



General Assembly

Distr.: General
27 April 2022

Original: English

Seventy-sixth session

Agenda items 136 and 66

Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations

Peacebuilding and sustaining peace

Investing in prevention and peacebuilding

Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions

I. Introduction

1. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions has considered the report of the Secretary-General on investing in prevention and peacebuilding ([A/76/732](#)). During its consideration of the report, the Advisory Committee met online with representatives of the Secretary-General, who provided additional information and clarification, concluding with written responses dated 22 March 2022.

2. The report, which is submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution [75/201](#), contains a request for the Assembly to approve the establishment of a funding mechanism through which assessed contributions in the amount of \$100 million would be appropriated on an annual basis through a dedicated special account, starting from 1 July 2022.

II. General matters related to the Peacebuilding Fund

3. In his report, the Secretary-General states that the Peacebuilding Fund was established in 2006 as a result of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (General Assembly resolution [60/1](#)) ([A/76/732](#), para. 8). The Advisory Committee recalls that through Assembly resolution [60/180](#) and Security Council resolution [1645 \(2005\)](#), the Secretary-General was tasked to establish the Fund as a multi-year standing fund for post-conflict peacebuilding, financed by voluntary contributions, with the objective of ensuring the immediate release of resources needed to launch peacebuilding activities critical to the peacebuilding process. Upon enquiry, the Committee was informed that the Fund is a flexible, responsive and focused resource for peacebuilding support to countries emerging from violent conflict or at risk of lapsing



or relapsing into conflict. It is also a risk-taking financing instrument of first resort intended to have a catalytic effect in helping to generate larger resource flows and more sustained support mechanisms. The Fund concentrates on addressing critical gaps in efforts to build or sustain peace. For instance, it plays an important role in helping to mitigate the impact of the financial cliffs that often arise in the context of major transitions of United Nations peacekeeping operations and special political missions. Such transitions are frequently accompanied by shifts in the types of aid made available by bilateral and other donor partners and result in the underfunding of critical peacebuilding areas. Furthermore, as an unearmarked, pre-positioned pooled fund, the Fund can approve multi-year projects, which places it at a significant advantage compared with other funding sources and recognizes the long-term nature of peacebuilding. **The Advisory Committee recognizes the critical contribution of the Peacebuilding Fund for countries emerging from violent conflict or at risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict, in particular following the closure or reconfiguration of United Nations peacekeeping or special political missions.**

4. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that, in accordance with its terms of reference ([A/63/818](#), annex), the types of activities undertaken through the Fund fall into the following categories: (a) implementation of peace agreements or imminent threats to peace processes; (b) promotion of peaceful coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflict; (c) efforts to revitalize economies and generate peace dividends; and (d) establishment or re-establishment of essential administrative services. In addition, the Fund has three priority windows, that take into account the global operating environment and contexts, in which it sees its biggest comparative advantage: (a) supporting cross-border and regional approaches; (b) facilitating transitions; and (c) fostering inclusion through women and youth empowerment. The Committee, upon request, was provided with a summary of the funding of activities by category from 2007, the year in which the Fund started to fund projects, to 14 March 2022 (see annex I). **While noting that the efforts to support the strengthening of national capacities to promote coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflict has received the highest level of investments (see also para. 5 below), the Advisory Committee, emphasizing the importance of the link between peace and development, trusts that greater detail will be provided to the General Assembly, at the time of its consideration of the present report, on the planned activities and additional resources aimed at addressing socioeconomic needs.**

5. In 2020, the Fund launched a strategic plan for the period 2020–2024 aimed at investing \$1.5 billion in peacebuilding efforts in response to increased global demand ([A/76/732](#), para. 14). According to the strategy, the Fund will maintain its core peacebuilding focus areas while scaling up its support to cross-border and regional approaches, settings undergoing a transition process following the departure or reconfiguration of a United Nations mission, and women and youth empowerment. In addition, the Fund expects to see an increased emphasis on prevention, which would receive an estimated 40 per cent of the total investments, while maintaining a significant footprint in post-conflict recovery and a smaller role in ongoing crisis contexts, receiving 50 and 10 per cent of the total investments, respectively. The Advisory Committee was informed, upon enquiry, that the proposal contained in the report of the Secretary-General is about both peacebuilding and prevention, as peacebuilding is aimed at preventing the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict. **The Advisory Committee trusts that the Secretary-General will provide further information on the prevention activities envisaged under the strategy for the period 2020–2024 to the General Assembly at the time of its consideration of the present report.**

6. Upon request, the Advisory Committee was provided with detailed commitments by donor, by year, made since the inception of the Fund (see annex II). Between 2012 and 2021, the Fund received \$1,015,313,908 and commitments in the amount of \$1,564,920,000 for the period 2006–2024. Of those commitments, 88 per cent have been paid out by 12 donors.¹

