview highlights the varied contributions of UN agencies and entities in deepening and widening the UN peace agenda conceptually, as well as experientially, through a range of innovative and interconnected visions and practices, at times transcending their assigned mandate. Their multifaceted peace activities, impacting diverse layers of the global community, resonate with the expanding UN peace agenda, especially the growing salience of humanitarian and socio-economic trajectories embedded in ‘sustaining peace’ and Agenda 2030. The increasingly complex challenges of peace and security have a close bearing on many UN entities, whose mandates place them at the epicentre of protracted conflict
situations or humanitarian crises. They are often at the forefront of situations facing
the brunt of disruptions and violence caused by geopolitical, demographic, climatic,
technological, social and economic upheavals.
The present study highlights some transformative trends in the dynamic evolution of the United Nations (UN) approach to building peace, ranging from the narrower concerns of peace during the Cold War era to the evolving expanse of positive peace, and culminating in the holistic visions of ‘sustaining peace’ embedded in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The study contextualizes the progress and challenges of the UN peace agenda over the past seven decades through the conceptual and practical insights of UN agencies and entities. Its reflexive analysis is anchored in groundbreaking debates on peace and peacebuilding, and enriched by the perspectives of 32 UN entities on their visions and contributions, highlighting their meaningful, if sometimes less recognized operations.

This epilogue draws together some of these achievements, as well as resurgent directions in the UN approach to peace, revisiting lessons and insights from Parts I and II of the study. It also highlights areas where the UN peace and security architecture is being renovated to keep pace with the fast-changing imperatives of peace in today’s turbulent world.

**Resurgent Approaches**

Since its founding, the UN has upheld its image as the single most important global institution devoted to the cause of peace amid the turbulence and upheavals of past decades. It has pre-empted, mediated and deployed peacekeeping operations and facilitated successful peace processes to defuse and resolve conflicts worldwide. The three predicates of the UN peace and security architecture – peace and
security, human rights and development – have inspired new trajectories to handle the growing complexity of new and old conflicts and other non-traditional threats to peace and security.

The attenuation of bipolar rivalries has provided the UN with a much-needed incentive to transcend narrow Cold War legacies and address insecurities and civilian violence in post-colonial societies. Innovative notions such as human security, peacebuilding and the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) have expanded the UN peace architecture in manifold ways. What began in 2015 as the ‘sustaining peace’ agenda now incorporates what the UN Secretary-General refers to as the need for ‘a surge in peace diplomacy’, further highlighting the growing centrality of peace and conflict resolution in UN parlance.

Among the recent UN achievements, perhaps none is as important as the dynamic reconfiguration of peacebuilding from a post-conflict context to a resurgent framework of ‘sustaining peace’, with the SDGs as its corollary. Peacebuilding now links up organically with preventive diplomacy and peacemaking, and is no longer restricted to contexts where conflict is manifest or proximate. In this respect, the UN’s role in bringing together 193 countries to set up a proactive global agenda around ‘sustaining peace’ and the SDGs was a historic move. Accordingly, the UN Secretariat has given special importance to the restructuring of key entities concerned with the ‘peace and conflict pillar’, so as ‘to ensure more joined up, cross-pillar engagement to prevent conflict and build and sustain peace’ (UN, 2017c).

**MEETING COMPLEX CHALLENGES**

Despite the recent advances in the UN agenda for peace, the world has not become any more peaceful. While large-scale interstate wars have declined, the severity of violence, both direct and indirect, continues unabated. Growing inequalities, aggravated by the consequences of globalization along with youth radicalization, religious fanaticism, acts of intolerance and ‘cultural cleansing’ have multiplied threats to peaceful co-existence. Referring to the increasingly complex nature of violent conflict in today’s turbulent world, the International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures declaration observes: ‘Recurrent cycles of deadlock and conflict undermine governance and legislation at international, national and local levels preventing long-term peace and development. The litany of polarization within our societies often defined along the lines of ’identity’ – religious, cultural, ethnic or otherwise – are increasingly manifested in prejudice, intolerance, racism, xenophobia, discrimination, radicalization and extreme violence’ (UNESCO, 2016).
Unsurprisingly, the UN’s peacebuilding credentials have come under critical scrutiny in many conflict-ridden areas. The Syrian conflict is a recent example where UN agencies have struggled to uphold their responsibility to protect the people of Syria. The failure to devise meaningful responses to the crisis has once again raised doubts about the very raison d'être of the UN’s Responsibility to Protect. The 2017 Report of the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect admitted that, ‘Despite this support coming from the highest levels of Government – the responsibility to protect doctrine has failed to be adequately upheld’ (UN, 2017). At the same time, the growing contention over humanitarian interventions has led many to doubt the continued relevance of the terminology of R2P. Members of the international community, especially from the global South, have raised doubts about the objectivity of military interventions on humanitarian grounds (Upadhyaya, 2005). Such contentions are also found in arguments over human security, as well as in debates on the Right to Peace.

The international community remains divided over many such critical issues, with the inability of UN Security Council members to work effectively together becoming a chronic limitation. The words of the UN’s first Secretary-General, Trygve Lie, seem particularly prophetic in this moment: ‘The United Nations will not work effectively if it is used merely as forum for destructive propaganda. Neither will it work if it is used only as a convenience when national interests are directly involved, and regarded with indifference, or bypassed or opposed, when the general world interest is paramount’ (Cordier et al., 1969). The trust of people in democratic institutions and governance is waning in many parts of the world. The challenge of political, social and economic inclusion remains daunting, in particular, with regard to persistent exploitation based on gender, caste, class, race, ethnicity and nationality. Mounting refugee crises and growing civilian causalities in terrorist attacks also continue to blight the lives of millions of the world’s most vulnerable people.

The increasingly complex nature of conflicts involving a range of social and economic factors has necessitated a multifaceted approach to peace. This in turn has led to greater recognition of the developmental and humanitarian activities of UN entities that supplement the quest for peace. The practical examples, narratives and future prospects showcased by UN entities in the preceding chapters highlight the diversity and innovation that mark their peace-supporting activities. For example, ILO’s ‘embedded approach’ to institution-building in Timor Leste produced the desired results over time and provided a pathway for future engagements. Other recent projects such as the ‘Work for Health’ action plan or the ‘CREWS’ early warning system present novel ways to address future challenges.
Many UN entities with technical expertise and operational depth have nurtured a vibrant relationship with civil society and other stakeholders. For instance, UNICEF and the WFP have been acknowledged for their exemplary public credentials in their respective fields. Similarly, many entities have achieved remarkable success in the promotion of transformative ideas and practice, including the WHO's global campaign against diseases or the UNDP's leading efforts to popularize the concept of human development and human security. This people-centric focus of UN entities strengthens their potential and legitimacy to effectively carry out their activities in support of peace.

Indeed, the UN entities have transcended the confines of their respective competence areas to demonstrate peerless standards in alleviating human suffering, preventing conflict and sustaining peace. The UN system needs to build on the enriching experiences of UN entities, notwithstanding their occasional setbacks.

**IMPERATIVE OF REFORM**

The current challenge is how to better anticipate current and future challenges, and to organize an effective response to address increasingly complex violent conflicts and other non-traditional threats. To this end, the present study highlights a few suggestions and recommendations. However, these proposals do not follow any rigorous schema and are not a substitute for more comprehensive analyses being carried out by the many agencies within and outside the UN system. Along with reinstating a few notable tracks of thinking, they emphasize some less-traversed perspectives, while envisaging the restructuring of the peace and security pillar.

The recent note from the UN Secretary-General to the Member States regarding the restructuring of the peace and security pillars is a bold initiative in this direction. It suggests a range of reforms within the UN system with a view to making it more cohesive, nimble and effective in its response to the peace and security challenges of today and in anticipation of those of tomorrow (UN, 2017c).

Peacekeeping, post-conflict reconstruction and peacebuilding remain as important as ever, but the focus must be re-oriented towards conflict prevention. This involves operating in a more integrated manner across the continuum of different peace and security tools, and with the development and human rights pillars, as well as the humanitarian system. Although there are ongoing deliberations within UN circles to conceptualize an effective conflict resolution approach at the prevention stage, much remains to be done.
The study reconfirms the need for a broader framework of peace interventions. The inadequacy of top-down peacebuilding efforts to deal with the complex, culture-sensitive requirements of local peacebuilding has opened up opportunities for developing innovative strategies to achieve peace around a vision of non-violent activism. While official negotiations are essential to end fighting, they are not sufficient to secure and sustain the peace.

Resurgent efforts for ‘peace diplomacy’ should pursue multiple tracks of engagement with all stakeholders, not merely restrict themselves to top-level official engagement across national bodies or between governments. The transformative targets of ‘sustaining peace’ require ‘promoting more strategic and close partnerships with diverse stakeholders’ (UN, 2017d). Indeed, partnerships are one of the most valuable preventive tools. One instructive example is the UN’s ongoing work with the Shanghai Cooperation Organization to address violent extremism, terrorism threats and drug trafficking. The twin impulses of ‘sustaining peace’ and ‘preventive diplomacy’ will be meaningful only if the resulting activity involves global, regional and local coalitions and partners at all levels, and is presented as an agenda of the people, by the people and for the people. These institutions also need to be better connected at all levels, from global to local.

Recent imperatives to rationalize the existing financial mechanisms of peacebuilding need greater emphasis. As mentioned in the recent Report of the UN Secretary-General, ‘fast, catalytic and risk-tolerant funding is crucial for sustaining peace’ (UN, 2017e). One recent achievement is the launch of the first United Nations dedicated funding stream on youth, peace and security, accompanied by the direct funding of civil society organizations, both achieved through the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF).

Evidently, the social, economic and environmental challenges of the twenty-first century necessitate greater synergies between local, regional and international institutions, as well as between civil society and the private sector. Any effective roadmap to attain the ambitious SDG targets will require wider participation from diverse regions and cultures. In his recent note to Member States, the UN Secretary-General recognized that ‘the UN’s capacity to “think” and engage regionally is limited by the lack of regional analyses and structures at Headquarters and in the field’ (UN, 2017c).

Along with regional perspectives, a strong need is felt for local presence and local knowledge to augment preventive diplomacy. This would entail widening the presence of UN staff beyond major towns to include local
populations in conflict zones. In order to be successful, the concerned UN staff must attain a better knowledge of the needs and experiences of people in violent conflicts.

There is no single cultural paradigm with a fixed or standardized meaning of peace. The major challenge is to understand how to reconcile universal standards of peacebuilding with the exigencies of the ‘local turn’ in peacebuilding. The ‘local turn’ argument, which favours ‘inclusive national ownership’ for peace operations, challenges many core assumptions of top-down liberal peacebuilding. It is widely felt that efficacious conflict prevention action must prioritize a community-first approach, acknowledging the needs and concerns of local communities involved in the conflict. It is important to focus on local perspectives and conflict dynamics, particularly as experienced by marginalized groups in the affected communities. Local ownership of conflict prevention activities is therefore a prerequisite for sustaining peace.

