

April 2024

Adapting UN Mediation for Emerging Challenges and Security Threats

About the Authors

Emmaculate Liaga
Researcher

Dawit Yohannes
Project Manager and Senior
Researcher

Tsion Belay
Researcher

Meressa K. Dessu
Senior Researcher and
Training Coordinator

Institute for Security Studies

Mediation is a crucial element of the United Nations (UN) toolbox in dealing with conflicts. It is anchored in the Charter's provision for peaceful settlements of disputes and has proven to be an adaptable and flexible tool for conflict settlement. In general, mediation remains uncontroversial as a tool. However, conflict parties are seeking less and less of the norm for political settlement of disputes through mediation since the Cold War era as these actors pursue more military solutions to resolve conflicts.

Mediation is at a critical juncture due to many intersecting factors, underlining the urgent need to adjust to an evolving landscape. We are increasingly witnessing fragmentation at three levels: in terms of the conflict landscape, in the nature of the geopolitical environment, and among mediators. From the South China Sea to Ukraine, Gaza, and the Sahel, shifts in the conflict landscape and global/regional political dynamics and rivalries pose the biggest obstacle to mediating conflicts and underline the urgency of adapting approaches within the international mediation architecture.

Ongoing geopolitical shifts and fragmentations have weakened consensus on mediation's political means and ends. With the proliferation of mediation actors, the UN has lost its monopoly in international mediation. The current fragmented mediation landscape is largely due to divergence of interests, visions for what is good enough in terms of peace, and what considerations need to be included in a peace process. This is increasingly apparent in negotiating Sudan's current crises, which has become a site for multiple and arguably competing mediation processes in a classic example of forum shopping.¹

This paper acknowledges that UN mediation operates within an international mediation architecture and that the role of other mediation actors is equally critical. But UN mediation also needs to be adapted to better meet the demands under the current reality of enhanced geostrategic competition. The Pact for the Future allows member states to

¹ Ameer Chughtai and Theodore Murphy, "Conflict and interests: Why Sudan's external mediation is a barrier to peace," *ECFR*, September 8, 2023, <https://ecfr.eu/article/conflict-and-interests-why-sudans-external-mediation-is-a-barrier-to-peace>.

reflect on the limitations, key challenges and opportunities for adaptation of UN mediation. Through the Pact, member states should reaffirm shared values for mediation, preventative diplomacy, and peaceful resolution through dialogue.

Challenges and opportunities

Trends in the state of peace and security, such as the continued global deterioration of peacefulness² and the rise³ in the intensity of conflicts, increasingly invite an interrogation of UN mediation practices. The 2017 report of the secretary-general on mediation argues that there is a pressing need to urgently redirect attention, effort, and resources to mediation, and other efforts to end conflicts. Doing so also may also require revisiting the nature of the existing international mediation architecture and the resources available for mediation. Examining how critical political actors relate to each other within the broader international mediation architecture is particularly important. For instance, the interaction among the UN, the African Union (AU) and the sub-regional actors in specific conflict settings is at times marred by the contestation around questions of subsidiarity, divergence within the AU and Regional Economic Communities (RECs), and other national and regional actors on core peace and security issues.

In numerous scenarios, various political and other obstacles hinder the potential for mediation success.⁴ The proliferation of violent actors, often in the context of protracted insurgencies, terrorism, and violent extremism, increases the intricacy of conflicts and complicates peace initiatives. In addition, numerous national and regional factions are also connected to various international players leading to the internationalization of internal conflicts. Mediation in such internationalized conflicts is further complicated by division in the UN Security Council, most notably among the five permanent members (P5). These geopolitical divisions exacerbate contestations of norms and approaches affecting mediation initiatives and processes.

These challenges underscore how differing perspectives on analyzing specific problems and vested political interests can complicate the collective quest for peace. Coordinated approaches to mediation are increasingly facing challenges.⁵ The pluralist normative frameworks that previously underpinned global order and peacemaking processes have been confronted by new ideologies and approaches to mediation. The role of new state actors in mediation, such as

² Institute for Economics & Peace Measuring peace in a complex world, “Global Peace Index,” 2023, <https://www.visionofhumanity.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/GPI-2023-Web.pdf>.

³ International Institute for Strategic Studies, “Number of fatalities due to violent events,” 2018–2022, https://www.linkedin.com/posts/international-institute-for-strategic-studies_internationalsecurity-armedconflict-activity-7144322789422874625-EqAj.

