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Foreword

The number of countries experiencing violent conflict is at its highest level in decades, resulting in more than 37 million children being displaced by conflict, violence, and other crises. When conflict arises, young people are disproportionately affected by the fighting and, moreover, are most vulnerable to longer term consequences of conflict such as poverty, unemployment, poor governance and the disintegration of families and communities. While one in four youths are affected by conflict and violence, their voices are often disregarded and excluded from formal peacebuilding processes.

The meaningful inclusion of young people is key to advancing the commitments of the 2030 Agenda and the role that young people, in particular, play is central to advancing SDG 16 towards peaceful and inclusive societies. In this spirit, and in support of Resolution 2250, there has been a growing movement to create the opportunities and the space for young peacebuilders to transform their communities and to chart their own pathways towards peace. This agency-wide exercise examines such efforts across the United Nations system and serves to spotlight key learnings shared across agencies on what worked and what did not work in the implementation of Priority 5 on peace and resilience building of the UN Youth Strategy. This second meta-synthesis comes at an opportune moment. It follows two important resolutions that were endorsed by the General Assembly this year reaffirming the vital role of youth in the work of the United Nations in all matters of concern to them. This includes the full, effective and meaningful participation of youth in the design, monitoring and implementation of peacebuilding efforts at all levels. It is our hope that this report provides rich, evidence-based learning to inform future interventions to help realize the potential of 1.8 billion young people in building a more sustainable, safer and more peaceful world.

We would like to thank the consultant team led by James Rogan and supported by Romeral Ortiz Quintilla, Kathryn Tong and Kassim Gawusu-Toure. Also, we would like to extend our deepest gratitude for the support and contributions of the following organizations that made this exercise possible: DPPA/Peacebuilding Support Office, EvalYouth, IOM, OSGEY, UNDP, UNICEF, UNIDO, UNFPA, UNODC, UNOY, and YOUNGO. We also express our particular appreciation to the co-chairs of this exercise; Karen Cadondon (UNFPA), Denis Jobin and Tami Aritomi (UNICEF) for overseeing the study and the finalization of the present report.

Marco Segone
Director, UNFPA Evaluation Office

Robert McCouch
Director, UNICEF Evaluation Office

Contents

ACRONYMS

1 INTRODUCTION

Youth 2030: The United Nations Youth Strategy
Meta-synthesis of evaluation reports
Synthesis questions
Definitions

2 METHODOLOGY

Participatory approach
Desk review
Evaluation selection
Pilot testing
Data extraction and synthesis
Limitations

3 LESSONS LEARNED

Meaningfully engaging youth as leaders
Enhancing inclusion through targeted adaptations
Utilizing interactive and experiential methodologies
Improving intergenerational trust and solidarity
Strategic and well-defined partnerships

4 LOOKING AHEAD

ANNEXES (AVAILABLE IN VOLUME 2)

Annex 1: United Nations Youth Strategy Priority 5 thematic areas
Annex 2: List of reports reviewed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSGEY</td>
<td>Office of the Secretary-General’s Envoy on Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBF</td>
<td>United Nations Peacebuilding Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBSO</td>
<td>Peacebuilding Support Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>United Nations Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPS</td>
<td>Youth, Peace and Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JUSTICIA

¡CLIMÁTICA YA!
The United Nations Youth Strategy

Youth 2030: The United Nations Youth Strategy (hereinafter the UN Youth Strategy) was launched in 2018 as a system-wide strategy which provides an umbrella framework to guide the entire United Nations in its efforts with and for young people. It established five priorities for the next 12 years to address the needs, advance the rights, and build the agency of young people in the context of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as well as other development agendas and frameworks. It seeks to ensure that the United Nations’ work on youth issues is pursued in a coordinated, coherent and holistic manner.

The UN Youth Strategy also aimed at building an evidence base of promising practices and lessons learned from the past operationalization of youth-targeted programmes across different geographical areas and changing intervention contexts. Thus, a series of meta-syntheses was launched to capture shared lessons across United Nations entities on the implementation of the five priorities of the UN Youth Strategy. The first meta-synthesis focused on Priority 1 (youth participation) and Priority 4 (youth and human rights) of the UN Youth Strategy. The present report is the second meta-synthesis focused on Priority 5 (peace and resilience building) of the UN Youth Strategy.

Meta-synthesis of evaluation reports

A meta-synthesis is a uniquely suited methodology to support United Nations learning as it seeks to broaden the understanding of existing knowledge through the integration of multiple and interrelated qualitative or evaluative studies. In this case, the meta-synthesis can facilitate higher-level lessons learned about the current implementation of Youth 2030, which can then inform the design of future interventions towards advancing the strategy, and, more broadly, achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The purpose of this meta-synthesis of evaluation reports is to generate learning on what works, what does not work (including for whom, under what circumstances and why) in the implementation across agencies toward the advancement of Priority 5 of the UN Youth Strategy.

The objectives of this exercise, include the following:

- Contribute to evidence-based decision-making for future programming by providing lessons learned and insights from past implementation of United Nations interventions that contribute to Priority 5
- Contribute to the existing body of knowledge base on supporting young people as catalysts for peace and security, humanitarian and climate action
- Contribute to increasing United Nations system coherence, lesson learning and accountability to advance the work of the United Nations on youth issues in a coordinated, coherent and holistic manner.

The temporal scope of the meta-synthesis will cover 2015 to date, accounting for the progress made thus far since the adoption of the strategic development goals (SDGs). The exercise covers all regions in which interventions toward Priority 5 have been implemented as recorded by the evaluation reports to be included in the review.

This meta-synthesis is entirely focused on Priority 5 (peace and resilience building) of the UN Youth Strategy, which comprises three thematic areas of work: youth, peace and security; youth and humanitarian action; and youth and climate action. This exercise also applied sub-priorities under Priority 5 to guide its analysis. These are listed below:

### Priority 5 (Peace and resilience building) sub-priorities

1. Promote an enabling environment conducive to young people's contribution to peace and security, humanitarian or climate action
2. Promote youth participation in all phases of formal peace and peacebuilding processes
3. Promote safe public spaces for young people, especially in conflict situations, informal settlements, slums, and refugee camps
4. Convene and strengthen partnerships at all levels, including between youth-led organizations and governments
5. Foster continuous dialogue for young people’s contribution to peace, security, humanitarian and climate actions
6. Reinforce the capacity of youth-led organizations involved in peace, security, humanitarian and climate action
7. Expand opportunities for young people to contribute to the promotion of a culture of peace
8. Protect and support youth in humanitarian settings

---

For more information on the three areas of work, please refer to Annex 1.
Synthesis questions were developed based on Priority 5 of the UN Youth Strategy, and its respective sub-priorities, in close consultation with the reference group for this exercise. Given that this meta-synthesis relies solely on secondary sources, i.e., evaluation reports, it is limited by the data that is available and reported in the evaluation reports reviewed, which may vary both in content and quality across United Nations agencies. That said, rather than prescribe what should be investigated in the exercise (and risk finding that there is no available/reported data on these issues in the evaluation reports), this exercise will use these synthesis questions to guide the data extraction and analysis. The synthesis questions served as a guiding framework to systematically review the evaluation reports and extract data where relevant.