7. The Advisory Committee also received, upon request, a summary of annual expenditure for activities funded by the Fund, by country, since its inception (see annex III). The information provided shows that the Fund has funded projects in the amount of \$1,627,800,000 since 2007. Expenditures in the past five years amounted to \$190.7 million in 2021, \$183.4 million in 2020, \$153.7 million in 2019, \$201.2 million in 2018 and \$171.9 million in 2017, compared with \$49.3 million in 2007, \$41.0 million in 2008 and \$44.4 million in 2009. **The Advisory Committee notes that the annual level of spending of the Fund has increased from \$49 million to \$191 million since its inception, albeit with some fluctuations (see also para. 15 below).**

8. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that the Fund aims at investing in approximately 40 countries at any given time. Fund resources are allocated to projects at the country level on the basis of proposals submitted by the resident coordinator and as agreed with the United Nations country team and the Government, in line with the core principle of national ownership. Any Member State may apply, through the Fund's Immediate Response Facility, for up to \$5 million for a period of up to two years to fund projects in response to urgent needs or opportunities. Countries that are on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission and countries declared eligible by the Secretary-General, on the basis of an application by the country, have access, through the Fund's Peacebuilding and Recovery Facility, to larger envelopes to fund longer-term projects.

9. With regard to management arrangements, the Advisory Committee was informed that the Peacebuilding Support Office is responsible for the overall management of the Fund under the authority of the Secretary-General. The Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support has delegated authority to approve projects and provides direction on the operational programme management and reporting of the Fund's operations. In addition, the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), which is the Fund's administrative agent, manages contribution agreements on behalf of the Fund in accordance with UNDP regulations, rules, directives and procedures (see [A/63/818](#)). The activities financed by the Fund are mainly implemented by United Nations agencies, funds and programmes. In a limited number of cases, however, the Fund directly finances non-United Nations partners, who can apply for funding in partnership with governments and through the resident coordinator. Accountability for programme implementation is delegated to the United Nations entities concerned, in accordance with their own rules and procedures. Funding is provided in tranches, with subsequent tranches depending upon expenditure rates and the substantive process, as reviewed and approved by the Peacebuilding Support Office. Measures to ensure quality and oversight in the allocation and management of the projects include a requirement that the resident coordinator have accountability for the strategic coherence of activities, biannual reporting on all projects, individual project evaluations and longer-term portfolio reviews. Monitoring is undertaken by resident coordinator offices at the country level and through visits by programme officers of

¹ Sweden, Germany, Netherlands, Department for International Development of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Norway, Japan, United Kingdom, Denmark, Canada, Canadian International Development Agency, Australia and Switzerland.

the Office, members of the Peacebuilding Fund Advisory Group and donors (see para. 28 below).

III. Rationale of the proposal: general comments

10. In his report, the Secretary-General seeks approval for supplementing the funding of the Fund through assessed contributions as a means to respond to the persistent funding challenges related to both resource unpredictability and underfunding ([A/76/732](#), paras. 7 and 34).

11. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that the report of the Secretary-General is submitted in response to the invitation by the General Assembly contained in paragraph 4 of its resolution [75/201](#) to United Nations entities to present inputs in advance of its high-level meeting to be convened at its seventy-sixth session to advance, explore and consider options for ensuring adequate, predictable and sustained financing for peacebuilding. The high-level meeting is scheduled for 27 April 2022.

12. The Advisory Committee was also informed that the Secretary-General does not present a new proposal in his report but rather offers technical modalities for the General Assembly to operationalize a proposal that he presented in his 2018 report on peacebuilding and sustaining peace ([A/72/707-S/2018/43](#)), in which he called upon Member States to consider the allocation of assessed contributions in the amount of \$100 million to the Fund, as one of the options to increase, restructure and better prioritize funding dedicated to peacebuilding activities. The Assembly, in its resolution [72/276](#), took note with appreciation of the recommendations and options contained in that report and requested the Secretary-General to further elaborate on them. Subsequently, the Secretary-General reiterated the option of the use of assessed contributions as a modality for financing peacebuilding activities in his report on peacebuilding and sustaining peace, dated 30 May 2019 ([A/73/890-S/2019/448](#)), in response to which no action was taken by the Assembly, and in his report on the same topic dated 28 January 2022 ([A/76/668-S/2022/66](#) and [A/76/668/Corr.1-S/2022/66/Corr.1](#)), which is pending consideration by the Assembly.

13. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that, according to the Secretariat, the introduction of a supplementary funding stream through assessed contributions would significantly strengthen the current financing situation, in particular to mitigate the impact of the financial cliffs resulting from the transition of peacekeeping and special political missions. In addition, adequate investment in prevention and peacebuilding is considered the most cost-effective approach to addressing conflict and fragility risks, as well as the need for costly crisis responses, and to securing development gains for the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

14. The Advisory Committee was also informed that the total target of \$1.5 billion under the Fund's strategy for the period 2020–2024 is broken down into annual funding targets, with a gradual year-on-year increase towards reaching the Secretary-General's vision of investing \$500 million per year through the Fund. However, voluntary contributions to the Fund have never exceeded \$180 million in any given year. In addition, of the \$1.5 billion target, slightly more than \$600 million has been committed or pledged to date, and the Fund has a funding gap of \$164.5 million relative to its \$275 million target for 2022.

15. The Advisory Committee was further informed that the exclusive reliance on voluntary contributions, which are mostly received from a small number of donors (see para. 6 above) and may fluctuate considerably from year to year, is not

sufficiently predictable or sustainable. In addition, the level of voluntary contributions has not been sufficient to meet the demands on and expectations of the Fund, and the gap between the supply of and demand for funding has been exacerbated in the past decade owing to increased requirements arising from the transition and closure of peacekeeping missions and to the decreased percentage of official development assistance (ODA) provided to peacebuilding priority areas. In recent years, only 13.5 per cent of such assistance was directed to peacebuilding and aid to conflict-affected and fragile countries. In addition, only 10 Development Assistance Committee members meet the Secretary-General's target of at least 20 per cent of ODA for peacebuilding in conflict settings (see [A/76/668-S/2022/66](#), paras. 34 and 44). **The Advisory Committee trusts that the contribution modality of the official development assistance and its aim will be further discussed in the appropriate forum of the General Assembly.**

16. The Advisory Committee recalls that the General Assembly has acknowledged the gap between the supply of and demand for funding for peacebuilding, including in its resolution [69/313](#), and has noted, in its resolution [75/201](#), that peacebuilding financing remains a critical challenge. The Committee trusts that the Secretary-General will continue his efforts to mobilize additional and predictable resources to sustain the Peacebuilding Fund (see also para. 24 below).

17. The Advisory Committee recalls that, in accordance with the twin resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council (Assembly resolution [60/180](#) and Council resolution [1645 \(2005\)](#)), the Peacebuilding Fund is financed by voluntary contributions (see para. 3 above). The Committee considers that any change to the funding modality of the Peacebuilding Fund, including the proposed introduction of assessed contributions as an additional funding stream, constitutes a policy decision outside the purview of the Committee. Pending action by the appropriate legislative body, the Committee identifies technical aspects that, in its view, would benefit from additional clarification, and provides preliminary observations.

IV. Specific aspects of the proposed arrangements

A. Financing arrangements

18. In his report, the Secretary-General proposes that \$100 million be appropriated on an annual basis, effective 1 July of each year, to a separate special account to be established by the Controller ([A/76/732](#), para. 25). Assessed contributions received by the Secretariat for the Peacebuilding Fund would be provided as grants to the Fund's account administered by the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office of UNDP. To allow for such funds to become available as soon as practicable, the Secretary-General requests that such an appropriation be made as at 1 July 2022. If approved, a similar request would be made to the General Assembly on an annual basis (*ibid.*, para. 26). The General Assembly is invited to consider an approach whereby the assessment rates applicable to the regular budget are applied to half of the amount requested for the Fund, while the assessment rates applicable to the financing of United Nations peacekeeping are applied to the other half (*ibid.*, para. 27).

Level of assessed contributions

19. It is indicated in the report that the proposed amount of \$100 million is based on the recommendation of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture that \$100 million, or a symbolic 1 per cent of the value of

the total requirements for United Nations peace operations (including both peacekeeping and special political missions), whichever is greater, be provided to the Fund (*ibid.*, para. 2). Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that, since 1 per cent of the total approved budget for peace operations would amount to approximately \$70.7 million for the current period, the level of funding proposed was \$100 million. The annual amount of \$100 million would correspond to 20 per cent of the \$500 million annual target set by the Secretary-General, which Member States committed to in the 2019 United Nations funding compact.

20. It is further indicated in the report that, unlike the budgets considered by the General Assembly, the level of resources requested through assessed contributions for the Fund is a static amount that is independent of prior-period performance or expenditure information (*ibid.*, para. 32). Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that, given the nature of the Fund as a flexible response mechanism to address peace sustainment requirements in situations at risk of, or affected by, violent conflict, the actual requirements for future periods cannot be forecast in advance in the same manner as the budgets considered by the Assembly.

21. The Advisory Committee is of the view that the Secretary-General should provide to the General Assembly, at the time of its consideration of the present report, additional clarification on the rationale for arriving at the proposed level of funding through assessed contributions. Furthermore, while noting the specific nature of the Fund, the Committee stresses that requests for assessed contributions should be presented on the basis of projected needs with the appropriate level of information, taking also into account previous expenditure levels (see also para. 32 below).