⁴ “United Nations Activities in Support of Mediation,” United Nations, June 27, 2017, A/72/115, https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/DPA%20Report%20REV9%20ENG%20WEB_o.PDF.

⁵ Abboud, Samer, “Making peace to sustain war: the Astana Process and Syria’s illiberal peace,” *Peacebuilding* 9 no. 3 (March 3, 2021): 326–343, <https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2021.1895609>.

China, the Gulf States, and Türkiye, has been on the rise. These actors do not have different approaches to mediation and peacebuilding to the UN and traditional mediators, which can be encapsulated as “illiberal peace.”⁶ While joining forces may be a viable option, at times, it also entails a challenge of aligning divergent values and ideologies.⁷ In addition, different actors with vested political and security interests are driving political processes parallel to the UN mediation.⁸

Furthermore, efforts to enhance knowledge, skills, and competencies in mediation⁹ have yet to adequately match the evolving demands of the conflict landscape. Mediation in violent extremist settings and in negotiating anti-coup norms in the African context underline how the lack-of buy-in from all parties remains a key challenge despite these advances in mediation techniques and approaches. The latter points to how these crises cannot be resolved through mediation expertise only and require sustained political engagement.

Despite being overshadowed by the substantial challenges, mediation remains a crucial and efficient tool for the member states, the UN, and other entities. Yet, there is a pressing need for the UN as an institution and member states to enhance the relevance of mediation by adopting it to the current realities.

In addition, mediation efforts should strive for long-term sustainable results rather than solely engaging in transactional mediation. First, while there is a general shift—at least temporarily—from comprehensive peace agreements, the UN and partners should continuously follow-up on the implementation of agreements. Second, it is essential to expand and fortify mediation efforts, including through forging effective partnerships to address some of the underlying challenges impeding progress on many conflicts. Finally, linking mediation to national prevention strategies is essential, noting that mediation is a tool for any country engaging in national prevention.

Navigating geopolitical fragmentation through greater awareness and capacity of mediators and recommitment to dialogue

Geopolitical polarization, competition, and contestation in the global governance system increasingly hamper UN mediation, particularly the division

⁶ Hamed, Adham, and Marylia Hushcha, “Emerging Approaches to International Mediation in a Fragmented World: Shifting Dynamics and Austria’s Response,” *Austrian Centre for Peace Working Paper*, NO. January 2024, https://www.aspr.ac.at/fileadmin/Downloads/Publikationen/Weitere_Publikationen/Publikation_New_Actors_in_Mediation_fin.pdf.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Some research indicates the Astana process In 2017 Moscow, together with Ankara and Tehran, established an alternative negotiation and conflict-management format in Astana, Kazakhstan, which competed with the UN approach. See Muriel Asseburg, Wolfram Lacher, and Mareike Transfeld, “Mission impossible? UN mediation in Libya, Syria and Yemen,” *Stiftung Wissenschaft and Politik*, October 2018, <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-60446-4>.

⁹ Such innovations include an explosion of guidance materials on various aspects of mediation, and academic literature courses which have greatly expanded the knowledge base. Teresa Whitfield (ed.), “Still time to talk: adaptation and innovation in peace mediation,” *Accord 30* (London: Conciliation Resources, 2024): 8, <https://www.c-r.org/accord/still-time-to-talk>.

in the UN Security Council. The sensitivities around sovereignty and contestations of subsidiarity are current debates that cut across the roles of the UN, regional and sub-regional actors.¹⁰ Resurgence of geopolitical polarization in recent years has seen growing division and mistrust within the UN. UN mediators are constrained by a Security Council that disagrees about how to solve specific conflicts, though admittedly, the secretary-general can engage in mediation (good offices) or dispatch mediators without being instructed to do so by the Security Council.

Despite political support and consensus for “mediation” generally, there is a lack of consensus on the shared interpretation and understanding of specific conflict situations and political processes around them. The contestation between Russia and the U.S. that affected the UN mediation process in Syria is an example of affecting their understanding of the Security Council's decision-making.¹¹ Divisions among Security Council members—and the P5 in particular—mean that they could not reach a consensus on resolving the Syrian crisis. In addition, parallel processes put pressure on the UN's formal lead, as highlighted earlier, including in the case of Yemen, where Oman facilitated the direct Saudi-Houthi talks and the UN-facilitated process. Some of these cases indicate the continued need to align UN efforts with regional efforts and developments.