Below are the synthesis questions that guide the analyses, and the links to the relevant sub-priorities of the UN Youth Strategy. These synthesis questions also help frame some of the lessons emerging from this exercise. It should be noted, however, that there may not be a specific lesson identified for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Links to sub-priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> What are the key common trends identified to address Priority 5 of the UN Youth Strategy?</td>
<td>All 8 sub-priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. What types of initiatives have been taken?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Are there any identified initiatives that have had a catalytic effect, including follow-up analysis and explanation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. How have initiatives been adapted in light of the COVID-19 pandemic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> What is the overall learning with regard to covering different adolescent and youth populations?</td>
<td>No specific sub-priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. In terms of inclusion, to what extent were gender, disability, displacement status, rurality, ethnicity, socio-economic status, and any intersectional aspects addressed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. How clearly is the leaving no one behind/reaching the furthest behind first agenda visible in Priority 5 interventions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. How clearly is a human rights-based approach included in interventions, and what are the lessons and promising practices in incorporating human rights aspects in Priority 5 interventions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. How do programmes with a general stakeholder population ensure youth inclusion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> How meaningfully are young people engaged within Priority 5 interventions?</td>
<td>Sub-priorities 5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. What are the learnings around meaningful engagement and participation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. What are the learnings around promoting youth leadership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key questions | Links to sub-priorities
--- | ---
4. What are the key enabling factors and hindering factors in Priority 5 programming? | No specific sub-priorities
   4.1. Enabling factors?
   4.2. Hindering factors/barriers?
   4.3. Mitigation strategies?
5. What are the promising practices and lessons learned with regard to effective implementation which could inform future programming of Priority 5 interventions, specifically for:
   5.1. Peacebuilding? | 5.1. Sub-priorities 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7
   5.2. Humanitarian? | 5.2. Sub-priorities 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8
   5.3. Climate change? | 5.3. Sub-priorities 1, 4, 5, 6
   5.4. Nexus programming? | 5.4. no specific sub-priorities
6. What are the promising practices and lessons learned with regard to coordination and coherence across United Nations entities at different levels including:
   6.1. Among United Nations actors and stakeholders at global and country levels? | Sub-priorities 1, 4
   6.2. Across peacebuilding, humanitarian, and climate change programming at global, regional and country levels?
7. What are promising practices and lessons with regard to partnerships for Priority 5, including:
   7.1. Partnerships with civil society, particularly youth-led organizations? | Sub-priorities 4, 5, 6, 7
   7.2. Government partnerships at the country level?
   7.3. Innovative partnerships, such as private sector partnerships?
8. What are promising practices and lessons learned with regard to resourcing and financing of Priority 5? | No specific sub-priorities

---

### Definitions

This report utilizes the following key definitions:

**Lesson learned**

A lesson learned is a generalization based on evaluation experiences with projects, programmes, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations. Frequently, lessons highlight...
strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact. 9

Promising practice

A promising practice is a strategy, approach and/or activity that has been shown through research and evaluation to be effective, efficient, and sustainable, and to have a reasonable probability for replication or transferability. 10

Meaningful youth engagement

Meaningful youth engagement is an inclusive, intentional, mutually respectful partnership between youth and adults whereby power is shared, respective contributions are valued, and young people’s ideas, perspectives, skills, and strengths are integrated into the design, delivery, monitoring and evaluation of programmes, strategies, policies, funding mechanisms, and organizations that affect their lives and their communities, countries, and world. 11

Sustainability

The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue without continued United Nations funding or support. The extent to which young women and men and/or youth-led organizations achieved ownership of the results. The degree to which capacity for youth mainstreaming through the project has been built and institutionalized. 12

Meaningful youth engagement principles at the United Nations

**Self-organized:** In the context of engagement, this implies autonomy and being free from outside control or pressure. Each group of young people can and will decide the best structure and working style for them based on their interests and capacities.

**Legally mandated rights-based:** In the context of the United Nations, the imperative to engage in any initiative/avenue should be formally enshrined as a requirement in its rules of procedure or modalities through wording that makes it clear that the ‘youth’ in the conversation have an equal say in any decision. This is critical to prevent an ad hoc approach and/or be entirely dependent on the prerogative of the engaging party.

**Designated:** Young people should not be made to compete with other stakeholders, parties or groups for space in the modalities and process of engagement. Specific designated/reserved seats must be made available in mechanisms through which they engage.

**Well-resourced:** Engagement is a right, and young people should not have to spend their own money to realize this right. Arranging the budget for the engagement of young people should be the obligation of the engaging entity/entities.

**Accountable:** To ensure far-reaching engagement, the respective engagement structures should have built-in accountability, reporting and feedback mechanisms towards a constituency of young people and the United Nations.

(Source: UN MGCY)

---

9 OECD Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management, 2002.
2 METHODOLOGY

**Participatory approach**
As an exercise across the United Nations system, this meta-synthesis employed a highly participatory and consultative approach. To this end, a reference group was formed at the onset of the exercise so that the Office of the Secretary-General Envoy on Youth (OSGEY), key United Nations entities, and youth-led groups working in the thematic areas of Priority 5 would be engaged in each phase of the meta-synthesis. The reference group provided targeted and technical guidance throughout the exercise and at particular key moments to optimize the quality and credibility of the synthesis, both in process and substance. In particular, the reference group reviewed and provided feedback and validation on the conceptualization of the exercise, including the synthesis questions, the methodological note, the emerging findings report, and the draft and final report.

**Desk review**
The initial phase of the meta-synthesis consisted of a preliminary desk review exercise to determine the breadth and depth of evidence related to the implementation of Priority 5 of the UN Youth Strategy. The desk review included a comprehensive literature review of evaluation, policy, guidance and lessons learned reports from across the United Nations system.

