

Principles for Quality Financing for Peacebuilding and Conflict Prevention

Practical Avenues to Improve
Support for Local Peace Actors



This paper was prepared by Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation (DHF), Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC), and the Life and Peace Institute (LPI).

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

A significant shift in funding for peacebuilding is imperative given the changing and complex nature of violent conflict. The current funding systems do not respond to the dynamic needs of local peace actors. Specifically, the funding patterns are characterised by: unpredictability; projectisation as a result of the rising share of funds tightly earmarked for specific activities; unfair competition among actors with different levels of capacity; and increased transaction costs. This context signals a missed opportunity for the UN, Member States and the donor community to engage critical local actors with proven records of effective and efficient peacebuilding in partnership to achieve shared sustaining peace objectives.

Local peace actors¹ are widely acknowledged as critical agents in peacebuilding and sustaining peace.² They are first responders to rising tensions and emerging crises; understand the drivers of conflict; and advance solutions for (re)building and sustaining peace at the community level. Importantly, local peace actors are trusted and legitimate actors in their communities. Furthermore, many local peace actors have the relationships necessary to collaborate with local and national governments as well as with other peacebuilding partners. Local peace actors' access and knowledge often go well beyond what national and multilateral partners can facilitate alone.³ The international community has readily embraced the concept of 'local resilience', with the understanding that post-pandemic and post-conflict recovery should be designed and led by local actors.⁴ The importance of local peace actors is further recognised in the Secretary-General's report on Our Common Agenda, with a call for a more inclusive multilateralism that includes a stronger voice for local civil society and grassroots movements at all levels of decision-making.⁵

Along with recognising the importance of local peace actors comes the need for a shift towards providing more resources to support their work.⁶ The commitment to strengthen financing for peacebuilding, including to local peace actors, has been placed at the heart of all UN agendas. For example, the Secretary-General's 2022 report on Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace recognises the importance of innovative financing mechanisms that strengthen national ownership and support local actors in their work.⁷ Moreover, ongoing reform of the UN development system also underscores the need for a shift in funding behaviour⁸ to support the work of UN entities and their partners, including local actors. These shifts require participatory, accessible, flexible, and sustainable financing mechanisms in order for local peacebuilding to produce meaningful impact. It also requires adopting best practices and continuing to test innovative models.

Building on this progress and interest in supporting local peace actors, this paper suggests **practical avenues to improve financial support for these actors whose work is an essential complement to international conflict prevention, peacebuilding efforts and sustaining peace.**

SHIFT TOWARDS INCREASING THE QUALITY OF FINANCING FOR PEACEBUILDING

Ongoing efforts to ‘advance, explore and consider options for ensuring adequate, predictable and sustained financing for peacebuilding’⁹ call for a recognition of local peace actors’ needs and experiences. To enhance the prospects of financing reaching these critical actors and the communities most at risk of being left behind, we have developed seven principles for *quality financing of peacebuilding*.

This paper understands ‘**quality**’ of financing as a standard encompassing more participatory, accessible, flexible, and sustained financial resources. In addition to increasing the ‘quantity’ of funds needed to meet the demands for peacebuilding activities by local peace actors, ensuring the quality of these funds is equally as crucial for long-term peacebuilding success.¹⁰

To enhance quality financing, the international donor community – broadly defined as multilateral and bilateral donors – should prioritise modalities and funding instruments that adhere to the following principles:¹¹

1. Prioritise participatory funding approaches;
2. Generate sustained support for local peace actors and their organisations;
3. Be flexible and reflect shifting peacebuilding realities;
4. Enable direct funding to local peace actors;
5. Support intermediary models rooted in network- and movement-building;
6. Promote community-focused accountability, community-determined impact, and creative means of achieving monitoring, evaluation, and learning; and
7. Consider realistic and transparent approaches to risk.