Scales of assessment

22. The proposal of the Secretary-General envisages a 50/50 financing of the \$100 million against the regular budget and peacekeeping scales of assessment. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that, currently, 8 of the 25 countries eligible to access the Peacebuilding Fund are host countries to peacekeeping or special political missions. **The Advisory Committee considers that the application of scales of assessment constitutes a policy matter to be decided upon by the General Assembly and trusts that the Secretary-General will provide further clarification to the Assembly during its consideration of the present report (see also para. 27 below).**

Voluntary contributions

23. In his report, the Secretary-General indicates that assessed contributions are not intended to supplant but to supplement voluntary contributions, which should remain the primary source of funding for the Peacebuilding Fund, in order to provide for a modicum of baseline stability and predictability that the Fund currently lacks (*ibid.*, para. 22). Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that it is unlikely that the introduction of an assessed funding stream to the Peacebuilding Fund would result in a decrease in voluntary contributions that would weaken the overall financial position of the Fund. **The Advisory Committee considers that the Secretary-General should provide to the General Assembly, at the time of its consideration of the present report, greater analysis on the impact of the introduction of assessed contributions on the voluntary contributions to the Fund, and related mitigating measures.**

24. The Advisory Committee was further informed that the Fund's strategy for the period 2020–2024 includes elements aimed at securing a higher level of voluntary contributions, such as increasing and diversifying the number of significant donors,

as well as encouraging Member States to commit to a more regular and higher-volume replenishment cycle. In line with the strategy, key outreach efforts have been undertaken at various levels, ranging from high-level events to targeted initiatives, and by various stakeholders, including the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund Advisory Group. The Committee was also informed that possibilities to expand resources for the Fund through corporate partnerships, blended financing or levies, which were previously identified by the Secretary-General ([A/72/707-S/2018/43](#), para. 49), are modest and unlikely to generate significant amounts. While private donations have been possible since 2019, an amount of only \$19,333 has been collected through that modality. **The Advisory Committee considers that greater fundraising efforts should be pursued, including with respect to securing contributions from official development assistance and the private sector, and trusts that additional information will be provided to the General Assembly at the time of its consideration of the present report (see also paras. 15–16 above).**

Other financing options

25. In his report, the Secretary-General indicates that access to assessed contributions has emerged as the only viable means for providing the Peacebuilding Fund with a consistent baseline level of funding to complement the voluntary contributions provided by donors ([A/76/732](#), para. 35). The Advisory Committee notes that no other option has been presented in the report of the Secretary-General, including options provided in previous reports in connection with peacebuilding financing (see paras. 12 and 24 above). **The Advisory Committee is of the view that additional information on the Secretary-General's consideration of other options to complement the voluntary contributions should be provided to the General Assembly at the time of its consideration of the present report.**

B. Management arrangements

26. In his report, the Secretary-General indicates that no changes to the existing arrangements for the consideration, approval, disbursement or management of funds are required to implement the proposed modality for providing the Peacebuilding Fund with access to \$100 million in assessed contributions on an annual basis ([A/76/732](#), para. 28).

Commingling of assessed and voluntary contributions

27. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that, according to the Secretary-General, the Fund does not accept earmarked contributions and the mechanism for the allocation of its resources is the same irrespective of the source of funding. Accordingly, it is proposed that the entirety of the assessed contributions would be transferred as an unearmarked grant to the Fund to be used as required, regardless of how the funds are assessed among Member States, and would be commingled with the voluntary contributions. **The Advisory Committee considers that the determination of the use of assessed contributions is a policy matter within the purview of the General Assembly (see also para. 22 above). The Committee considers that the management of assessed contributions in an unearmarked pool of resources raises concerns regarding the possibility of effective oversight by the Assembly on their use (see also para. 31 below), and considers that the Secretary-General should provide additional clarifications to the Assembly at the time of its consideration of the present report.**

Management of assessed contributions under existing governance structures

28. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that the assessed contributions would be managed in the same manner as voluntary contributions and subject to the existing governance and oversight structures of the Peacebuilding Fund. Accordingly, responsibility for overall direction and guidance on programme management and operational monitoring over the Fund would continue to rest with the Peacebuilding Support Office, and the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office would continue to manage the Fund in accordance with the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP. The Committee was informed that the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office previously received funding from assessed contributions related to the United Nations Haiti cholera response multi-partner trust fund. The Committee was also informed that the Secretariat does not have the capacity to perform the functions of the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office in as cost-effective a manner, and it would not be practical or efficient for the voluntary and assessed funding streams of the Fund to be administered by separate entities. **The Advisory Committee considers that further information should be provided to the General Assembly, at the time of its consideration of the present report, on how accountability for the management of assessed contributions would be ensured. In addition, greater clarification should be provided regarding the administration of assessed contributions under the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP, taking also into account the lack of applicable precedents. The Committee is also of the view that the possibility of the administration of assessed contributions by the Secretariat within its existing capacity should be explored further.**