**Evaluation selection**
The following inclusion criteria were used in the selection of the evaluation reports to be included in this exercise:

- **Language**: English, French, Spanish
- **Thematic focus**: youth in peacebuilding, peace and security, humanitarian action, resilience, climate action
- **Learning design**: formative, mid-term, final, impact evaluation; assessment; lessons learned; after action review; promising practice
- **Date**: published in and after 2015
- **Geographic coverage**: broad range, including global, regional and country focus
- **Organizational focus**: reports that cover United Nations projects and programming only.
A total sample of 167 evaluation reports, selected from 27 United Nations organizations, were identified. The evaluation reports sample selection also considered representation by geographic scope and the Priority 5 (peace and resilience building) sub-thematic areas of the UN Youth Strategy (i.e., youth, peace and security, 63 reports identified; youth and humanitarian action, 45 reports identified; and youth and climate action, 59 reports identified). Refer to Annex 2 for the full list of evaluation reports to be included in the meta-synthesis.

### Pilot testing

A pilot was conducted to test the meta-synthesis methodology and refine the data collection tools. The pilot involved the selection of two evaluations from each of the three areas of work under Priority 5 of the UN Youth Strategy. The evaluation reports were tested against the matrix of synthesis questions to ensure cohesion, coherence and utility of the questions to extract and organize data in a meaningful manner.

During this pilot phase, the original sample was processed and cleaned, resulting in a smaller sample of 121 evaluation reports that provided relevant information to this exercise. The final sample includes reports from 23 United Nations agencies (see figure A) and included 44 reports focused on youth and climate action (36 per cent), 40 reports focusing on youth, peace and security (33 per cent); 19 reports on cross-cutting issues (16 per cent); and 18 on youth and humanitarian areas (15 per cent) (see figure B). The 47 reports excluded from the final sample did not include any relevant information directly linked to the synthesis questions, providing evidence outside the scope of this exercise.

#### Figure A: Distribution of sampled reports by agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBSS/DPPA</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITAR</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCCD</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHABITAT</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNECA</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAOC</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFDB</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure B: Distribution of sampled reports by thematic area

- **Climate Action**: 36%
- **Peace and Security**: 33%
- **Humanitarian**: 15%
- **Cross-Cutting**: 16%

---

13 Evaluation reports included in the report come from the following United Nations organizations: AfDB, FAO, IFAD, IOM, OCHA, OSGEY, Peacebuilding Support Office/DPPA, UNAOC, UNCCD, UNDP, UNDRR, UNECA, UNEP, UNESCO, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNFPA, UNHABITAT, UNHCR, UNHR, UNICEF, UNIDO, UNITAR, UNODC, UNV, UN Women, WFP, WMO. Some of these reports were multi-agency joint evaluations.
Data extraction and synthesis

The meta-synthesis utilized qualitative data collection methods for an in-depth, systematic review and analysis of the evidence captured in evaluation reports. Specifically, the methodology employed content analysis against key synthesis questions. Content analysis involved recognizing certain tag words, themes, and concepts to identify shared lessons learned from among the reviewed evaluations. The analysis reviewed findings, conclusions, lessons, promising practices, gaps, challenges and recommendations identified in the reports.

Data was extracted from evaluations and included in a database established specifically to systematically collate all evidence against the synthesis questions. Evidence extracted from the evaluation reports was recorded in columns by sub-question, using additional coding/tagging which allowed content analysis to be applied to respond to the research questions. Systematic analyses of the coded data were used to draw the higher-level lessons learned, based on relevant evidence from key research questions, but also allowing for analyses across the full sample. Not every evaluation report contained evidence that responded to each of the research questions (or sub-priorities). As highlighted above, this exercise had no primary data collection element and relied entirely on the information found within the selected evaluation reports.

Once evidence was collected for each question, the team conducted an additional, higher-level analysis—or synthesis—of the evidence to achieve a deeper understanding of the trends and, specifically, lessons learned that emerge from the meta-synthesis of evaluation reports. Examples from the country level were sought as much as possible to provide contextualized insights into lessons learned.

Limitations

Consistent with the experience from the previous meta-synthesis of lessons learned for Priorities 1 and 4, this exercise was limited to the data provided by evaluation reports which have varying content and quality across United Nations entities. The meta-synthesis team attempted to mitigate this risk by collecting a wide sample of evaluation reports to review. All lessons learned provided below are drawn from a limited sample of evaluation reports and, as such, cannot be considered generalizable or representative of the wider body of projects or evaluations.

Extracting data in a consistent manner against the research questions was challenged by the varying quality, reporting, and coverage of the reports. The meta-analysis team mitigated this risk by conducting a pilot to optimize the methodology and ensure all team members had a common understanding and approach.

As much as possible, the report provides a diverse set of examples from interventions that fall across the thematic areas of peacebuilding, namely, Youth, Peace and Security (YPS), humanitarian and climate action. However, the dearth of examples for certain thematic areas (e.g., humanitarian and climate action) is related to the limited data provided in the evaluation reports. As such, the imbalance of examples presented by thematic area is not necessarily representative of the work being done in each area; rather it is representative of the detailed data that was available in evaluation reports reviewed for this exercise.

14 Evaluations included in the sample covered projects focused explicitly on youth and peacebuilding, and not youth and peacebuilding mainstreamed into broader development programming.
# Lessons learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | Meaningfully engaging youth as leaders and creating an enabling environment for youth leadership in decision-making processes is critical for transformative change.  
*Directly responds to Q3, Linkages to Q1, 2, 5* |
| 2. | Interventions seeking to enhance the inclusion of diverse groups of young people were more successful when they adapted their activities to the different profiles of youth and the local context.  
*Directly responds to Q2, Linkages to Q1, 3, 5* |
| 3. | Interactive and experiential methodologies offer effective, inclusive ways to build the capacity of youth in peacebuilding competencies.  
*Directly responds to Q5, Linkages to Q1* |
| 4. | Enhancing interaction between youth and duty bearers to improve intergenerational trust and solidarity can lead to catalytic and transformational effects in youth interventions.  
*Linkages to Q1, 4, 5* |
| 5. | Strategic and well-defined partnerships across civil society, governments and the private sector reap significant benefits for youth projects in terms of effectiveness, reach and inclusivity.  
*Directly responds to Q7, Linkages to Q1, 4, 5, 6, 8* |

See Chapter 1 for key questions and links to sub-priorities.
Lesson 1  Meaningfully engaging youth as leaders

Meaningfully engaging youth as leaders and creating an enabling environment for youth leadership in decision-making processes is critical for transformative change.