However, all too frequently, ‘national ownership’ is defined narrowly and equated with acquiescing to the strategies and priorities of the national government. In divided post-conflict societies, such an approach risks perpetuating exclusion. Just as importantly, in the aftermath of violence, neither a cohesive nation state, nor an inclusive or effective system of governance, should be taken as givens. The national responsibility to drive efforts to sustain peace must therefore be shared across all social groups and encompass a wide spectrum of political opinions, including those of women and youth. Clearly, peace activities need to emerge organically from within society, in order to address the multiple concerns and aspirations of different sectors and seek common ground, so that all sectors feel involved in strategies, policies and mechanisms that offer a way forward. Peace cannot be imposed from outside, but neither can it be imposed by domestic elites or authoritarian governments on fractious populations that lack even minimal trust in their leadership or each other. However, the need for ‘national ownership’ should not be allowed to become a justification for inaction.

It is also important to focus on successful examples of societies that have moved towards non-violent and peaceful methods of conflict resolution. The transformative norms, values and narratives of such successful practices need to be evaluated by policy-makers and practitioners in order to develop guidelines to help attain peaceful, just and inclusive societies.

There is a relative dearth of research on why and how ordinary citizens relate to the United Nations system in the way that they do. In some cases, citizens
have exaggerated expectations, which fall outside the mandate and competence of UN entities. At other times, the peace and development work of UN entities is under-appreciated. Indeed, the UN system could benefit from a more expanded and enhanced communications strategy to help disseminate a more realistic image of its limitations as well as its competencies. This would save the organization from undue criticism and enhance collaboration with host communities.

UN agencies and entities have also made numerous contributions to promoting education as a resource of peace; however, much remains to be done. Warfare and violent upheaval have had a disastrous impact on the educational opportunities of the most vulnerable children and youth in conflict zones, including refugees and internally displaced children, whose needs should be prioritized by the international community. Over 40 per cent of out-of-school children live in conflict-affected countries, which are also noted for gender inequalities and have the lowest literacy levels in the world. The importance of cultural dimensions and multi-religious synergy for transformative education also needs to be accorded greater attention at all levels.

Pressure is now increasing to expand efforts to effectively implement the Agenda 2030 prevention framework in partnership with the coalition of agencies including UN Women, End Violence, Alliance 8.7 and other partners. In 2011, the UN Peacebuilding Fund launched a Gender Promotion Initiative (GPI) calling for targeted projects on women’s empowerment and gender equality, however the target was missed by almost 15 per cent in every participating country. UN entities must speed up progress in tracking resource allocation for gender-focused interventions. As of 2015, only one-quarter of UN entities had established efficient systems to track resources for gender equality and women’s empowerment (Coomaraswamy, 2015).

The attention of the international community is also being drawn to issues affecting youth. There is growing awareness of the multiple ways in which young people are impacted by conflicts, both as actors and as victims. As today’s youth are tomorrow’s world leaders, it is vital to ensure their engagement in nurturing peace. This is even more the case in conflict zones where the combination of a ‘youth bulge’ and shrinking employment opportunities can result in young people being easily drawn into internal armed conflict, riots and terrorism.

One concern in this area is how to dispel widely prevalent stereotypes that portray young men in conflict-affected societies as the primary perpetrators of
violence or the potential ‘spoilers’ of delicate peace processes. While some studies highlight the link between the growing ‘youth bulge’ in many parts of the world and political violence, due to social and political exclusion and lack of economic opportunities (Urdal, 2007), the **positive outcomes arising from youth involvement in peace activities have not been explored to the same extent**. While recognizing the work of various UN agencies and entities in empowering and encouraging young pioneers to carry out projects promoting peace, justice and inclusion, this study highlights the need for UN-sponsored nodal agencies to promote and coordinate youth participation at global, regional and local levels. While many strong initiatives are underway, as mentioned earlier, much greater efforts are needed to address the key issues in this critical area.

The conceptualization of ‘sustaining peace’ notwithstanding, society faces a number of major threats to humanity which must be accorded the highest priority on the emerging UN peace agenda. Weapons of mass destruction constitute one such threat. **The humanitarian imperative to achieve a nuclear weapon-free world must be constantly highlighted alongside the sustaining peace agenda.**

**STREAMLINING STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES**

A major issue that continues to impede the UN’s peace efforts is fragmentation and lack of coordination within and across the UN Secretariat including intergovernmental organs and entities and field offices. Many UN reports and commentaries have observed that UN entities tend to remain trapped within their silos and focus narrowly on their area of specialization. Despite communicating with each other at various levels, they remain confined to their own specific mandate at the expense of overall coherence.

There is a long-felt need to improve coordination between agencies and entities currently engaged in peace work in a fragmented manner. There are obvious and numerous advantages to improved sharing of knowledge, resources and experiences of peacebuilding. UN Secretary-General Guterres’s recent proposal, ‘Restructuring of the Peace and Security Pillar’, could be a benchmark in this direction. Highlighting the imperative for increased coordination within the overarching peace architecture, he aptly observed: ‘The Secretariat cannot continue to address these challenges in separate functional silos, but needs to be more nimble, pragmatic and flexible and able to develop and deploy a diverse range of engagements and operations across the conflict cycle’ (UN, 2017c).
It has been suggested that the UN needs to explore the feasibility of creating a single, unified platform to bring together all departments, programmes and agencies concerned with peace. Although this might not appear to be viable, a robust reorientation of the UN structure on peace and security, along with attitudinal change, could help remediate the present fragmented system and advance the UN peace agenda. Greater harmony and integration is also needed between separate departments, entities and agencies concerned with regional responsibilities, as well as among regional and sub-regional organizations. This is an area in which the UN and concerned academics need to focus afresh. It is important to evolve relevant formats or parameters to assess the impact of inter-agency partnerships on the ground, and how, in the long run, such cooperation might lead to improved efficiency.

There are, however, many good examples of partnerships between UN entities, especially in the realm of peacebuilding. UN entities are transcending entrenched habits of working in silos and are beginning to work in concert to address common challenges. Agencies are pooling resources and expertise, ranging from their roles in complex and massive relief operations such as the 240-partner 3RP Regional, Refugee and Resilience Plan for Syria, and the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF), which unites 38 entities around common counter-terrorism efforts, to standout inter-agency partnerships tackling HIV/AIDS or building capacity for conflict resolution.

The activities of UN entities concerned with interconnected challenges such as climate change, population growth and mass population movements necessarily intersect and overlap in a mutually reinforcing way. The mainstreaming of issues such as gender and human rights and the integration of peacebuilding principles into their projects and activities builds further coherence and common ground between them. Indeed, coordinating and consulting with colleagues from other entities, through joint task forces or more informal methods, tends to be the norm for UN workers in the field. UN entities also frequently come together at international conferences and other events to discuss common issues with experts and practitioners. Doubtless, ‘top-down’ organizational and bureaucratic barriers, as well as competition for resources, tend to discourage such synergies; but these hurdles could be surmounted by creating new norms and mechanisms.

The recent proposal to reform the UN’s peace and security pillar is linked organically with the framework for ‘sustaining peace’. The proposed restructuring of the key substantive entities – namely the Department of
Political Affairs (DPA), the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) – around the new Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA) and the Department of Peace Operations (DPO), and their further realignment with the proposed Standing Principals’ Group of Under-Secretaries-General (USGs) and the Executive Office of the Secretary-General (EOSG), would endow a ‘whole pillar’ approach to the UN peace and security architecture. This reorganization proposal would be a realistic step forward to better harness existing capacities and resources for prevention, peacemaking and sustaining peace. Also of relevance is the UN Secretary-General’s proposal for a new management paradigm to support the delivery of mandates across the three pillars of the Organization: peace and security, development and human rights.

Along with various initiatives to promote joined up, cross-pillar engagement to build and sustain peace, it is important to focus on growing calls for a ‘local turn’ that involve populations more closely in the design and implementation of projects and activities. An argument can be made that the UN could practice internally what it preaches by ensuring that reforms are ‘inclusive’ and take on board a broader array of ‘insider’ perspectives to achieve the most sustainable outcomes. The knowledge and experience of UN staff, their grasp of the issues, their understanding of local conditions, and their experience of what works and what does not, could be better harnessed to improve the UN’s organizational and operational unity and effectiveness.

Evidently, there is a growing urgency within UN circles to develop an inclusive and overarching framework for implementing peace, with preventive action at its fore. The ‘sustaining peace’ agenda, which was launched in 2015, now incorporates a greater UN focus on ‘preventive diplomacy’. Indeed, the new emphasis on leadership, accountability and performance management around the surge in preventive diplomacy, an emerging ‘whole-pillar’ approach and the proposal to establish a High-Level Advisory Board on Mediation is suggestive of a major transformation in the ethos and work culture of the peace and security architecture. The UN Secretary-General’s much anticipated ‘Report on Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace’ is a bold policy innovation to revamp UN’s approach to manage and resource its peacebuilding efforts and ‘to ensure greater coherence and accountability within those pillars and generate greater coherence and synergies across the United Nations system’ (UN, 2018). By firmly positioning preventive action at the forefront of peacebuilding and highlighting new tools along with better management and financial practices, the report lays
the groundwork for a much-needed renovation of concerned UN structures and processes to deal more effectively with the complex challenges of sustaining peace in today’s turbulent world.

**SUMMING-UP**

The emerging consensus equates peace not only with the absence of conflict, but also with the synergetic presence of diverse vectors that prevent and transform conflict in a peaceful and constructive manner. Nurturing peace in today’s interconnected world thus requires a broader canvas that along with the imperatives of human rights and development also entails a vibrant focus on education for peace, global citizenship, cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue. Such holistic visions of peace resonate well with the ethos of ‘culture of peace’, which has been described as ‘a set of values, attitudes, modes of behaviour and ways of life that reject violence and prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation among individuals, groups, and nations’ (UN Resolution A/Res/52/13, 20 November 1997). This definition was further augmented by Irina Bokova, former Director-General of UNESCO, who observed: ‘Peace cannot be decreed through treaties – it must be nurtured through the dignity, rights and capacities of every man and woman. It is a way of being, a way of interacting with others, a way of living on this planet’ (UNESCO, 2013). Leading peace researchers consider this description to be the most progressive definition of peace to date (Richmond, 2014: 125). It is therefore unsurprising that UNESCO was assigned the role of lead agency within the UN system for the International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures (2013–2022), with a view to advancing intercultural dialogue as a resource for peace by promoting human rights-based intercultural competencies.

While the preceding academic and experiential exploration exemplifies the dynamic progression of the UN peace agenda since its founding, it also brings into sharp focus the contested nature of peace and security. Indeed, peace is never apolitical, it is always politically charged. Peace can be radically transformative or it can be a passive acceptance of wrongdoing and injustice. Just as conflict is inevitable to the human experience, the concept of ‘peace’ will always be a site of arguments and a journey of discovery. This contestation should also be recognized as a lively feature of the process of conceptualizing as well as achieving peace. Instead of trying to conflate peace with one or other schema, all those involved should constantly anticipate and nurture its plural ramifications.
While there is every reason to support the emerging paradigm of ‘preventive action’ embedded in ‘sustaining peace’, the diverse and politically contested nature of peace needs to be recognized, not as a part of the problem, but as an inherent part of the solution.
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ANNEX I

LANDMARK UN DOCUMENTS AND TEXTS ON PEACE: A CHRONOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

The following annex provides a summarized chronological overview of key legal texts and documents that exemplify the foundational concerns and major shifts in the United Nations (UN) peace agenda over the past decades. It aims to better contextualize the expanding horizons of peace, both conceptually and in praxis, as delineated in Parts I to III of this volume.