Fund management and programme implementation costs

29. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that, in accordance with its terms of reference, the overall management fees for both programme implementation and Fund management should not exceed 11 per cent of the funds received. This percentage breaks down as follows: 1 per cent for the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office for Administrative Agent functions, in accordance with the Protocol on the Administrative Agent for Multi Donor Trust Funds, Joint Programmes, and One UN Funds; 7 per cent as indirect costs for the recipient United Nations entities; and 3 per cent for the global management of the Fund, covering the costs for: (a) eight staff (1 D-1, 2 P-5, 2 P-4, 1 P-3 and 2 General Service (Other level)) in the Financing for Peacebuilding Branch of the Peacebuilding Support Office, which manages the Fund; and (b) a surge capacity established within the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office to provide additional support depending upon the volume of funds received and programmed. **The Advisory Committee notes that the fees for Fund management and programme implementation amount to 11 per cent of the resources received by the Fund, and considers that further information, including with respect to the fees for programme implementation, particularly for non-United Nations organization implementing partners, should be provided to the General Assembly at the time of its consideration of the present report.** The Advisory Committee discussed issues related to implementing partners in its report on the financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors for the period ended 31 December 2020 ([A/76/554](#), paras. 41–46).

Complementarity with individual peacekeeping operations

30. In his report, the Secretary-General indicates that, under the proposed arrangements, there would be no impact on the proposed budgets of individual peace operations, and the use of the Peacebuilding Fund would be fully coordinated with peace operations and country teams to ensure complementarity and no duplication

(A/76/732, para. 3). Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that in mission settings the Fund complements Security Council-mandated activities by helping Governments, with support from United Nations country teams and other partners, to meet prevention and peacebuilding requirements not adequately covered through existing funding, such as cross-border and regional initiatives that may fall outside the scope of mission mandates, as well as projects that would continue after the closure of a mission to help mitigate the financing cliff and safeguard the achievements of the mission. **The Advisory Committee is of the view that greater information should be provided to the General Assembly, at the time of its consideration of the present report, on how assessed funding would be complemented by the proposed assessed funding for the Peacebuilding Fund, and on the locus of responsibility for ensuring complementarity in the design of programmes and maximum impact from the various sources of funding, taking into account the distinct roles of peace operations, United Nations country teams, the Peacebuilding Fund, the international financial institutions and other stakeholders.**

C. Oversight

31. In his report, the Secretary-General indicates that a principle underpinning the proposal, which was also emphasized by the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, is that assessed contributions should be provided to the Peacebuilding Fund in a way that ensures necessary oversight without undermining the Fund's comparative advantage as a fast, unearmarked, flexible and pre-positioned fund (*ibid.*, para. 23). **The Advisory Committee stresses that the appropriate oversight by Member States in the management and utilization of assessed contributions is indispensable. The Committee trusts that the Secretary-General will provide appropriate solutions to the General Assembly at the time of its consideration of the report, taking into account the need to mitigate the impact that the introduction of such a necessary level of oversight might have on the facility of the Fund to immediately disburse resources for peacebuilding activities and on the availability of appropriate financing for recovery (see General Assembly resolution 60/1, para. 103).**

32. The report of the Secretary-General indicates that assessed contributions would be requested as at 1 July, while the Peacebuilding Fund would be managed on a calendar-year basis and the performance report would also continue to be provided on a calendar-year basis, in accordance with the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP (A/76/732, paras. 32–33). Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that, according to the Secretariat, there is no requirement for changes in the reporting cycle of the Fund to align with the assessment cycle. Every annual request for funding would be accompanied by: (a) the annual report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund, usually issued in March, which would be considered by the Advisory Committee and, subsequently, by the Fifth Committee during the second part of its resumed session; and (b) the consolidated annual financial report issued by the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office by 31 May, which would be shared with the Fifth Committee in time for its consideration of the request. **The Advisory Committee notes that it would not have access to the most recent consolidated annual financial report on the Fund during its consideration of the yearly request of the Secretary-General for funding from assessed contributions, with implications for its ability to evaluate the proposal fully and appropriately (see also para. 21 above).**

33. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was also informed that the accounting activities of the Peacebuilding Fund are included and reported in volume I of the

United Nations financial statements. **The Advisory Committee is of the view that, should the Fund be granted access to assessed contributions, the Board of Auditors should review the accounting of the Fund separately from the entities and programmes reported under volume I, taking also into account the assessment cycle.**

V. Conclusion

34. The action requested of the General Assembly is contained in paragraph 37 of the report of the Secretary-General. **The comments and observations of the Advisory Committee are contained in the present report (see also para. 17 above).**