The importance of meaningfully engaging youth in peace and security cannot be overstated. The United Nations Security Council Resolution 2250 (2015) on Youth, Peace, and Security is the first ever resolution to recognize the positive role young people play in the maintenance and promotion of peace and security and this continues to be recognized and re-affirmed in multiple United Nations resolutions and commitments. From a rights-based perspective, young women and young men have the right to be informed and consulted, and make decisions on all matters that have a direct or indirect impact on their lives and futures. From an efficiency perspective, ensuring that young people are meaningfully engaged can significantly improve the relevance, legitimacy, sustainability and impact of projects.

Among the reports used for the analyses, 56 per cent of reports (68) present relevant information regarding meaningful youth engagement. Figure 1a presents the two main topics that emerged from the analyses, including relevant information on the role of meaningful youth engagement (50 per cent of reports) and youth leadership (31 per cent of reports). The evaluations informing this lesson learned come from reports produced by 70 per cent of all the United Nations agencies included in the analyses. The largest percentage of these reports fall within the category of climate action (57 per cent), followed by YPS (28 per cent) (see figure 1b).

In the evaluations reviewed, there were a number of projects that engaged young people as leaders and decision makers. These interventions not only focused on building the capacities of youth, but also made efforts to create an enabling environment to ensure young people had the opportunity and space to influence decision-making that directly relates to effecting higher level change in conflict and peace dynamics. This could include building the capacities of youth-related institutions, such as youth councils or committees.

---

16 Final evaluation UNFPA, UN Women, UNV participation of youth and women in the peacebuilding process 2020; YPS28, YP35, MIX 28, YPS 14, MIX 08, YPS 21.
17 Lesson learned 1 information, largely comes from data harvested from synthesis question 3, “How meaningfully are young people engaged within Pillar 5 interventions?”
This is demonstrated in the IOM-UNDP South Sudan Final Evaluation of the ‘Beyond Bentiu Protection of Civilian Site (POC) Youth Reintegration Strategy’ project (2019). The evaluation noted that, in addition to building the capacities of young people, the formation and strengthening of platforms for youth leadership such as peace committees, unity forums and advocacy groups transformed the role of young people from observers in conflicts to “champions of peace” and positive change agents. In doing so, this intervention ensured that young people had the capacity, opportunity and space to influence decision-making that directly relates to effecting higher level change in conflict and peace dynamics. As a result, the evaluation reported that the intervention contributed to building the “human, social, physical and financial capital of young people” as well as enhancing the social cohesion and a peaceful co-existence within the broader community.

Another interesting example is the joint initiative developed by UNFPA, UN Women and UNV on the ‘Participation of Youth and Women in the Peacebuilding process’ in Sri Lanka. The project aimed to empower youth and women with a greater understanding of peacebuilding issues and to enhance their participation in governance and decision-making peace processes. The evaluation noted that the intervention, to a significant extent, has been able to enhance the knowledge of young people in topics such as peace, conflict, violence, conflict escalation and management, gender, among others; strengthen their skills in project development and community mobilization; and promote the values of nonviolent communication, empathy, respect to diversity and tolerance. In addition to building their capacities in these ways, the project also launched platforms such as the Youth Peace Panel to provide a space in which the young people can utilize their newly acquired knowledge and skills, empowering them to participate in national peacebuilding processes. Moreover, the evaluation noted that these individual-level changes had the potential for longer-term transformational impact, specifically on national level peacebuilding processes, because the young people became involved in community level peacebuilding activities from a very young age and gained experience and capabilities that could position them to develop into national level leaders.

Lesson 2   Enhancing inclusion through targeted adaptations

Interventions seeking to enhance the inclusion of diverse groups of young people were more successful when they adapted their activities to the different profiles of youth and the local context

At the core of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is the principle of ‘no one is left behind’, where the declaration explicitly and implicitly calls for the inclusion of youth in all their diversity, in particular those who are more vulnerable, marginalized and hardest to reach. In order to meaningfully include diverse groups of youth, there is a need to address intersectionality more consciously throughout the work of the entire United Nations system. This includes examining the underlying factors that perpetuate exclusion, discrimination and inequality that would need to be addressed in order to ensure that the multiple roles and identities of young people are represented. These include gender, class, economic circumstance, ethnicity, language, and sexual orientation, among other factors.

Among the evaluation reports included in the analyses, 86 per cent (104) reported relevant information on coverage of different adolescents and youth populations. The two most prevalent main topics from the analyses, included the inclusion of gender, disabled, and displaced populations (61 per cent, representing 74 reports); and leave no one behind and human rights (40 per cent, 49 reports) (see figure 2a). Among these reports, 40 per cent were within the climate action area; 36 on YPS, 13 per cent within cross-cutting issues, and 11 per cent within youth and humanitarian topics (see figure 2b).

18 Final evaluation of participation of youth and women in the peacebuilding process in Sri Lanka UN Women, UNFPA, UNV (2020).
21 Lesson learned 2 information, largely comes from data harvested from synthesis question 2, “What are the overall learning with regard to covering different adolescent and youth populations?"
Across the sample, there were relevant descriptions of engagement with vulnerable and marginalized youth groups, including youth with disabilities, youth from rural areas, youth from ethnic minorities, youth migrants or youth refugees, youth in conflict with the law and/or youth from marginalized communities, among others. Overall, these evaluations noted that interventions that were able to meaningfully include diverse groups of young women and men achieved more successful results, particularly in terms of relevance and improving social cohesion and community trust.

However, a common challenge for youth peacebuilding initiatives to reach a diversity of young people is related to the short time frame of most peacebuilding interventions. This is highlighted in the evaluation of the UNFPA, UN Women and UNV joint project on ‘Supporting the Western Balkan’s collective leadership on reconciliation’ (2020) that noted the short-term nature of the project did allow for the additional time or resources required to meaningfully engage young people of different backgrounds and identities.22

A systematic finding across the evaluations was the ability of interventions to adapt to the different profiles of youth and their local contexts. This was noted as a key factor for interventions to ensure the inclusion of vulnerable and marginalized youth. This is demonstrated in a UNDP mid-term evaluation of UNDP’s Youth Empowerment Programme in Pakistan (2021). The evaluation highlighted inclusion efforts that involved activities that purposely and exclusively targeted female youth, as well as transgender youth. For example, where low participation from female youth was anticipated, targeted efforts were made to engage these groups, including focusing on activities that are in line with their interests; promoting activities using multiple channels to attract young women to participate; providing support mechanisms such as transport to training venues; and employing technological solutions to reach those who are homebound. Similarly, the 2021 evaluation of Bosnia and Herzegovina IOM’s ‘programming of prevention of violent extremism (PVE)’ provides another good example.23 This evaluation reported the inherent challenge of engaging the “hardest to reach” and most at-risk youth in such settings. The project mitigated such challenges by using adaptive management and allowing for constant stakeholder consultation and engagement with youth which was coordinated by carefully selected community liaison focal points that acted as bridges between the project team in Sarajevo and each local community.