RECOGNISING THE CHALLENGES OF CURRENT FUNDING SYSTEMS

Approaches to improving local peacebuilding support need to accommodate constraints faced by the donor community and local peace actors. Donor systems are not designed to disperse or oversee micro-grants to local peace actors. Bilateral donors regularly cite fiduciary rules on using taxpayer money and associated risk management restrictions as a key challenge to making adjustments that would enable quality funding. Risk management requirements are present in monitoring and evaluation, results frameworks, and financial management tools that are often at odds with how local peacebuilding organisations operate. Further, these risk management standards establish barriers to entry that can be insurmountable for local peace actors.

For example, requirements that organisations must have previous experience managing large grants when applying for funding exclude many local peacebuilding organisations from consideration. Other restrictions such as requiring legal registration as a non-governmental organisation or having an organisational bank account exclude movements and associations that are recognised as making important contributions to peacebuilding efforts. A nuanced understanding of the local context is needed to ensure that risk management requirements are not exclusionary of some of the most effective local peace actors and do not limit the potential impact of

funding their work.

Concrete avenues exist to overcome the limitations and advance principles of quality financing. In research published in 2021, the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation and GPPAC found that in contrast to commonly held assumptions about accountability with small and local organisations, actual incidents of fraud were nominal and unsubstantiated.¹² Recent examples of donors such as the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) adjusting practices like providing flexibility in their reporting requirements or donors increased budgetary flexibility during COVID-19¹³ signal that there are openings and opportunities for advancing quality financing practices.¹⁴ However, more is needed to answer questions about *how to overcome the limitations, who can do this, and what it will entail*.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING PRINCIPLES FOR QUALITY PEACEBUILDING FINANCING

1. Funding instruments should prioritise participatory funding approaches

Rather than a purely financial partnership where local peace actors often function as little more than service deliverers, there is a need for more active strategic partnership between donors, intermediaries¹⁵ and local peace actors who should all have an equal role in how the project is developed and how funding is allocated, monitored, and reviewed. Donors should recognise that within partnerships, money is only a contribution to the co-creation of projects that serve the goals of conflict prevention, peacebuilding and sustaining peace.

Revising funding and oversight processes that are more inclusive of local peace actors helps create a shared sense of ownership and a feeling of equality in decision-making processes. Opportunities for participatory funding approaches include:

1. Designing funding mechanisms so that local organisations are the primary implementing partner and international non-governmental organisations play a supporting and administrative role;
2. Including local organisations in the process of determining criteria for calls for proposals, the selection of projects and in how the funds are dispersed;
3. Creating collaborative capacity-building assessment processes that allow organisations being assessed, their networks, and the communities they serve to have a role in identifying what capacities need to be strengthened and how to meet those needs;
4. Ensuring knowledge, connections, and access are reciprocal and not simply extractive of information from local peace actors and capacity building is provided “downwards” from international organisations to local peace actors; and
5. Prioritising funding arrangements that establish long-term partnerships that continually build trust, rather than short-term and one-off processes that fail to address questions of trust and collaboration between donors, intermediaries, and local peace actors.

Adopting a participatory partnership model means the donor community contributes to building local and national capacities for peacebuilding and conflict prevention, deters the practice of INGOs ‘courting’ local

organisations for the sake of one-off tender processes, and makes the results of the partnership more relevant to peace initiatives at the country level.

The PBF-CSO Partnership in Somalia:

The first UN Peacebuilding Fund (PBF)-Civil Society partnership, under the PBF's Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative (GYPI), has been built between the PBF Office in Somalia and the Life & Peace Institute's Somalia Country Programme (LPI-Somalia). A key feature of this partnership was the high degree of collaboration between LPI-Somalia and PBF at all stages of the process. Maintaining this level of collaboration proved beneficial for all parties. At the local level, conflict analyses were regularly updated, which was then fed back to PBF staff who incorporated the updates into their broader peacebuilding work. Simultaneously, information was also passed from UN workers to civil society resulting in enhanced cohesion and understanding between the global and local level. Through this cross-collaboration, local voices were heard in more powerful circles and the UN obtained more in-depth and localised information on conflict situations than they would otherwise be able to obtain.