Annex I

Summary of Peacebuilding Fund by area of activity, 2007–2022

(Millions of United States dollars)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Peace agreements</i>	<i>Dialogue and coexistence</i>	<i>Peace dividends</i>	<i>Basic services</i>	<i>Peacebuilding Fund Immediate Response Facility^a</i>	<i>Total</i>
2007 ^b	25.8	13.6	4.8	0.0	5.3	49.4
2008	13.0	11.2	11.7	2.4	2.8	41.1
2009	17.2	9.7	4.4	7.2	5.9	44.4
2010	31.7	12.7	8.5	9.1	31.3	93.3
2011	24.9	26.8	5.1	4.7	29.5	91.0
2012	8.0	3.2	5.0	3.6	19.5	39.3
2013	12.0	24.6	16.5	7.1	17.9	78.1
2014	12.1	11.9	14.3	0.0	60.8	99.1
2015	11.9	9.7	3.0	3.7	38.5	66.9
2016	13.6	6.7	19.8	.0	25.3	65.3
2017	0.0	14.8	0.0	5.0	121.9	141.7
2018	20.0	42.8	6.6	4.1	127.6	201.2
2019	27.1	34.9	9.0	2.8	79.8	153.6
2020	22.8	119.4	18.2	17.1	0.0	177.5
2021	33.2	133.7	17.8	6.0	0.0	190.8
2022	6.0	36.9	15.0	0.9	0.0	58.8
Total, activities	279.2	512.5	159.7	74.0	566.1	1 591.5

^a Until 2019, the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office coded Immediate Response Facility projects as “IRF” rather than by area of activity.

^b The Peacebuilding Fund began funding projects only in 2007.

Annex II

Commitments by donor, 2006–2024

(Millions of United States dollars)

Donor	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total
Albania																0.01				0.01
Argentina																				0.05
Australia		0.79	0.92	0.71	1.70	4.17	2.09	1.03	4.39	2.90	2.70	2.45	2.35		4.89	2.37				33.48
Austria	0.66	0.67	0.78																	2.11
Bahrain		0.01																		0.01
Bangladesh							0.01						0.10				0.05			0.16
Belgium		3.65			0.70	0.70						0.53	2.27		2.63	2.26				12.75
Brazil		0.02	0.57																	0.59
Canada												3.73	7.78	5.16	10.47	11.89				39.02
Canadian International Development Agency/ Global Affairs Canada	8.57	10.19			4.99	5.09	5.01													33.86
Chile	0.01	0.05		0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10		0.10						1.07
China		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	2.00		1.00										8.00
Colombia							0.02													0.02
Croatia	0.01	0.02	0.03		0.06			0.03												0.15
Cyprus		0.02	0.02								0.01			0.01						0.06
Czechia	0.05	0.17	0.13						0.01							0.02				0.38
Denmark	8.88						8.87					1.85	0.89	5.06	10.44	8.66	6.51	7.57		58.74
Department for International Development/Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (United Kingdom)		11.81	24.09	17.06		8.97	19.73	22.54	24.70	23.18	2.41			0.64	0.97					156.11
Egypt	0.02			0.03		0.05			0.02							0.02				0.13
Estonia								0.10	0.09	0.08	0.08		0.17	0.08	0.09	0.06				0.75
European Union														0.11		1.38	0.90			2.39
Finland		2.12	4.43		2.70	2.66	5.21		5.43	2.22					3.52	1.18	1.19			30.66

Donor	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total
France		1.36	1.52									0.25	0.17	0.83	1.11	4.84				10.08
Germany			11.00	2.98	5.00		6.47		7.49	3.79	22.25	26.29	36.37	44.24	46.45	69.56	11.26			293.15
Guyana																0.01				0.01
Iceland		1.00																		1.00
India	2.00					2.00					1.00	0.50				0.15				5.65
Indonesia		0.02	0.02		0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03				0.09				0.33
Ireland	12.60				1.00	0.97			1.31	0.55	0.56	1.12	3.45	2.21	2.05	2.42				28.22
Israel					0.01															0.01
Italy		5.77		0.21							0.65	1.17	0.34	1.44		1.22				10.79
Japan	20.00					12.50			10.00		3.50	2.50	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.20	2.60			60.30
Kuwait	0.25	0.25																		0.50
Latvia																0.02				0.02
Liberia												0.05								0.05
Libya		0.05			0.05															0.10
Luxembourg	0.13	0.72	0.40	0.44	0.40	0.79	0.50	0.54	0.38	0.57	0.21	0.34	0.46	0.44	0.36	0.34				7.02
Malaysia									0.10		0.10									0.20
Malta																0.07		0.01	0.01	0.09
Mexico		0.05	0.05	0.05		0.10	0.08	0.04												0.37
Morocco		0.01			0.01		0.02								0.01	0.03				0.08
Netherlands		18.52	27.94				14.29		6.15	5.47	5.20	11.86	17.02	16.62	36.07	11.70				170.82
New Zealand														2.00	1.98	2.19				6.18
Nigeria				0.01																0.01
Norway	32.12					5.21	5.19	5.08	5.00	3.65	0.35	15.52	8.70	7.64	12.29	10.32	11.32	11.32	11.32	145.02
Pakistan						0.01	0.01					0.01				0.03				0.05
Peru				0.01			0.01	0.01		0.01	0.00		0.01	0.01	0.00					0.05
Philippines																0.05				0.05
Poland	0.05	0.05		0.04			0.03	0.05		0.06	0.03	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.03	0.03				0.61
Portugal				1.00									0.02	0.02	0.02	0.06				1.13
Private sector		0.02				0.00	0.00													0.02
Qatar		0.20				0.20				0.20										0.60
Republic of Korea	3.00			0.30	0.20	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.48	0.52	0.60	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.80	1.58				13.73
Romania		0.15																		0.15

