English version

STUDY

Dr. Oliver Jütersonke
Independent consultant

Navigating the Triple Nexus

Lessons and Insights from Across Unité's Ecosystem

An environmental economist on assignment with Comundo and a Nicaraguan farmer are developing new cultivation methods to make agriculture more resilient to climate change. Photo: KubaOkon, Comundo (2022)

About the author

Dr. Oliver Jütersonke is a Geneva-based strategic advisor with extensive in-country experience in conflict-affected settings across Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia. Over the past 25 years, he has worked with international organisations, national authorities, and civil society networks on peace and security, humanitarian action, and sustainable development. His thematic expertise includes social cohesion, stabilisation, solutions pathways, triple nexus programming, and conflict sensitivity. His work focuses on applied research, foresight and strategic anticipation, organisational learning, and the design and delivery of innovative mentoring programmes for practitioner audiences.

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

COVID-19	Coronavirus disease 2019
CSPM	Conflict-sensitive programme management
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
DRR	Disaster risk reduction
EU	European Union
GBV	Gender-based violence
HDP nexus	Humanitarian-development-peace(building) nexus
IDP	Internally displaced person
INGO	International non-governmental organisation
LNOB	Leaving no-one behind
LRRD	Linking relief, rehabilitation, and development
MHPSS	Mental health and psychosocial support

MO	Member organisation
MSC	Most significant change (method)
NWoW	New way of working
OECD-DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PDC	Personnel development cooperation
PO	(Local) partner organisation
PSEAH	Protection from sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal of the 2023 Agenda for Sustainable Development
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
VUCA	Volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous
WHS	World Humanitarian Summit

List of Tables

Navigating the Triple Nexus

—

1. Introduction

The concept of the "triple nexus," integrating humanitarian, development, and peace-and-security concerns, has become a cornerstone of international aid discourse. It serves as both a reporting requirement for many donors, including the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), and a guiding principle for programme design and implementation. This study examines the diverse understandings, practices, and aspirations related to the nexus within Unité's member organisations (MOs) and their in-country partner organisations (POs), with a particular focus on the unique positioning of Unité as an umbrella association facilitating development cooperation via the strengthening of POs, notably through the exchange of volunteer personnel (see Unité 2024).

The terms of reference for this mandate outlined several key objectives:

- To capitalise on concrete nexus-related experiences within Unité's ecosystem;

- To identify and showcase good practices;

- To provide actionable suggestions on how "nexus thinking" can be appropriated by MOs and POs of varying sizes and capacities; and

- To reinforce a shared understanding of the triple nexus concept among Unité's constituencies.

While this study is primarily intended for Unité's internal audience, its findings and reflections – made publicly available – may also hold value for a broader range of actors engaged in development cooperation, both in Switzerland and internationally.

1.1. Study design and methodology

The research was structured in several phases, ensuring a comprehensive and participatory approach. Following an inception phase that included detailed discussions with the Unité Secretariat, the consultant reviewed an extensive array of Unité-related documentation. This included, with explicit permission from MOs, access to internal programming and reporting materials.

Building on the insights from this desk research, a short online survey was developed in two tailored versions – one for MOs and another for POs – and translated into three languages (English, French, and Spanish). The Unité Secretariat distributed the survey to MO focal points, who were encouraged to share it with their in-country teams and

POs. Nearly 60 responses were collected, forming the foundation for over 20 in‑depth interviews conducted either face‑to‑face or online.

Preliminary findings were summarised in a short insights paper, which was presented to MOs during an online workshop. Subsequently, a draft of the full study was circulated more broadly among MOs and POs for feedback and validation. Throughout the process, the anonymity of respondents was prioritised, and confidentiality was upheld during interviews. In this report, no individuals are cited by name or organisation to preserve this commitment.

A terminological note: throughout this report, the term "volunteer" refers to all forms of unremunerated assignments that fall under the Personnel Development Cooperation (PDC) framework (see Perold et al. 2020: 7 for a similar approach). Within Unité and its MOs, a distinction is made between "professional volunteers" and "learning volunteers" (trainees, culture/sensitisation exchanges) – with all those implicated by MOs in the work described in this study being qualified professionals. Other commonly used terms used include "*Fachleute*" (German), "*cooperantes*" (Spanish), "*volontaires professionnel(le)s*" and "*coopérant(e)s*" (French), as well as "co‑workers" and "development workers."

1.2. Structure of the report

The study is organised into six sections. Following this introductory overview is an eclectic exploration of the origins of the triple nexus terminology, informed by the consultant's professional journey over the past decade. This background sets the stage for Sections 3 and 4, which delve into the two primary linkages within the nexus framework: first, the humanitarian‑development interface, and second, the development‑peace(building) connection.

Section 3 examines the practicalities of engaging with the humanitarian community during emergencies, offering guidance on effective collaboration while cautioning against potential "mission drift." Section 4 shifts focus to peace‑related activities, exploring the merits of the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 vocabulary ("peaceful, just and inclusive societies"), and advocating for a reimagining of Unité's third, "systemic" effects level to better capture local and community‑level impacts.

Section 5 underscores the importance of conflict sensitivity in Unité's operational contexts, presenting a case for the integration of conflict‑sensitive programme management (CSPM) as a cornerstone of nexus thinking. Finally, Section 6 offers concluding reflections and a series of recommended action points for advancing Unité's engagement with the triple nexus.

To support readers, in‑text references provide a curated selection of accessible resources for further exploration, emphasising publicly available documents. These references as well as additional reading suggestions are compiled in an annotated list of "bibliographic resources" found at the end of this report.

1.3. Report highlights

1. With many POs increasingly operating in contexts affected by conflict, political upheaval, and/or (primarily climate change-induced) natural disasters, providing punctual humanitarian assistance has become an inevitable reality – even if it is not explicitly reflected in organisational mandates, results frameworks, or programming budgets. However, these emergency responses can have lasting implications for development interventions, influencing community resilience, trust in institutions, and long-term stability. When local staff, project participants, or community members face urgent needs, offering assistance is often perceived as the "obvious" and "natural" thing to do.

2. There is likely far more peace-related work taking place within Unité's eco-system than is currently acknowledged. However, with "anecdotal" micro-level evidence not easily translatable into quantitative impact indicators (the "attribution gap"), many of these valuable contributions remain under-reported. Encouraging MOs to report on SDG 16 and promoting qualitative monitoring and data collection methods – such as outcome harvesting, most significant change (MSC), and participatory storytelling – could help shift the reporting mindset to better capture these efforts.