2. Financial instruments should generate sustained support for local peace actors and their organisations

Most of the currently available peacebuilding financing is project-based, short-term, and in some cases, one-off grants. Grants structured this way often leave peacebuilders scrambling to maintain continuity of funding rather than focusing on addressing challenges as they arise through the development of sustainable conflict prevention and peacebuilding mechanisms. Particularly in complex and changing peacebuilding contexts, recognising the importance of time to implement interventions appropriately is critical.¹⁶ Donors and local peace actors alike have a more realistic chance of achieving their shared goals with longer funding cycles.

The following changes to the structure of a grant provide opportunities to improve local peace actors' ability to respond effectively to changing dynamics, focus on implementing sustainable peacebuilding mechanisms, and recognise a more appropriate peacebuilding time horizon:

1. Consider 36-month funding cycles (as opposed to 12- or 18-month) to allow local peacebuilding projects to take root and have time to demonstrate results. Already some donors like the PBF's Peacebuilding and Recovery Facility provide 36-to-48-month grants in recognition of the need to allow enough time for peacebuilders to develop high-quality and meaningful interventions.
2. Clearly communicate the potential for continued funding and support in the form of a project renewal in the call for proposals, or, at the latest, at the beginning of the grant period.
3. Facilitate connections to other relevant donors and share potential funding opportunities with grantees as appropriate.

Approaches based on appropriate timelines and grounded in communication and a shared understanding of the project's future are more likely to result in realistic expectations and activities. The power dynamics inherent in the donor-grantee relationship, particularly between large multilateral donors and small community-

based organisations, often stops grantees from broaching topics like funding even when the information is critical to their project implementation and future sustainability. Recognising this power imbalance, donors should facilitate open and transparent communication, especially on current and future funding. Additionally, fundraising is a time-consuming task with a high failure rate. Donors should use their position and access to information not available to small community-based organisations to pass on relevant opportunities in support of fundraising efforts.

SIDA's Support to LPI's Inclusive Peace in Practice Initiative (IPIP)

In October 2018, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) provided a 48-month grant to LPI to establish the Inclusive Peace in Practice Initiative (IPIP). IPIP is an innovative learning program designed to understand how shifting power dynamics in policy processes impacts the meaningfulness and inclusiveness of the process for those most affected by violence and conflict. To launch the program, SIDA approved a 15-month inception period to conduct initial exploratory work and planning, but communicated a guarantee that they would fund the resulting program plans. Throughout, SIDA has provided flexible funds by considering budget modifications and extensions, and encouraging the program's search for additional funding partners. SIDA's role as a funder and active partner has allowed for innovation, flexible and adaptive programming. Clear communication has provided the confidence needed to develop appropriate program plans and set monitoring, evaluation, and learning expectations and goals.

3. Financial instruments should be flexible and reflect shifting peacebuilding realities

Flexible financing models allow local actors to continuously pursue and adjust their activities while having the ability to report on their outcomes in real-time. The increased donor flexibility in the times of COVID-19 - for example, by allowing budgetary changes of up to 20% and changes in project outputs without prior approval - demonstrates that more flexible approaches to funding are possible. This includes efforts to eliminate burdensome reporting or accounting requirements, as well as approaches to compliance that are predicated on mistrust; providing emergency support response; and adopting soft earmarking and flexibility on output and budget changes.

Ensuring that local peacebuilding work is reflective of shifting peacebuilding realities requires the donor community to consider the following steps:

1. Providing core funding generates sustainability for local peace actors to break cycles of dependence on international non-governmental organisations and build their own institutional structures.
2. Relax budget modifications procedures and threshold change amounts that require official donor approval in line with changes made at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic.
3. Test innovative funding models (micro and small grants) that facilitate flexible access to funding for community-based organisations, movements, and networks.