The Charter of the United Nations

As the Second World War drew to a close, the international community began to consider its next steps. There was growing recognition that the post-war period would require a successor to the now defunct League of Nations to ensure the calamities of the two world wars would never again be repeated. As a result, on 25 April 1945, the UN Conference on International Organization took place in San Francisco. The purpose of the conference was to formulate and negotiate the future architecture of the UN, as well as to recognize the necessity of ensuring a rapid and orderly transition from war to peace. The UN’s birth thus constituted a collective response to two world wars, with Member States united in their intentions to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

It was at this time that the UN Charter was introduced. Along with the peace treaties of Augsburg (1555), Westphalia (1648), Paris (1814) and Versailles (1919), the UN Charter was, and is, the most important international peace treaty adopted in the modern history of humanity, laying the foundations for modern multilateralism based on transparency and equality. As a result of vigorous lobbying by Latin American countries during the San Francisco conference, the UN Charter included a provision for human rights, and entrusted more forcefully the task of upholding these rights to the newly formed United Nations General Assembly (UNGA).

As in many UN documents, the preamble is an integral part of the UN Charter. Rather than setting forth the basic obligations of Member States, it served as an
interpretative guideline for the provisions of the *UN Charter*. It essentially contained two ideas: maintenance of peace and international security, and respect for human rights. The main purposes of the UN, which are spelled out in Article 1, and its principles, which are set out in Article 2, aimed to guide State Parties in upholding the *UN Charter*. These principles included the prohibition of aggression, sovereignty, equal rights and self-determination of peoples, territorial integrity, peaceful and friendly relations among nations, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and respect for human rights. Thus, despite containing no explicit obligations, the preamble clearly stated the principles around which UN Member States were expected to operate.

The *UN Charter* also stated that peace need not be tied explicitly to the concept of security. Indeed, Article 1(2) of the *UN Charter* proclaimed that the purpose of the UN was to ‘take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace’. This was the only provision in the *UN Charter* to interpret ‘peace’ or ‘universal peace’ as separate from security. However, the term ‘peace’ was also mentioned in other contexts. For instance, Articles 55 and 56 stated that the UN should be built on the understanding that peace needs to be secured by economic and social welfare, and also by the realization of human rights. Indeed, the concept that peace should be linked to the full enjoyment of development and human rights informed many sections of the *UN Charter* and UN activities (i.e. Chapter IX on International Economic and Social Cooperation and Chapter X on the Economic and Social Council). The notion of peace was therefore starting to be considered in a more positive way, rather than simply as the absence of war.

It is important to note, however, that the notion of peace as ‘absence of the use of force’ is reflected in other important sections of the *UN Charter* (i.e. Chapter VI on the Pacific settlement of disputes and Chapter VII on Action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression). That being said, the *UN Charter* still represented a decisive shift in understanding peace as an evolving and multilateral concept not solely tied to security.

**The Universal Declaration of Human Rights**

One of the most important moments in UN history was the production and signing of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR). The process began in February 1946 when the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) decided to commence the fulfilment of its human rights mandate by authorizing the creation of a preparatory group named the Nuclear Commission on Human Rights. Henri Laugier, the Assistant Secretary-General of Social Affairs, opened the first meeting by stating that: ‘it is a new thing and it is a great thing in the history of humanity, that the international community ... after a war which destroyed material wealth and spiritual wealth accumulated by human effort during centuries, constituted an international mechanism to defend the human rights
in the world’. In addition, in her inaugural speech, Eleanor Roosevelt, chairperson of the Nuclear Commission, stated that the main purpose of the nine members was ‘to help the UN achieve its primary objective of keeping the peace of the world by helping human beings to live together happily and contentedly’. The purpose of the Nuclear Commission on Human Rights was thus clear: find a way to enable human beings to live in peace through the defence of human rights enshrined in international law.

With regard to the legal form this might take, René Cassin, one of the Members of the Nuclear Commission, felt that there might be two positions:

1) To prepare something that would immediately strike public opinion and serve as a guide to the future policies of States; this would be a Declaration or Manifesto which might not be accompanied by a convention or by any other measure; [and] 2) to make immediately an enumeration of the rights of man, that enumeration to be in the form of an international convention obligatory for all States, to create immediately, under the auspices of the UN (Doc. E/CN.4/AC.1/SR.5, 1946).

As a result of their deliberations and considerations, finally, on 15 December 1947, the Nuclear Commission adopted the resolution on *Preparing a Shortened form of the Declaration on Human Rights*, whereby the Drafting Committee agreed to prepare a shortened form of a Declaration on Human Rights, which could be readily understood by all peoples. Consequently, on 10 December 1948, the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* was adopted by the UN General Assembly at Palais de Chaillot, Paris.

The Declaration arose directly from the experience of the Second World War and represented the first global expression of rights to which all human beings are inherently entitled. It consisted of thirty articles, which have since been elaborated on in subsequent international treaties, regional human rights instruments, national constitutions and laws. The package of rights contained in the UDHR constituted a set of normative aspirations which it was hoped, over time, would become real rights and, as such, effectively recognized and universally enjoyed. To ensure this was the case, the UN set up the United Nations Commission on Human Rights (UNCHR) in 1946. However, the ‘rights’ had deliberately been formulated in highly general and abstract terms. This was to enable states to maintain a degree of flexibility during the required transformation of their internal systems (Eide, 1999).

The preamble of the UDHR serves as an introduction to the reader and constitutes a useful basis for understanding the universal philosophy from which it seeks inspiration. The preamble also provides the reasons given by the drafters for proclaiming the list of rights, as follows:
1. Recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family as the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.

2. The disregard and contempt for human rights as a cause of barbarous acts.

3. The rebellion against tyranny as a last resort and the protection of human rights by the rule of law.

4. The promotion of friendly relations between nations.

5. Protection of human rights and human dignity, including equality between men and women, as a condition for social progress and better standards of life.

6. The principle of cooperation in the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms and seventh, the common understanding of these rights and freedoms for the full realization of this pledge.

Based on these reasons, it can clearly be seen that the UDHR was a continuance of the new international ethos of positive peace. Indeed, René Cassin stated that the Declaration was a development of the UN Charter which brought human rights within the scope of a positive international environment and paved the way for the covenant to which states would consign their undertakings to make them legally binding (Doc. A/PV.181, December 1948). Positive conceptions of peace thus became a key aspect in international law.

As time progressed, the UDHR, became the inspiration for other legal apparatus. Indeed, the Universal Bill of Rights was completed in 1966 with the adoption of two Covenants, the Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Civil and Political Rights, both of which had their roots in the UDHR. Consequently, both Covenants adopted in their respective preambles the first recital contained in the preamble of the UDHR. This preamble expressly recognized the existing linkage between the UN Charter and the notion of peace and human rights, understood in the light of the contributions received during the drafting process of the UN Charter and the UDHR.

The means of ensuring the UDHR was upheld and continued to evolve. During the World Conference on Human Rights held on 25 June 1993 in Vienna, the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action was agreed. This agreement, which was based on the Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights held in Teheran in 1968, recommended the establishment of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), and was enacted by the UNGA under Resolution 48/121. In addition, on 15 March 2006, the UNGA adopted Resolution 60/251, establishing the Human Rights Council (HRC). The Council was composed of 47 United Nations Member States elected by the UNGA, and replaced the former UN Commission on Human Rights. The Resolution recognized in paragraph 6 of its preamble that:
‘peace and security, development and human rights are the pillars of the United Nations system and the foundations for collective security and well-being, and ... that development, peace and security and human rights are interlinked and mutually reinforcing.’ Once again, the concept of peace and human rights continued to evolve.

The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

The end of the Second World War saw a decisive shift in colonial policies. Decolonization was on the rise and the UN was eager to assist in these efforts. Indeed, the UN saw the process of decolonization as linked to the principles set out in the UN Charter, namely those of ‘equal rights and self-determination of peoples’. Moreover, three specific chapters in the UN Charter were devoted to the interests of dependent peoples: the Declaration regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories (Chapter XI), the International Trusteeship System (Chapter XII) and the Trusteeship Council (Chapter XIII).

It was in this context that the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted through UN Resolution 1514 by the UNGA on 14 December 1960. In its preamble, the Declaration stated that increasing conflicts resulting from denial and impediments to the freedom of such peoples constituted a serious threat to world peace. As such, it was understood that the continued existence of colonialism prevented the development of international economic cooperation, impeded the social, cultural and economic development of dependent peoples, and militated against the UN ideal of universal peace. Indeed, Article 1 of the Declaration stated that ‘[t]he subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the UN Charter of the UN and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation’. For this reason, the Declaration recognized that all peoples have the right to self-determination and that by virtue of that right they may freely determine their political status and pursue their own economic, social and cultural development. The Declaration undoubtedly represented a milestone in the process of decolonization, recognizing both the yearning for freedom of all dependent peoples and the decisive role of such peoples in the attainment of their own independence.

In 1961, the UNGA established the Special Committee on Decolonization (also known as the C-24) through Resolution 1514(XV) to monitor implementation of the Declaration. The Special Committee was the main UN entity exclusively devoted to the issue of decolonization. The Committee annually reviewed the list of Territories to which the Declaration was applicable and made recommendations as to its implementation. It also heard statements from Non-Self-Governing Territory (NSGT) representatives, dispatches from visiting missions, and organized seminars on the political, social and economic
situation in the Territories. Furthermore, the Special Committee continues to make annual recommendations concerning the dissemination of information to mobilize public opinion in support of the decolonization process, and observes the Week of Solidarity with the Peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

UN work concerning decolonization continued for decades following the creation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Indeed, in 1990, on the occasion of its thirtieth anniversary, the UNGA declared the first International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism. This was followed ten years later by Resolution 55/146, which declared 2001–2010 the Second International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism. Most recently, on 20 January 2011, the UNGA adopted Resolution 65/119, which declared 2011–2020 as the Third International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism. This most recent resolution called upon Member States to intensify their efforts to continue to implement the plan of action for the Second International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism and to cooperate with the Special Committee on Decolonization, and to provide updates as necessary. Thus, the issue of decolonization remains salient within the UN system to this day.

The Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples

Today, the UN system stresses the profound importance of the direct participation of youth in shaping the future of humanity and the valuable contribution they can make in all sectors of society. The origins of this principle can be found in the 1965, UNGA endorsed Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples. The Declaration proclaimed that ‘young people shall be brought up in the spirit of peace, justice, freedom, mutual respect and understanding in order to promote equal rights for all human beings and all nations, economic and social progress, disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security’ (Principle I), and that ‘exchanges, travel, tourism, meetings, the study of foreign languages, the twinning of towns and universities without discrimination and similar activities should be encouraged and facilitated among young people of all countries’ (Principle IV). The participation of youth thus began to be seen as crucial to fostering the ideals of peace.