There are also differences when it comes to the fundamental principles that underlie mediation, including human rights, accountability, and inclusion of women in peace and security. This is related to variation on ideational/ideological interpretations and stances around these issues. While the fragile consensus behind the liberal vision of peacemaking has broken down, values prioritizing peace over violence will always need to underpin mediation.¹²

Additionally, mediating internal conflicts having regional and international dimensions amid geopolitical rivalries presents unique challenges where the interests of external actors can significantly impact the mediation process. The presence of diverse mediation actors and processes aligned with different geopolitical interests can hinder progress and coordination, and this has led to contestations around leadership and the clarity of the path to be pursued in some regionalized crises. For instance, efforts to mediate in Libya have been complicated by the involvement of multiple external actors pursuing conflicting

¹⁰ Félicité Djilo and Paul-Simon Handy. “Unscrambling subsidiarity in the African Union: from competition to collaboration,” *ISS Africa*, December 17, 2021, <https://issafrica.org/research/africa-report/unscrambling-subsidiarity-in-the-african-union-from-competition-to-collaboration>; and Andrews Atta-Asamoah, Christian Ani, Dawit Yohannes, Emmaculate Liaga, Meressa Kahsu and Priyal Singh, “Regional conflict prevention and peacebuilding in Africa: pathway for the New Agenda for Peace,” *ISS Africa*, July 2023, <https://issafrica.org/research/africa-report/regional-conflict-prevention-and-peacebuilding-in-africa-pathway-for-the-new-agenda-for-peace>.

¹¹ William Zartman, “UN Mediation in the Syrian Crisis,” *Syria Studies* 11, no. 2 (2019): 1–43, <https://ois.st-andrews.ac.uk/index.php/syria/article/view/2016>.

¹² Whitfield, “Still time to talk.”

agendas. The growing entanglement of external actors in Libya’s conflicts also led to a proliferation of mediation forums, signalling the drift towards unilateral mediation initiatives by individual states.¹³ The ongoing Russia-Ukraine conflict further underscores the erosion of the UN’s role in mediation arising from the shifting geopolitics in some crises, which “accelerated geopolitical re-alignment and the polarization associated with the weakening of multilateral frameworks.”¹⁴

Even so, the UN possesses the mandate, expertise, global membership, and resources to initiate and effectively implement peace processes. At the same time, it should be underscored that the UN needs to continue working with other mediation actors. As each mediation process is circumstantial, the question of who mediates is equally context-dependent. This helps to recalibrate the UN’s role as a lead actor in mediation or a provider of critical support to enable peace processes.

The changing geopolitical environment does not require the development of new approaches as all tools listed in Article 33 of the UN Charter, the 2012 UN Mediation Guidelines, and others remain as relevant as they were then. However, mediation requires consistent political engagement, and the UN’s mediation greatly relies on consensus building and multilateral cooperation among members. As such, the current state of affairs requires re-establishing trust and solidarity among the institution’s members.¹⁵ The Pact of the Future should reflect calls for a renewed commitment peaceful resolution through dialogue and deliberate attention by the UN and other multilateral institutions to incorporate divergent and competing perspectives—from different countries, regions, etc. —in their analysis and designing of proposed solutions.¹⁶

Besides efforts to (re)-build trust and foster collective action among UN member states, up-and-re-skilling today’s mediators is key to matching current geopolitical realities. Some key considerations include ensuring that mediators have “greater self-awareness and the fluency and capacity to work within and across distinct worldviews.” While it seems self-evident, it is important for mediators to recognize “unconscious bias and supporting conflict parties to reach mutually acceptable agreements that may not always align with their ambitions.”¹⁷

¹³ Asseburg, Lacher, and Transfeld, “Mission impossible.”

¹⁴ Whitfield, “Still time to talk,” 6.

¹⁵ Sara Hellmüller and Martin Wählich, “Reflecting about the Past, Present, and Future of UN Mediation,” *International Negotiation* 27 no. 1 (March 18, 2022): 1–9, <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718069-bja10055>.

¹⁶ Interview with Mediation Expert.

¹⁷ Jeffrey Seul, “Mediating worldview Collisions in Violent Conflicts,” 2024, in Whitfield, “Still time to talk.”