3. "Triple nexus thinking" does not have to be perceived as an additional, donor-driven reporting burden. If staff embrace conflict sensitivity and incorporate basic conflict analysis tools into routine office practices and staff meetings, reflecting on how programmes interact with the humanitarian and peace(building) spaces can become a daily habit. For example, simple mapping exercises or "do no harm" checklists can be integrated into existing team discussions without adding bureaucratic workload. Moreover, this approach is not data-heavy, costly, or time-consuming.

2. Conceptual origins and perspectives

The "triple nexus," or HDP nexus – a term used interchangeably throughout this study – represents a conceptual synthesis of various political and programmatic shifts undertaken by donors and, subsequently, implementing organisations since the early 2000s. The roots of this approach can be traced to longstanding efforts to optimise international aid delivery, exemplified by milestones such as the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. However, a pivotal moment came with the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit (WHS), which introduced the "Grand Bargain" to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of aid, emphasising the localisation of response efforts and capacity building at the national level.

The WHS also introduced the "New Way of Working" (NWoW) for protracted crises – settings characterised inter alia by entrenched violent conflict, large-scale population displacement, ecological challenges, and climate-induced disasters, where traditional distinctions between war and peace are increasingly blurred. These crises see humanitarian and development actors working in parallel and, in many cases, tackling overlapping priorities. Humanitarian agencies increasingly go beyond immediate relief to engage in longer-term resilience-building and livelihood support, with disaster risk

reduction (DRR) and the European Union's Linking Relief, Rehabilitation, and Development (LRRD) approach being some of the conceptual precursors. The NWoW formalised the call for closer collaboration between humanitarian and development actors, encouraging alignment toward long-term collective outcomes that leverage their respective strengths and prioritise local capacities. The 2016 WHS is thus widely credited with enshrining the terminology of the "humanitarian-development (double) nexus."

2.1. Sustaining peace

Simultaneously, the peacebuilding agenda within the United Nations underwent significant soul-searching. The 10-year review of the UN peacebuilding architecture in 2015 revealed critical shortcomings, prompting the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 2282 in 2016, which introduced the concept of "sustaining peace." The proposed paradigm shift expanded peacebuilding beyond a post-conflict activity, framing it as a continuum that begins with prevention and preparedness, and encompasses efforts to establish conditions for good governance. The UN Secretary-General, António Guterres, has since positioned "sustaining peace" as a cornerstone of his agenda, emphasising conflict prevention and violence mitigation as key priorities. The focus on "durable solutions" for internally displaced persons (IDPs) is part of this narrative (see Nguya and Siddiqui 2020).

"Sustaining peace" also aligns closely with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, particularly SDG 16, which calls for peaceful, just, and inclusive societies. This interplay between development and peace-and-security concerns – following years of debate over whether security precedes development, or if chronic under-development drives insecurity – culminated in the OECD-DAC's 2019 proposal of the triple nexus concept, bringing together humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding approaches (OECD 2019). The OECD-DAC outlined three key areas of action:

1. **Coordination:** Joint analyses, empowered leadership, and political will to bridge gaps across sectors.

2. **Programming:** Collaborative approaches emphasising prevention, inclusion, LNOB (Leave No One Behind), and the strengthening of local and national capacities (so-called "localisation").

3. **Financing:** Evidence-based HDP financing strategies, featuring predictable, flexible, and multi-year funding.

2.2. Concerns and scepticism

While the triple nexus narrative rapidly gained traction among donors like SDC (see SDC 2023) and institutions such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), which now hosts a "Nexus Academy," it also encountered scepticism – particularly within the humanitarian community. Humanitarian actors have expressed concerns that aligning with the nexus could compromise their neutrality and impartiality, particularly in conflict-affected contexts where "stabilisation" agendas, rooted in military strategies stemming from interventions in places such as Afghanistan and Iraq, have become increasingly *en vogue*: many UN integrated country missions, from Mali

to Haiti, began featuring the term "stabilisation" in their mission titles, and examples of stabilisation programming, such as those led by UNDP in the Sahel and Lake Chad Basin, illustrate this growing ambition to transcend humanitarian, development, and peace silos in favour of more comprehensive approaches.

Development actors, meanwhile, fear that the triple nexus could divert funding from their core mandates. This concern was echoed by respondents in this study (see Section 3), who noted that humanitarian funding often receives greater political support, while development cooperation remains more contested in debates such as those in the Swiss Federal Parliament. Despite these apprehensions, the realities on the ground reveal considerable overlap: humanitarian actors often engage in livelihood support and resilience-building in protracted crises, while development actors increasingly operate in settings sliding back into emergencies. This convergence suggests that the triple nexus may be less about creating new mandates and more about strategically leveraging comparative advantages across sectors.

2.3. Embracing the nexus narrative

At its core, the triple nexus narrative does not intend to blur the lines between the humanitarian, development, and peace-and-security spaces, nor imply that implementers must address all three dimensions simultaneously. Rather, it offers a framework for clarifying roles and responsibilities in complex settings where actors from the three fields often operate in parallel. The world's crises – ranging from evolving armed conflicts to ecological disasters and rising authoritarianism – are increasingly interconnected, reflecting the volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) nature of today's global environment. In such contexts, the traditional "development setting" is no longer the norm, necessitating a rethinking of intervention spaces and modalities. The triple nexus narrative is an invitation to do so.

To now reiterate and expand on the objectives of this study: the following sections aim to capture the diverse perspectives on the triple nexus within Unité's ecosystem, addressing concerns, clarifying misconceptions, and synthesising the experiences and good practices gathered through data collection. These perspectives range from viewing the nexus as peripheral "background noise," lacking the resources or capacity to address locally, to advocating for a comprehensive rethinking of Unité's programming strategies, particularly in relation to volunteer deployment. While some MOs have embraced the "nexus logic" to enhance their agility and adaptability, others remain cautious, citing risks of mission drift and donor distractions from core mandates. Additionally, many in-country respondents, including POs, country coordinators, and volunteers, are still relatively unfamiliar with nexus terminology.

It is hoped that this study – and the dialogue it has fostered across the Unité ecosystem – represents a modest yet meaningful step toward greater sensitisation and operational alignment with the triple nexus and the programming vision it entails.

3.   Linkages between development cooperation and humanitarian assistance

Regardless of their familiarity with the triple nexus terminology, nearly all respondents underscored the importance of continuously monitoring the situational dynamics of conflict and disasters. This is particularly pertinent given the increasing socio-economic and political instability in countries where Unité's MOs operate, compounded not least by exacerbated climate fragility risks. Across most programming contexts, the connection between humanitarian and development work was evident and often described as an "organic" aspect of daily realities.