Consequently, the UN began to focus more on the participation of youth in peace dialogue. Indeed, from 1965 to 1975, both the UNGA and ECOSOC emphasized three basic themes in the field of youth: participation, development and peace, while concurrently highlighting the need for an international policy on youth. Later, in 1979, the UNGA designated 1985 as International Youth Year: Participation, Development and Peace. The observance of International Youth Year provided a useful and significant
opportunity to draw attention to the situation and specific needs and aspirations of youth; to increase cooperation at all levels in dealing with youth issues; to undertake concerted action programmes in favour of youth; and to improve the participation of young people in the study, decision-making processes, and resolution of major national, regional and international problems. Moreover, in 1995, on the tenth anniversary of *International Youth Year*, the UN strengthened its commitment to young people by directing the international community’s response to the challenges faced by youth into the next millennium. It did this by adopting an international strategy – the *World Programme of Action for Youth to the Year 2000 and Beyond*. Each of the priority areas identified by the international community were presented in terms of principal issues, specific objectives and the action points proposed for implementation by various actors. The objectives and actions reflect the three themes of *International Youth Year: Participation, Development and Peace*, which were interlinked and mutually reinforcing.

In the wake of 11 September 2001, the global narrative on peace became increasingly shaped by issues of terrorism and, as a consequence, the UN began to explore how this related to youth. After much deliberation and consultation, on 9 December 2015, the UN Security Council (SC) adopted a historic resolution on youth, peace and security, which for the first time in the UN’s history, focused entirely on the role of young men and women in peacebuilding and countering violent extremism. The resolution represented an unprecedented acknowledgment of the urgent need to engage young peacebuilders in promoting peace and countering extremism. The resolution also positioned youth and youth-led organizations as important partners in the global efforts to counter violent extremism and promote lasting peace. In addition, the resolution urged Member States to consider ways of increasing inclusive representation of youth in decision-making at all levels, and to offer mechanisms for the prevention and resolution of conflict in partnership with young people. This important resolution was a response to the limited opportunities for young people to participate in formal peace processes, and called for the inclusion of youth in peace negotiations and peacebuilding efforts. It stressed the importance of addressing conditions and factors leading to the rise of radicalization and violent extremism among youth. It also noted the important part young women and men can play as positive role models in preventing and countering violent extremism.

More recently, in an effort to acknowledge the difficulties youth face in today’s world, the UN adopted Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4, as part of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda. The goal aims to ‘ensure inclusive and quality education for all and promote lifelong learning’. Accordingly, the UNGA agreed that by 2030, it would strive to substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship. Once again, this demonstrates that the UN remains cognisant of the need to engage
and include youth in their frameworks, a process that can be traced back to the Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples.

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

The UN has sought to eliminate nuclear weapons ever since its creation. Consequently, the first resolution adopted by the UNGA in 1946 established a Commission to deal with problems related to the discovery of atomic energy, among others. The Commission would make proposals inter alia for the control of atomic energy to ensure its use only for peaceful purposes. The resolution also stated that the Commission would make proposals for ‘the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction’. A number of multilateral treaties have since been established with the aim of preventing nuclear proliferation and testing, while simultaneously promoting progress in nuclear disarmament. These include the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, also known as the Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT), and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), which was signed in 1996 but has yet to come into force.

However, perhaps most notable among these treaties is the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The NPT came into being in 1970 with the express aim of limiting the spread of nuclear weapons. The treaty defined nuclear-weapon states as those that have built and tested a nuclear explosive device prior to 1 January 1967. These states included China, France, Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. The three main points of this treaty are: (i) non-proliferation, (ii) disarmament and (iii) the peaceful use of nuclear energy. This treaty had the objective of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, promoting cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and furthering the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament.

The year 2015 marked the anniversary of the atomic bombings of the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Seventy years after those tragic events, Mr Ban Ki-Moon, former UN Secretary-General, indicated that the world stands at a precipice, facing serious threats stemming, among other things, from the existence of over 20 000 nuclear weapons worldwide and the ‘contagious doctrine’ of nuclear deterrence. The Treaty, particularly Article VIII, paragraph 3, envisages a review of the operation of the Treaty every five years, a provision which was reaffirmed by the States Parties at the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference and at the 2000 NPT Review Conference. Despite intensive consultations, the Conference was unable to reach agreement on the substantive part of the draft final document.
That being said, to make clear their continuing commitment to the NPT, on 23 September 2016, the UN Security Council (SC) adopted Resolution 2310. This resolution emphasized and reaffirmed the continuing salience of the NPT regarding the nuclear non-proliferation regime; the essential foundation for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament and for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy; and the understanding that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and their means of delivery, constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

**The Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States**

Resolution 2625, entitled the *Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States*, was adopted by the UNGA on 24 October 1970 during a commemorative session celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the UN. The Declaration was an important landmark because it solemnly developed, codified and proclaimed the main principles of international law, as previously embodied in the *UN Charter*, which were as follows:

- The principle that States shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the UN.
- The principle that States shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered.
- The duty not to intervene in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of any State, in accordance with the UN Charter.
- The duty of States to co-operate with one another in accordance with the UN Charter.
- The principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and sovereign equality of States and the principle that States shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the UN Charter.

The Declaration was arguably the most authoritative and comprehensive formulation so far of the principle of self-determination. According to this document, the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples enshrined in the *UN Charter* embraces the right of all peoples to freely determine their political status without external interference, and to pursue their economic, social and cultural development. It also affirms the duty of every State to respect this right in accordance with the provisions of the *UN Charter*. It further added that ‘the establishment of a sovereign and independent State, the free association or integration with an independent State, or the emergence into any other political status freely determined by a people, constitutes modes of implementing the right of self-determination’. Rather than focusing solely on the outcome, it also stressed that
The methods and processes utilized in decision-making should be considered a critical issue for the UN.

Over time, some of these principles were further elaborated in specific international instruments, such as the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States (9 December 1981), the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes (15 November 1982), the Declaration on the Enhancement of the Effectiveness of the Principle of Refraining from the Threat or Use of Force in International Relations (18 November 1987), and the Declaration on the Prevention and Removal of Disputes and Situations Which May Threaten International Peace and Security and on the Role of the United Nations in this Field (5 December 1988). Furthermore, with regard to the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes, a group of states presented its first resolution, entitled Strengthening the Role of Mediation in the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes, Conflict Prevention and Resolution, before the UNGA in June 2011. The UN Secretary-General described the resolution, which was adopted by consensus, as 'a groundbreaking development that positions the Organization as a standard setter of mediation'. To the surprise of many, it was the first resolution on mediation to be adopted by the UN.

To this end, in 2014, the UNGA reiterated in Resolution 68/303, that all Member States should strictly adhere to their obligations as laid down in the UN Charter. These include the peaceful settlement of disputes, conflict prevention and resolution. The UNGA also welcomed the contributions of Member States, as well as those of the UN and regional and sub-regional organizations, to mediation efforts, and invited Member States to continue to optimize the use of mediation and other tools mentioned in Chapter VI of the UN Charter.

With its origins laid out in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, it is clear that the UN views peace as more than simply an outcome. Rather, peace is conceptually reflected in the process of mediation. Once again, this demonstrates the multidimensional nature of peace as envisaged by the UN system.

The Declaration on the Right to Development

The Declaration on the Right to Development, which was adopted by the UNGA in 1986, enshrines the ‘inalienable human right by virtue of which every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to, and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized.’ It also recognizes that international peace and security are essential to the achievement of this objective. Article 7 of the Declaration on the Right to Development calls on all Member States to ‘promote the establishment, maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security and, to that end, do their utmost to achieve general and
complete disarmament under effective international control, as well as to ensure that the resources released by effective disarmament measures are used for comprehensive development, in particular that of the developing countries’. The Declaration thus clearly views peace and development as interlinked.

Within the context of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) affirmed that, as a whole, the Declaration’s vision of development addressed many of the root causes of conflict, and established a normative framework through which conflict and militarization can be transformed into international cooperation and human-centred development with a view to achieving equality, justice and peace. The former Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon also noted in his 2008 report Securing Peace and Development that Member States are the primary providers of security, which contributes to the protection of human rights and sustainable development. The task of the United Nations is thus to support national actors in achieving their security, peace and development goals. To this end, the development of effective and accountable security institutions on the basis of non-discrimination, full respect for human rights and the rule of law, is essential for social and economic development.

Mr Ki-Moon’s report also underlined how activities undertaken early on in the peace process, such as disarmament and demobilization, can have a significant impact on longer term peace and security. Indeed, the report findings indicate that effective and accountable security institutions are essential for sustainable peace and development, and must be at the heart of the United Nations approach to security. In development contexts, an inefficient and unaccountable security sector can represent a major obstacle to democratic governance and can undermine the implementation of poverty reduction strategies. Consequently, it is important to link peace to the longer term development process, given that this process demands a sufficient degree of security to facilitate poverty reduction and economic growth.

Building on the lessons outlined in Mr Ki-Moon’s report, the Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, adopted in Addis Ababa in 2015, emphasized that conflict poses a direct threat to development and called for the mobilization of resources for peacebuilding and development. These instruments clearly establish the human rights obligations of states, requiring them to prioritize funding to fulfill the right to development for all persons and to pursue peace, security and disarmament.

Looking forward, to realize the ultimate objective of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (discussed in more detail later) and leave no one behind, the world must move towards disarmament and reduction of military spending, along with a
corresponding reallocation of funds to fulfil the right to development for all persons.

**Agenda for Peace**

On 17 June 1992, pursuant to the presidential statement adopted by the UN SC during its meeting on 31 January 1992, the then Secretary-General, Mr Boutros Boutros-Ghali, submitted to the SC a report entitled *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping.* This Agenda was launched just after the 1992 Rio Summit which brought the challenge of sustainable development onto the political agenda. The Agenda reflects the turbulence and change of the early 1990s, which included costly humanitarian tragedies not seen since the Second World War. In his presentation, the Secretary-General remarked that the report was being presented at a time of global transition, with the collapse of ideological barriers that had given rise to decades of distrust and hostility. The consequent improvement in East-West relations, he argued, thus afforded new possibilities for successfully meeting threats to common security.

Several important concepts were outlined in the *Agenda for Peace*, which remain in use today. Indeed, Mr Boutros-Ghali, provided the following definitions for the key terms used in his report:

- **Preventive diplomacy**: action taken to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur.

- **Peace-making**: action to bring hostile parties to agreement, essentially through such peaceful means, such as those foreseen in Chapter VI of the UN Charter of the United Nations.

- **Peacekeeping**: the deployment of a UN presence in the field, hitherto with the consent of all the parties concerned, normally involving UN military and/or police personnel and frequently civilians as well – this technique expanded the possibilities for both the prevention of conflict and the making of peace.

- **Post-conflict peacebuilding**: action to identify and support structures which would tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict.

In line with this report, the first half of 1992 saw a resetting of both the normative and the organizational framing of the peace and security apparatus within the UN system. The Department of Political Affairs (DPA) and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) were formed from a number of existing units, both of which are still in existence today.