Reestablishing consensus on mediation norms and approaches

Despite significant shifts, the UN mediation framework has yet to fully address and adapt to emerging challenges, especially due to challenges to established mediation and governance norms and negotiating non-traditional security threats. The principle of sovereignty has been increasingly invoked to resist international mediation in crisis contexts. For example, in January 2024, Sudan resisted the mediation efforts of the Intergovernmental Agency for Development, citing the violation of the country's sovereignty by inviting the chief of the Rapid Security Forces to a summit.¹⁸

The world is also increasingly witnessing a prevailing tendency of “might is right” to the detriment of established norms, such as political solutions to end conflicts.¹⁹ Different conflict cases in Syria, Sudan, and Ukraine indicate that mediation efforts have taken a back seat to military and securitized approaches. This indicates the need for reaffirming the consensus around norms critical norms and principles furthering international mediation.”²⁰

In addition, mediation efforts have been hampered by a lack of clear approaches to negotiating with “designated terrorist groups” and other non-state armed entities. Research indicates at least three major issues around mediating with these groups: proscription, accessing these groups, and legal protection for mediators. First, there is a legal hazard associated with such groups as well as the lower mediation probabilities that arise from the designation or proscription by international organizations.²¹ Second, sanctioning these groups also increases the reluctance of mediations to engage these entities.²² Third, greater flexibility may be required in the proscription and de-listing of armed groups in UN and other sanctions regimes, offering “carrots” as well as “sticks,” including by negotiating criteria for suspending sanctions. Once achieved, timely follow-through on promised relief from sanctions across the public and private sectors is essential.²³

In addition, the field of mediation has become increasingly diversified with an increasing number of mediation actors with specific normative thrusts, which can further complicate mediating amidst geopolitical rivalries. Divergent approaches, such as those between Saudi-led and UN-led mediations in Yemen in 2018, can create obstacles to finding common ground and achieving peace.²⁴ Adapting mediation efforts requires reaffirming shared values and principles in mediation across different actors. These include preparedness, consent, impartiality, inclusivity, national ownership, international law and normative frameworks, coherence, coordination and complementarity of the mediation effort, and quality peace agreements.²⁵ Particularly, ensuring impartiality and neutrality of major mediation actors such as the UN is key, a distinctive

advantage of the UN that fortifies its position and reinforces its strength at this moment of polarization. Therefore, the Pact of the Future should encourage the UN to live up to its current potential by going beyond a cautious approach and encouraging boldness and innovation. Particularly, this can be done through the choice of the envoys, in terms of diversity and their capacity, which has an important influence on the impartiality and neutrality of the mediation process. Reestablishing consensus on mediation should be accompanied by institutionalization and robust support to navigate complex geopolitical rivalries and manage external pressures and interests, which can be highlighted in the Pact.

Addressing spillover effects/geoeconomic and geoeconomic dynamics

Mediation at the UN occurs in within broader peacemaking and preventive diplomacy measures as integral components of conflict resolution strategies aimed at addressing the key political, economic, and security drivers of conflicts. In general, the role for UN mediation in traditional conflict situations has gone down. At the same time, there is an emerging demand for mediation in new areas of geoeconomic contestation. This type of intervention should extend beyond addressing the immediate causes of conflicts to encompass broader spillover effects, particularly in geoeconomic and geoeconomic dynamics. For instance, the mediation surrounding the FSO Safer, a sinking oil tanker in the Red Sea, illustrates the relevance of mitigating environmental and security risks associated with a catastrophic oil spill that could have far-reaching ecological and economic consequences. Another example of addressing conflicts' geoeconomic consequences is the recent Black Sea grain deal, brokered with the support of Türkiye and the UN. Cooperation among Black Sea countries helped maintain stability in grain supplies and protects against regional economic disruptions. Both of these examples show that the UN has the capabilities to be able to provide mediation support in these contexts and provide examples of how Whitfield points out that such cases demonstrate that mediators can adopt innovative approaches. This includes exploring possibilities for humanitarian,

¹⁸ “Sudan suspends contacts with IGAD mediating group: Foreign Ministry,” *Aljazeera News*, Jan 16, 2024,

<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2024/1/16/sudan-suspends-contacts-with-igad-mediating-group-foreign-ministry>.

¹⁹ Whitfield, “Still time to talk.”

²⁰ This includes consensus on fundamental mediation principles—including sovereignty, consent, and national ownership as well as agreed international humanitarian and human rights law norms. See, Whitfield, “Still time to talk,” 117.