Donor	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total
Russian Federation			2.00		4.00	2.00			6.00	2.00	2.00									18.00
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines																0.01				0.01
Saudi Arabia		0.50						0.10												0.60
Slovakia								0.04			0.17	0.47	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.12				0.87
Slovenia			0.02	0.02													0.02			0.06
Spain	3.43	4.02	4.55	5.02		0.53		0.08			0.14		0.15			1.18				19.10
Sweden	27.16	15.11	12.28	9.63	8.73	11.52	10.07	8.37	7.74	6.60	6.26	10.73	21.13	20.47	32.49	29.12	29.23	27.48		294.13
Switzerland					0.52					0.33	0.97	1.03	3.03	3.04	3.92	8.00	6.60	3.50		30.93
Thailand		0.01		0.01												0.10				0.12
Turkey	0.80	0.20	0.20		0.10			0.20	0.20		0.40		0.20	0.38	0.22	0.22				3.12
United Arab Emirates		0.50																		0.50
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland											8.04	10.43	20.97	20.67						60.11
United States of America										0.25		0.30								0.55
Total	119.75	79.01	91.95	38.62	31.31	58.09	79.22	40.83	79.63	53.49	57.76	92.35	128.93	134.79	174.82	173.50	69.68	49.88	11.33	1 564.92

Annex III

Annual expenditure for Peacebuilding Fund activities by country, 2007–2022

Country	Special political mission	Peacekeeping mission	Transition setting	Amount (millions of United States dollars)																Total
				2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	
Albania															3.43					3.4
Angola																			1.60	1.6
Benin																	1.40			1.4
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)																	3.00			3.0
Bosnia and Herzegovina											2.00			2.00		1.93				5.9
Burkina Faso														4.00	2.20	9.48	5.14	15.26	2.14	38.2
Burundi		BNUB (2011–2014)	YES	28.13	5.79	2.79	3.00	10.65			9.06	1.24	8.26	1.74	13.85	1.50		4.00	1.50	91.5
Cameroon	CNMC											0.00		1.72	1.50		10.15	6.68	1.50	21.5
Central African Republic		MINUSCA		1.00		10.82	19.18		2.40	0.91	14.36	8.78		18.59	5.09	18.57	7.25	8.99	2.30	118.2
Chad		MINURCAT (2007–2010)					2.73		2.06	0.00				1.50	8.98	8.07	0.91	13.50		37.8
Colombia	UNVMC									0.00	2.00		3.00		13.90	10.15	0.62	7.60	3.65	40.9
Comoros						3.75	5.25	0.40		2.50		0.43		0.13						12.5
Congo															2.88					2.9
Côte d'Ivoire		UNOCI (2004–2017)	YES	2.53	6.00			3.00	8.71		1.50	13.98		10.90	7.29	2.01	6.50	6.22		68.6
Democratic Republic of the Congo		MONUSCO	YES				12.60	6.10	1.41		8.52		3.00	7.57	9.15	8.97	11.35	1.90	3.50	74.1
Dominican Republic																		1.00		1.0
Ecuador																3.00				3.0
El Salvador														2.27	4.67	1.50		7.93	1.50	17.9
Ethiopia	UNOAU (regional)	UNMEE (2000–2008)													2.84					2.8
Gabon	UNOCA (regional)																1.56			1.6