When emergencies occur, POs frequently pause project implementation to provide immediate humanitarian assistance, typically modest in scope, within their available means, and wherever possible involving their volunteer staff – from abroad as well as, importantly, involving local volunteers. This response was widely perceived as "obvious" and the "natural thing to do," especially in cases involving natural disasters (e.g., flooding, earthquakes), pandemics (e.g., COVID-19), food insecurity, or shortages of essential medical supplies, including for displaced populations. Survey respondents and interviewees shared compelling examples of POs stepping in during crises. These included providing food aid, shelter, and non-food items to street children and even PO staff during COVID-19 lockdowns, draining floodwaters, offering trauma counselling, supplying kits and disinfectants to under-resourced public schools during the pandemic, or transforming schools into temporary soup kitchens for internally displaced persons (IDPs).

"Following the passage of two devastating hurricanes that destroyed many homes in the Atlantic Coast region of Nicaragua (in late 2021), AMCA, in collaboration with a Swiss network in solidarity with Central America and local partners, acted immediately, raising and redirecting resources to support the reconstruction of affected homes. This type of intervention was not part of the programme's original plan, but thanks to our presence in the region and strong relationships with local NGOs, we were able to quickly coordinate assistance and contribute to the reconstruction of homes, providing affected communities with a short-term solution." (AMCA survey respondent, October 2024; translated from the original Spanish).

A key observation emerging from these examples is that most of these activities are spontaneous, driven by the immediate hardships witnessed by POs in their communities. Respondents frequently framed this response in moral terms: "How can one stand by and watch an emergency unfold without offering help?"

3.1.   Strategic positioning in humanitarian contexts

Some POs, however, have deliberately emphasised humanitarian dimensions for strategic positioning or fundraising purposes, a phenomenon highlighted by several MO respondents. For instance, POs working with IDPs in Burkina Faso have shifted their geographic focus to address the needs of displaced populations. While such adjustments are often seen as empowering local partners and championing localisation and the decolonisation of aid, some interviewees raised concerns about POs appearing to "follow the money" (for a broader discussion of the challenges around financing the nexus, see Poole 2019). This critique reflects a broader trend: private donors, particularly those accessed through church networks, are often more inclined to support

humanitarian crises (e.g., earthquakes) than to fund core organisational costs or long-term development projects.

Rather than pointing the finger at the triple nexus narrative for this dynamic, however, it can be argued that the nexus provides an opportunity to address these concerns more consciously and refocus on the core mandates of development organisations.

3.2. Navigating conflict-affected settings

The connection between humanitarian and development work is less obvious in settings affected by violent conflict or political upheaval, as opposed to natural disasters – risk anticipation and early-warning mechanisms are moreover weaker in conflict environments than for natural hazards, making programming adaptation even more challenging (see Zamore 2019). In recent years, some of Unité's MOs have ceased their on-the-ground presence due to insecurity, withdrawing volunteers from conflict zones (e.g., Lebanon), relocating them from rural areas to safer urban centres (e.g., Burkina Faso), or rethinking collaborative modalities in response to political instability (e.g., El Salvador) – often at the behest of the PO.

In acute conflict situations, duty of care and security considerations make continued development activities untenable. However, most MOs and their POs operate in complex "protracted crises" (e.g., Haiti, Chad), where the lines between armed conflict and peace are blurred. These settings often generate a "grey zone" where local conflict dynamics create overlaps between long-term development work and more immediate humanitarian relief.

"Development and humanitarian actions coexist — sometimes intertwining unintentionally, other times coming together voluntarily — within the activities of our partners, as this reflects the reality in which they operate. This reality must be taken into account in how we accompany and support our partners: remaining attentive to their needs and adapting our practices based on what is expressed from the field."
(E-CHANGER survey respondent, October 2024; translated from the French original).

Respondents agreed that "nexus thinking" is particularly valuable in such contexts – not to fundamentally change an organisation's core mission but to enable a more nuanced understanding of the humanitarian-development continuum. This includes recognising opportunities for DRR and resilience-building, for example. Importantly, many respondents emphasised that nexus thinking does not necessarily mean engaging in humanitarian work directly. Instead, it involves collaborating with other actors operating in the same space, whether through forums, experience-sharing, or partnerships.

3.3. Volunteer deployment considerations

Unité's distinctive focus on volunteer deployment adds a crucial dimension to these discussions. Interviewees stressed that volunteers cannot – and should not – be sent into conflict zones where conditions have spiralled out of control (e.g., Sudan or Eastern DRC). The more fragile the setting, the harder it becomes to recruit suitable volunteers, as practical concerns such as age, family circumstances, and safety regulations come into play. In some instances (e.g., Cameroon), recent deployment requests have been denied outright by Swiss civil service authorities due to security concerns.

Furthermore, volunteers do not typically possess humanitarian profiles, nor are Unité's MOs or POs institutionally geared for sustained humanitarian assistance. In some cases, MOs have opted to operate in crisis-affected regions without volunteers, as seen in Syria and Lebanon.

While the triple nexus does not alter these parameters, it offers a framework for addressing key interrelated considerations:

1. **Strategic complementarity:** Based on regular stakeholder analysis, how can our contributions complement those of other organisations operating across the HDP continuum? What is our unique value to target communities, and how might this involve, for instance, integrating IDPs into our programming (e.g. by providing them with trauma counselling, access to education and healthcare, as well as income-generating opportunities)?

2. **Tactical flexibility:** How can projects adapt to and be flexible in the face of volatile conditions? Instead of seeing humanitarian and development projects to be at loggerheads with each other, where could our (modest) contribution have the most impact along the continuum in periods of crisis? What opportunities exist, via our networks, to mobilise additional resources, such as private donors, to address emergent needs (e.g. to raise additional funds to help youths with their daily needs following an earthquake)?

3. **Risk management:** What local discussion forums, contacts and data sources are available to help anticipate and prepare for shocks, minimising disruptions to ongoing activities and volunteer safety? How can the evacuation and/or relocation of staff be avoided – and if not, how can they nonetheless continue to strengthen collaborative ties between MO and PO?

As will be emphasised further in Section 5 below, underlying such reflections is conflict sensitivity: without it becoming a laborious, time-consuming and data-driven exercise, the continuous analysis of changing situational dynamics, the mapping of actors and stakeholders, and the identification of conflict drivers and amplifiers can quite rewardingly become part of the daily routines of MO and PO staff members.