Continuing on from *An Agenda for Peace*, in 1997, Mr Kofi Annan, who replaced Mr Boutros Boutros-Ghali as Secretary-General, submitted a report entitled *Supplement to An Agenda for Peace.* In this report, Mr Annan stressed that:
the responsibilities involved in peace-making, as well as in peacebuilding activities and peacekeeping operations which can be multifunctional, transcend the competence and expertise of any one department, programme, fund, office or agency of the United Nations... Coordination [was] therefore required within the United Nations system as a whole and between United Nations Headquarters and the head offices of United Nations funds, programmes, offices and agencies. In this regard, the UNGA ... encourage[d] improved coordination of efforts, for example the establishment of coordination procedures between the UN and other agencies involved, to facilitate and coordinate measures to contribute to the prevention of conflicts as well as the transition from peacekeeping to peace-building.

Both reports were innovative in a number of aspects, notably in their introduction of the concept of peacebuilding to the UN lexicon. Additionally, it should be noted that the concept of peacebuilding described in the reports includes not only post-conflict reconstruction, but also rebuilding relations between nations or fighting parties formerly at war. The result of these reports was the evolution of a new approach to preventive diplomacy, peace-making, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Mr Boutros-Ghali emphasized in his report *An Agenda for Peace* that ‘these four areas of action, taken together and carried out with the backing of all Members, offered a coherent contribution towards securing peace in the spirit of the Charter’.

**The Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace**

In accordance with Resolution 50/173, in September 1996, the UN Secretary-General transmitted the report of the Director-General of United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), entitled *Towards a Culture of Peace*, to the members of the UNGA. The report, which concerned educational activities within the framework of a UNESCO transdisciplinary project, made clear that a culture of peace was needed to address the deep roots of conflict. It suggested a need for a shift from sharing aspects of cultures that had been shaped by war and violence towards sharing a culture of peace. It also underlined the importance of prevention, as problems become more intractable once they evolve into crises.

Consequently, on 10 November 1998, the UNGA adopted Resolution 53/25 on the *International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World* (2001–2010). The UNGA invited the UN Secretary-General to submit a draft programme of action to promote implementation and coordination of the Decade’s activities at local, national, regional and international levels. Finally, on 13 September 1999, after a long process of deliberation, the UNGA adopted the *Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace*. 
The Declaration on a Culture of Peace clearly defines a culture of peace as a set of values, attitudes, traditions, modes of behaviour and ways of life that are rooted in the following elements:

- respect for life and the practice of non-violence through education, dialogue and cooperation;
- respect for the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of States and non-intervention in the domestic jurisdiction of any State;
- respect for and promotion of all human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the right to development, freedom of expression and opinion, equality between women and men, and respect of the environment; and
- commitment to the peaceful settlement of conflicts and adherence to the principles of freedom, justice, democracy, tolerance, solidarity, cooperation, pluralism, cultural diversity, dialogue and understanding at all levels of society and among nations.

The eight areas of action contained in the Programme of Action are as follows:

1. Fostering a culture of peace through education
2. Promotion of sustainable economic and social development
3. Respect for all human rights
4. Equality between men and women
5. Democratic participation
6. Understanding, tolerance and solidarity
7. Participatory communication and the free flow of information and knowledge
8. International peace and security.

Regarding formal and non-formal education for a culture of peace, the report recommended a coordinated effort by specialized agencies, UN funds and programmes with a view to developing a comprehensive strategy.

In 2000, the President of the UN SC recognized the need for appropriate implementation of the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace in order to prevent violence and conflicts, and strengthen efforts aimed at the creation of conditions of peace and its consolidation through post-conflict peacebuilding. Additionally, the UN SC stressed in Resolution 1366 (2001) the need to create conditions for durable peace and sustainable development by addressing the root causes of armed conflict and, to this end, called upon Member States and relevant bodies of the UN system to contribute to the effective implementation of the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace.
As a result – and following the end of the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World in 2010 – the UNGA adopted a resolution entitled *Implementation or Follow up to the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace*. Here, the UNGA reiterated the main objectives regarding effective implementation of the *Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace*, and made clear the following needs:

- to further strengthen the global movement for a culture of peace;
- for UNESCO to continue to strengthen the activities it had undertaken to promote a culture of peace;
- for all relevant UN bodies, in particular the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF), the UN Development Fund for Women and the University for Peace, to continue their activities to further promote a culture of peace and non-violence; and
- for the Peacebuilding Commission to continue to promote peacebuilding activities and advance a culture of peace and non-violence in post-conflict peacebuilding efforts.

The *Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace* thus invited relevant UN bodies to continue their efforts to heighten awareness of the Programme of Action, with particular reference to its eight areas of action. Since 2012, subsequent Presidents of the Assembly have organized a yearly High-Level Forum on the Culture of Peace featuring the participation of a wide range of partners, Member States, international organizations and representatives of civil society.

**Security Council Resolution on Women, Peace and Security**

The contribution of women to peace is evident throughout history. The *UN Charter* was the first international instrument to recognize the rights of women as equal to men and prompted the legal codification of these rights in international human rights treaties and national laws. It follows that a transformed partnership based on equality between women and men was a necessary pre-condition for people-centred sustainable development and world peace. In 1979, the *Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women* stated in its preamble that the full and complete development of a country, the welfare of the world and the cause of peace, requires the maximum participation of women on equal terms with men in all fields.

Women’s movements have raised key issues relating to war worldwide, notably in cases where war and conflict situations have intensified. Without doubt, these movements to wage peace have fostered the creation of significant and historical inroads for the inclusion of women in peace discourses. The 2000 UN SC Resolution 1325 on
Women, Peace and Security, and subsequent resolutions on this topic adopted by the same UN body, link these movements with the gradual adoption of a gender perspective in peace negotiations. This resolution was particularly important given that the long-term effects of conflict and militarization create a culture of violence which has the potential to render women more vulnerable in post-war scenarios.

Resolution 1325 (2000) covers a broad spectrum of issues concerning violence against women and girls in conflict, couched in the following language:

Expressing concern that civilians, particularly women and children, account for the vast majority of those adversely affected by armed conflict, including as refugees and internally displaced persons, and increasingly are targeted by combatants and armed elements, and recognizing the consequent impact this has on durable peace and reconciliation,

Reaffirming the important role of women in the prevention and resolution of conflicts and in peace-building, and stressing the importance of their equal participation and full involvement in all efforts for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security, and the need to increase their role in decision-making with regard to conflict prevention and resolution,

Moreover, by indicating that ‘all those involved in the planning for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration should consider the different needs of female and male ex-combatants’, Resolution 1325 (2000) recognized that gender mainstreaming should be a crucial aspect of a major global strategy for the promotion of gender equality.

Interest in involving women and girls in peace processes arguably stems from their experiences of armed conflicts, whether primarily as victims or as armed participants. The unique experience of women in conflict thus has the potential to manifest itself as an acute awareness of their potential to transform and reform their environment during periods of peacemaking. Understanding women in conflict in these terms demonstrates how gender began to enter the mainstream of UN thinking, as peace was increasingly understood as differentially experienced by women, and that therefore their involvement was fundamentally necessary in peacemaking.

The process of gender mainstreaming in peace discourses began during the 1995 Beijing Platform for Action, which made clear that ‘the girl child of today is the woman of tomorrow. The skills, ideas and energy of the girl child are vital for full attainment of the goals of equality, development and peace.’ Indeed, the Platform stated that the full participation of women in decision-making, conflict prevention and resolution, and any other peace initiative, was essential to the realization of lasting peace.
The ethos continues to be relevant today. In the 2010 report of the UN Secretary-General on Women’s Participation in Peacebuilding, the UN reinforces gender mainstreaming by outlining a seven-point action plan focusing on women’s representation in the following areas:

1. Conflict resolution
2. Post-conflict planning
3. Post-conflict financing
4. Gender-responsive civilian capacity
5. Post-conflict governance
6. The rule of law
7. Economic recovery

While the inclusion of women in the peacemaking process represented a positive step towards women’s equality, it should be noted that equality in the first instance is a crucial deterrent to war. Indeed, persistent inequality in mental attitudes and behaviours between men and women not only perpetuates a notion of power that deprives others of the enjoyment of their basic human rights and human dignity, it also acts as a major barrier to the achievement of peace and has the potential to lay the groundwork for conflict. It is thus clear that equality between men and women is a human rights issue and a condition for social justice, as well as a necessary and fundamental prerequisite for equality, development and peace.

Panel on United Nations Peace Operations

The Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, commonly known as the Brahimi Report, was named for the chairman of the commission that produced it, namely, Lakhdar Brahimi. The then UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan convened the Panel on 7 March 2000, ahead of the upcoming Millennium Summit. He requested that the panel conduct a thorough review of UN peace and security activities as well as recommend improvements. The ensuing report was published on 17 August 2000. Four days later, Mr Kofi Annan transmitted the report to the presidents of the UNGA and the UN Security Council (SC), putting forth the Panel’s recommendations. In these letters, he made clear that the ‘high level and historic meeting presente[d] a unique opportunity for us to commence the process of renewing the UN capacity to secure and build peace’. The panel concluded that the countries of the world should renew their commitment to the ideals of the UN and commit to strengthening its capacity to fully accomplish its mission, namely, to help communities engulfed in strife and to maintain or restore peace.
The UN Secretary-General highlighted the following five key areas which would enable effective implementation of the Brahimi report:

1. Enhance rapid deployment of peacekeeping operations
2. Strengthen the relationship with Member States and legislative bodies
3. Reform the management culture of peacekeeping operations
4. Reform the peacekeeping operations relationship with field missions
5. Strengthen relationships with other UN bodies

As a result, on 13 November 2000 at the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, the UN SC unanimously adopted Resolution 1327 concerning the implementation of its recommendations. The Resolution reaffirmed its determination to strengthen UN peacekeeping operations and emphasized that addressing the root causes of conflict remained its biggest objective. It was therefore important to address these roots causes by promoting sustainable development and fostering democratic societies based on a strong rule of law and civic institutions, which included adherence to all human rights. The Resolution also recognized that stronger measures to reduce poverty and promote economic growth were important for the success of peacebuilding.

Continuing the work of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, pursuant to UNGA Resolution 61/276, the Secretary-General issued the Report on Peacekeeping Best Practices in 2007. The report provided an overview of the policy on capturing best practices in peacekeeping and included information on how they were being utilized in mission planning, as well as efficiency gains and improvements in effectiveness as a result of these efforts. The report also described the methodology and tools being used to manage best practices in peacekeeping operations since the introduction of a new system in 2005. This system linked the identification and sharing of best practices in the field to the development of guidance materials (e.g. policies, guidelines and procedures) which reflected lessons learned.

Additionally, the 2010 report prepared by then Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon, entitled Strengthening the Capacity of the UN to Manage and Sustain Peacekeeping Operations, indicated that after a period of historically high deployment levels, UN peacekeeping was entering a time of consolidation, following the closure, reconfiguration and transition of a number of operations over the previous year. The report further explained that UN peacekeeping was continuing to build on the consensus that immediate post-conflict interventions required not only a stable and secure environment for peace processes to take root, but also early peacebuilding measures to address the root causes of conflict and build sustainable peace. This notion sustained the process of reform initiated ten years previously with the launch of the Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations.
Looking back, there can be no doubt that the UN’s peace operations have acted as a tool for advancing international peace and security. Indeed, 70 years after the UN’s first peacekeeping mission, peacekeeping operations are still characterized by the concept of mediation and backed up by a strong multilateral system that encompasses many of the UN’s bodies. However, it should be noted that many of these operations face significant challenges. As always, operations are implemented in complex and unsafe conflict environments, yet too often their capacity to carry out their mandates is circumscribed by the absence of an underlying peace process. Therefore, despite the efforts of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, peace operations continue to struggle to achieve their goals, working under difficult conditions and faced with pervasive problems.