22 Lesson learned 2 information, largely comes from data harvested from synthesis question 2, “What are the overall learning with regard to covering different adolescent and youth populations?”.
23 Community-based approaches to support youth in targeted municipalities in Bosnia and Herzegovina” and “Moving towards sustainable approaches to prevent violence,” IOM, 2019.
Lesson 3  Utilizing interactive and experiential methodologies

Interactive and experiential methodologies offer effective, inclusive ways to build the capacity of youth in peacebuilding competencies

Despite their potential positive long-term and sustainable effects on youth well-being and empowerment, the majority of capacity-building and awareness-raising projects in the sample were designed using one-time events with no actual long-term or sustainable objectives planned. Among the sample of projects, findings show that the use of experiential learning programmes offers a more effective alternative with proven positive effects on violence reduction and conflict resolution issues. By immersing young people in an experience, they can undergo experiential learning that motivates them to reflect on their experience in order to transform themselves and create new skills, attitudes and ways of thinking. Evidence has also shown that experiential learning can achieve greater learning outcomes, particularly in empathy and prosocial behaviours, than non-experiential approaches.24,25 Such experiential efforts include interventions utilizing sports, play, youth camps, culture, media and the arts that led to observable results in strengthening the capacity of youth to prevent, mitigate and manage conflict, and improve social cohesion.

Around 82 per cent (99) of reports used for the analyses presented some relevant information on effective implementation that could inform future programming (for Priority 5), coming from reports produced by 19 different United Nations agencies (83 per cent).26 Two main topics arise from these data, relating to the use of interactive activities and experiential capacity building (12 per cent, 15 reports), and multidimensional programmes with a focus on labour markets and gender (27 per cent, 33 reports) (see figure 3a). Among these reports, 40 per cent are within the climate action area, and 31 per cent within the YPS area (see figure 3b).

Figure 3a: Percentage of reports with relevant information on effective implementation which could inform future programming of Pillar 5 (Q5), by main topics

Figure 3b: Percentage of reports with relevant information on effective implementation which could inform future programming of Pillar 5 (Q5), by priority thematic area

26 Lesson learned 3 information, largely comes from data harvested from synthesis question 5, “What are good practices and lessons learned with regard to effective implementation which could inform future programming of Pillar 5 interventions, specifically”. 


These experiential methodologies were considered to be consistent with a participatory and inclusive approach that enables all beneficiary groups to be active agents within the frame of a project, and not merely recipients of knowledge. Moreover, particularly in the case of cultural and media activities, they can reach harder-to-reach youth groups, including young people with low levels of literacy, adolescents with disabilities, and young women and girls. The 2015 UNICEF Global Evaluation of UNICEF’s ‘Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Programme’ in Cox’s Bazar, Bangladesh, for example, finds that the theatre for development programme proved to be effective in raising youth awareness, building their confidence and offering solutions that they could teach to their peers and families. The cultural initiative proved to be an effective way to reach more girls and adolescents with disabilities and, moreover, offered girls a chance to benefit from increased mobility, as their guardians allowed them to participate in more activities outside the home.

**Experiential approaches to build understanding, skills and peacebuilding competencies**

In areas of high tension and conflict on the Kyrgyz-Tajik border, UNICEF sought to strengthen mechanisms for cross-border dialogue, deliberation and collaborative problem-solving by and with adolescents. This included targeted attention to promoting social cohesion and inter-ethnic tolerance among adolescent girls and boys, to lower immediate and future risks of conflict and violence among communities.

To increase understanding and empathy across border communities, the programmes incorporated creative arts as a communication for development approach, and supported adolescents to design and run projects. In the PBF programme, for instance, adolescents on both sides of the border decided to run a joint photography contest to learn more about each other, and many continued to exchange photos after the contest ended. Adolescents developed radio programming on tolerance across borders, and both Tajik and Kyrgyz schools distributed a newspaper developed by adolescents from the two countries. In the Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF) programme, adolescents created 26 short films to raise peacebuilding awareness, a digital platform for children was developed and 22 television lessons were produced. These activities built trust and understanding of the adolescents’ peacebuilding efforts among parents, caregivers and other community members. This helped secure greater support for adolescents to join in cross-border activities, which was critical for overcoming a reluctance among many adults to allow cross-border engagement by young people.

*Source: UNICEF - Engaging Adolescents across Borders in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan for Sustainable Peace and Development*

Notably, combining sports with life skills can be an efficacious approach for projects working on peacebuilding and youth crime prevention. Sports also helped reach more marginalized youth. A clear example comes from the 2018 UNODC Evaluation of the ‘Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration’. A core component of the intervention is the prevention of youth crime through sports-based programmes that combined life skills with athletics to build resilience against antisocial and risky behaviour. The intervention targeted population groups such as out-of-school youth who are exposed to multiple risk factors that predispose them to criminal behaviour. The intervention was observed to have promoted social developmental approaches on youth crime prevention and enhanced the rehabilitation of youth who had been in prison.

*27 Global evaluation of UNICEF’s peacebuilding, education and advocacy programme. UNICEF. 2015.*
Lesson 4 | Improving intergenerational trust and solidarity

Enhancing interaction between youth and duty bearers to improve intergenerational trust and solidarity can lead to catalytic and transformational effects in youth interventions

It has long been recognized that adults, as duty bearers, have a responsibility towards improving the lives of young people and, conversely, young people, as rights holders, have a responsibility to contribute to their own and their communities’ development. The ‘intergenerational approach’, where young people and adults work together to address social problems in their communities, is not new, but it can lead to transformative experiences for youth and the community alike and, moreover, lead to catalytic effects in youth development interventions.