3.4. Key "do's and don'ts" for humanitarian–development linkages

In this vein, and in a very tentative and by no means exhaustive manner, it is worth outlining some of the "do's and don'ts" for Unité's MOs and POs in order to clarify linkages between humanitarian and development work further. These are based primarily on the interviews and discussions held for the purpose of this study, as well as on the consultant's prior nexus experience in other institutional contexts. The example used is one of severe flooding that has affected the district in which a PO is active:

Possible Actions	What to Avoid
Provide punctual, localised support (e.g., food, shelter, draining floodwater) to flood victims.	Attempting sustained humanitarian relief requiring large-scale logistics or resources.
Support the continuation of education services during crises, such as by offering temporary learning spaces or integrating displaced children into existing schools.	Establishing parallel education structures that duplicate or compete with existing local education systems.
Assist flood-related IDPs in resettling and promoting tolerance in host communities.	Shifting target groups or geographic focus away from core mandates.
Enable volunteers to contribute based on their skills and maintain a presence.	"Rebranding" volunteers as humanitarian responders or recalibrate their roles.
Support volunteers to remain safely during emergencies, as a gesture of solidarity.	Compromising safety or security of volunteers or staff by encouraging undue risk-taking.
In the case of health projects: collaborate with humanitarian and government actors to provide essential medical supplies.	Assuming the role of primary health care providers for disaster victims.
Facilitate private donor contributions through existing networks (e.g., churches).	Acting as a humanitarian "donor" or "implementer," risking capacity overreach and mission drift.
Participate in local forums to identify vulnerable populations using an LNOB lens.	Taking on formal humanitarian coordination roles and responsibilities.
Integrate climate resilience and disaster preparedness into programming to reduce vulnerability to future shocks (e.g., flood-resistant housing, drought-resistant crops).	Treating disasters as isolated events rather than part of broader structural vulnerabilities requiring long-term adaptation strategies.

Table 1: Key "do's and don'ts" for humanitarian-development linkages

In sum, respondents emphasised the versatility of volunteer deployments, which can be adjusted to suit rapidly evolving contexts. While shorter deployments (two to four months, or at times even less) offer agility, longer deployments allow volunteers to become embedded in local communities, enhancing their ability to weather crises alongside POs and host communities.

4. Linkages between development cooperation and peace(building)

While the humanitarian-development linkage resonates broadly with respondents, the connection to the "P" of the triple nexus elicited more varied reactions. Some respondents identified a clear peacebuilding component in their work, often aligned with an implicit theory of change centred on strengthening "social cohesion." This approach, reflected in Unité documents, underscores the relational and community-focused dimensions of peace. Others, however, were more cautious, describing peace-related elements as "latent" or "invisible."

Several respondents emphasised that peace – whether viewed through religious or secular lenses – begins with the individual and is thus a relational concept shaping interpersonal attitudes and behaviours. This perspective starkly contrasts with many humanitarian actors, who often approach the nexus warily, concerned that the "P" might involve "taking sides," thereby compromising the neutrality and impartiality foundational to humanitarian principles (for a discussion see: DuBois 2020). Yet for many of Unité's MOs and their POs, mediating between conflicting parties, addressing local disputes, and mitigating communal tensions are integral to their work.

4.1.   Peacebuilding and SDG 16

When prompted, respondents generally agreed that the framing of SDG 16 ("peaceful, just and inclusive societies") could enhance the visibility and recognition of their peace-related activities. Peacebuilding was frequently described as a process of reducing violence and countering the marginalisation and exclusion that drive local conflicts. Many examples highlighted the micro-level, often informal, nature of this work, which tends to be overlooked in standardised results frameworks. Activities cited included inter-religious exchanges and joint initiatives, identifying and supporting the most vulnerable populations, fostering inter-communal dialogue, providing mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS), and addressing legacies of conflict through reconciliation initiatives.

"Our daily work aligns closely with SDG 16 and actively contributes to peace. By working with street-connected children and youths, their families, and the broader Gulu community, we help reduce violence and support youth rehabilitation by addressing the root causes of violence in young people's lives and reconnecting them with their families and communities. We promote non-discrimination and social inclusion by fighting stigma and supporting social reintegration. We strengthen accountable and inclusive institutions by collaborating with local leaders and building their capacity to understand and address the needs of children and youth. We enhance access to justice and establish mediation structures by offering mediation services that help families resolve conflicts constructively. Lastly, we create foundations for lasting peace and community resilience by empowering young people to see themselves as active, positive contributors to society and supporting families in overcoming challenges and reuniting, thus reinforcing the social fabric of the community" (Survey respondent from Hashtag Gulu, Uganda, PO of Eirene Switzerland).

Respondents repeatedly emphasised that the "P" of the nexus is as much about prevention and preparedness as it is about post-conflict peacebuilding. Indeed, much of this work predates any formal engagement with the triple nexus concept, underscoring its foundational role in Unité's approach.

4.2.   Contributions to peacebuilding

Given the wide array of practices and activities associated with peacebuilding, respondents suggested that a rigid definition of "peace" may not be useful for Unité's purposes. Instead, a more flexible approach allows organisations to adapt their contributions based on specific programming contexts (for a recent discussion see Brown et al. 2024). The following list highlights possible ways to contribute to peaceful, just, and inclusive societies, as identified during the study:

- Providing MHPSS and various forms of trauma care to help individuals and communities address the past.

- Mediating and mitigating community tensions (e.g., through inter-religious collaborations).

- Creating platforms for dialogue and exchange to foster tolerance and peaceful coexistence.

- Promoting trust and social cohesion by sustaining local civil society structures (e.g., through long-term volunteer deployment).

- Reducing interpersonal violence, including gender-based violence (GBV), through interventions at the school, parish, or community level.

- Providing safe spaces and support for survivors of violence.

- Strengthening relational and interpersonal skills by supporting the "whole individual" through school and community initiatives.

- Building trust and reducing tensions between IDPs and host communities.

- Supporting the reintegration of prisoners and former members of armed groups into society.

- Engaging in advocacy and raising awareness on legislative reforms and rights-based issues.

- Facilitating joint activities and exchanges between confessional and public schools.

- Ensuring continuity of essential services (e.g., education and healthcare) during crises to strengthen community resilience.

This list is illustrative rather than exhaustive, as peace-related efforts vary widely depending on the context. Moreover, it is important to avoid defining every development activity as inherently peacebuilding, which could dilute the concept and make it too broad for practical application.

"The MET and its partners pay particular attention to conflicts, especially ethnic conflicts or those between herders and farmers. For example, a pastor from the Assemblées Évangéliques au Tchad (AET) movement was integrated into the mediation team set up by the state following ethnic clashes in the Mangalmé region between farmers and herders, which resulted in 25 deaths in 2022. Additionally, at the request of the Chadian government, the president of AET participated in the Inclusive National Dialogue, demonstrating the important role of religious authorities in decision-making bodies aimed at achieving lasting peace in Chad. As is already the case, boarding schools in Guéra welcome both Christian and Muslim students. Those in charge ensure that dormitories are shared by students from both religions so that they learn to live together." (Survey respondent from Mission Evangélique au Tchad (MET), October 2024; translated from the French original).