²¹ Rafael José Gude et al., “Lessons for Peacemakers from engagement with criminal organisations in the Americas,” 2024 in Whitfield, “Still time to talk,” <https://www.c-r.org/accord/still-time-talk/lessons-peacemakers-engagement-criminal-organisations-americas>.

²² Jerome Drevon, “Mediating with proscribed armed groups: the imperative of innovation,” 2024, in Whitfield, “Still time to talk,” <https://www.c-r.org/accord/still-time-talk/mediating-proscribed-armed-groups-imperative-innovation>.

²³ Whitfield, “Still time to talk,” 118.

²⁴ Maktary, Shوقي, and Katie Smith. “Pathways for peace and stability in Yemen.” Search for Common Ground 12 (2017), https://documents.sfcg.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Yemen-Peace-Analysis_FINAL.pdf.

²⁵ United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon, “Report of the Secretary-General: Strengthening the role of mediation in the peaceful settlement of disputes, conflict prevention and resolution,” *United Nations*, A/66/811, September 2012, 25, https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/GuidanceEffectiveMediation_UNDPA2012%28english%29_o.pdf.

economic, and other dimensions of mediation that can help reduce suffering in the absence of conditions conducive to mediation that aims to resolve the crisis comprehensively.²⁶ It also calls for multiple mediation processes (or “multi-mediation”) as a tapestry of different mediation processes for different purposes in different places and levels, and with different groups of actors that each address one dimension of the conflict in ways that can impact the whole.²⁷

Enhancing mediation partnerships and coordination

In recent years, the role of the regional mediation actors, non-governmental organizations, and private negotiators has increased. In particular, regional organizations have become prominent in mediation efforts within their regions. While not a panacea, regional and sub-regional organizations can be well-positioned to mediate conflicts because they enjoy various leverage points: influence, proximity, and legitimacy. Beyond burden sharing, collaboration between the UN and regional actors has great potential to enhance the effectiveness of mediation efforts. However, some issues hinder effective coordination.

The first concerns the disparity in capacities between the UN and regional organizations. While some regional structures have robust mediation structures, others need more expertise, resources and logistical capabilities to engage in mediation efforts effectively. Some regions, such as Africa, have regional and sub-regional bodies, such as the AU and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), with some level of mediation capabilities. However, their political legitimacy and their mediation roles have been contested at times by their member states, and the relationship between the two levels has also been blurred.²⁸ A case in point is the announcement to leave ECOWAS by Mali, Burkina Faso, and Niger military leaders—defying mediation efforts by the regional bloc.²⁹

Additionally, despite some efforts by the UN Mediation Support Unit to provide support, some regional mediation structures still need to be fully operationalized.³⁰ Also, mandate overlap often leads to competition for influence. The lack of clarity around certain normative frameworks is also a source of confusion regarding coordination—a case in point is dealing with the fallouts of unconstitutional change of governments.³¹ This lack of clear norms

²⁶Theresa Whitfield, “Diversified mediators, mandates and ambitions,” 2024, in Whitfield, “Still time to talk,” 3, <https://www.c-r.org/accord/still-time-talk/diversified-mediators-mandates-and-ambitions>.

²⁷ Whitfield, “Still time to talk,” 10.

²⁸Félicité Djilo and Paul-Simon Handy. “Unscrambling subsidiarity in the African Union: from competition to collaboration,” *ISS Africa*, December 17, 2021, <https://issafrica.org/research/africa-report/unscrambling-subsidiarity-in-the-african-union-from-competition-to-collaboration>.

²⁹ Relations have been deteriorating since the coups in Mali (2020 and 2021), Burkina Faso (2022), and Niger (2023), which resulted in their suspensions from ECOWAS. *ISS Today*, “Proposed ECOWAS exits leave West Africa at a crossroads,” *ISS Africa*, February 8, 2024, <https://issafrica.org/iss-today/proposed-ecowas-exits-leave-west-africa-at-a-crossroads>.

³⁰ Interview with Regional Mediation Expert.

³¹ Interview with Africa regional mediation Expert.

and absence of policy coherence often leads to diverse responses from the UN and regional actors.³²

The UN should strengthen its collaboration with regional organizations by building on existing partnership frameworks. This includes boldness on the side of the UN to play a supportive role in a mediation setting marked by the prevalence of various mediation actors. Committing to partnership is essential, among others, clarifying mandates/roles and their positions on certain contentious normative issues, ensuring the translation of joint analysis into action, and drawing lessons from past experiences (including successful joint mediation models)³³ to inform future practice. Recognizing the uniqueness of each conflict, the UN should adopt a flexible and adaptive strategy for mediation and leverage the comparative advantage regional organizations bring.