**United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy**

Since 11 September 2001, terrorism has increased alarmingly the world over. The civilian population is often the principal target of terrorist attacks which regularly involve massacres in streets, markets and restaurants. The UN has worked to bring the international community together to prevent and combat terrorism, and as part of these efforts has developed the international counter-terrorism legal framework to help states tackle the threat collectively.

Since 2001, the relationship between counter-terrorism and human rights has attracted considerable interest within the UN SC. Indeed, on 28 September 2001, acting under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, the UN SC unanimously adopted Resolution 1373 (2001), which created the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and called upon Member States to implement a number of measures intended to enhance their legal and institutional ability to counter terrorist activities. Moreover, the resolution called upon Member States to take appropriate measures to conform with the relevant provisions of national and international law, as well as international standards of human rights, before granting refugee status. The aim was to ensure that asylum-seekers had not planned, facilitated or participated in the commission of terrorist acts. In Resolution 1456 (2003) and subsequent resolutions, the UN SC also affirmed that states must ensure that any measure taken to combat terrorism complies with their obligations under international law. Indeed, all measures should be adopted in accordance with international law, in particular international human rights, refugee and humanitarian law.

On 8 September 2006, the UNGA adopted the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. The strategy was a unique global instrument designed to enhance national, regional and international efforts to counter terrorism. Its adoption by all Member States was a landmark agreement, committing states to a common strategic and operational approach to fight terrorism. This not only sent a clear message that terrorism was unacceptable in all its forms, it also demonstrated a global resolve to
take practical steps individually and collectively towards preventing and combating terrorist acts.

In addition to combating terrorism, the SC emphasized in Resolutions 1624 (2005) and 2354 (2016) the need for continued international efforts to enhance dialogue and broaden understanding among civilizations as a means of combating extremism, and also to prevent the indiscriminate targeting of different religions and cultures. Indeed, UN SC Resolution 1624:

call[ed] upon all States to continue international efforts to enhance dialogue and broaden understanding among civilizations, in an effort to prevent the indiscriminate targeting of different religions and cultures, and to take all measures as may be necessary and appropriate and in accordance with their obligations under international law to counter incitement of terrorist acts motivated by extremism and intolerance and to prevent the subversion of educational, cultural, and religious institutions by terrorists and their supporters.

In this spirit, in 2010 the President of the UN Security Council stated that continuing international efforts to enhance dialogue and broaden understanding among civilizations can help to counter the forces that fuel polarization and extremism. This understanding consequently contributed to strengthening the international fight against terrorism, and resulted in the creation of United Nations Alliance of Civilizations, an initiative the President noted played a positive role in combating extremism. Continuing this trend, the UNGA emphasized in the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy Fourth Review, which took place in June 2014 (A/RES/68/276), that tolerance and dialogue among civilizations and the enhancement of interfaith and intercultural understanding and respect among peoples are among the most important elements in promoting cooperation, combating terrorism and countering violent extremism.

The UN demonstrated the existence of a close link between human rights law, the rule of law, the promotion of tolerance, and international peace and security. Indeed, it was believed that a demonstrable commitment to human rights, the promotion of dialogue among civilizations and the rule of law would help to promote more effective cooperation at the political level. In this regard, on 24 December 2015, then UN Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon released the Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism. This report appealed for concerted action to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and made clear that the Plan constituted the inaugural basis for a comprehensive approach to this fast evolving, multidimensional challenge.
In order to apply the *Plan of Action*, the Secretary-General instructed UN entities to redouble their efforts in coordinating and developing activities, and announced his attempt to adopt an All-of-UN approach to supporting national, regional and global efforts to prevent violent extremism through the UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, as well as through existing UN inter-agency bodies. This proposal made by the Secretary-General was in the line with the *United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy Review* adopted by the UNGA in 2014, which underlined the importance of enhancing counter-terrorism efforts undertaken by all relevant UN agencies and bodies in accordance with existing mandates. Accordingly, on 24 May 2017, the UN SC unanimously adopted Resolution 2354 (2017) on *Threats to International Peace and Security Caused by Terrorist Acts*. The Resolution established a new ‘[c]omprehensive international framework to counter terrorist narratives’ consisting of a 12-point set of guidelines based on the proposal from the Counter-Terrorism Committee. While UNESCO and the UN Development Programme (UNDP) were the only UN entities specifically mentioned, the resolution nevertheless represented a concerted effort on behalf of the UN to tackle terrorism and extremism on a multilateral basis.

Another important landmark in UN attempts to protect culture and art from terrorist acts is the adoption on 24 March 2017 of Resolution 2347, which affirms that directing unlawful attacks against sites and buildings dedicated to religion, education, art, science or charitable purposes, or historic monuments, may constitute under certain circumstances and pursuant to international law a war crime.

**World Summit Outcome Document**

The 2005 World Summit held at UN headquarters in New York from 14 to 16 September 2005 was a follow-up meeting to the 2000 Millennium Summit, which led to the 2005 *Millennium Declaration* of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). During the Summit, billed as the ‘largest gathering of world leaders in history’, numerous heads of state and governments delivered speeches concerning the UN’s past successes and future challenges. At the end of the Summit, delegations adopted a final document known as the *World Summit Outcome Document*.

Member States acknowledged in this Summit Document that peace and security, development and human rights continue to be the fundamental pillars of the UN system and the foundation for collective security and well-being. The document further recognized that development, peace and security, and human rights are not separate entities and should be viewed as interlinked and mutually reinforcing. The Summit Document also recognized that the world was facing a wide range of threats that require urgent, collective and more determined responses. Addressing such threats necessitated cooperation among all the principal organs of the UN within their respective mandates.
Consequently, the Summit reaffirmed its ‘commitment to work towards a security consensus based on the recognition that many threats are interlinked, that development, peace, security and human rights are mutually reinforcing, that no State can best protect itself by acting entirely alone and that all States need an effective and efficient collective security system pursuant to the purposes and principles of the Charter’.

The Summit Document led to the establishment of a Peacebuilding Commission, which was set up as an intergovernmental advisory body in order to advise on and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery.

The Summit Document reaffirmed the UN Security Council’s primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security and noted the positive role of the UNGA in the maintenance of international peace and security, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the UN Charter. The Summit Document recognized the vital role played by the UN regarding peacekeeping efforts in helping parties to end conflict hostilities. Indeed, world leaders agreed that the international community has a ‘responsibility to protect’:

> Each individual State has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This responsibility entails the prevention of such crimes, including their incitement, through appropriate and necessary means. We accept that responsibility and will act in accordance with it. The international community should, as appropriate, encourage and help States to exercise this responsibility and support the UN in establishing an early warning capability (Summit Document, para. 138).

The responsibility to protect principally entails, under the *peace and security pillar*, the state’s responsibility to protect populations on its territory from genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity (hereafter referred to as ‘atrocity crimes’), as well as ethnic cleansing. Under the *development pillar*, the responsibility to protect refers to the responsibility of states to provide support to other states to fulfil their development potential. Under the *human rights pillar*, the responsibility to protect refers to the responsibility of other states to take timely and decisive collective action to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, if the states where they live manifestly fail to do so.

In acknowledgement of the ‘responsibility to protect’, the international community, through the UN, agreed to exercise its responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, to help protect populations in accordance with the UN Charter.
In recognition of the positive ethos of the *World Summit Outcome Document*, in April 2006, UN SC Resolution 1674, ‘reaffirm[ed] the provisions of paragraphs 138 and 139 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document regarding the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity’, and committed the UN SC to take action to protect civilians in armed conflict. The World Summit Outcome Document can thus be considered one of the forebears of the UN’s peace agenda as it stands today.

**The Promotion of Intercultural Dialogue, Understanding and Cooperation for Peace**

On 19 February 2010, the UNGA adopted Resolution 65/138 on the *Promotion of Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue, Understanding and Cooperation for Peace*, which ‘reaffirm[ed] that mutual understanding and interreligious and intercultural dialogue constitute important dimensions of the dialogue among civilizations and of the culture of peace’, and also ‘recogni[sed] the importance of interreligious dialogue and its valuable contribution to promoting social cohesion, peace and development’. The Resolution also ‘reaffirm[ed] the solemn commitment of all States to fulfil their obligations to promote universal respect for and observance and protection of all human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, in accordance with the UN Charter, the UDHR and other instruments relating to human rights and international law’. In particular, it emphasized that everyone had the right to freedom of expression, but that the exercise of this right carries special duties and responsibilities and may therefore be subject to certain restrictions, namely: respect of the rights or reputations of others, protection of national security or of public order, or of public health and/or morals.

The UNGA had progressively evolved this notion over time and the 2010 Resolution was arguably the culmination of these elaborations. Indeed, the following additional topics and initiatives aimed at promoting interreligious and intercultural dialogue, understanding and cooperation for peace, were expressly included in its preamble section, namely:

- *the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief*, 56/6 of 9 November 2001.
- *on the promotion of religious and cultural understanding, harmony and cooperation*, 59/23 of 11 November 2004.
In line with the UN’s evolved stance, and pursuant to the 2013 resolutions on the Follow-up to the Declaration and Plan of Action on a Culture of Peace, and on the Promotion of Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue, Understanding and Cooperation for Peace, the then UN Secretary-General submitted a report to the UNGA on 2 October 2014. The Report for the Promotion of Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue, Understanding and Cooperation for Peace, named after one of the resolutions to which it was pursuant, was the first submitted report to cover the implementation of two different UN resolutions. The increased proximity between the two topics was also evident in a later report issued by the UN General Assembly on 18 September 2015, covering the same subject matter. Like its predecessor, this report provided an overview of activities carried out by the main UN entities working in the areas of a culture of peace, interreligious and intercultural dialogue, and understanding and cooperation for peace. The reports concluded by highlighting the expectation that the UN system would strengthen its capacity to tackle increasingly complex global challenges.

The International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures

On 10 December 2013, the UNGA adopted Resolution 68/126, which [w]elcome[ed] the launch of the International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures (2013–2022) for which UNESCO, in consultation with Member States and the relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, will provide a plan of action to enhance interreligious and intercultural dialogue and promote tolerance and mutual understanding’. UNESCO was thus designated the lead agency for the UN system in this area. The task was consistent with the Organization’s mandate and its steadfast commitment in favour of mutual understanding, cooperation and peace. Indeed, the first preambular paragraph of the UNESCO Constitution clearly states that ‘since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed’ and also that ‘ignorance of each other’s ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war’. Consequently, in accordance with their Action Plan for the International Decade, UNESCO aimed to ‘foster international cooperation, solidarity and reconciliation
through the maintenance of a climate of mutual trust and security, understanding and better knowledge among nations, cultures, traditions, religions and beliefs, especially in communities and nations where post-conflict and post-disasters situation create tensions’.