As in the previous section, the following table outlines key "do's and don'ts" regarding potential peace-related activities:

Possible Actions	What to Avoid
Mediate family or interpersonal community disputes, e.g., through schools, local elders, or religious leaders.	Becoming a formal or routine adjudicator in justice matters.
Foster inter-religious and interfaith dialogue to promote a culture of tolerance.	Acting as a spokesperson for a particular faith or promoting partisan or polarising worldviews.
Engage in community networks to anticipate risks and prevent tensions from escalating (conflict sensitivity).	Assuming a convening role in establishing and managing early warning and early response systems.
Contribute to social cohesion by identifying marginalised and vulnerable groups and advocating for their meaningful integration into community life.	Taking on peacebuilding functions that exceed the organisation's mission and mandate.
Support youth-led initiatives that promote dialogue, civic engagement, and conflict resolution at the community level.	Encouraging youth activism in a way that may expose them to political risks or securitised environments beyond the organisation's protective scope.
Strengthen women's participation in community decision-making and peacebuilding efforts, ensuring gender-sensitive approaches in programming.	Tokenising women's involvement without addressing systemic barriers to their meaningful participation in peace and governance structures.
Support livelihoods and vocational training programmes that provide at-risk populations with economic alternatives, reducing incentives for participation in violence or illicit activities.	Framing economic support explicitly as a conflict-prevention tool in politically sensitive settings, which may create backlash or suspicions of external interference.
Engage in advocacy efforts that promote legal awareness and protection of vulnerable groups, ensuring that communities are informed about their rights.	Taking on a direct lobbying role that positions the organisation as an opposition actor in politically sensitive environments.
Foster collective healing by creating discussion forums to address past grievances.	Becoming a formal actor in transitional or restorative justice mechanisms that go beyond programmatic scope.
Provide punctual trauma counselling for violence survivors among project participants.	Overextending capacities by taking on a formal medical provider role in the realm of MHPSS.

Table 2: Key "do's and don'ts" for peace-related activities

4.3.   Challenges in reporting

Despite the wealth of peace-related activities MOs and their POs are involved in, respondents acknowledged significant underreporting of such work. Key challenges include:

1. **Lack of explicit engagement:** Some MOs place the emphasis on other SDGs rather than SDG 16, frequently citing limited data or reporting capacities. While some MOs champion SDG 16 and place social cohesion at the core of their programming, others focus on different priorities.

2. **Hesitancy to report anecdotally:** Many respondents were reluctant to report "minimal" or localised contributions, such as the social cohesion effects of operating a clinic or distributing medical supplies. Concerns over the "attribution gap" were also common, with fears that incomplete reporting might appear "mediocre" to donors ("better not to report at all than to appear to not be doing enough").

3. **Systemic vs. micro-level impacts:** Unité's current templates encourage reporting on systemic change (the third "effects level"), which some respondents argued is difficult to demonstrate at the grassroots level. This third point is worth exploring further in the sub-section below.

4.4. Adjusting the systemic level of reporting

Respondents repeatedly suggested that Unité's third, "systemic" level in the effects reporting template could benefit from adjustments. Specifically, there is a need to enable a more nuanced, micro-level appreciation of what constitutes "systemic change" under SDG 16, while still aligning with donor requirements. The prevailing focus on regional or national impacts often overshadows meaningful, localised contributions that collectively underpin broader systemic transformations.

As one respondent noted, "it takes a lot of courage to interpret 'systemic' on the grassroots level." This observation highlights both the challenges and opportunities of redefining systemic change to reflect the realities of community-level interventions. Localised activities – whether through fostering social cohesion, promoting trust among communities, or reducing interpersonal violence – may not always align with traditional macro-level indicators, but they play a critical role in laying the foundations for sustainable peace and inclusive development.

Reframing systemic change to include grassroots-level impacts could address several gaps in current reporting practices:

1. **Recognition of local contributions:** Micro-level initiatives, such as fostering dialogue between IDPs and host communities or supporting interfaith collaborations, are often underreported despite their significant role in mitigating conflict and promoting inclusivity.

2. **Alignment with SDG 16:** Localised actions that reduce marginalisation, enhance access to justice, and build community resilience are central to SDG 16's vision of peaceful, just, and inclusive societies. Including these contributions in systemic reporting would better reflect their importance.

3. **Enhanced credibility:** By capturing tangible, community-driven outcomes, reporting frameworks can present a more comprehensive and credible narrative of systemic change that resonates with both donors and local stakeholders.

To achieve this shift, respondents suggested greater integration of qualitative reporting tools, such as the Most Significant Change (MSC) method. Such tools, which also include participatory storytelling and outcome harvesting, for instance, allow organisations to document transformative stories and examples that may not fit into traditional quantitative metrics but nonetheless illustrate significant progress toward systemic goals.

For example, the MSC method could highlight how:

- A community-based reconciliation initiative reduced tensions between rival groups.

- Trauma counselling services helped individuals rebuild their lives and reengage with their communities.

- Grassroots advocacy led to policy changes or improved local governance structures.

Such narratives can provide a richer understanding of systemic change, complementing quantitative data and offering a more holistic perspective on Unité's impact.

4.5. Balancing jargon and localisation

Reporting challenges extend beyond Unité, with respondents frequently voicing concerns about the burden of donor-centric terminology, including the triple nexus. Small MOs with limited staff capacities often struggle to synthesise diverse PO contributions across multiple countries. One MO representative shared an innovative approach of simplifying Unité's reporting templates into a series of straightforward questions for POs to answer. This practice may resonate with other organisations facing similar challenges.

A recurring critique was the potential conflict between donor-driven jargon and localisation efforts. For some respondents, the triple nexus represents yet another instance where bureaucratic processes overshadow substantive work, diverting attention from in-country efforts. Communicating nexus-related concepts to private donors also proved challenging, as these audiences often prioritise tangible, immediate outcomes over conceptual frameworks.

5. "Triple nexus thinking" via a conflict sensitivity mindset

While the previous two sections explored humanitarian-development (H-D) linkages and development-peace (D-P) opportunities, adopting a genuine "triple nexus" approach – integrating humanitarian, development, and peace(building) efforts – raises additional considerations. Positioned at the intersection of these three domains, development actors often look "backward" toward humanitarian response and "forward" toward peacebuilding. However, this framing assumes a degree of programmatic linearity that does not reflect the realities of fragile and conflict-affected contexts. As

discussed in Section 2, these contexts are characterised by humanitarian, development, and peace actors operating in parallel – often without sufficient coordination to ensure coherence, complementarity, and synergy. In this sense, the H-D-P sequence is largely arbitrary and must be rethought in more dynamic and context-sensitive ways.