In the context of aid volatility and financing gaps in fragile and conflict-affected countries, there is an increasing tendency for Member States and donors to provide local actors with earmarked funds for peacebuilding efforts.¹⁷ While earmarked resources deliver important results, this form of financing leads to increased administrative and reporting burdens, and promotes competition for limited resources favoring more established or well-connected organisations. Core funding is generally seen as the most efficient way for organisations to build institutional capacity; respond, adapt and innovate to peacebuilding needs in a more flexible way; adapt to situations; lower administrative and operational costs; build relevant and effective partnerships with stakeholders, including local communities; and focus on long-term strategies for peacebuilding and sustaining peace.¹⁸ For many small or informal organisations, predictable core funding is central to ensuring sustained peacebuilding action on the ground.

Local peacebuilding work focuses on learning and responding in real-time to socio-political realities, continually assessing and understanding program impact and success, and adjusting implementation accordingly. Recognising that core funding is not always available, donors should adopt the most flexible grants management procedures like reducing restrictions on modifications and allowing for project extensions, providing meaningful grant-support.

Donors should continue to support innovative funding mechanisms, whether established internally or through intermediary organisations, to test options for advancing meaningful support to local peace actors. Already, the PBF is piloting a nimble funding mechanism with Mercy Corps in the Liptako-Gourma region that provides an increase in opportunities for community-based organisations to access micro and small grants. Similar initiatives will test and prove new mechanisms that can be incorporated into current structures.

GPPAC's Emergency Grant:

With the core funding support from SIDA, GPPAC offers emergency grants to the members of its network to bridge funding during crises (e.g., the COVID pandemic or the military takeover of power), which provides operational costs so the staff and organisation can stay afloat even when activities need to be suspended. The grant also offers rapid response funding to enable protection and participation in peace processes or respond to other urgent situations (e.g., responding to security threats). In Zimbabwe, this grant supported the bilateral political dialogues between GPPAC member and various peace and security state actors which is set to culminate in the joint convening a first ever CSO-convened national multi-stakeholder peace and security dialogue platform amongst select key state actors to deliberate and discuss Zimbabwe's emerging and pre-existing socio-economic and political threats.

4. Financial instruments should enable direct funding to local peace actors

Funding provided directly to local peace actors provides numerous benefits. Such an approach can break the cycle of dependence on larger organisations and invest in building local capacities. Direct funds to trusted local peace actors also create a more equitable partnership between donors and local peace actors.

Specific actions that donors can take to increase direct funding to local actors and incentivise quality financing

practices include:

1. Changing the current eligibility criteria that are making it difficult for local actors to apply for funds. Further inquiry is required into how to better balance donors' own fiduciary requirements with the realities and capacities of local actors and reduce their burden to meet those requirements.
2. Proactive outreach to local peace actors raises awareness of calls for proposals at local levels. Specific actions such as providing application guidance in local languages, hosting proposal trainings, and providing direct engagement on proposal development build local organisational capacities.
3. Refining project proposals together with the potential recipients allow for the enhancement of local ownership and opportunities for impactful delivery at the local level.
4. Act as a convenor to bring local activists, peacebuilders, and their coalitions and networks together with other donors and embassies in a risk-informed manner. This would provide local peace actors with the required political support to sustain their actions long-term.

However, it should be recognised that adequate direct bilateral support requires sufficient coordination among donors and needs to be grounded in a shared analysis and understanding of national and local peacebuilding priorities. Without such coordination and joint analysis, there is a risk that direct funding of local actors contributes to fragmentation, unhealthy competition and duplication of efforts, while subsequently undermining local authorities.

Further, recognising the reality that many government donors are unable, or can only provide a small percentage of their budget, to fund local peace actors directly, INGOs play important roles as intermediaries. Donors can support INGOs to incorporate quality financing into their subgranting and engagements with local peace actors. In particular, INGOs can absorb the administrative burdens necessary to meet donor accountability measures while allowing the local peacebuilder to focus on implementation.