Catalytic effects of youth initiatives are described in around 24 per cent of evaluation reports sampled for analysis. Systematic findings from these evaluations indicate that trust building between young people and those in positions of authority (duty bearers) was critical to improve the effectiveness of programmes and to create transformational experiences for youth. Among these reports, 59 per cent fall within the YPS thematic area; 21 per cent in cross-cutting thematic evaluations; 14 per cent in humanitarian, and 7 per cent in climate action (see figure 4).

Across the reports reviewed, efforts were made to enhance the interaction between young people and duty bearers in varying ways, including building the capacities of youth to better engage with adults who were decision-makers as well as community elders and parents. Importantly, evaluations noted that interventions that focused on supporting youth leadership demonstrated better results in building youth confidence and efficacy in working with communities and local authorities. For example, a UNFPA, UNICEF and UNDP project conducted in border communities between Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan proved to be effective in enhancing collaboration between the local youth and duty bearers which resulted in a transformational experience for youth. The evaluation reported participants perceived this project as a “passage to adulthood, or a self-revealing experience”. The report attributed this in part to the activities of the intervention that created unexpected and new experiences for the participants (e.g., exposure to high quality training, new forms of interactions) and a recognition of the leadership role that they can play within their community.

Supporting institutional and structural changes – such as mechanisms for intergenerational dialogue or the meaningful collaboration between youth and decision makers – can also contribute to catalytic,
transformational and sustainable effects. One evaluation on a UNFPA-UNICEF project in the Gambia noted the importance of creating space for intergenerational dialogue. The objective of this project was to increase women and youth participation in the decision-making processes of community conflict prevention in the Gambia, in a context that valued seniority, and where youth were not expected to speak out or voice their concerns, let alone have a role in policy development processes. Through the provision of civic dialogue sessions, training and support to local authorities on the rights of women and young people to participate in decision-making processes, authorities pledged to include women in critical tasks and in decision-making processes. The evaluation reported that this dialogue with duty bearers helped facilitate a better inter-generational understanding and solidarity (as the evaluation noted: “the building of bridges among generations”).

Another example of building intergenerational dialogue and trust is a UNFPA and UN-HABITAT project funded by PBF under the Youth Promotion Initiative Window in Somalia. This project involved a multi-faceted capacity building strategy for youth – including training on leadership and intergenerational dialogue – which resulted in increased confidence of youth to take up political activities and work with government authorities. In turn, the government authorities’ perceptions of youth improved, which led to more opportunities for youth participation. This included the establishment of District Youth Councils in three regions to create a permanent mechanism for youth participation in local governments. In addition, governance experts and youth fellows have been placed in the Ministries of Youth and Sports to ensure youth priorities and voices are considered and included in policies, activities and planning.

Such changes in perception between youths and adults were key in allowing young people the opportunity and space to be empowered and achieve their full potential. One evaluation on the global intervention on sustaining peace and forced displacement rightly noted that “seeing youths as assets – at the community and national levels – opens up new perspectives and strategies to support them as agents of peaceful change...participation should not always mean that youth come to the adults; it should also mean that the adults go to them.”

Lesson 5  Strategic and well-defined partnerships

Strategic and well-defined partnerships across civil society, governments and the private sector reap significant benefits for youth projects in terms of effectiveness, reach and inclusivity

Partnerships have been largely utilized to significantly benefit youth projects, particularly on effectiveness, reach and inclusivity. Among the reports included in the analyses, 62 per cent (75) present relevant information regarding good practices on partnerships for Priority 5. Three main types of partnerships were explored, including partnerships with civil society organizations (31 per cent, 38 reports); with governments (48 per cent, 58 reports); and with the private sector (24 per cent, 29 reports) (see figure 5a). These reports include evaluations from 65 per cent of all United Nations agencies. Additionally, 53 per cent of these reports were classified within the climate action thematic area and 29 per cent within the YPS (see figure 5b).

---

31 Evaluation of women and youth participation in decision-making processes and as agents of community conflict prevention.
32 Ibid.
34 Ibid.
35 UNDP final evaluation of the beyond Bentiu protection of civilian cite (Poc) youth reintegration strategy: Creating conditions for peaceful coexistence between youth internally displaced persons, returnees and host community members (2019).
36 Lesson learned 5 information, largely comes from data harvested from synthesis question 7, “What are good practices and lessons with regard to partnerships for Pillar 5”.

---
Evidence indicates that positive results are observed when interventions engage multiple partnerships simultaneously in a strategic and well-coordinated way, in youth peacebuilding, humanitarian response and climate action. Within the sample reviewed, the main collaborators with the United Nations are civil society (particularly youth-led organizations), government and private sector actors.

Partnerships with civil society, particularly youth-led organizations

The role and commitment of civil society organizations were reported as crucial to the success of the projects in terms of reach and inclusivity. These partnerships allowed for projects to better reach community members and to access marginalized and vulnerable individuals. Working with civil society organizations, and particularly youth-led organizations, fostered more functional community engagement and dissemination mechanisms. Moreover, the synthesis found that partnerships with youth-focused civil society organizations and non-governmental organizations introduced new perspectives to the projects, particularly in placing an emphasis on youth experience and voice.

By way of an example, the joint final evaluation of the Project Supporting the Participation of Young Men and Women in Local Governments, in Guinea presents promising practices of community youth-led groups, including AfriYAN (African Youth and Adolescents Network) and RAJ-Gui (Réseau Afrique Jeunesse de Guinée), partnering with other civil society organizations as well as local governments to achieve positive results for youth peacebuilding efforts. With the direct support of various United Nations agencies (particularly UNFPA, UNESCO and UNICEF), these partnerships positively contributed to the strengthening of democratic values and dialogue both horizontally (between youth) and vertically (between youth and other actors). In addition, the project amplified the needs and concerns of the youth population.


youth population, helped to change social attitudes and negative perceptions toward youth, and overall, contributed to a reduction in the percentage of conflicts caused by youth in conflict-prone municipalities (from 88 per cent to 56 per cent).

Partnerships with governments

Partnerships with government actors are key for the ownership and sustainability of United Nations interventions. Moreover, a number of evaluations referenced how projects supported, worked under, or improved government coordination. For example, a global evaluation of the International Fund for Agricultural Development’s support to smallholder farmers for climate change highlighted that the strengthening of, and coordination with key government institutions at different levels was key to ensuring the success of interventions designed to enhance national and community resilience to climate change, including climate-related disasters.