At the heart of triple nexus thinking is the recognition of these operational complexities – starting with the acknowledgment that actors from the other two sectors are often engaged in overlapping efforts. Ensuring that programming does not exacerbate tensions or create unintended harm ("do no harm") is a fundamental principle, but maximising positive impact requires a deeper level of conflict sensitivity. This involves the systematic use of conflict analysis tools, including stakeholder mapping, network analysis, and contextual risk assessments (see CSC 2012, Oliva 2016, UNSDG 2016).

Although conflict-sensitive program management (CSPM) is often perceived as donor-driven jargon, respondents in this study largely welcomed the consultant's advocacy for CSPM as a means of making the triple nexus more practice-oriented rather than purely theoretical. While many respondents, particularly those working in-country, initially stated that they were unfamiliar with CSPM as a formal organisational approach, follow-up discussions revealed their deep, context-specific understanding of local complexities. This is an encouraging finding, suggesting that CSPM principles are already being applied, even if they are not always recognised as such within organisational day-to-day practice.

5.1. Perceptions and challenges

A reluctance to embrace CSPM further may stem from the way it is often presented – through formal training courses and modules offered by INGOs, think tanks, and research institutions (including in Switzerland). These sessions can leave trainees with the impression that conflict analysis is an arduous, resource-intensive, and data-heavy process, making it seem unfeasible for POs with limited capacities.

Respondents observed that CSPM is frequently perceived as an additional item on an already overwhelming list of donor requirements, alongside gender responsiveness, PSEAH, localisation and LNOB, among others. This accumulation of themes risks overburdening organisations, leading to a scenario where "everything is done a little, but nothing properly." While volunteers receive basic training in conflict sensitivity as part of their deployment preparations (alongside duty of care, security protocols, and protection measures), some respondents felt that imposing such capacities on POs was unrealistic. For others, however, conflict sensitivity was already a cornerstone of their programme design and implementation – not least because POs will tend to have greater situational awareness and in-depth localised knowledge than volunteers or MO staff.

Discussions with in-country respondents confirmed that CSPM is widely practiced as a "mindset" or "état d'esprit," even if it is not explicitly labelled as such. This approach acknowledges the importance of understanding and navigating societal fault lines and conflict dynamics, emphasising that "conflict" should not be conflated with (armed) "violence." Viewed through the lens of "positive peace," conflict can be understood as an intrinsic – and not necessarily destructive – aspect of interpersonal and collective interactions.

"In CSPM, the term "conflict" refers to a situation of tensions or disputes between different groups or actors, which may have political, social, economic, or cultural causes. These conflicts can manifest themselves in various ways, ranging from latent disagreements to situations of active violence, negatively impacting development and social cohesion. CSPM emphasizes the importance of analyzing and understanding these conflicts in order to design programmes that not only avoid intensifying tensions but also promote peaceful resolution and contribute to peacebuilding." (Survey respondent of the Asociacion Cristiana Menonita de Justicia, Paz y Acción Noviolenta - Justapaz, PO of Comundo in Colombia; translated from the Spanish original).

This broader definition implies that conflict sensitivity is not limited to "war zones." It applies equally to mitigating tensions within teams (e.g., over budget cuts), avoiding conflicts of interest among project participants, and understanding the dynamics among societal stakeholders, including donors.

5.2. Integrating CSPM into Unité's frameworks

Currently, the triple nexus and CSPM remain largely separate elements within Unité's multi-year programming and reporting frameworks. However, there is significant potential to strengthen their linkages, ensuring that conflict sensitivity serves as a practical vehicle for "nexus thinking."

While not every staff member needs to become a conflict analyst, enhancing capacities in CSPM is crucial, as it intersects with multiple aspects of programme design and monitoring – from participant selection to LNOB and risk analysis. More importantly, conflict sensitivity provides a structured entry point for embedding triple nexus thinking by prompting critical questions that guide strategic decision-making.

One such area of application is Unité's hallmark: the deployment of volunteers. In fragile contexts that deviate from traditional development cooperation settings, a conflict-sensitive mindset challenges us to rethink collaboration modalities between MOs and POs, as well as the parameters for volunteer deployment. Some key considerations include:

- **Contextual relevance:** What situational dynamics in my operating environment extend beyond the boundaries of development cooperation?

- **Engagement with other actors:** Who are the humanitarian and peace actors in my space, and how do I – and our participants – engage with them?

- **Deployment strategy:** Does it make sense to deploy volunteers from Switzerland in this fragile setting, or would collaborating with local personnel be more appropriate?

- **Volunteer profiles and skills:** What specific skill sets should volunteers possess to address the unique challenges of fragile environments?

- **Deployment duration and flexibility:** How can deployment durations be optimised to balance adaptability with long-term impact?

- **Budgetary responsiveness:** What financial flexibility could enhance the agility of deployment strategies in rapidly evolving contexts?

- **Strengthening local capacities:** How can PO capacities be reinforced to complement volunteer efforts sustainably?

As one respondent aptly noted, "conflict sensitivity is key for sustainability" – without it, interventions may not outlast periods of crisis or endure over the long term.

5.3.   Small steps toward a conflict-sensitive mindset

Achieving a conflict-sensitive mindset will require "small, incremental steps" rather than sweeping changes. Respondents emphasised the importance of adopting a mentoring approach, rather than relying solely on formal training. The role of the MO, and particularly the country coordinator, is central to this process, acting as a "midwife" to be in dialogue with POs in efforts to integrate conflict sensitivity into their daily practices.

Practical steps to foster this mindset might include:

- **Localised guidance:** Providing context-specific mentorship that aligns with the realities faced by POs, rather than generic training modules.

- **Simplified tools:** Developing user-friendly tools for conflict analysis that focus on practicality and relevance, minimising the perception of CSPM as overly complex.

- **Participatory approaches:** Encouraging POs to identify and address conflict drivers collaboratively, leveraging their local knowledge and networks.

- **Integrated reporting:** Linking CSPM more explicitly to existing frameworks, such as LNOB or gender responsiveness, to highlight its cross-cutting nature.

By embedding conflict sensitivity into project management through these incremental changes, Unité's MOs and their respective POs can move toward a more robust nexus approach that is both practical and sustainable.

5.4.   Nexus thinking as a framework for localisation

This shift also opens the door to broader structural reflection – particularly on the central role of local actors in navigating complex environments and leading context-specific responses. As emphasised throughout this section, conflict sensitivity provides more than just a risk management lens — it is also a means of fostering agency and ownership among local actors. From this perspective, nexus thinking, when grounded in a conflict-sensitive mindset, offers a powerful framework for advancing localisation within Unité's ecosystem.