Specific actions that donors can take to increase funding to local actors through intermediary organisations include:

1. Allowing intermediary organisations to provide core support subgrants recognising that intermediary organisations conduct regular partner capacity assessments and require reporting that provides oversight aligned with most donors' current risk management requirements.
2. Permit intermediary organisations to accept innovative applications and reporting. For example, intermediary organisations may accept video and audio applications in local languages instead of proposals that are required to be written in English or another internationally recognised language.

Direct funding to peacebuilding organisations by embassies at the country level:

Many embassies provide direct support for local peacebuilders, including Canada, Sweden, the Netherlands, the European Union, Switzerland, and Ireland, among others. One of the key benefits of direct bilateral support is the proximity to the beneficiaries of peacebuilding activities. The donors in this model can maintain regular contacts with peacebuilding organisations and enable the process of co-creation. This allows for locally-informed methodologies and rapid adjustments when required. Furthermore, in their engagement with local peacebuilding organisations, embassies can gradually enhance the capacity of local peace actors through core funding to support them to grow into entities that can later sustain themselves independently. Moreover, it is notably less expensive than supporting multilateral organisations due to the high transaction costs involved when engaging with multilateral organisations. Finally, these grants are normally long-term, which enables the sustainability of action and promotes stability for peacebuilding partners.

5. Financial instruments should support intermediary models rooted in network- and movement-building

Networks and movements help local peace actors to combine their powers in a collective effort to promote peace and prevent conflict through the principles of local-ownership, complementarity, mutual support and joint action. However, the current approach to peacebuilding financing is primarily centred on donors funding individual local peace actors separately. While some local actors operating at the national level may be able to access funding from multilateral organisations and multi-donor trust funds, others require additional support in obtaining resources, especially small youth- and women-led grassroots organisations. Given these realities, funding to networks and movements that these organisations usually partner with merit more attention.

Concrete approaches that donors can take to support movement and network building include:

1. Supporting movements and networks as meaningful partners in advancing goals of peacebuilding and sustaining peace. This can be done by investing in community-led approaches, consortia, coalitions to facilitate the inclusive involvement of different societal groups (young people, church leaders, people in the most remote areas, etc.) and diverse experts among them (i.e., gender, climate, human rights, etc.) in conflict prevention and peacebuilding. This will inevitably encourage organisations to coordinate and bring those who would not be able to obtain resources individually on board.
2. Incentivising network collaboration and engagement. This could be done by supporting specific convening and conference grants to support local peace actors to access greater diversity of knowledge and experience (i.e., of varied local contexts), expertise (i.e., in human rights, gender, the environment, economic development, law), and constituencies (i.e., different ethnic and religious groups, youth, women).

Networks and movements need to be nurtured over time and sometimes this raises issues of capacity for donors. Donors play an important role in supporting networks by prioritising their support to convenings or other fora that enable people to get together and share and build relationships. When operating sustainably,

these networks and movements can mitigate some of the deficiencies in the funding environment and build on each other's expertise.

Mutual support through the GPPAC Network¹⁹:

The members of the GPPAC network have been able to support each other through a variety of avenues that networks offer. By acting collectively and learning from one another, GPPAC members have been able to increase their impact through efficient joint action. For example, during the war in Ukraine, members of GPPAC from Romania supported humanitarian efforts in partnership with members in Ukraine. Peaceboat, a member from North East Asia, has also launched an emergency relief fund to support humanitarian efforts in the neighbouring countries. GPPAC was able to provide members with small grants and flexible crisis funding that is not always available through a traditional grant-recipient relationship.

6. Financial instruments should promote community-focused accountability, community-determined impact, and creative means of achieving monitoring, evaluation, and learning

The complex processes of social transformation that are at the heart of peacebuilding continue to evolve over long time horizons and often require significant engagement before the fruits of social cohesion and cooperation begin to emerge. Short-term monitoring and evaluation practices entrench projectisation thinking and limit learning on peacebuilding's contribution to the larger community and societal changes at work. Additionally, traditional monitoring and evaluation practices that rely on results frameworks and outcome indicators prioritise accountability to the donor for a quantifiable set of activities rather than promoting accountability between local peace actors and the communities they serve.