The Action Plan made clear that ‘UNESCO has been increasingly called upon by its Member States to respond to post-crisis situations, a field of work particularly important to enhance the rapprochement of cultures, with a focus on five operational strengths: education in emergencies and reconstruction; natural disaster risk reduction; culture and world heritage in emergency situations; media in conflict and post-conflict situations; and promotion of gender equality in crisis situations’. The Action Plan equally stressed that ‘as the lives of all peoples and nations are growingly interdependent, respect for each other must be more than keeping one’s distances, it must rest on a positive and reciprocal knowledge of cultural, ethnic, linguistic and religious diversity’.

With regard to conflict resolution and prevention, as suggested in the Action Plan, the Decade will strengthen peace and non-violence through education, and develop the use of heritage and contemporary creativity as tools for building peace through dialogue in an effort to address the causes of and increase the capacity for peaceful resolution to conflicts. The Action Plan cited in particular the following tools: ‘Dialogue, solidarity and rapprochement are key to the implementation of all the dimensions of peace, including the prevention of violence and terrorism, the peaceful settlement of conflicts, mutual respect, understanding and international cooperation’.

Human dignity has been recognized by all UN entities as a central element of the UN system. The Action Plan states that ‘a genuine rapprochement of cultures can happen if governments, international organizations, civil society and religious communities commit to disseminating a message of peace, justice, respect and tolerance based on the cardinal principle of the equal dignity of all cultures and religions’. The Executive Board of UNESCO has thus repeatedly invited ‘all Member States and relevant organizations and institutions, when developing their own agenda, to draw on this Action Plan and its principles, with a view to furthering their commitment to intercultural dialogue, understanding and cooperation for peace’.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

The Sustainable Development Goals, officially known as *Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, are a set of 17 ‘Global Goals’ with 169 targets between them, as well as a plan of action for people, planet and prosperity. The SDGs replaced the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), whereby Member States and international organizations committed to help achieve eight goals by 2015 following
the Millennium Summit of the UN in 2000, and the adoption of the *United Nations Millennium Declaration*. Spearheaded by the UN through a deliberative process involving its 193 Member States, as well as global civil society, the SDGs are contained in paragraph 54 of UN Resolution A/RES/70/1 of 25 September 2015. The Resolution is a broad intergovernmental agreement that acts as the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

The inclusion of peace as an SDG in its own right was an important milestone and achievement in seeking to strengthen universal peace. Indeed, SDG 16 calls for humanity to ‘[p]romote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels’. SDG 16 and its targets consequently address important conditions for peace, such as inclusion, participatory decision-making, the fight against poverty and hunger, gender equality, decent work, protection of ecosystems, reduction in inequalities and sustainable cities. The goal thus underlines the point that peace is a critical condition for human development.

The potential for this goal to advance peace can more fully be appreciated within the context of the 2030 Agenda. The text states explicitly that the SDGs are interrelated and indivisible. Together, the goals and targets aim to stimulate action over the next few years in areas of critical importance for humanity and the planet. In accordance with the Agenda, ‘sustainable development cannot be realized without peace and security; and peace and security will be at risk without sustainable development’.

Importantly, SDG 4 concerning quality education calls for action to ensure that by 2030, ‘all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity’ (target 4.7). The acknowledgement of the need for a culture of peace is significant. Achieving sustainable peace will require a profound transformation in human consciousness. The integrated placement of this target within SDG 4 reinforces the interrelated nature of the goals. It also highlights the importance of education for cultural transformation. Indeed, this is aptly captured in the title of the Agenda, *Transforming our World*.

As indicated by UN Secretary-General António Guterres in his *Vision on Prevention*, efforts to address inequalities, strengthen institutions and ensure that development strategies are risk-informed are central to preventing the fraying of the social fabric where there is the potential to erupt into crisis. Development is, he argues, the key to this prevention. He added that far from diverting resources or attention away from development, an effective and broad focus on prevention will generate more investment and concerted efforts to achieve the SDGs.
While a full elaboration of the conditions for peace is not given in the text, the Agenda provides an important foundation from which to move towards peaceful and sustainable development for humankind. The next challenge will be for all nations, institutions and members of the global community to work together to make the necessary changes for the meaningful realization of peace and all the SDGs.

As the global community moves towards implementation of this Agenda, it is important to note the linkage of the SDGs with the realization of 'human rights for all'. Connecting the SDGs to a human rights framework demonstrates that the goals are not merely lofty aspirations, but markers of obligation for the global community. It follows that peace and security, development and human rights will continue to function as the pillars of the UN system within the 2030 SDG Agenda.

The UN Climate Change Conference

A good example of global agreements on the environment is the recent adoption by 195 States of the Paris Agreement at the 2015 UN Climate Change Conference (COP 21), held in Paris from 30 November to 12 December 2015. In the context of the recent elaboration of strong linkages between environment and peace, human rights and development, the preamble of the Paris Agreement recognized that climate change represents an urgent and potentially irreversible threat to human societies and the planet. As such, the issue requires the widest possible cooperation among all countries given that climate change is a common concern of humankind. Member States agreed that ‘parties should, when taking action to address climate change, respect, promote and consider their respective obligations on human rights, the right to health, the rights of indigenous peoples, local communities, migrants, children, persons with disabilities and people in vulnerable situations and the right to development, as well as gender equality, empowerment of women and intergenerational equity’.

While COP21 represents the most recent efforts of the international community, the close relationship between peace, development and environment has been taken into account in many UN instruments concerned with the environment prior to the Paris Agreement. The obligation to preserve nature and for states to view preservation as an imperative goal of humankind was recognized in the 1972 Stockholm Declaration: ‘to defend and improve the human environment for present and future generations has become an imperative goal for mankind – a goal to be pursued together with, and in harmony with, the established and fundamental goals of peace and of worldwide economic and social development’. Additionally, the 1982 World Charter for Nature recognized in its preamble that the ‘competition for scarce resources creates conflicts, whereas the conservation of nature and natural resources contributes to justice and the maintenance of peace and cannot be achieved until mankind learns to live in peace.
and to forsake war and armaments’. Similarly, the *Rio Declaration on the Environment and Development* adopted in 1992 stated that ‘peace, development and environmental protection are interdependent and indivisible’. The preamble of the *Earth Charter* continued in a similar vein, stating that ‘we are at once citizens of different nations and of one world in which the local and global are linked. Everyone shares responsibility for the present and future well-being of the human family and the larger living world. The spirit of human solidarity and kinship with all life is strengthened when we live with reverence for the mystery of being, gratitude for the gift of life, and humility regarding the human place in nature’. The *Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development* of 2002 recalled the same idea set forth in the Earth Charter and the Declaration on a Culture of Peace, when it proclaimed that all stakeholders should act together, united by a common determination to save the planet, promote human development and achieve universal prosperity and peace (principle 35).

Lastly, in June 2015, the UNGA endorsed the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015–2030), which was adopted by UN Member States between 14 and 18 March 2015 at the World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction held in Sendai, Japan. The Sendai Framework is the first major agreement of the post-2015 development agenda, with seven targets and four priorities for action.

The UN’s work to reduce disaster risks and its perceptions regarding the linkages between peace and the environment were thus demonstrably built on the knowledge and experience of countries and other stakeholders over the past several decades.

**The New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants**

A refugee is defined in international law as a person who is outside his or her country of origin due to a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion. This person is thus in need of international protection when his or her country of origin is unable or unwilling to provide protection from the feared persecution or serious harm. This definition is at the heart of the 1951 *Refugee Convention* and its Protocol and is also reflected in regional instruments. It has a broad scope and relevance, encompassing those who flee individual persecution, as well as those fleeing armed conflict or violence associated with one or more of the above-noted grounds. It also includes those fleeing state and non-state actors and has thus been the basis for providing protection for those escaping war, conflict, human rights abuses, gang violence, domestic abuse and other forms of serious harm on the basis of their age or gender identity or orientation.

Sadly, today the globe is home to more refuges than ever before, and consequently the UN has had to step up international efforts to deal with the current situation. This is of particular importance as a human rights issue, but also given that migration and peace
are closely related, as was outlined by the *International Conference on Population and Development* (1994) and the *Programme of Action of the World Summit for Social Development* (1995). Accordingly, on 19 September 2016, the General Assembly of the United Nations held a *High-Level Plenary Meeting on Addressing Large Movements of Refugees and Migrants*. The meeting took place during the UN Summit for Refugees and Migrants. World leaders came together for the first time to address issues affecting both refugees and migrants. The meeting culminated with the adoption of the *New York Declaration*, which outlined the necessity for safe, orderly and regular migration, as well as the need for a Global Compact on Refugees in 2018.

The New York Declaration arguably expressed the political will of world leaders to save lives, protect rights and share responsibility on a global scale. To follow-up on the New York Declaration, the Global Migration Group (GMG), an inter-agency cooperation mechanism consisting of 20 UN entities, plan to organize meetings to discuss the role of the UN system in implementing the migration-related commitments stated in the New York Declaration. The Declaration thus set in motion a much larger process, which clarified the need for regular and orderly migration that upholds the human rights of migrants and their families. Indeed, human rights should remain salient irrespective of migration status, and continue to enhance their well-being and promote inclusive growth and sustainable development in societies of origin, transit and destination. The Compact plans to present a range of principles on international migration and will offer a framework for comprehensive international cooperation.

According to the UNHCR, the New York Declaration is of vital importance for refugees across the globe. All 193 Member States reaffirmed the enduring importance of the international refugee protection regime, committed fully to respect the rights of refugees, pledged to provide more predictable and sustainable support to refugees and the communities that host them, and agreed to expand opportunities to achieve durable solutions for refugees. Moreover, the New York Declaration addressed large movements of refugees and migrants and underscored the obligation of States to create conditions that allow communities and individuals to live in peace and prosperity in both their home and adopted lands. This includes addressing the root causes of such crisis situations by preventing or resolving conflict by peaceful means.

By eradicating extreme poverty and inequality, combating climate change and subsequent natural disasters, and promoting peaceful and inclusive societies based on international human rights and the rule of law, the international community has the opportunity to create the conditions for balanced, sustainable and inclusive economic growth. If this is achieved, it is hoped that migration will become a choice, not a necessity.
Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture

In the context of the tenth anniversary of the creation of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), the UN Secretary-General, in January 2015, tasked an Advisory Group of seven experts to prepare a review report of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture. The Advisory Group engaged in wide consultations and discussions and analysed abundant background documents to motivate its recommendations, which were presented in June 2015.

In parallel, Resolutions 2282 and 70/262 were adopted in 2016 by the UN SC and the UNGA, respectively, during the review of the UN peacebuilding architecture. These resolutions recognize the fundamental interconnectivity between peace, sustainable development and human rights; the importance of conflict prevention to peacebuilding efforts; and the need for organizational reform within the UN system to ensure that the international community is able to bring a comprehensive and integrated approach to sustaining peace. Additionally, as evidenced in the Advisory Group of Experts report, the resolutions recognized that ‘sustaining peace’ should be broadly understood as a goal and a process on which to build a common vision of society. Indeed, the Advisory Group of Experts suggested that the terms ‘post-conflict peacebuilding’ and ‘peacebuilding architecture’ should be abandoned as misleading and instead be replaced by the term ‘sustaining peace’.