By encouraging organisations to think beyond sectoral silos, the triple nexus highlights the interconnectedness of humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding efforts. At the same time, it reinforces the importance of recognising the unique

mandates, capacities, and comparative advantages of each actor – particularly those of POs, whose proximity to the context equips them with vital knowledge and relationships.

The more fragile the setting, the more important it becomes to support POs not only as implementing partners, but as sovereign decision-makers, capable of navigating complex dynamics and adjusting strategies accordingly. Nexus thinking reinforces this shift by promoting collaboration, adaptive programming, and long-term investments in local capacities – all of which are prerequisites for effective engagement in volatile and uncertain environments.

Ultimately, localisation and nexus thinking are mutually reinforcing. One cannot effectively engage in triple nexus programming without privileging local leadership, and local leadership will increasingly rely on integrated, cross-sectoral approaches to confront today's multidimensional challenges.

6.   Concluding reflections and action points

Many Unité MOs and their partners have already integrated elements of nexus thinking into their approaches, as reflected in the 2025–2028 programming cycle and the findings of this study. In an era of global challenges – marked by complex crises involving human-made conflicts, authoritarian governance, and natural disasters – the triple nexus underscores the need for heightened situational awareness. In these complex environments, humanitarian, development, and peace(building) actors frequently operate in parallel, often within the same localities.

The triple nexus, when underpinned by a conflict-sensitive mindset, is not about uniformity of purpose. Rather, it encourages organisations to remain aware of one another – not necessarily to pursue identical objectives, but to coordinate and align efforts where relevant, thereby maximising impact and efficiency.

Although the triple nexus may initially appear aspirational, it need not remain confined to the realms of abstraction and theory. Nexus thinking is deeply pragmatic, offering a framework to navigate real-world complexities while ensuring that interventions are responsive, adaptive, and sustainable.

6.1.   A call for modesty

Far from advocating for programmatic expansion, increased reporting burdens, or budgetary overreach, nexus thinking calls for modesty. It requires acknowledgment of the intricacies and uncertainties of our VUCA world, as well as recognition of the humble yet significant roles that organisations and individuals play within it.

Respondents consistently highlighted the need to place local POs at the heart of programming. The triple nexus should not be seen as an additional chore but as an opportunity to empower local partners as autonomous, sovereign decision-makers, capable of charting their own strategic directions and priorities.

In today's increasingly constrained donor landscape – particularly for development cooperation – the triple nexus must avoid being perceived as yet another paternalistic imposition of "Northern" donor priorities on "Southern" partners. Instead, it should serve as a catalyst for dynamic risk management, financial independence, greater awareness of programming opportunities, and stronger localisation efforts. If properly implemented, nexus thinking has the potential to enhance local agency rather than undermine it.

6.2. Action points

To ensure that nexus thinking takes further root, the following practical steps are recommended:

1. **Regular actor mapping:** Encourage staff members in Switzerland and abroad to periodically take stock of "who's who" in intervention zones (see Oliva 2016: 71 and UNSDG 2016: 65-66 for details). The country coordinator and key PO staff should take the lead in this process.

2. **Consolidate networks:** Based on ongoing stakeholder analysis, ensure that your organisation is actively engaged in relevant discussion forums, working groups, and coordination platforms across the triple nexus.

3. **Apply basic conflict analysis tools:** Simple exercises such as "dividers and connectors" or the "multi-level triangle" (see CSC 2012, Annex 1) can be incorporated into team routines (e.g., Monday-morning staff meetings or monthly stocktaking). These exercises serve both as valuable analytical tools and as team-building mechanisms that require minimal resources.

4. **Foster organisational familiarity with the nexus:** Make the triple nexus a regular part of team discussions – the more it becomes embedded in daily conversations, the more natural it will feel in reporting and strategy development.

5. **Encourage micro-level reporting on peace contributions:** Small, community-level actions that promote social cohesion, prevention, or inclusion are often underreported – teams could further experiment with qualitative approaches such as the MSC method to help surface and validate these contributions.

6. **Reinforce localisation through decision-making and reporting:** Ensure that local POs are not only implementing activities, but also shaping programme strategies and reporting narratives. Nexus thinking should support POs in taking the lead on defining priorities and interpreting context, in line with their own visions and operational realities.

Bibliographic resources

The following is a curated selection of publicly available readings related to the themes explored in this report. While not exhaustive, this list aims to provide accessible references that offer deeper insights, country case studies, and a range of critical perspectives on the triple nexus. Most of the resources are in English, though several Francophone publications are also included.

In addition to serving as a reference for further reading, this resource list also functions as the bibliography for this report, encompassing all cited publications.

Beuret, Jean-Eudes and Yacouba Kanazoe, *Quelle coopération par l'échange des personnes pour le développment de l'agroécologie au Sahel, face aux situations de fragilités?* (2021), available at: https://unite-ch.org/media/download/38/736/CEP_agroécologie_au_Sahel_FR.pdf
> A Unité study, published in French, compiling best practices and challenges encountered by POs working in fragile contexts in the Sahel.

Beuret, Jean-Eudes and Daniele-Enrico Fino, *Phasing-in et phasing-out dans la Coopération au développement par l'échange de personnes* (2022), available at: https://unite-ch.org/media/download/38/736/Rapport_Final_PHASING_IN_OUT_FR.pdf
> A Unité study, published in French, providing an in-depth analysis of the dynamics surrounding the deployment of volunteers across various country settings.

Brown, Summer, Rodrigo Mena, and Sylvia Brown, "The peace dilemma in the triple nexus: challenges and opportunities for the humanitarian–development–peace approach", *Development in Practice*, 34(5), April 2024, pp. 568–584, available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2024.2334774
> This academic journal article critically examines the challenges of incorporating a peace perspective into the humanitarian-development nexus, drawing on project examples from Kenya, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Indonesia.

Brugger, Fritz, Joane Holliger and Simon J.A. Mason, *Triple Nexus in Fragile Contexts: Nexts Steps* (2022), available at: https://ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/nadel-dam/documents/research/policybriefs/ETH_NADEL_CSS_Policy_Brief_Triple_Nexus_%20Sept22.pdf
> This concise policy brief, published by the NADEL Centre for Development and Cooperation at ETH Zurich, provides an analytical overview and advocacy perspective on triple nexus programming.

Cassam-Chenaï, Florence L'Humanitaire dans la Globalisation. Discours de l'aide et enjeux du triptyque "Humanitaire / Développement /Paix et sécurité" au Sahel: construction d'une " success story"? (2020), available at: https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02612497
> This French-language working paper, published by the Fondation Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, critically examines the triple nexus narrative, using case studies from the Central Sahel.