In developing such monitoring and evaluation processes, it is critical to consider the following principles:

1. Supporting locally-led determination of impact: This requires donors to revise their approach to the development of indicators and outcomes; allocate reasonable budgets for monitoring and evaluation; and consider their long-term engagement. In doing so, there should be a move towards developing financing mechanisms that are flexible and allow for continuous assessment and reflection on the impact and success of initiatives, and that can be adapted along the way.
2. An adaptive peacebuilding approach provides a methodology by which to do this. Adaptive peacebuilding is a process whereby local peace actors, in partnership with conflict-affected communities, engage actively in a "structured process to sustain peace and resolve conflicts by employing an iterative process of learning and adaptation".²⁰ This adaptive peacebuilding methodology, underpinned by six concrete principles²¹, is aimed at supporting societies to develop resilience needed to cope with and adapt to complex conflict situations, and has been used in UN peacekeeping operations in the Central African Republic and South Sudan in partnership with local communities.²²

Locally-driven accountability mechanisms

There are ample examples of local accountability mechanisms. However, few have been institutionalised at this point. In 2020, with support from the PeaceNexus Foundation, the PBF developed a Guidance Note on Perception Surveys and Community-Based Monitoring that is a first step towards monitoring work based on stakeholders' views in conflict-affected communities.²³ Another initiative, Everyday Peace Indicators allows communities to develop their own indicators of difficult-to-measure concepts like peace. Everyday Peace Indicators prioritise local understandings of peace and how it is visible in communities rather than top-down conceptions. Community indicators developed through this process can complement current indicators and guide the development and evaluation of programs.²⁴

7. Financial instruments should consider realistic and transparent approaches to risk

“Pooling risk” by dividing risk responsibilities amongst donors is a mechanism for promoting investment in local peacebuilding. Pooled funds are increasingly recognised as a mechanism for donors to pool risks inherent to the financing peacebuilding action and supporting multi-stakeholder partnerships across the UN system and with local actors. Pooled funding mechanisms have a proven potential to reduce earmarking and increase flexibility for local peace actors to address challenges and opportunities as they arise in specific contexts. Generally, current pooled funds tend to be medium- to long-term and outcome-oriented rather than output-oriented.

The following recommendations are made in support of the UN and member states finding an appropriate balance between risk and flexibility, fiduciary management and accountability:

1. Explore pooled funding mechanisms at the country level, including multi-partner trust funds that can improve local peace actors' access to quality financing and serve donors to pool risk and resources.
2. Develop risk management frameworks that include contextual risks to local actors in addition to programmatic risks to aid providers and a broader analysis of conflict sensitivities.

Risk management frameworks that support collective and integrated conflict and risk analysis help provide realistic risk management policies that can be updated and adjusted appropriately to the context. Practical, effective and transparent platforms such as the Risk Management Unit in Somalia can help ‘de-risk’ investments in peacebuilding and promote a shared understanding of local needs that inform programming for peacebuilding.

An Approach to Risk Assessment in Somalia:

An example of such a platform is the Risk Management Unit (RMU) in Somalia²⁵, a unique UN entity established in 2011 to support stakeholders across the country to jointly navigate risks that arise in volatile environments. The RMU was developed to support the UN, its partners and donors in delivering impact for interventions at the humanitarian-development-peacebuilding nexus by enhancing risk-informed decision-making. It supports risk management approaches that aim to improve programme planning and implementation; informed decision-making and context analysis; fiduciary accountability; and open dialogue regarding risk management challenges.²⁶ For donors, the RMU provides due diligence support in selecting partners in Somalia – including local civil society partners. For NGOs and civil society organisations, the RMU provides risk management training and advice.