Overall, several reports consistently highlighted that wide and targeted partnership with government entities, beyond a simple relationship with the relevant youth line ministry at the national level, is important. Cross-ministerial engagement helps to ensure maximum engagement and coordination, aligning with the "whole of government" approach set out in SDG16+ as an enabler for the entire 2030 Agenda. In the evaluations reviewed, projects partnered with national judiciaries, criminal justice systems, and district- and national-level authorities are all potentially effective partnerships. For example, in Brazil, an UNODC project working with youth, citizenship, and access to justice engaged in dialogue and cooperation with a diverse range of government actors including the federal district government, the civil and uniformed police of the federal district, the Public Security Council and the Office of the Attorney General. Further, the intervention facilitated collaborative actions that were promoted with the National Secretariat of Youth through youth dialogues. The engagement with district government representatives was reported as a driving factor of success in terms of the project providing a solid foundation upon which further youth engagement with the government could be built.

Partnerships with the private sector

Evidence on partnerships with the private sector was reported in only 24 per cent of evaluations, suggesting that private sector engagement is not consistently leveraged for youth projects in this review. The evaluations, however, did not explain why projects did not partner with the private sector more, nor why they engaged more with specific industries over others. Where private sector partnerships were evidenced, the synthesis found that the interventions led to improved efficiency and sustainability.

In the sample of evaluations reviewed, evidence of private sector partnership was more consistently observed among evaluations assessing climate change initiatives than humanitarian or peacebuilding initiatives. Such interventions benefitted from private sector contributions to technical reports or the provision of technical knowledge, services or equipment relating to climate change technologies. For example, in Sudan, a UNDP project on climate risk finance for sustainable agriculture and pastoral systems worked with a broad partnership of private sector actors, youth-led organizations, and civil society and government partners. A key objective of the project was to empower target groups, in particular young people, small producers, farmers and pastoralists, through financial services and adaptation technologies that were provided through their private sector partnerships. Further, to enhance reach to the target population, helped to change social attitudes and negative perceptions toward youth, and overall, contributed to a reduction in the percentage of conflicts caused by youth in conflict-prone municipalities (from 88 per cent to 56 per cent).
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In the sample of evaluations reviewed, evidence of private sector partnership was more consistently observed among evaluations assessing climate change initiatives than humanitarian or peacebuilding initiatives. Such interventions benefitted from private sector contributions to technical reports or the provision of technical knowledge, services or equipment relating to climate change technologies. For example, in Sudan, a UNDP project on climate risk finance for sustainable agriculture and pastoral systems worked with a broad partnership of private sector actors, youth-led organizations, and civil society and government partners. A key objective of the project was to empower target groups, in particular young people, small producers, farmers and pastoralists, through financial services and adaptation technologies that were provided through their private sector partnerships. Further, to enhance reach to the target population, helped to change social attitudes and negative perceptions toward youth, and overall, contributed to a reduction in the percentage of conflicts caused by youth in conflict-prone municipalities (from 88 per cent to 56 per cent).
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Partnerships with government actors are key for the ownership and sustainability of United Nations interventions. Moreover, a number of evaluations referenced how projects supported, worked under, or improved government coordination. For example, a global evaluation of the International Fund for Agricultural Development’s support to smallholder farmers for climate change highlighted that the strengthening of, and coordination with key government institutions at different levels was key to ensuring the success of interventions designed to enhance national and community resilience to climate change, including climate-related disasters.

Overall, several reports consistently highlighted that wide and targeted partnership with government entities, beyond a simple relationship with the relevant youth line ministry at the national level, is important. Cross-ministerial engagement helps to ensure maximum engagement and coordination, aligning with the "whole of government" approach set out in SDG16+ as an enabler for the entire 2030 Agenda. In the evaluations reviewed, projects partnered with national judiciaries, criminal justice systems, and district- and national-level authorities are all potentially effective partnerships. For example, in Brazil, an UNODC project working with youth, citizenship, and access to justice engaged in dialogue and cooperation with a diverse range of government actors including the federal district government, the civil and uniformed police of the federal district, the Public Security Council and the Office of the Attorney General. Further, the intervention facilitated collaborative actions that were promoted with the National Secretariat of Youth through youth dialogues. The engagement with district government representatives was reported as a driving factor of success in terms of the project providing a solid foundation upon which further youth engagement with the government could be built.
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Evidence on partnerships with the private sector was reported in only 24 per cent of evaluations, suggesting that private sector engagement is not consistently leveraged for youth projects in this review. The evaluations, however, did not explain why projects did not partner with the private sector more, nor why they engaged more with specific industries over others. Where private sector partnerships were evidenced, the synthesis found that the interventions led to improved efficiency and sustainability.

In the sample of evaluations reviewed, evidence of private sector partnership was more consistently observed among evaluations assessing climate change initiatives than humanitarian or peacebuilding initiatives. Such interventions benefitted from private sector contributions to technical reports or the provision of technical knowledge, services or equipment relating to climate change technologies. For example, in Sudan, a UNDP project on climate risk finance for sustainable agriculture and pastoral systems worked with a broad partnership of private sector actors, youth-led organizations, and civil society and government partners. A key objective of the project was to empower target groups, in particular young people, small producers, farmers and pastoralists, through financial services and adaptation technologies that were provided through their private sector partnerships. Further, to enhance reach to the target population, helped to change social attitudes and negative perceptions toward youth, and overall, contributed to a reduction in the percentage of conflicts caused by youth in conflict-prone municipalities (from 88 per cent to 56 per cent).

Partnerships with governments

Partnerships with government actors are key for the ownership and sustainability of United Nations interventions. Moreover, a number of evaluations referenced how projects supported, worked under, or improved government coordination. For example, a global evaluation of the International Fund for Agricultural Development’s support to smallholder farmers for climate change highlighted that the strengthening of, and coordination with key government institutions at different levels was key to ensuring the success of interventions designed to enhance national and community resilience to climate change, including climate-related disasters.

Overall, several reports consistently highlighted that wide and targeted partnership with government entities, beyond a simple relationship with the relevant youth line ministry at the national level, is important. Cross-ministerial engagement helps to ensure maximum engagement and coordination, aligning with the "whole of government" approach set out in SDG16+ as an enabler for the entire 2030 Agenda. In the evaluations reviewed, projects partnered with national judiciaries, criminal justice systems, and district- and national-level authorities are all potentially effective partnerships. For example, in Brazil, an UNODC project working with youth, citizenship, and access to justice engaged in dialogue and cooperation with a diverse range of government actors including the federal district government, the civil and uniformed police of the federal district, the Public Security Council and the Office of the Attorney General. Further, the intervention facilitated collaborative actions that were promoted with the National Secretariat of Youth through youth dialogues. The engagement with district government representatives was reported as a driving factor of success in terms of the project providing a solid foundation upon which further youth engagement with the government could be built.