Conflict Sensitivity Consortium (CSC), *How to guide to conflict sensitivity* (2012), available at: https://www.saferworld-global.org/resources/publications/646-how-to-guide-to-conflict-sensitivity
> This comprehensive guide explains how conflict sensitivity can be integrated throughout the programme cycle. An annex provides concise overviews of key conflict analysis tools.

DuBois, Marc, *The Triple Nexus – Threat or Opportunity for the Humanitarian Principles?* (2020), available at: https://www.chaberlin.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/2020-05-triple-nexus-threat-or-opportunity-dubois-en-1.pdf
> A critical reflection on the implications of nexus thinking for humanitarian action, published by the Centre for Humanitarian Action (CHA). The paper explores whether the nexus approach supports or undermines humanitarian principles.

Fanning, Emma and Jessica Fullwood-Thomas, "The Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus: What does it mean for multi-mandated organizations?", *Oxfam Discussion Paper* (2019), available at: https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/the-humanitarian-development-peace-nexus-what-does-it-mean-for-multi-mandated-o-620820/
>   This discussion paper provides a useful overview of the triple nexus concept and its practical implications for multi-mandated organisations. Available in both English and French.

Infante, Vittorio, "Transforming the Systems that Contribute to Fragility and Humanitarian Crises: Programming Across the Triple Nexus", *Oxfam Briefing Paper* (2021), available at: https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/transforming-the-systems-that-contribute-to-fragility-and-humanitarian-crises-p-621203/
>   Building on Oxfam's 2019 discussion paper (see Fanning and Fullwood-Thomas above), this briefing paper further explores the tensions and dilemmas Oxfam faces in implementing triple nexus programming. Available in English and French.

Nguya, Gloria and Nadia Siddiqui, "Triple Nexus Implementation and Implications for Durable Solutions for Internal Displacement: On Paper and in Practice", *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 39(4), December 2020, pp. 466–480, available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdaa018
>   This academic journal article provides a critical analysis of the conceptual linkages between the triple nexus and durable solutions for IDPs.

OECD, *DAC Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus, OECD/ LEGAL/5019* (2019), available at: https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/public/doc/643/643.en.pdf.
>   The full text of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) recommendation, referenced in Section 2, which formally enshrined the concept of the triple nexus into international development discourse.

Oliva, Fabio and Lorraine Charbonnier, *Conflict Analysis Handbook: A Field and Headquarters Guide to Conflict Assessments* (2016), available at: https://www.unssc.org/news-and-insights/resources/conflict-analysis-handbook
>   This comprehensive handbook, authored by experienced UN trainers and published by the United Nations System Staff College (UNSSC), details a variety of conflict analysis tools and includes an extensive bibliography. It is designed to be both accessible and practical for field and headquarters staff.

Perold, Helene, Cliff Allum, Ben Lough and Jacob Mwathi Mati, *Experiences of Unité volunteers in the 2020 pandemic* (2020), available at: https://unite-ch.org/media/download/38/736/Experiences_of_Unité_volunteers_in_the_2020_pandemic_EN.pdf
>   A Unité study, based on survey data, examining how MOs adapted to the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Perret, Liam, *Operationalizing the Humanitarian–Development–Peace Nexus: Lessons Learned from Colombia, Mali, Nigeria, Somalia and Turkey* (2019), available at: https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/operationalizing_hdpn.pdf
>   A study published by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), providing an in-depth discussion of key barriers and enablers in the operationalisation of the triple nexus.

Poole, Lydia, with Vance Culbert, *Financing the Nexus: Gaps and Opportunities from a Field Perspective* (2019), available at: https://www.nrc.no/resources/reports/financing-the-nexus-gaps-and-opportunities-from-a-field-perspective
>   Commissioned by the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), this study focuses on the potential for improved coordination between humanitarian and development funding streams, with a particular emphasis on Cameroon, Chad, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Ukraine.

Stroble, Jérôme, *Quelle coopération par échange des personnes pour la paix dans les contextes fragiles?* (2016), available at: https://unite-ch.org/media/download/38/736/Quelle_coopération_par_échange_de_per-sonnes_pour_la_paix_dans_les_contex_BRTyeqW.pdf
> A study published by Eirene Suisse and Unité, in French, exploring how volunteers can contribute to local peace initiatives, with insights drawn from experiences in the Great Lakes region.

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Report on the Learning Journey on the Triple Nexus (2023), available at: https://www.sdc-pge.ch/en/news-learning-journey-triple-nexus
> This report presents the outcomes of a reflection process in Bern aimed at developing a common understanding of the triple nexus within Swiss International Cooperation.

Unité, *Praxis*, various issues, available at: https://unite-ch.org/fr/Publications/praxis/
> Unité's magazine, published in English, French, and German, has covered themes related to fragility, the triple nexus, and related topics in several issues, including:
> - No. 16 (2023): *Migration et coopération au développement: Agir sur les causes, protéger les droits et offrir des perspectives*
> - No. 12 (2021): *Sécurité alimentaire au Sahel: Le potentiel de l'agroécologie dans les contextes fragiles*
> - No. 11 (2021): *Le triple nexus: Conjuger l'aide humanitaire, le développement et la paix*
> - No. 5 (2017): *Affectations dans les contextes fragiles: Potentiels et défis*

Unité, Standards de qualité pour la coopération par l'échange de personnes (2024), available at: https://unite-ch.org/fr/Publications/standards-dunite/
> One of Unité's core reference documents, available in French and German, outlining its quality standards and positioning on cooperation through personnel exchange, including its approach to fragile contexts and the triple nexus.

United Nations Sustainable Development Group (UNSDG), *Conducting a Conflict and Development Analysis Tool* (2016), available at: https://unsdg.un.org/resources/conducting-conflict-and-development-analysis-tool
> This comprehensive guide provides an "agency-neutral" approach to conflict analysis, offering real-world examples and detailed commentary on the stages of conflict assessment, along with guidance on when and why such analyses should be conducted.

Zamore, Leah, *The Triple Nexus in Practice: Toward a New Way of Working in Protracted and Repeated Crises* (2019), available at: https://cic.nyu.edu/wp-content/uploads/1662/65/triple-nexus-in-practice-nwow-full-december-2019-web.pdf
> A detailed review published by the Center for International Cooperation (CIC) at New York University (NYU), examining the implementation of the "New Way of Working" (NWoW) across multiple country contexts.

About us

For 60 years, Unité, the Swiss association for personnel exchange in development cooperation, has been monitoring the quality of professional volunteer assignments through standards, evaluations, institutional support, studies and training. It consists of 13 member organisations. In partnership with the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Unité is committed to an impactful, sustainable and equitable cooperation with partners in the South.

www.unite-ch.org