CONCLUSION

Despite a broad acceptance and the critical role that local peace actors play in sustainable peace efforts, the current funding systems struggle to respond to the dynamic needs of local peace actors. This paper's principles and subsequent recommendations are designed to support local peace actors to access quality financing that better meets their needs and helps achieve peacebuilding objectives. The recommendations are not made with the belief that donors will implement all of them. Rather, the recommendations are designed for different donors and funding mechanisms with considerations based on their current status, activities, and mandates. For example, this paper recognizes that the PBF is beginning to implement locally-driven accountability structures. Regardless of current progress, more action and consistent implementation are needed to ensure peacebuilding financing is participatory, accessible, flexible, and sustained for local peace actors. Implementing even a few of the above recommendations will be a positive, tangible step toward enhancing quality financing.

ABOUT THE ORGANIZATIONS

The **Life & Peace Institute (LPI)** is an international peacebuilding organisation established in 1985 that works in partnership with civil society in nonviolent conflict transformation.

The **Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation** is a non-governmental organisation established in memory of the second Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Foundation aims to advance dialogue and policy for sustainable development, multilateralism and peace.

The **Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict** is a global member-led network of local peacebuilders who bring their practices, knowledges and experience to prevent conflict and build more peaceful societies.

Endnotes

- 1 We understand local peacebuilding actors to include diverse national, sub-national and community-based civil society organisations, grassroots movements, and faith-based organisations and other actors, including women, youth and indigenous actors, who rely on conflict analysis in driving their strategies and programming.
- 2 In the 2021 joint resolutions on peacebuilding and sustaining peace, the UN General Assembly and Security Council recognised that local peace actors are critical partners in peacebuilding. UN General Assembly Resolution 75/201, 21 December 2020: <https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/75/201>; UN Security Council Resolution 2558, 21 December 2020: [https://undocs.org/S/RES/2558\(2020\)](https://undocs.org/S/RES/2558(2020)), OP 1. The recently published UN Community Engagement Guidelines on Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace (CEG) also emphasise the importance of local peace actors in implementing peacebuilding and sustaining peace. See UN, Community Engagement Guidelines on Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace, 2020: https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/sites/www.un.org.peacebuilding/files/documents/un_community-engagement_guidelines.august_2020.pdf. The UN Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), in its 2020-2024 Strategy, has committed to expanding partnerships with civil society organisations and to exploring new avenues to make funding available for community-based organisations. See The 2020-2024 Strategy of the Peacebuilding Fund: <https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/content/peacebuilding-fund-strategy-2020-24>. The UN Secretary-General highlighted in his 2020 report on peacebuilding and sustaining peace that financing for peacebuilding must adapt to support local ownership. Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace: Report of the Secretary-General, 30 July 2020: <https://undocs.org/en/S/2020/773>
- 3 Life & Peace Institute and Somali Peace Line, Peace Financing Case Study: lessons from the first UN Peacebuilding Fund-Civil Society partnership in Somalia, September 2021 (Internal Reflection Paper); GPPAC, “In the Spirit of Partnership: Operationalisation of Sustaining Peace at the Regional Level”, February 2020: <https://gppac.net/resources/spirit-partnership-operationalisation-sustaining-peace-regional-level>.
- 4 UN SG Policy Brief: COVID-19 in an Urban World https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/sg_policy_brief_covid_urban_world_july_2020.pdf
- 5 United Nations, Our Common Agenda – Report of the Secretary-General, 2021, https://www.un.org/en/content/common-agenda-report/assets/pdf/Common_Agenda_Report_English.pdf
- 6 The donors recognise more and more the value of engaging with local peacebuilding actors, including in the contexts where the national government capacities are limited to advance peacebuilding action, and see investments in local peacebuilding action as more impactful in the long-term. GPPAC, Strengthening the Implementation of Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace, <https://www.gppac.net/strengthening-implementation-peacebuilding-and-sustaining-peace>
- 7 Secretary-General’s report on Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace, 28 January 2022, https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/sites/www.un.org.peacebuilding/files/documents/sg_report.peacebuilding_and_sustaining_peace.a.76.668-s.2022.66.corrected.e.pdf
- 8 For further information, see the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation’s report The Way Forward: Fulfilling the Potential of the Funding Compact at the Country Level, <https://www.daghammarskjold.se/publication/the-way-forward-fulfilling-the-potential-of-the-funding-compact-at-the-country-level/>
- 9 UN Security Council Resolution 2558, 21 December 2020: [https://undocs.org/en/S/RES/2558\(2020\)](https://undocs.org/en/S/RES/2558(2020)), OP4.
- 10 Global Network of Women Peacebuilders, Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation & GPPAC, Investing Smarter: Assessing structural transformation in financing for impactful peacebuilding, 2021: https://gppac.net/files/2021-06/Investing%20Smarter_Meeting%20Note_10%20June%202021.pdf
- 11 The principles elaborated below are derived from dialogue that has been ongoing for the past several years – they reflect a general consensus on the tenets of financing local peacebuilding actors. See more DHF & GPPAC, Financing Mechanisms to Support local peace actors, 2021: <https://www.gppac.net/resources/financing-mechanisms-support-local-peacebuilders>
- 12 DHF & GPPAC, Financing Mechanisms to Support local peace actors, 2021: <https://www.gppac.net/resources/financing-mechanisms-support-local-peacebuilders>
- 13 Ibid
- 14 GNWP, GPPAC, ICAN, Kvinna Till Kvinna, MADRE, WILPF, “FUND US LIKE YOU WANT US TO WIN: Feminist Solutions for more Impactful Financing for Peacebuilding”, 2021, Accessed at: <https://www.gppac.net/resources/fund-us-you-want-us-win-feminist-solutions-more-impactful-financing-peacebuilding>