Partnerships with the private sector

Evidence on partnerships with the private sector was reported in only 24 per cent of evaluations, suggesting that private sector engagement is not consistently leveraged for youth projects in this review. The evaluations, however, did not explain why projects did not partner with the private sector more, nor why they engaged more with specific industries over others. Where private sector partnerships were evidenced, the synthesis found that the interventions led to improved efficiency and sustainability.

In the sample of evaluations reviewed, evidence of private sector partnership was more consistently observed among evaluations assessing climate change initiatives than humanitarian or peacebuilding initiatives. Such interventions benefitted from private sector contributions to technical reports or the provision of technical knowledge, services or equipment relating to climate change technologies. For example, in Sudan, a UNDP project on climate risk finance for sustainable agriculture and pastoral systems worked with a broad partnership of private sector actors, youth-led organizations, and civil society and government partners. A key objective of the project was to empower target groups, in particular young people, small producers, farmers and pastoralists, through financial services and adaptation technologies that were provided through their private sector partnerships. Further, to enhance reach to the target
communities, the project collaborated with private telecommunication companies (MTN and Sudani) in providing customized SMS services to disseminate information on microfinance and micro-insurance as well as to serve as an early warning system for droughts and floods. The evaluation highlighted that a key positive outcome from the private sector partnerships was that one of the participating banks will continue financing young farmers and pastoralists after the project is phased out, and depending on the borrower’s commitment to repayment, the bank will continue supporting those most in need. The latter point on sustainability is underscored in another UNDP global thematic evaluation on youth employment and social cohesion, in which it found working with established private sector companies has resulted in achieving high targets, effortless up-scaling, impact, and sustainability.

42 UNDP. Terminal evaluation of the climate risk finance project for sustainable agricultural and pastoral systems in Sudan. 2021.
43 UNDP. Mid-term portfolio evaluation on thematic area of youth covering youth employment project and youth and social cohesion project. 2020.
Priority 5 of the UN Youth Strategy seeks to address the needs and aspirations of youth facing the most challenging situations – violent conflict, disasters, complex emergencies, and the impacts of a changing climate. Youth in these contexts are highly vulnerable, yet they also present a formidable resource for transformative change. It is in these places that the role played by the United Nations is, arguably, at its most important. Within this frame, this report has sought to illuminate evidence of what has worked, and what has not, in a broad sample of evaluations of United Nations youth projects.

The report has captured an array of efforts by United Nations entities to work with and for youth in these demanding contexts, employing a variety of strategies, methodologies and partnerships. This includes varying approaches to meaningfully engaging youth. Given the importance of this dimension to youth programming, the United Nations would do well to guide implementing teams further on effective approaches, strategies, and standards for meaningful youth engagement. This is, of course, linked to forging (often non-traditional) partnerships with youth-led organizations, and to eschewing reliance on short-term, one-off events. From the use of experiential methodologies to empowering and building the capacities of youth to fostering greater interaction between young people and policy- and decision-makers, United Nations initiatives are demonstrating that they are learning from the evolving evidence base of effective youth interventions.

The meta-synthesis has also identified gaps in understanding, which still need to be explored. Most evaluations did not measure the impact of the interventions on the lives of youth, and this behooves the United Nations family to find ways to assess whether investments have led to longer-term changes in the realities of youth. Moreover, many reports in the sample did not disaggregate data among youth groups, making it difficult to discern which groups of youth are being prioritized and which are being left behind. Further, there was limited data to allow the capture of any lessons on the resourcing and financing of youth-led and youth-targeted programmes. There is an opportunity to provide a strong investment case for more strategic financing of youth projects. However, data on youth, existing or planned funding allocations to youth projects, and on what works in youth interventions are essential to make this case.
To the latter point, evaluations underscored the importance of the quality of funding and efficiency of financial administrative procedures to youth programming. Several global United Nations funds are increasingly playing an important role in bridging this gap by providing financing for youth and youth-led programming, including the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) Youth Promotion Initiative, UNAOC’s Youth Solidarity Fund (YSF), and the Women’s Peace and Humanitarian Fund (WPHF). Yet, even as youth-led organizations have slowly gained more access to United Nations funding, these funds are still out of reach for most of these organizations, in particular grass roots youth-led organizations that are unable to absorb large grants or do not have the capacity to adhere to the strict administrative requirements of the larger financing modalities. It is clear there is a need to further explore practical solutions to ensure predictable and adequate multi-year financing to all youth-led organizations.

The lessons in this review also provide insights into progress towards advancing recommended actions and strategies enshrined in recent United Nations global normative and policy reports on youth. Notably, evidence from this review particularly relates to calls for actions by Security Council Resolution 2250 (2015) and the most recent GA Resolution (76/305) on financing for peacebuilding as well as the GA Resolution (76/306) on the establishment of a youth office. Lessons also align with the three strategies laid out in the Progress Study on Youth, Peace and Security (2018) – especially investing in the capacities, agency and leadership of youth, and prioritizing partnerships and collaborative action where youth are viewed as equal and essential partners – and the goals of the Compact for Young People in Humanitarian Action.

Thus, while the lessons in this report are not generalizable or representative of all United Nations youth interventions, they offer insights into key issues that have featured prominently in the 2030 Agenda and deserve further investigation and response by the United Nations system. Every opportunity should be taken to further guide United Nations teams and implementing partners in the field to strengthen their design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of youth interventions contributing to Priority 5 of the UN Youth Strategy.

44 More specifically, for example, Resolution 2250 (2015) called for supporting inclusive and enabling environments for youth to implement violence prevention activities and support social cohesion, as well as the importance of establishing policies for youth; advancing education for peace and help promote a culture of peace, tolerance and intercultural and interreligious dialogue that involve youth; working with youth-led and peacebuilding organizations as partners in youth employment and entrepreneurship programmes.


46 For instance, in particular, this review offers learning about the extent to which United Nations programming systematically engaged and partnered with youth in humanitarian action, strengthened young people’s capacities to be effective humanitarian actors, supported local youth-led initiatives and organizations in humanitarian response; what resources were provided to address the needs and priorities of adolescents and youth affected by humanitarian crises; the use of the new gender and age marker, as well as age- and sex- disaggregated data.