In the context of the UN's mediation partnership with the AU, frank discussion is required to address issues of mutual mistrust and misperception, including listening to each other and addressing the concerns and views of both parties in the partnership so that no one side feels they were sidelined in the mediation of internalized internal conflict such as Sudan. Bold measures are required to break barriers and tendencies of protecting institutional turfs. Such measures can generate more reception among regional and sub-regional actors in terms of openness to receive UN support and build their capacities for regional mediation initiatives/capacities.

Coordination and collaboration among various actors are essential to ensure effective mediation. Adapting mediation partnership arrangements, including providing leadership and clarifying roles and processes⁶⁵ is essential. Streamlining mediation processes and engagement of mediation actors, including strategic convenings and drawing from the experience of international contact groups and troika arrangements³⁴ can help address the challenges of uncoordinated approaches and limited collaboration in mediation settings. Strategic convening brings together key stakeholders to foster cooperation and consensus, while Troika settings involving a limited number of mediators can reduce friction and improve coordination.³⁵

³² Interview with mediation expert. See also "Report of the Chairperson of the Commission on the Partnership between the African Union and the UN on Peace and Security: Towards Greater Strategic and Political Coherence," *African Union*, January 9, 2012, <https://www.peaceau.org/uploads/report-au-un-jan2012-eng.pdf>, 19.

³³ Dawit Yohannes and Meressa K Dessu. "Mediating Africa's conflicts demands strong partnerships," *ISS Africa*, August 18, 2018 <https://issafrica.org/iss-today/mediating-africas-conflicts-demands-strong-partnerships>.

³⁴ An arrangement that involved the United Kingdom, the United States, and Norway supported the South Sudan mediations. Here, a troika setting can involve multiple countries as such or involve a combination of states and intergovernmental organizations as with Troika-plus (the United Kingdom, the United States and Norway, Intergovernmental Authority on Development, and the AU). Another format of the Troika setting is the situation in Afghanistan which saw a meeting between the Special Representatives/Envoys for Afghanistan from China, the Russian Federation, the United States and Pakistan.

³⁵ Brahimi, "Report of the panel on United Nations peace operations," United Nations, A/55/305, August 2000, <https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/report-of-panel-united-nations-peace-operations-brahimi-report-a55305>.

Addressing asymmetry in partnerships in terms of capacity is also vital. Some mediators may have limited geopolitical interests but possess valuable mediation expertise. Balancing these capacities within mediation processes is essential. While the pact discusses partnerships, it could better reflect the strategic value of partnerships in peacemaking.

Conclusion

In conclusion, adapting UN mediation strategies to meet emerging challenges and security threats requires a keen acknowledgement of ongoing geopolitical shifts and the proliferation of mediation actors. These factors have significantly undermined consensus on mediation's objectives and methods, posing challenges to the UN's leadership and political influence. The imperative for adapting mediation practices becomes clear when considering the necessity for political consensus and norm congruence, which are fundamental for effective mediation. Furthermore, fostering robust partnerships with regional organizations and other stakeholders is paramount to bolstering mediation efforts. Despite these challenges, mediation remains indispensable in the UN's conflict resolution toolkit, especially in today's complex global landscape. Strengthening partnerships with regional bodies, harnessing technological advancements, and addressing the root causes of conflicts are crucial strategies for enhancing mediation's effectiveness and sustainability.

The Summit for the Future in September 2024 presents a pivotal opportunity for member states to forge a consensus on innovative approaches, ensuring that UN mediation remains a vital tool for peace and security in an increasingly interconnected world.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful for the support of the German Federal Foreign Office for funding this analysis.

NYU Center on International Cooperation

The Center on International Cooperation is a non-profit research center housed at New York University. Our vision is to advance effective multilateral action to prevent crises and build peace, justice, and inclusion.

www.cic.nyu.edu

Institute for Security Studies

The Institute for Security Studies (ISS) works with partners to build knowledge and skills that enable sustainable peace, development and prosperity in Africa. Established in 1991, the ISS is Africa's leading multidisciplinary human security organisation, with a unique operational model that combines research, policy analysis, technical assistance and training.

www.issafrica.org