- 15 This refers to a group of international non-governmental organisations, think tanks, research and policy institutions that work to connect local actors to global policy discussions.
- 16 Life & Peace Institute, “The United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture Review: Perspectives from local peace actors in the Horn of Africa and Great Lakes”, May 2020, available online at https://assets.ctfassets.net/jzxyrkiixcim/211F910Pov0sLC-G0a7fvOf/0831e2258157ce2d67dfaace3476c44c/LifePeace_Institute_Submission_to_the_2020_UN_Peacebuilding_Architecture_Review__July_2020_.pdf
- 17 The 2020-2024 Strategy of the Peacebuilding Fund, <https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/content/peacebuilding-fund-strategy-2020-24>, page 3/
- 18 Annex to the Secretary General’s 2017 Report on Funding, Technical note on definitions, sources and coverage, 2017, https://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/qcpr/pdf/technical_note_on_funding.pdf
- 19 GPPAC (2022), Financing Peacebuilding: The added value of GPPAC’s locally-led network approach, <https://gppac.net/news/financing-peacebuilding-added-value-gppacs-locally-led-network-approach>.
- 20 De Coning, Cedric (2018) Adaptive Peacebuilding, *International Affairs*, 94(2), pp. 301–317, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iix251>
- 21 Adaptive peacebuilding is guided by a selection of principles. For more information about this approach, see here: <https://www.accord.org.za/conflict-trends/the-six-principles-of-adaptive-peacebuilding/#:~:text=Adaptive%20peacebuilding%20is%20a%20process,process%20of%20learning%20and%20adaptation>
- 22 Ibid
- 23 Peacebuilding Fund. 2022. “Background Note: Peacebuilding Fund’s Community-Based Monitoring and Evaluation.” https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/sites/www.un.org.peacebuilding/files/documents/pbf_cbme_background_note_2022.pdf
- 24 For more on the Everyday Peace Indicators see: <https://www.everydaypeaceindicators.org/how-does-epi-work>
- 25 For more information about the UN in Somalia’s Risk Management Unit, see here: <https://somalia.un.org/en/134317-risk-management-unit>
- 26 United Nations Somalia, ‘Risk Management Unit’, <https://somalia.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-01/RMU.PDF>