In line with this concept, it was considered important to ensure that the needs of all segments of the population were taken into account by encompassing activities concerning the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict; addressing the root causes of conflict; assisting conflict parties to end hostilities; and ensuring national reconciliation by moving toward recovery, reconstruction and development. The resolutions also emphasized that sustaining peace is a shared task and responsibility which should be fulfilled by governments and all other national stakeholders. The ethos of all of the above should moreover flow through the three pillars of the UN’s engagement at all stages of conflict and in all its dimensions. This will require sustained international attention and assistance.

As a result, both the SC and the UNGA emphasized in its resolutions the importance of a comprehensive approach to sustaining peace. This approach should be achieved, in particular, through the prevention of conflict, by addressing root causes, and by strengthening the rule of law at both international and national levels. This can be facilitated by promoting sustainable economic growth, poverty eradication, social development, sustainable development, and national reconciliation and unity. These concepts are in turn achieved through inclusive dialogue and mediation, access to justice and transitional justice, accountability, good governance, democracy, accountable
institutions, gender equality and respect for, and protection of, human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The challenge of sustaining peace demands the priority, attention and effort of the entire UN system, including the three relevant principal intergovernmental organs: the UNGA, the UN SC and ECOSOC (para. 124). In this context, on 16 June 2015, the High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations presented its report to the Secretary-General. The Panel was coordinated closely with other parallel reviews, such as the Resolution 1325 Expert Study and the Advisory Group on the Review of Peace-building Architecture. The report identified four essential conceptual and practical shifts needed to strengthen peace operations:

1. **Primacy of politics**: Lasting peace as achieved through political solutions and not through military and technical engagements alone.

2. **Responsive operations**: UN missions tailored to context.

3. **Stronger partnerships**: A more resilient global and regional architecture for international peace and security for the future.

4. **Field-focused and people-centred**: An increased focus at UN headquarters on enabling field missions and a renewal of resolve among UN personnel to serve and protect the people.

Building on this, the President of the UNGA convened a high-level dialogue entitled *Building Sustainable Peace for All: Synergies between the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and Sustaining Peace*, which took place on 24 January 2017 at UN Headquarters in New York, with the participation of the President of the Security Council, the President of the ECOSOC and the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission. As a result of this dialogue, the Human Rights Commission (HRC) decided to convene a panel on 27 February 2017 focusing on the theme ‘The Contribution of Human Rights to Peacebuilding through the Enhancement of Dialogue and International Cooperation for the Promotion of Human Rights’. The Geneva-based event aimed to highlight the importance of addressing human rights concerns and underline the notion that applying a human rights framework to any peacebuilding initiative is an essential ingredient for its effectiveness and sustainability over the long term. The event also provided an opportunity to discuss the role of the HRC and other human rights mechanisms in light of the new peacebuilding framework.

The High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, the New York dialogue and the Geneva panel discussion will surely help to prepare the next high-level meeting on Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace, which will be convened during the 72nd session of the UNGA in September 2017. Indeed, there can be no doubt that the current debate concerning the importance of conflict prevention to peacebuilding efforts has served to
break down the fragmentation within the UN system, and overcome divisions across the three pillars, and indeed between Geneva, New York and various UN bodies.

**The Declaration on the Right to Peace**

On 19 December 2016, the plenary of the UNGA endorsed, through a majority of Member States, the *Declaration on the Right to Peace*, as previously adopted by the UNGA Third Committee on 18 November 2016 in New York and the HRC on 1 July 2016 in Geneva. The *Declaration on the Right to Peace* updated the 1984 *Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace* and included a much-needed human rights perspective. Indeed, throughout the long negotiation process, Member States elaborated the human rights approach in Article 2 of the right to peace as follows: ‘States should respect, implement and promote equality and non-discrimination, justice and the rule of law, and guarantee freedom from fear and want as a means to build peace within and between societies’. Member States have traditionally understood that the right of peoples to peace should be linked to principles contained in Article 2 of the UN Charter, namely, that relations among nations remain friendly and that settlement of disputes should be conducted peacefully with reference to the territorial integrity of the State and the prohibition of the threat or use of force. However, the 2016 Declaration arguably strikes a balance between the UN Charter and the protection of all human rights, regardless of whether they are civil, political, economic, social and/or cultural. Given that all human rights are violated during war, the Declaration had a clear victim-orientated approach, emphasizing the right of everyone to enjoy the three UN pillars.

Indeed, the last preambular paragraph of the 2016 Declaration on the Right to Peace invites ‘all stakeholders to guide themselves in their activities by recognising the high importance of practising tolerance, dialogue, cooperation and solidarity among all human beings, peoples and nations of the world as a means to promote peace; to that end, present generations should ensure that both they and future generations learn to live together in peace with the highest aspiration of sparing future generations the scourge of war’. This explicit recognition of the linkage between the right to life and peace, based on the notion of tolerance and cultural diversity, can also be found in the 1999 report on the *UN Year of Dialogue among Civilizations*. The former UN Secretary-General elaborated on this concept when he stated that other concepts with similar and complementary purposes and values have preceded the *Dialogue among Civilizations*, such as the recent UNGA resolutions on the *Culture of Tolerance and the Culture for Peace*. He made clear that tolerance is of vital importance and should serve as ‘the recognition that human beings are diverse and have the right to live in peace with their diversity while not imposing their beliefs on others’.
In Article 3, the Declaration on the Right to Peace invited UNESCO, among others, to support and assist with the implementation of the present Declaration. For this reason, Member States agreed to focus their attention on Article 4, which specified the need to promote education for peace in order to strengthen the spirit of tolerance, dialogue, cooperation and solidarity among all human beings. To achieve this objective, this provision in the Declaration on the Right to Peace also declared that ‘the University for Peace should contribute to the great universal task of educating for peace by engaging in teaching, research, post-graduate training and dissemination of knowledge’. In light of these precedents, the 2016 Declaration requires that all stakeholders work on the basis of dialogue, inclusiveness, transparency and consensus. In order to evolve from a culture of conflict to a culture of peace, human rights and development, it is vital to strengthen the positive trend towards the promotion of peace worldwide, initiated at the time of the UN Commission on Human Rights and carried on by the HRC and the UNGA.

The Declaration on the Right to Peace arguably has innate value, given that it develops the New Agenda 2030 and reinforces the three UN pillars. Moreover, the preamble of the Declaration contains many elements which clarify the need for a full range of views representing all stakeholders. In this sense, the Declaration on the Right to Peace has positively evolved and continues to reinforce the understanding that peace is a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of all human rights by all people. The message of the 2016 Declaration for succeeding generations is that only through humanity can peace be achieved and therefore the main aspiration for men and women should be to create a world free of war and conflict. For this reason, in the twenty-first century, denying the right of any human being to access and enjoyment of the three pillars – peace, human rights and development – is to deny the existence of the UN.
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Page 21: **Photo 01**: © UN Photo/Martine Perret. Medal ceremony for Mongolian peacekeepers serving in South Sudan. Mongolian peacekeepers of the UN Mission in the Republic of South Sudan (UNMISS) stand in formation during a medal ceremony at their base in Bentiu. The ceremony was attended by UN Under-Secretary-General for Field Support, Ameerah Haq, as part of her tour of South Sudan. 08 November 2013. Bentiu, South Sudan. Photo # 570222. **Background**: © UN Photo/Isaac Billy. Photo # 579020.

Page 22: **Photo 02**: © UN Photo/Harandane Dicko. UN Police Patrol in Timbuktu. United Nations Police (UNPOL) officers do frequent patrols in Timbuktu to secure the city against threats of terrorism and banditry. A UNPOL officer greets a woman and her baby while on patrol in Timbuktu. 11 March 2017. Timbuktu, Mali. Photo # 723566. **Photo 03**: © UN Photo/Bernadino Soares. Timor-Leste holds second round of presidential election. A woman holds up her stained finger after voting today in Timor-Leste’s presidential run-off poll, which follows the first round of voting held on 17 March. 16 April 2012. Timor-Leste. Photo # 510220.

Page 27: **Photo 04**: © UNICEF/UN0141031/LeMoyne. Bangladesh, 2017: Students look at an inflatable globe from a School-in-a-Box kit, in a new child-friendly space in the Uchiprang camp in Cox’s Bazar district. They are among 15,000 children receiving educational and other support at 182 UNICEF learning centres in Rohingya refugee camps and makeshift settlements in the district. Over half of the Rohingya who fled Myanmar are children. **Background**: © UN Photo/Kibae Park. Photo # 451902.

Page 28: **Photo 05**: © UNAOC 4_17*11.jpg. **Photo 06**: © UN Photo/Albert González Farran. UNMIL Peacekeepers prepare for troop withdrawal. The United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) is withdrawing its military presence from the country on 8 February, as part of the termination of its mandate scheduled for 30 March, 2018. UNMIL was established in September 2003 to monitor a ceasefire agreement in Liberia following the conclusion of the Second Liberian Civil War. Inspector Second Class Zhang Ying, a member of a Chinese Formed Police Unit (FPU) deployed with UNMIL, interacts with a girl of the Steward Camp in Tubmanburg, destination of the last long range patrol the contingent is conducting before withdrawal. 01 February 2018. Monrovia, Liberia. Photo # 750383.

Page 71: **Photo 07**: © UN Photo/Eskinder Debebe. MINUSCA police officer conducts class on gender violence. Gladys Ngwepekeum Nkeh, UN Police officer from Cameroon serving with the UN Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA), conducts a class on gender violence at a school in Bangui. 23 October 2017. Bangui, Central African Republic. Photo #739296. **Background**: © UN Photo/Eskinder Debebe.
Photo 08: © Julius Mwelu/UN-Habitat. Local artist replace the old iron sheets with the new ones in Medellin, Colombia. Photo 09: © Sylvian Liechti/MINUSMA. FlickR UN Mission in Mali. MINUSMA Nigerian contingent, secures and assists health assessment operation near border with Niger to detect possible cases of Rift Valley Fever, Tamalet 29th October 2016.

Photo 10: © UN Photo/John Isaac. United Nations Protection Force in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. UN Soldier of the Kenyan Battalion playing with a Croatian child in a predominantly Serbian village near Knin. The child’s family is in the background. 28 August 1992. Knin, Croatia. Photo # 122019.

Photo 11: © IOM CAR_8*5.jpg.

Photo 12: © UNICEF/UN052473/Hetman. 9 year-old Elizaveta writes in her notebook during a class at school No. 2 in the Donetsk region of eastern Ukraine. Sandbags reinforce the classroom windows to prevent them from shattering during the frequent shelling. Background: © UNICEFUN068286 Anmar_48*32.jpg.

How can the United Nations best address the imperatives of peace? Long Walk of Peace presents a fresh review of the conceptual and practical approaches to peace since the creation of the UN. Through an in-depth theoretical analysis, combined with a presentation of innovative practices across 32 UN bodies, it explores the long, steady haul towards peace and provides inspiration for the way forward. This book represents the collaborative efforts of scholars, experts and UN staff from a wide range of backgrounds. Long Walk of Peace, through its conceptual history and robust analysis, shows that peace is a dynamic process and a continuous journey of discovery. Thereby, the book provides a unique understanding of the emerging priorities of ‘sustaining peace’ and promoting ‘a culture of prevention’. As such it is an expression of UNESCO’s mandate to serve as a laboratory of ideas and thereby help advance the imperatives underscored by Agenda 2030.