Country	Special political mission	Peacekeeping mission	Transition setting	Amount (millions of United States dollars)																	Total
				2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022		
Gambia														6.10	5.40		7.16	5.89	1.50	26.1	
Guatemala								2.38	1.96	5.66	1.00		2.33	15.27	0.99	3.00		6.82	3.00	42.4	
Guinea				0.96		1.64	9.80	14.83	4.60	10.17	13.28	5.35	0.00	6.25	5.85	5.40	6.10	7.73		92.0	
Guinea-Bissau			YES		5.69	0.96	0.05	11.10	6.00	2.36	2.82		3.18	8.52	1.00		4.80	5.18	1.41	53.1	
Haiti	BINUH		YES		0.80		3.00								3.00		9.04	8.00	1.50	25.3	
Honduras															3.00		3.00	5.43	1.50	12.9	
Kenya					1.00									0.50					1.00	2.5	
Kiribati																	1.04			1.0	
Kosovo (in accordance with Security Council resolution 1244 (1999))		UNMIK													2.77					2.8	
Kyrgyzstan							3.00	7.00		9.08	5.90	4.32	1.00	3.99	10.64	1.45		4.50	0.60	51.5	
Lebanon	UNSCOL	UNIFIL						2.00	1.01						3.00		3.00			9.0	
Lesotho															2.00			1.50		3.5	
Liberia		UNMIL (2003–2018)	YES	0.79	5.12	10.81	7.77	3.00	1.58	15.76	0.50	0.62	0.40	4.56	9.87	8.02	5.50	6.78		81.1	
Libya	UNSMIL								1.92	0.50			2.97			2.95				8.4	
Madagascar												0.51	8.69	5.00	1.50	3.47	9.15	3.05		31.4	
Mali		MINUSMA									12.43		1.00	4.12	14.77	4.20	18.04	3.00	6.85	64.4	
Marshall Islands																	1.16			1.2	
Mauritania															3.00		5.35	3.98	0.95	13.3	
Montenegro																0.95				0.9	
Myanmar									1.55	2.10		4.07	2.36		3.87	2.84	2.50			19.3	
Nepal						6.76	4.50		0.90	8.33	1.58	0.67								22.7	
Niger										3.00		1.47	9.00	4.00	10.70	5.34	4.96	9.00	2.56	50.0	
Nigeria	CNMC														3.00					3.0	
Papua New Guinea										0.35		8.74		2.00	6.50		4.00	1.50	1.50	24.6	
Philippines											3.00			3.00			3.00			9.0	
Rwanda																1.50	1.35			2.9	
Senegal	UNOWAS (regional)																	1.40		1.4	

Country	Special political mission	Peacekeeping mission	Transition setting	Amount (millions of United States dollars)																	Total
				2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022		
Serbia																	1.30			1.3	
Sierra Leone		UNIPSIL (2005–2014)	YES	15.98	16.69	4.88	1.26	7.91	0.33	3.08	2.04			5.42	1.50	3.30	3.00	3.90	1.50	70.8	
Solomon Islands													2.50	3.00	1.80	2.79		1.50	1.50	13.1	
Somalia	UNSOM		YES			1.00		2.00	1.00			10.42	13.81	4.50	8.83	14.77		8.50	3.78	68.6	
South Sudan		UNMISS						5.99	0.53	10.00				5.00	1.50	10.19	4.50	9.85	5.50	53.1	
Sri Lanka							3.00					1.47	3.81	7.97	3.95	1.94		6.00		28.1	
Sudan	UNITAMS	UNISFA	YES				10.03	8.70	0.35						3.00		22.80	8.88	6.50	60.3	
Tajikistan													2.60				2.00			4.6	
Timor-Leste		UNMIT (2006–2012)				0.99														1.0	
Togo															2.34		3.00			5.3	
Tunisia															3.00					3.0	
Tuvalu																	1.00			1.0	
Uganda							8.10	5.90		1.46						2.75				18.2	
Ukraine																	2.00			2.0	
United Republic of Tanzania														0.95						0.9	
Uzbekistan																	2.20	1.50		3.7	
Yemen	UNMHA								3.00	2.59	12.91	2.20		2.90	8.69	1.50				33.8	
Zimbabwe																3.14				3.1	
Global										0.29	6.20			28.45		7.78	5.87	3.80		52.4	
Total				49.39	41.09	44.40	93.26	90.96	39.29	78.14	99.10	66.87	65.32	171.92	201.23	153.77	183.40	190.79	58.83	1 627.8	

Abbreviations: BINUH, United Nations Integrated Office in Haiti; BNUB, United Nations Office in Burundi; CNMC, Cameroon-Nigeria Mixed Commission; MINURCAT, United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad; MINUSCA, United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic; MINUSMA, United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali; MONUSCO, United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; UNIFIL, United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon; UNIPSIL, United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone; UNISFA, United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei; UNITAMS, United Nations Integrated Transition Assistance Mission in the Sudan; UNMEE, United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea; UNMHA, United Nations Mission to Support the Hudaydah Agreement; UNMIK, United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo; UNMIL, United Nations Mission in Liberia; UNMISS, United Nations Mission in South Sudan; UNMIT, United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste; UNOAU, United Nations Office to the African Union; UNOCA, United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa; UNOCI, United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire; UNOWAS, United Nations Office for West Africa and the Sahel; UNSCOL, United Nations Special Coordinator for Lebanon; UNSMIL, United Nations Support Mission in Libya; UNSOM, United Nations Assistance Mission in Somalia; UNVMC, United Nations Verification Mission in Colombia.